

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, May 30, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 205****The Crown Corporation and
Government Agency Disclosure Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 205, The Crown Corporation and Government Agency Disclosure Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to ensure that Crown corporations and government agencies listed in the schedule attached to this Bill provide annual reports, and that these reports be scrutinized by a select standing committee of the Legislature. When enacted, this Bill will require directors and officers of Crown corporations and government agencies to be publicly accountable in respect of their activities.

[Leave granted; Bill 205 read a first time]

Head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, a group from the Vauxhall high school in my constituency. This group has travelled to Edmonton this morning. They certainly want to observe the legislative and law-making processes and, I am sure, the behavior of their member of the Legislature. [laughter] Well, it's sometimes good and sometimes bad.

The class is accompanied today by two teachers, Mr. Seaman and Mr. Burbank, and their bus driver Mr. Roy Wood. At this time I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to be able to introduce to you, sir, and to the members of the Assembly a group of 115 Stettler junior high students from my constituency. They are in both the public and the members galleries. I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

Head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to table with the Assembly the eighth annual report, the 1978 report, of the Environment Council of Alberta.

MR. R. CLARK: The eighth! It's the first one.

MR. COOKSON: In tabling it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to two organizations, the policy advisory committee and the science advisory committee. They are made up of a large number of fully qualified people who spent a lot of voluntary time putting together this report.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table three documents this afternoon: first, the annual report for 1977-78 of the Department of Labour as required by The Legislative Assembly Act; secondly, the annual report of the pension benefits branch for the period April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978; and third, regulations 71/79 and 149/79 of The Gas Protection Act.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table copies of the annual report of the Alberta Law Foundation as required by The Legal Profession Act.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Legislature the annual report of the Alberta Research Council.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 1977 annual report of the Alberta Hospital Visitors Committee, and the annual report of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission for the nine months ended March 31, 1978.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Department of Housing and Public Works for fiscal 1977-78 as required by statute; also the annual report for the same fiscal period for the Alberta Housing Corporation as required by statute. Copies are available for each member.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file two copies of a publication prepared by the public lands division of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Copies will be available for each member.

Head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Campaign Fund-Raising**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. I understand that during the past election campaign, letters were sent out on behalf of the minister to individuals outside the minister's own constituency, but whose business interests could be directly affected by the minister's Department of Housing and Public Works.

Will the minister advise the Assembly as to the extent of such fund-raising activities in the course of his campaign?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't wish to be unduly restrictive, but there'd be some doubt as to whether this would fall within the public duties of the minister.

MR. NOTLEY: That's what we want to find out. Is that part of the public responsibility?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, commenting on your tentative ruling, if I might put it that way: the

purpose of the question is to ascertain to what extent the minister went . . . In the course of the campaign, letters went out to business people who had dealings with the minister's department. That's the reason, sir, for asking the question. That's the reason I think it's important, in the public interest, that the minister answer the question.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, since being in this House, first elected in 1971, I've always made a point of appointing a finance chairman, assigning him the responsibility of raising funds for the campaign, and leaving that with him. I've never interfered in any way with the finance committee in terms of whom they contact — certainly never the amount contributed by anyone. I don't want to know that and never have.

I might add that the same finance committee that worked on my campaign this time, almost to a person — I'll have to admit it's a fairly good-sized committee — worked for my campaign in 1975. In the three election campaigns I have been in, I think they have been in the habit of sending a routine letter to prospective contributors, as is common practice in the British parliamentary system — perhaps even the habit of the opposition, for all I know.

I've been in the engineering profession, I've worked across this province for the last 27 years, lived in almost all geographic regions of the province. Therefore I have a lot of friends across the province. Obviously letters have been sent out to friends of mine and friends of members of the campaign committee regardless of where they might reside in the province, or out of the province for that matter. I seem to recall they generally contact my mother and brother.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Out of the province?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just following up the minister's last comment, in light of the prohibition of that in the present financial disclosures legislation. Would the minister care to rethink his statement about soliciting funds outside the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I should clarify that. My mother and brother were very disappointed that they couldn't contribute to my campaign this time. In '71 and '75, they were pleased to do so.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, might I say to the hon. minister that certain businessmen in areas outside the city of Edmonton, outside the member's constituency, didn't share the feeling of his mother and his sister.

Mr. Speaker, might I pose a secondary question to the minister. Was the minister aware that solicitation was going on to business people to whom the minister's department had awarded contracts in the course of the last four years?

MR. CHAMBERS: Emphatically no, Mr. Speaker, other than, I suppose, providing names some years ago to the finance committee when it was originally established. From there they worked with that basic list. Of course I'm sure the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury knows how it works. Each member of the finance committee knows people and contacts those people who may well wish to contribute to the free-enterprise system.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister, so there's no misunderstanding. Then the minister did not know that on his behalf solicitation for funds was going on to companies which had done business with the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: The minister has categorically answered that question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, if I may. Can the minister advise the House whether, after assuming the position of Minister of Housing and Public Works, he instructed his campaign finance committee in their solicitation of funds to stay away from any companies that might in fact put him in a conflict of interest or a difficult position?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Speaker. I would say the province of Alberta does a large volume of business with almost every company engaged in the structural area of engineering and architecture. To find out who in the province hasn't worked on a government project at one time or another would be a massive research job, which I don't think it would be reasonable to ask of any volunteer fund-raiser. He would probably tell one to find another fund-raiser. That sort of question would be very difficult to answer, because obviously most engineers, most architects in the structural field do some work on government projects at one time or another in their careers. I think that's immaterial.

I'm really concerned about the questions in terms of the reflection on the integrity of the engineers and architects out there . . .

MR. NOTLEY: No.

MR. CHAMBERS: Let me ask this: are you inferring that you can buy him for \$100 or \$200? I think the questions are rather insulting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the Premier. Does the Premier accept the principle that a clear distinction must be maintained between the partisan nature of constituency fund-raising and the impartial exercise of ministerial responsibility?

MR. LOUGHEED: I think that's an easy question to answer: yes.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, as a result of that easy yes, is the Premier prepared to take steps to give that kind of direction to his ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister has answered the question very appropriately. He leaves that to a finance committee. That's what he's answered in the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the Premier. Will the Premier give a directive to his cabinet ministers to separate their constituency fund-raising responsibilities from their ministerial responsibilities in those areas where there's very obvious opportunity for conflict?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it's pretty clear from the minister's answers that that's precisely what he does.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would pose this question then. If that's what the minister does, why does the campaign material going out . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Quite apart from this being a postfinal supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works whether he recognizes the distinction, in terms of his responsibilities, between fund-raising of a general nature among the business community *per se* and that section of the business community which comes directly under the responsibilities of his department and will in fact have contracts with his department.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that. However, we're talking about generally small contributions from people who want to contribute to the free-enterprise system. I'm sure a medical doctor would have many medical doctors contribute to his campaign. It's who knows people. There aren't many engineers in politics, so I suspect that engineers and architects, who in this province are certainly a close group, would tend to want to support the candidacy of an engineer and architect.

I still find troublesome the line of questioning the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is getting at. It seems to me, at least to some degree, that it impinges on or at least puts inferences on the integrity of those engineers and architects who really believe in this country, this province, and this system, and who want to make a contribution to make the free-enterprise system work.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Since the minister's answer invites debate, there's no such inference at all to the question. I put the question again to the hon. minister, whether he recognizes the difference between those involved in the private sector in a general way and those people who have contracts with the department, and whether it is ethical for the minister of that department, or people on his behalf, to be requesting money from those who are going to have direct financial commitments or obligations to the Department of Housing and Public Works,

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret very much to have to intervene in a line of questions of this kind, whether the information be important or of relatively less importance. But to ask a minister for his opinion on a question of ethics is certainly not a subject for the question period. It may be a subject for debate or for social conversation, but it does not come within any minister's duties to lay down ethical guidance for other members.

Welding Technique

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a second question to the Member for Calgary McKnight in his capacity as chairman of the Research Council of Alberta. In April we were advised of an order in council

setting up a joint venture consisting of Algas Resources Ltd., Petro-Canada Exploration Inc., and Mid-con Pipeline Equipment Co. Can the member advise us of the status of that joint venture?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond to the question in this way. It's the intention of the government to have the chairman of the Research Council — whom we hope in due course, subject to legislative approval, to be the Member for Calgary McKnight. He hasn't assumed that responsibility and will not assume it, subject again to the approval of the Legislature, until August 1. That of course will apply as well to the chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, the chairman of the hospital facilities review committee, the chairman of the northern development council, and the Alberta representative on Syncrude. So pending August 1, I'd refer the question to the Minister of Economic Development.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, this morning I signed a memorandum to the hon. Leader of the Opposition outlining the present status, and would be quite happy to table the letter of intent relative to the welding process.

Petro-Canada Status

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question with regard to PetroCan. I understand that the provincial government has no responsibility in that particular area, but I wonder, because of the head offices being located in Calgary, whether representation has been made to the Premier with regard to the future of PetroCan.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, regardless of the ultimate decisions of the federal government with regard to the future of PetroCan, I would presume they would have the wisdom to continue to have the head office of such an organization — whether it was held by shareholders of the public at large or through government control — in the city of Calgary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Would it be possible that the Alberta Energy Company would participate in any kind of shares, or whatever, if PetroCan in its present form were dissolved?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would think not, because they're very different entities and the scope of the Alberta Energy Company is so entirely different. As the hon. member will recall, in establishing the Alberta Energy Company we specifically set up the prohibition, if you like, that they not participate in the conventional oil and gas industry. Of course, as I understand it, that is one of the very basic thrusts of PetroCan. So the two entities really are too diverse and too separated in their function to consider something implicit in the hon. member's question.

Plant Closures

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It flows from the closure tomorrow of the non-hog operations of Burns packing plant in the city of

Edmonton. My question to the minister is: what discussions, if any, took place between Burns Foods and the government of Alberta before the announcement last April 17 concerning the proposed closure of the Edmonton plant?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, of course I can only respond for my own department. Apart from some general information, there was a limited amount of discussion — very limited, I believe — before the announcement of the precise date was made. Of course at the present time there is in effect an agreement between the government of Alberta through the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, with the federal government, Canada Manpower, Burns Foods and the trade union involved, which does assist and has in place a committee to assist any individual workers either in upgrading or in adjusting to a different job. But the Department of Labour has one person who assists on that committee as needed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to identify for members of the Assembly the time before the announcement of the closure that discussions began to take place between the government of Alberta and Burns Foods, if any, and whether any notice was in fact given to the Department of Labour before the April 17 announcement?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there was very short notice in my own case.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly on the duration of "very short notice"? Was it a week, a month, six months, a day, a matter of hours? Can the minister identify the time frame for the Assembly?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of hours, and that is the concern which I believe I have publicly expressed. It is the desire of government and government policy that when employers are in a position of undertaking an initiative such as Burns did, wherever possible they give some advance notice to government. Our concern as government is that we should provide every assurance to the individual employee who is being affected, either in terms of the process by which we can assist to locate another form of employment, if that is necessary, or the process by which we can assist in upgrading.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Beyond the minister's comments in the press, has there been any correspondence from either the minister or the Premier to Burns Foods concerning the government's view that to lay off people, some of whom have been working for 30 years or more, and to give only a matter of hours' notice to the government of Alberta, is just not good enough?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise that in fact it went beyond correspondence. I personally had a meeting with the vice-president of Burns Foods shortly after that event, in which government policy on this matter was reviewed. I don't think there's any

question as to the understanding of Burns Foods now with respect to what government policy is.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour. In view of the minister's statements in this House, is it the government's intention to introduce legislation which in fact would compel employers to provide reasonable notice both to employees and to the government of Alberta? In view of the fact that we have now had a series of closures, whether it be Firestone in Calgary, Medicine Hat packers — a whole host of companies that have closed down — is this government going to enunciate any overall policy?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of overall policy, I think I've just expressed the policy in place at the moment. With respect to potential legislation, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has raised, that is an item of consideration at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, if I might, since there has been some reference to the loss of jobs and the suggestion that short notice did occur, I would like to express, so there's no confusion, that in a case such as Burns there has to be an orderly phase-out. If certain people resign or retire too quickly — they may be specialists, which jeopardizes the operations of the plant and thereby jeopardizes the employment of other employees. Now there is a provision in the collective agreement. It was contemplated by the party, by the trade union, and by the company that there could be a phase-out of operations, so there is a provision for an orderly phase-out and compensation, if you will, for those people who see the operation through to the end.

I would also say that apart from the government not having notice, I think the position of employees is somewhat different since they are being phased out over a period of time. I think in every case the notice exceeded one month by at least some days and, in some cases, ran close to six months.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister indicated that a committee has been set up. The minister also indicated that the layoffs are not necessarily related to seniority but rather to the operation of the plant, and that certain people are required for the orderly closure of the plant and what have you.

In view of the fact that some people being laid off have been working with Burns Foods for more than 30 years, and the prospect of leaving the city, their families, and everything else is a rather difficult one, what priority has this committee given to finding jobs in the Edmonton area on the basis of seniority, so those people who have been working longest would have first chance at jobs available in the Edmonton area?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, today I cannot respond totally to the last question by the hon. member. I would take it as notice, however, and we can obtain an answer. I would just like to be perfectly clear, though, that when we are talking about the orderly phase-down — we are talking about phasing the plant down, as I understand it, in sections or production lines, if you will; I'm not sure of the precise appropriate description — there may be, and I'm sure there would be, a respect for seniority within that given process.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has any new or special policies being developed or in place now to deal with such a problem regarding the employees of Burns?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as indicated by my colleague the Minister of Labour, a manpower adjustment committee is in place at this particular plant. The parties to the agreement have entered into a contract including the government of Canada, the government of Alberta through Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower, the company, and the union. Each of these parties has contributed financially to the costs of establishing the committee. The committee is now at work and trying to find new employment for members who are displaced. My colleague has covered the situation very well.

I would like to point out to hon. members of this Assembly that this type of committee has been in effect for some time and has worked well in many other plants in Alberta where this type of problem has arisen. Of course we welcome suggestions as to how that may be improved. But certainly, as disheartening as it may be — and I'm sure it is to employees who have been relieved of their employment through this closure and others — not only are we doing everything we can to ensure that new jobs are located, but through the services of our department we are making efforts to provide retraining opportunities in the various institutions in this province.

Brooks Air Terminal

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Could he indicate whether it's the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of the air terminal for Brooks?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, the contract for the terminal building should be ready to be submitted for tender in about three weeks.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate the completion date for the Brooks airport terminal?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give an accurate time. I would guess it would run into the spring of 1980. But I couldn't say that positively. I can get the information.

Tourism Promotion

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business. In light of the fact that tourism is a very important part of our economy, can the minister indicate if any major initiatives have been taken to promote additional tourists' coming to Alberta this summer?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, yes, in early May the kickoff of the expansion of the Stamp Around Alberta program outside the province of Alberta began in British Columbia. I was in British Columbia with the members of Travel Alberta to kick it off and to invite the people of British Columbia to come to Alberta now, as

well as next year and in future years, for the opportunity to renew old friendships, visit people in the province as they may see fit, and see the sights. So in fact a campaign is under way outside the province, specifically directed at the moment to the province of British Columbia.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister indicate if there have been any major initiatives in attracting tourists from the United States to come to Alberta this summer?

MR. ADAIR: The continuation of the programs in place through Travel Alberta and the initiatives made with the various western states of the United States will carry on. There have been no additional ones at the moment, although we've been reviewing just what opportunities we may have relative to capitalizing — if I can use that particular term — on the problems they are experiencing on the southwest coast of the United States.

MR. R. CLARK: Send them gas?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on the matter of the shortage of fuel in that portion of the United States. Can the minister indicate if any studies have been done or if there have been any discussions with the people in that area on what effect it will have on tourism in Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware specifically of the particular studies in the past, although some information has been gathered as to the problems we have experienced over the last couple of years relative to the gas shortages in the United States. It has shown that there are some problems relative to getting some of the American tourists into Canada. I think our concern now is to ensure that the message is out that there is in fact a supply, accommodation, and facilities in the province of Alberta for not just United States tourists but all tourists who come to this province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In light of the fact that the Stamp Around Alberta program has been extended to British Columbia, has there been any thought to extending it to our neighboring provinces, the territories, and Montana — the immediately surrounding jurisdictions?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, as a matter of fact that invitation has been open for some time, Mr. Speaker. Relative to Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and particularly the Northwest Territories, in fact they are already travelling. We've indicated to their particular governments and to the people of those provinces that they can pick up passports by writing to us. I might indicate that there have been quite a number of requests from Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the territories, and other provinces as well, requesting information on the Stamp Around Alberta program and the availability of passports at border points as they enter the province.

Water Pollution

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Environment. In light of recent reports of a serious and rapid deteriora-

tion in the water quality of the Bow River in and downstream from the city of Calgary, and a resulting potential health hazard apparently due to organic wastes being dumped into the Bow River by the city of Calgary sewage treatment facilities, could the minister advise the House what steps are being taken to review the situation?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, our department has started a major study on the eutrophication problem in the South Saskatchewan drainage basin. It involves both the Bow River and the Oldman River — a considerable, large area. The eutrophication study will determine the problems with regard to a build-up of algae, a phosphorus problem in the area. It will be fairly substantial and will take some time to complete.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the fact that, as I understand it, the study you've referred to is of a three-year duration and is, as you've mentioned, a study of the entire South Saskatchewan system and not just this specific area of the Bow River, and in light of some claims that there is already some considerable evidence of the degree and seriousness of pollution in the Bow River, could the minister advise the House whether any consideration is being given to a speedier and separate review of this particular situation, so that if some remedial action is required it can be undertaken more quickly?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the presentation made by the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn and can assure him I will pass this information on to my people doing the study. The total study will possibly require until 1983. However, an interim report, hopefully in the fall of 1979, will perhaps clarify some of the real problem areas.

Ministers' Business Disclosures

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of the unfortunate, ill-conceived, and ill-researched question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday concerning the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member would like to come directly to the question.

MR. KNAAK: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. The question is, Mr. Premier, have you been able to obtain more information concerning D. Getty Investments Ltd.? Can you now advise the House whether the company was in fact inoperative and whether Mr. Getty was in breach of any regulations?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a chance to speak to Mr. Getty personally, but it's clear that he was in no way in breach of the intent of the disclosure of interest statement, insofar as D. Getty Investments Ltd. was not active until after he resigned his post on the Executive Council.

Fertilizer Supply

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is a follow-up from one yesterday to the Minister of Agri-

culture. It's with regard to the supply of fertilizer in southern Alberta. I wonder if the minister has some information on that matter.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the information we have in regard to supply of fertilizer in southern Alberta is that no shortages exist at the present time. It's understandable, of course, that as seeding reaches this stage, some local outlets may not have the varied numbers of fertilizer for which demands exist. At the present time, Cominco shows a surplus of both 11-55 and 16-20. To those people in the fertilizer industry who are tied to a manufacturer, supplies have been reasonably constant. Dealers who are not really tied to any manufacturer and have been making available supplies that were on hand are of course finding it difficult to supplement as they sell out their supplies on hand.

There has been some movement — certainly by individual choice — of purchasing fertilizer in Montana. Of course the border is free, and the movement of fertilizer between Alberta and Montana. But the indicators we have are that the fertilizer that has been purchased in Montana has indeed been by individual choice, because of either timing or availability. Pricewise it would appear that they're comparable, and that hasn't been a factor in the choice as to whether you went south or purchased it locally.

Eastern Slopes Development

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. It deals with a development that at least some people in the Rocky Mountain House area feel has been approved by the government, a recreational development west of Nordegg.

My question to the minister is: what is the status of what I think is referred to as the Odyssey complex in the Eastern Slopes?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, preliminary disclosure has been granted for the Odyssey proposal. There are, of course, conditions which have to be met; specifically, environmental concerns dealing with water supply, sewage disposal, things like that. But we have granted preliminary disclosure for this proposal.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister had an opportunity to receive representation from the Rocky Mountain House area concerning the possibility of moving the project east of Nordegg into a less fragile environment, and to an area which could be serviced to some extent by the Rocky Mountain House business community?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have had representations from some people from Rocky Mountain House. I think people should be made aware that back in 1968 the former administration asked for proposals to be developed in this area, and Odyssey was one of the ones put forward. As I mentioned, preliminary disclosure has been granted. But there are these concerns which have to be met, and we are awaiting a reply from the developer as to whether he is in a position to meet these requirements.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister — and I appreciate that little 11-year history lesson. Can I say to the minister: is the minister prepared to give a commitment that public hearings will be held in Rocky Mountain House prior to any final decision to allow the project to go ahead, as had been agreed to in 1968?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, public hearings were conducted in 1973.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister referring to the Eastern Slopes hearings or to the specific project we're discussing now? Has there been a specific public hearing on this project?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the hearings were conducted in 1973 in regard to the Eastern Slopes policy, and the Odyssey proposal fits into the Eastern Slopes policy.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then is the minister saying he will not agree to a set of public hearings on this particular project, even though the request has come forward from people in that area?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we can't go on having public hearings forever. These people are prepared to go ahead. As I mentioned to the hon. leader, these were carried out in 1973.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question, then, to the minister, so there's no misunderstanding. The minister is not prepared to go himself to Rocky Mountain House and hold public hearings prior to the government's making a final decision on the matter?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to go to Rocky Mountain House. But in regard to this specific proposal, we held the public hearings in 1973, we have granted preliminary disclosure, and I think we've done quite well.

DR. BUCK: Typical arrogant government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Same old story.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Moved by Mrs. Osterman:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate May 28: Mr. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity of participating in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne. In rising, I'd first of all like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for comprehensive and, I think, constructive speeches in introducing the resolution.

I'd also like to take a very brief opportunity to pay tribute to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, as other members have, in the speech, Mr. Speaker. It appears as if shortly after July 1, there will be a new Lieutenant-Governor, although I gather it is now a subject of some interest and discussion in many circles as to who the successor to His Honour may be. But I would join other members in saying that over the last five years the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Steinhauer, and Mrs. Steinhauer have played, in my judgment, an outstanding role as representatives of Her Majesty the Queen in this province.

Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in the throne speech debate, I suppose it would be a little less than fair of me not to congratulate all the hon. members on their re-election to the Legislature, especially the hon. members on the government side of the House, although I would say that a little more humility might be in order. Albeit the mandate was very substantial — no question about that — hon. members on the government side should at least be cautioned by the fact that where the Lougheed team secured 57 per cent of the vote in the provincial election, the Joe Clark team received 64 per cent of the vote in the federal election. Something of some interest, I might suggest, if we find there's a difference between the province of Alberta and the federal government — who in fact is going to be speaking for Alberta?

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the government can take some consolation from a healthy victory, notwithstanding the fact that their 6 per cent drop in popular vote over the last four years was exceeded, to my knowledge, only by the Liberal Party in Quebec when they were defeated by the PQ in 1976. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, a victory notwithstanding. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there to deal with some of the issues I think are a little more significant than the election statistics we've just discussed. First of all, to deal with the question of ethics in government; to move from there to look at the question of some of these interesting caucus committees that have been appointed; from there, to examine the blueprint, or lack of one, for economic development in this province; and finally, to deal with the question of health care and hospitalization in Alberta today.

I think most Albertans were a little more than somewhat disturbed on Friday last week, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps not the members on the government side in this House, but most Albertans were a little disturbed when, in answer to a series of questions from the opposition, the hon. Premier indicated that the matter of the free air line tickets and other aspects of ethics in government — whether it be the PWA bagmen situation, the patronage appointments — essentially are closed as far as the government is concerned, because a mandate was received on March 14. May I remind the members of this Assembly that no mandate in general absolves the government of specifics. I think we have to examine those specifics.

To put this in context, shortly before Christmas the government had organized an Agriculture North conference. It was not too long after the prorogation of

the Legislative Assembly. During the course of that conference I had quite a conversation with several local Conservative organizers, people who fully intended to vote for Mr. Lougheed and his colleagues, fully intended to support the Conservative government, but who expressed to me their concern about the PWA bagman situation and the ethical question of board members of a quasi-Crown corporation out bagging money for the Tory party. Mr. Speaker, they were going to vote Conservative in the general election, and no doubt did. But to suggest that because they finally put their X beside the Conservative column, somehow they endorsed the whole question of whether or not the board members of PWA should be out collecting money for the Tory party, or that they approved of the free air line tickets or would support the example of patronage we've seen since the election on March 14, is quite another thing. To suggest that simply because an election took place on March 14 and this government was returned with a very large majority all discussion stops, or the book is closed, is simply incorrect. That book is going to be open. It's the responsibility of both opposition parties to continue to hammer away on the very important question of ethics in government.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned patronage. I find some of these appointments particularly interesting. Last summer I and other members of the public sat back with interest as we learned of one cabinet minister after another deciding to give up the onerous public responsibilities of elected office because they wanted to get into good old private enterprise. Week after week we had one minister after another appearing before the television cameras. It was really a heart-rending scene — back to wife and family, back to good old private enterprise. It is with a little interest that we find that of the nine ministers, four have now moved from elected public office to appointed public office. Mr. Speaker, the whole question of patronage raises its hoary head.

I think this question, the problems of patronage, was well put in a House of Commons debate in 1974; not well put by a Liberal, a New Democrat, or even a Creditiste, but by the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain, one Mr. Joe Clark, who talked about the whole practice of patronage and what an awful thing it was. I quote page 1046 of *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, for any of the hon. members who would like to read his speech, because I certainly think it's worth reading for members of this Tory caucus. "The practice poses three critical threats to our system." The first threat is that it "jeopardizes the long range independence of the Canadian public service." Well, there's no question about that. Mr. Clark goes on to say that the second threat is that "it undermines the morale in the service itself. It removes the incentive to excel. Indeed, it fosters an incentive simply to please one's master." Very shrewd, appropriate comments by the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain concerning Mr. Trudeau's government; equally applicable to Mr. Lougheed's government. "The third threat", says Mr. Clark, "is that it narrows the basis of advice on which national decisions are made." While that's true nationally, the same comment can be made provincially as well.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days before this particular debate took place, eight days as a matter of fact, the hon. member Mr. Clark asked a question in the House of Commons that I thought was particularly appropriate. He said:

My question is for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister make a statement on motions outlining the principles now to be followed in appointments to the senior public service, and in particular show whether the elevation of Mr. Michael Pitfield indicates a replacement of the merit system by the buddy system?

Mr. Speaker, this government certainly knows a lot about the buddy system. That seems to be the main theme.

I think the reply of the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, is interesting too. This is what he said:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite improper for a member of parliament to cast such aspersions on a member of the public service.

Rather similar to the outburst we saw Monday of this week, when the Leader of the Opposition posed a question about Mr. Getty's investment. Instead of answering the question what we had was an attack on the question.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that ethics in government is, in my judgment, a very crucial issue. It's going to be the basis of at least two private member's Bills presented to this Legislature. I would say to hon. members across the way who are not in the Executive Council that in the weeks, months, and years ahead this is the sort of issue that you have a responsibility to raise, to question, and to challenge this government on in caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there, if I can, to very briefly talk for a few moments about what I perceive to be the institutionalization of a one-party state in Alberta. It's easy enough to see that occur with 74 out of 79 members in this Legislative Assembly. It's easy enough to fall into the trap of seeing democracy as essentially no more than a plebiscite once every four years. Once every four years we allow the voters of Alberta to render a sort of yes or no verdict on the affairs of the province. A sort of Ayatollah Khomeini approach to politics — we have the general endorsement, then the opposition and other members are to stay out of the road. Mr. Speaker, that really isn't the way democratic government should operate.

We have all sorts of caucus committees now appointed, caucus committees where remuneration will be paid. It's interesting talking to interns from other parts of the country who work for different legislatures. It always amazes them when they come to Alberta and find that caucus committees are going to be paid, that there's going to be remuneration for sitting on caucus committees. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the problems this would pose for our tiny opposition, what we should be looking at is not caucus committees but more use of select committees. In the province of Ontario the bulk of the committee structure is based on select committees representing both sides of the House. That's the kind of system that recognizes the importance of a multiparty system, not simply the right of the party in power to so completely draw in all the strings of power that we have virtually a one-party state.

I want to move from there if I can, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the larger question of where Alberta is headed as far as the next 10 or 15 years are concerned. In the last several years we've seen some of the important elements of this government's so-called economic development policy come crashing down. For example, we've had the closure of Firestone's plant in

Calgary. In southern Alberta we've had several closures of plants in the meat-packing business. Just a matter of five or six weeks ago, and brought up in the question period today, we had the closure of the Burns packing plants in Edmonton, and the threatened closure of others, or at least concern in the beef industry about other packing plants being closed down. We've had the example of the lamb plant at Innisfail.

The point is that we've talked for a long time about agricultural processing. Nothing is more basic to agricultural processing than the meat-packing industry. Yet where do we stand on meat packing in Alberta? To what extent are we going to have an industry 10, 15, or 20 years down the road? To what extent are the companies going to modernize and re-equip their plants in western Canada or move their future investment closer to the population areas where the bulk of their market will be? Will it not be cheaper, Mr. Speaker, to ship the grain so that the feeder industry develops around the major cities of Canada and the potential markets, and we have a gradual slowing down of the economic activity, not only in the processing of meats, but even in our feeder cattle industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when I looked at the Speech from the Throne and examined it in the context of an economic blueprint, I was astonished not to see any reference to the report of the environmental conservation authority on forestry. We know the government had it. They had it just before the last provincial election was announced. They conveniently kept it under wraps so it wouldn't embarrass any of our Tory candidates during the election campaign, because there are certainly elements of that report that would be embarrassing, particularly when we come to land-use conflict between oil companies and the forestry industry.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we know the government had the report. It's obvious that the Premier didn't pay any attention to it, because one of the major recommendations of the report was that we draw together into one department all the various branches and agencies dealing with land use. Instead of moving in that direction, we now have an Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, a separate Minister of Recreation and Parks, a separate Minister of Environment, a separate Minister of Agriculture, and a separate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. So we've splintered an area where the ECA said, look, let's draw together the pieces so we have a coherent land-use policy as it applies to forestry in Alberta.

We've got the problem of grain handling on the west coast. Tory members of the Legislature and Conservative candidates throughout the province talked about Prince Rupert almost as a fait accompli, that we've got this all worked out. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are some distance from finalizing the facilities at Prince Rupert.

What about a science policy? Certainly that's going to be important, Mr. Speaker, if we're looking at diversification of the Alberta economy. But we have a situation now where instead of the minister chairing the Research Council, we've decided we're going to have a back-bench MLA chair the Research Council. That's very nice, Mr. Speaker, except I think we should be moving away from either the minister or back-bench MLAs chairing the Research Council. The whole question of science is the exposition, if you like, of the awkward truth. The last thing you want to do if you're

dealing with the awkward truth is to have boards dominated or controlled by politicians. Mr. Speaker, if this province is seriously concerned about developing a science policy, we put neither the minister nor, for that matter, a back-bench MLA in the chairmanship of something as important as the Alberta Research Council. I intend to discuss that in a little greater detail when we get into debate on that particular Bill.

If Alberta is to develop any kind of realistic blueprint for the future, what is needed is an inventory of what is possible in this province. If you don't have an inventory of what is possible, it just isn't possible to make the necessary trade-offs.

We have a good example in this whole question of natural gas export versus improved access for agricultural commodities in the American market. For two years before the last provincial election, we had very emphatic statements made in the Legislature by Mr. Lougheed and others, in full range of the television cameras, that there will be no export of natural gas unless we get those concessions in the American market for Alberta farmers. It was really very impressive to listen to the kind of fight this government was going to wage on behalf of Alberta farmers.

That was before the election. As a matter of fact, even last July the former Minister of Agriculture was quoted in Calgary as saying, we're not going to budge; we're going to get those concessions for the cattle industry or else no export of natural gas. Then we saw the softening of the government's position last fall, and now we have a change: natural gas exports without any preconditions at all. There's supposed to be a great threat from Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, remember when we got into the whole discussion of Syncrude? We had to move right away because the Premier stood up in the Legislature in 1973 and said, unless we move on the tar sands those Americans are going to develop the oil shales. Mr. Speaker, the Americans are so far behind in the oil shales that it's going to take a long, long time to even begin to challenge us, when you consider the environmental problems.

I suspect that the main thing that has changed between the speeches we saw in the Legislature about the *quid pro quo* export of gas for agricultural products in return is none of these other things, but rather the event that took place on March 14. Now that the Tories are safely back in power, we can go back to the old hit-and-miss approach. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that is good enough.

When one reads the Speech from the Throne, one sees considerable emphasis on the need to entice risk capital from other countries, the whole business of foreign ownership. Mr. Speaker, I want to say very bluntly to the members of this Assembly that I think more foreign capital, however well-meaning the people who argue the case for it, is simply the wrong direction for Canada to go.

One has to look at the figures. If you examine the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act, the most recent CALURA report, you find that Alberta has by far the highest percentage of non-Canadian ownership and control of any provinces. In the case of the resource industries, we're looking at 86.2 per cent compared to a national average of 78 per cent; in manufacturing, an average of 80.6 per cent, compared to a national average of 66 per cent; construction, 31.9 compared to 17.9 national average; utilities, 38.8 com-

pared to 19.6; total non-financial institutions, 67.1 contrasted to 49.4. So there's little doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we have by far the highest percentage of foreign ownership of any part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone disagrees that when you have foreign capital come in, one has to look at it from the perspective of a balance sheet. There are obviously going to be pluses; certainly there are pluses. We see the pluses in the Alberta economy today, a buoyant economy with a very low rate of unemployment. But there are also minuses. The rate of inflation in this province, in such areas as housing, for example, is much greater than the national average.

But for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I'd rather deal with the impact of foreign ownership, not just on our province but on our country as a whole. We've heard various people talk about the problems with our balance of payments, and we've had right-wing politicians especially argue that if we could just keep some kind of control over wage rates we'd be able to get into foreign markets, improve our balance of trade, and everything would be all right. If one looks at the cold, hard facts of Canadian balance of payments, what does one find? One finds that we actually had a very substantial surplus in our merchandise account last year, a surplus of \$3.5 billion. But there was a net deficit in our balance of payments of \$5.285 billion. Where did that come from, Mr. Speaker? In large part it arose because of such things as interest and dividends paid to companies not controlled in this country. We have fees, patents, and royalties paid out — almost \$7 billion going out of the country and creating a huge balance of payments deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the conventional wisdom followed by the Bank of Canada is that if you have this tremendous outflow of capital, the only way you can balance the balance of payments is to attract investment back into the country. How do you do that? By pushing up interest rates. That's the conventional theory of the Bank of Canada, which has been followed to the letter by the federal government, which can be followed by any right-wing government, because that's the only way you can balance the balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that creates is that we simply borrow trouble. We're getting into a situation where, down the road, we're going to have an even greater outflow of interest and dividends. It's a continuing treadmill. We bring in more foreign investment. Once that investment begins to yield interest and dividends it contributes to an even greater balance of payments problem, so that sooner or later we have a situation so desperately bad for the country that the inevitable result will be a sluggish economy, a resource-based and immature industrial sector, and a country in serious trouble.

Mr. Speaker, in the moments left to me, I would like to move if I can to deal with the question of health care in this country. We see a number of interesting problems that face Alberta today. Balance billing is now very widespread, and the reason it's widespread is very simple. In my judgment, we have not been bargaining in good faith with the medical profession. As a consequence we haven't been taking in some of the legitimate increases in the costs of operating a medical practice over the last number of years. The medical profession is now suffering the inevitable consequences of four years of protracted, unimaginative restraint. The restraint policies announced in 1975 have

had their impact on the entire area of health, education, and social services, but have certainly had an impact on the medical profession. I think the information they've supplied in their briefs convinces me that their net income has, at the very least, flagged behind other professions.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have that particular problem. The result is that now doctors are second billing or balance billing, call it what you will. I don't believe we should have balance billing in Alberta, but I think there should be reasonable negotiations with the Alberta Medical Association that would take into account some of the actual costs of operating a practice. When I read over the AMA document and see some of the figures cited there, I know the fee schedule hasn't even begun to take those things into account. In fact we have a situation where doctors are forced into a position of balance billing. Now obviously some doctors will balance bill. I think we have to look at a system similar to other provinces: if you want to balance bill after a fair negotiation takes place, you have to withdraw from the system and take the risk of collecting your fee, plus your balance bill, from the patient. I suspect that would be a disincentive to many doctors to withdrawing from the system, if, as I say to the members of the House, we bargained in good faith.

I want to move from there to look at the question of hospitals. Again we have the government coming out with a totally unimaginative, unworkable guideline. We're going to increase hospital budgets by an average of about 8 per cent for salaries and 7 per cent for, of all things, supplies. Seven per cent for supplies, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that according to the Alberta Hospital Association, utility rates for 1979 are expected to increase by 20 to 25 per cent. All the members read in the newspaper the figures from Statistics Canada about the price of food going up by 15 per cent last year. The estimates for the coming year are still a substantial increase in food costs. The minister implied yesterday, when I asked him questions on this matter, that maybe they should get by with a little bit less. What do you mean? Get by with a little less food? Mr. Speaker, surely not.

In addition to the problem of hospital construction and operation in this province, I want to deal with what I think is a very serious problem: the inability of this government to deal imaginatively with the disparities in health care services in Alberta. All one has to do, Mr. Speaker, is look at the statistics on infant mortality in Alberta. The differences are just dramatic. If you look at some of the Indian reserves, the chance of infant mortality is seven times the chance in Edmonton; in the Lesser Slave Lake area, two and a half times Edmonton or Calgary. I raise this because one of the major reasons the government was able to convince this Legislature that the new arrangement of fiscal responsibility between Ottawa and the provinces was better than the old cost-sharing scheme was that we could improve our overall health system. Well, Mr. Speaker, we haven't done so. We have simply taken time, but have made no progress at all.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, that would incorporate in it one of the most important recommendations made by the Alberta Medical Association in its brief to members of the Legislature. Resolution I would be amended by adding after the words "the present session" the following words; I read them out now and have

copies for other members of the House:

... but direct Her Majesty's government to initiate a wide-ranging study of the health care system in Alberta with particular emphasis on developing new, cost-effective delivery systems and eliminating regional disparities in the quality of health care.

In closing my remarks and in moving this amendment, I would say that one of the real concerns in Alberta today is a disparity in health care. I just leave the members of the House with one experience I came across last summer. A number of my colleagues and I were in the Fort Vermilion area. We went into the Fort Vermilion hospital — a hospital I should say, Mr. Speaker, where if one were to drop a match, it would go up in flames in about 30 seconds flat. In that particular hospital there was one doctor — there are two now — and I went into the doctor's office. My heaven's sakes, people were crowded into that doctor's office. Jammed in there so you would almost have to have a shoehorn to get into the office! Most politicians would love to have public meetings with as many people as were in that doctor's office — one doctor to cover the area of La Crete to Fort Vermilion and three Indian reservations.

The crying concern medical practitioners in the area brought to my attention was, there aren't enough of us. Small wonder we have headlines in the *Edmonton Journal* about the infant mortality rate on the Assumption reserve. That's been the case for years, Mr. Speaker, because we haven't done anything to deal with the health disparities in this province. That's why I think the amendment today is so appropriate, and I ask hon. members to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: Just before the hon. Member for Innisfail continues with the debate, I should express some reservation as to whether this Assembly should be directing Her Majesty's government to do anything. But perhaps we could give some further consideration to the text so that it might be in appropriate form before it's put in the Votes and Proceedings.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker . . .

Point of Order

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of order. It would seem to me entirely appropriate that the Assembly have the right, and exercise that right, to direct Her Majesty's government. Her Majesty's government, the members of the Executive Council, are responsible to the Legislative Assembly. We have a system of responsible government and, while appointed by Her Majesty the Queen through the Lieutenant-Governor, this does not rule out the fact that they are accountable to the Legislature. If this Legislature is not able to direct the members of Executive Council to undertake a certain course, then in fact the Legislature is not supreme, and one of the major tenets of the parliamentary system is not lived up to.

MR. SPEAKER: Without wishing to debate the point at the moment, I just express reservations about it. As I see it, it does not involve any question of the supremacy of parliament, because there's no question that the government is answerable to the Assembly. But that

falls short of saying the Assembly directs the government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, again on the point of order. With greatest respect, sir, I find it hard to follow the reasoning of the argument. It would seem to me that the basic right of this Assembly to direct the Executive Council is instrumental to the supremacy of parliament as an argument, and that it is not at all possible to talk about the Legislature being supreme if we are not able to direct the Executive Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members opposite or the members of this House don't agree with the amendment, they have the right to vote it down. But surely, in a system of legislative supremacy, this kind of motion would be in order. If it's imprudent, let the members say so and the members will deal with it accordingly.

DR. BUCK: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that the hon. member has just raised, I want to indicate that no copy of the proposed amendment has come to me yet. As I heard the hon. member describe it when he read it out, it seemed to me the arguments he just made are not relevant to the point raised by Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly we could continue with the debate. I've expressed my reservation about it; I'd like to take the point under consideration.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, may I revert to introduction of guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (reversion)

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 46 members of the grade 6 class of the Glenmary school in beautiful Peace River. They're accompanied by their teachers Mary Ellen Murphy and Mrs. Lucy De Almeida, and three parents: Mrs. Carmen Tellier, Mrs. Denise Winnicky, and Mrs. Vi Weaver. Mr. Speaker, they are a perfect example of what the future holds for us in Canada. I would now ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

Point of Order (continued)

MR. PENGELLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I guess I get to . . .

MR. NOTLEY: On that point of order, I'd like, for my own . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. Member for Innisfail kindly allow some further discussion on the point of order. I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview as well as the Government House Leader may wish to make some further remarks on that point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Copies of the amendment are available for other members. I guess the pages haven't had an opportunity to deliver copies of the amendment.

I would say again, Mr. Speaker, that I can't imagine any motion that would be more in order. If on something as basic as the Speech from the Throne we can't move an amendment to direct the Executive Council to do something, I would feel that our role as members of the Legislature has been so completely hamstrung that I find it just incredible. With greatest respect, sir, I say that to be able to move this kind of amendment is so clearly a right. If the hon. members don't agree with it, that is their prerogative. Even the history of parliament goes out the window if we don't have the basic right to introduce an amendment of this kind. And in my judgment, to say we're going to shelve that until such time as it's considered misses the entire point of the legislative process. It seems to me completely in order to move this kind of amendment, and I say to the hon. members opposite that if the hon. members choose not to accept it, that is up to them.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, might I speak to the point of order by asking a question. As the hon. member suggests it is "so clearly a right", perhaps he could suggest one or two precedents to which we might refer. I am aware of the House directing individual members or committees of the House to act, or of the passage of legislation upon which it becomes the responsibility of departments to act. But perhaps he could cite an instance in which any House — not just this one — has directed the government to act. I'm not aware of any such case.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not here to be able to cite specific precedents on this matter — they are undoubtedly available, if one has the opportunity to look them up — except to say that the whole system of parliamentary government is based on the supremacy of parliament. In Alberta, regardless of what the hon. Minister of Education may think, the Legislature, not the caucus, is supreme. Now I know it's a little difficult for hon. members opposite to realize that, Mr. Speaker, but the Legislature is supreme. If we chose to direct Executive Council to do what we think right and proper, that is our prerogative, clearly our prerogative. To argue against it, Mr. Speaker, I find incredible. Because basically you're saying, you don't have the right to do that. And if you say you don't have the right to do that, how you can possibly argue that parliament is supreme?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it is possible to make a distinction which would be clear to the hon. member. The right of members individually or otherwise to make what are known as motions of no confidence in the government, expressed in terms of a criticism of government action or inaction, is of course a well-established tradition in this House. The member does not have the same understanding as I do of what is meant by the supremacy of the Legislature. I am simply offering to him that I am not aware of any situation in which supremacy has been manifested as the power to direct the government to do something. I am well aware of any number of occasions in which it is manifested by the withdrawal of support for inaction or having failed to do something, but I am not aware

of it ever having been manifested in terms of a direction to the government to do something. Since he made the comment that it was so manifestly obvious, I'm simply asking him if he couldn't provide us with this precedent that leads us in the direction that for him is so manifestly obvious.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can accommodate the hon. Minister of Education, of birds and bees or what have you.

Mr. Speaker, if the Legislature will recall, in 1978 I moved a motion that directed the Executive Council to enter into an agreement with Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited. As I recall, that particular resolution was accepted for debate. It was turned down. The government fortunately acted upon it a few weeks later, but the motion itself was turned down. It was moved in precisely the same way this resolution has been moved, and was accepted for debate.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the points raised by Your Honour and by the hon. Minister of Education are clearly the relevant points, despite the histrionics of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. There is a citation in *Beauchesne* to which I'll shortly refer Your Honour. On the overall issue of the appropriateness of such a motion, an amendment in the form the hon. member proposed, surely the supremacy of parliament is something that is entirely in the hands of the parliament or legislature at any given time, and the enactment of public laws, which indeed bind the government, or in this case the Crown in the right of Alberta, is a matter over which the Legislature, the Legislative Assembly, has entire and complete jurisdiction.

So it is farcical — and perhaps there are other adjectives as well, Your Honour — to have attempted to put forward the case, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has, that any question of the supremacy of parliament is involved in any disposition of this matter by Your Honour or by the Assembly.

The one citation I want to refer hon. members and Your Honour to in *Beauchesne* is Citation 560 on page 184:

The tendency in the House of Commons has been to rule out all motions purporting to give the Government a direct order to do a thing which cannot be done without the expenditure of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is a precedent that should be followed in the circumstances this afternoon.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order. The hon. Government House Leader is attempting to say that this is in fact a money bill. There is a distinction between private members being able to introduce some money bills, although in the interest of as much debate as possible, I suppose the general rule has been to allow that rule to be as liberally — if I can use this expression — interpreted as possible.

But, Mr. Speaker, the citation in *Beauchesne*, "the tendency", in my judgment is not mandatory, nor are we dealing with a money bill here. We are dealing with an amendment to a resolution which asks the government to undertake a major study. One could argue that that would involve money, but that is not absolutely necessary to the argument. I would think that the heart of the matter is whether or not this Assembly is going to be given latitude in the Speech

from the Throne debate, where all hon. members have an opportunity to have a free-flowing discussion of the concerns of their constituency or, as they perceive it, the concerns of the province; that we have that opportunity to fully debate and then, if we choose, to instruct the government in the best traditions of our parliamentary traditions. Again I say with great respect to the hon. Government House Leader that he is saying essentially that the initiative for proposing bills, for proposing ideas, has to rest with the government. That is not the case. The right to move, particularly in the Speech from the Throne debate, an inconvenient amendment — and there's no question this may be an inconvenient amendment for hon. members opposite. That's too bad. That doesn't mean it isn't procedurally correct.

MR. KING: Could I refer . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly this might be the last intervention on this point of order. I think we should get on with the debate. I may make a few more remarks after the hon. Minister of Education.

MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could refer you briefly to an additional citation, 203. I would suggest that the heart of the matter is not that described by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The heart of the matter is simply whether or not he can draft a motion of non-confidence which falls within the rules and traditions of the House. He has managed to do it successfully on previous occasions. I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, to 203 in *Beauchesne*, page 171:

Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point I would like to argue is that that would not pertain in this case. You cannot move a motion of non-confidence directing the government to do something if the passage of that amendment would have the effect of doing away with the government to whom the direction purports to be given. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to make my argument to you rather than to some of the members opposite. The effect of the amendment, I think, would be inconsistent as understood in 203, since its passage would create a motion inconsistent within itself. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm making these remarks only in a preliminary way, because I would like to give the matter further consideration without delaying the debate any further. There is no question of the supremacy of parliament involved in this motion. It's simply a question of whether it's appropriate or proper, having regard to the tradition in which we operate this parliament, for the word "direct" to be included in a motion directed to or intended for Her Majesty's government. For example, I would suggest that possibly the word "request" might be appropriate. But that is the narrow point which is concerning me and which I would like to take under advisement, then bring back word to the House as soon as possible.

In the meantime the amendment need not inhibit the scope of debate. There is no intention at all to do that, I'm sure, on the part of the Chair or any member of the Assembly or the Assembly as a whole. The debate can

continue as fully as it was going on before the amendment was moved.

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

(continued)

MR. PENGELLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to rise and speak in this Assembly for the first time. I would like to offer my sincere congratulations on your election and to the hon. Member for Athabasca, Mr. Frank Appleby, on his election as Deputy Speaker. I would also like to congratulate, the Premier, the Hon. Peter Lougheed, on his election and praise him for his wisdom and the leadership he has given to our province. I also offer congratulations to all other members of the Assembly on their election, particularly those who have been elected to cabinet and to those who were elected for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to the hon. Member for Three Hills and the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne, for their most excellent addresses.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud and excited about being a part of this government and of an Assembly that will formulate programs that will benefit all Albertans. For this I would like to express my gratitude to the voters of Innisfail, who elected me and gave me the opportunity to speak on their behalf.

It is a distinct privilege to represent one of the greatest constituencies in Alberta. This constituency is 60 miles in length and varies from 16 to 28 miles in width. It includes the towns, villages, hamlets, and centres of Innisfail, Bowden, Penhold, Spruce View, Markerville, Pine Lake, Elnora, Lousana, Delburne, and Ardley, as well as the Penhold air base at Mynarski Park and the many subdivisions surrounding the city of Red Deer.

In times past, the area was molded by glaciation, which left a variety of topographical features. These include undulating plains, clusters of wooded hills, depressions where lakes and sloughs remain, surrounded by aspens and willows. The main fissure or cut in the landscape is the Red Deer River, that winds through the western heart of the constituency and forms the northeastern and eastern boundaries.

This constituency, Mr. Speaker, has one of the highest rural populations and contains some of the best black soil in Alberta. The majority of the farms gain half their income from cattle and hogs, but sheep and poultry are also represented. Feedlots, dairies, and purebred operations, large and small, are common. Two good livestock markets are located here to serve the livestock industry. The main crop is barley, but oilseeds and fodder crops are also increasing.

The constituency, Mr. Speaker, is not without its share of industry and resources. It contains not only the energy resources of gas and oil, but coal. Gas processing plants and an oil refinery are located here. There are many manufacturing industries, which include the Bowden nurseries, sash and door mills, cabinet manufacturing, printing, four local newspapers, building components, concrete products, upholstery, pet foods, wooden toys, meat processing, and a Stramit plant. One of the largest industries, employing over 170 people, with a payroll of close to \$250,000 a month,

is the Johns-Manville fibreglass plant in Innisfail. Interestingly enough, 90 per cent of the employees live right in the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous growth, particularly in Innisfail. It has three new malls. Two new hotels and a provincial building are under construction, and architectural plans for a new hospital will be finalized by this fall. The point is that the talent of the people, government policies, and the economic climate created by our government have made it all happen.

Mr. Speaker, although we live in what might be called an Eden, we are not without concerns and recommendations. One of the priorities of the government should include the upgrading of primary and secondary highways. I would like to see the upgrading of Highway 2A from south of Bowden to Penhold. It would serve the Bowden Institution and the Bowden refinery, and would also serve as a market and access road to Bowden, Innisfail, and Penhold.

Secondly, I would like to see the completion of Highway 590 to the new bridge across the Red Deer River. Requests have been made to have secondary Highway 816 paved. It runs from secondary Highway 590 past Pine Lake to Highway 42. Highway 21, through the eastern part of the constituency, should also be selectively upgraded. The junction of Highway 2A and secondary Highway 595, just south of Red Deer, has of late received much criticism. Hopefully improvements can also be made here.

Mr. Speaker, growth has caused some problems in Innisfail, which is the population centre of the constituency. Schools are becoming crowded. The early childhood services can no longer be housed in the John Wilson elementary school. Even though generous grants are available for early childhood services, I recommend that additional funds be issued to help with the off-school location of early childhood services. These funds would help to pay for the upgrading of facilities, for utilities, janitorial services, supplies, and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I have received several letters from constituents expressing their desire to have the legal drinking age raised because of some of the associated problems. Eighteen-year-olds can legally drink at noon hour and return to class. In some schools this action may result in suspension from classes or expulsion from school. The other problem mentioned was the easier access to alcohol that younger students have from these 18-year-olds.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the upgrading and extension of the Elnora hospital. It serves a great need for the surrounding area. It was first opened in 1947; at present it has 16 beds and six bassinets. Four of the beds are assigned to an extended-care unit, and the remaining beds are utilized for active treatment. The total land area served by the Elnora hospital is in excess of 560 square miles. The population it serves is over 3,000. This doesn't take into consideration the extra population that might be served when the new bridge over the Red Deer is completed to Big Valley. It is also interesting to note that 26 per cent of the residents in Elnora alone are senior citizens. The hospital also serves an economic need in that it provides jobs for area residents and helps maintain the local pharmacy.

Mr. Speaker, as part of the water management policy, a dam on the Red Deer River at Site 6 is nearing reality. It will provide a stabilized water supply and will help the development of downstream communities

such as Red Deer and Drumheller. It is interesting to note that many constituents have voiced strong opposition to the choice of the dam site; I have personally felt that pressure. But it's also interesting to note that some who have sold their land for the site, and some who have not yet sold their land, worked for and supported me during my campaign for election. Those who have sold their land feel they have been treated generously. It is my hope that the government will continue to see that the farmers involved will receive more than fair compensation for their land and for their relocation.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with government policy, I would like to see the further decentralization of government departments, especially to locate in the constituency. I would also encourage secondary industries to locate there. They would provide jobs and opportunities for young people, and provide a tax base for towns and country jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Speech from the Throne. It focuses on children and the handicapped, who will benefit in important ways from the many new initiatives. Besides providing for these needs, perhaps an advertising campaign could be launched to encourage business and industry to employ the employable handicapped, part time or full time. This would add even more meaning to their lives.

The extension of the educational opportunity fund for programs in junior high schools serves a specific need. Students with limited academic ability or uninterested in academic courses can be helped and may even be encouraged to seek apprenticeship qualifications in certain trades.

Mr. Speaker, schools suffering from declining enrolments will benefit from the small jurisdiction grant to further equalize educational opportunities, particularly the small high school and the double grading at grade 1 and 2 levels.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons already mentioned, I'm delighted that the government will again receive submissions for new hospital projects, beginning June 1.

Grain growers will welcome the government's initiative to have grain handling facilities at the port of Prince Rupert rebuilt or upgraded. If we can move, store, and load our grain efficiently, surely we will have better access to stable world markets.

Mr. Speaker, the flexibility of the municipal debt reduction program is a boon to municipal jurisdictions. The aspect that jurisdictions with little debt will not be penalized is most fair. It will encourage sound business management and provide some municipalities with their own savings trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, when I'm reminded there are some 150 countries in the world and only 30 of them are democracies, I am somewhat overwhelmed by the privileges and responsibilities I have as an elected M.L.A. To help my constituents achieve their aspirations and to help this Assembly with its goals, I pledge my abilities, my diligence, my energies, and my efforts.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of Innisfail, thank you very much.

MRS. FYFE: In responding to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, there are many components of the speech that are extremely important to the St. Albert constituency. As the representative for the constituency of St. Albert, I wish to set out a number of characteristics that I think have some significance.

Firstly, St. Albert is the largest constituency in Alberta, with nearly 28,000 eligible voters, and growing. If not the most diverse, it is certainly among the few that are diverse. Agriculture can be said to be the base economy. But due to the proximity of a large, urban centre, a great deal of land has been subdivided into acreage developments. The villages of Legal and Bon Accord have experienced substantial growth and are now well over the 1,000 population mark. The towns of Morinville and Gibbons are also expanding at a rapid rate. In addition, the constituency of St. Albert includes the Alexander Indian Reserve, the Namao air force base, Alberta Hospital at Oliver, and the Evergreen mobile-home park, which are communities unto themselves. Concerns of the Horsehills district in the southeast of the constituency differ from those of Namao, from Vimy in the north, or Alcomdale, Riviere Qui Barre, Villeneuve in the west, and Calahoo in the extreme southeast. Some of these extremities sometimes feel like forgotten areas.

St. Albert, located in the south centre of the constituency, is Alberta's newest city, having been given city status under the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Dick Johnston. The city of St. Albert is comprised of a little more than 50 per cent of the population of the constituency and, in addition to being the newest city, also has the distinction of being the oldest municipality within Alberta. St. Albert's origins as a settlement date back to 1861, when Father Albert Lacombe selected the site for the residence of some 20 Metis families. This site was selected on the basis of its picturesque topography, fresh water from the Sturgeon River, and the surrounding good agricultural land.

The primary importance of St. Albert was as a mission and a religious centre for the region, having capacity also to look after the spiritual and educational needs of the small settlement, later to become the city of Edmonton. [laughter] By 1901, St. Albert was a major urban settlement of 960 persons, second only in size to the communities of Edmonton and Strathcona, which had a combined population of 4,200.

As the railroads played an all-important part in the development of community centres — the CN came to Edmonton and the CP to Strathcona — St. Albert was left to await a future major role in the development of this province.

The discovery of oil near Leduc in 1947 was the catalyst for the tremendous physical and economic development which has been experienced in the Edmonton area and in Alberta as a whole. St. Albert has grown rapidly, particularly in the past decade, and still retains a strong identity with its past, which partly explains the vigorous determination to maintain an independent identity.

Due to the fact that taxes within the St. Albert constituency are based primarily on residential assessment, the municipalities are energetically pursuing a more favorable tax base through the attraction of suitable industry. I am very pleased with the establishment of the Department of Economic Development, as it is most important to have this department responsible for the promotion and co-ordination of industry and for planning this province's economic future. The establishment of this department is very important to the St. Albert constituency.

During the past year, I have spent a great deal of time travelling throughout my constituency, meeting

the residents and listening to their ideas and concerns. I suggest the results were not a yes or no verdict, as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggests. The greatest problems we face in our constituency relate to growth and the management of that growth, together with the provision of services for new and long-term residents.

The traffic congestion on the St. Albert Trail is a symptom of the need for a co-ordinated approach to metropolitan development. I feel it is essential to provide more centres of employment and certainly subscribe to this government's decentralization policies. The St. Albert constituency can provide ideal alternatives to the concentration of development with a one-way traffic flow in and out of a major area. The construction of a ring road in the Edmonton region is becoming increasingly more necessary, as major truck routes are essential for decentralization to be effective.

Mr. Speaker, while there are a host of topics I could select from the throne speech, I would like to comment on three that I feel are of particular significance. Firstly, I would make reference to the municipal debt reduction plan. Over the past eight years, an increasing number of program grants have been made to municipalities: increases in policing grants, utility grants, substantial grants in roadway and public transportation. While I was on St. Albert municipal council, I recall we were delighted with the \$780,000 grant received for purchase of new transit buses.

In addition to cultural, recreation, and preventative social services grants, which have been substantially increased over the past eight years, each municipality receives an unconditional grant based on the equalized assessment. I feel it is grossly unfair to suggest that support for municipalities has been static or that financial assistance was suddenly announced to resolve a critical problem. Property taxes in Alberta are the lowest in Canada before this program comes into effect. For the city within which I reside, the amount of grants set out in the municipal debt reduction program, \$500 per capita, is 23 times larger than the 1979 unconditional grant. This debt reduction grant, which is extremely significant, relieves the municipal corporation from debt payments and provides a great deal of flexibility for future economic planning. I believe it is unfair to say this is a one-time shot, but rather an increasing concern for the ratepayer of this province that has been demonstrated through actions over the past years.

The second item in the throne speech that I would like to comment on is related to handicapped services. I believe it is important to mention that these programs, set out in the Speech from the Throne, were developed as a response to the need which exists within our province. Handicapped persons and those responsible for the handicapped have been communicating concerns and needs for government involvement in a variety of areas. A responsive government listens and, as the Speech from the Throne has announced, new programs will be introduced to assist many handicapped persons.

However, our task is not completed. We must continue to respond, improve, and — I believe, very importantly — co-ordinate government services to make their application less confusing and ultimately more effective for the recipients. I urge government to move as quickly as possible in the provision of the deaf and blind facility, as time is the most critical factor for

youngsters with this condition.

Thirdly, I would like to comment on the medical research component of the throne speech. Having been a parent who has taken a child to the United States for medical treatment, it is with the greatest joy that I anticipate the development of a medical research climate that is second to none in the world. I do not wish to repeat comments already made by the hon. Member for Edson. But if observers have felt that this throne speech is stuffy or boring, I challenge them to a more exciting possibility than to find a new treatment or cure due to research carried out in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with each of you in this term and to sharing your ideas and concerns. The constituents of St. Albert have entrusted me with a great responsibility, which I take very seriously. I will do my best to represent all areas of my constituency fairly and equally. It is indeed a privilege to take my place in this Legislative Assembly.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to revert to introduction of guests. This isn't my speech.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member have leave?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

DR. C. ANDERSON: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you, the members of the Frog Lake school. There are 24 grades 7 and 8 students from Frog Lake, accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Kraemer, Sister Jeannette, and Mr. Norman Quinney. I'd like them to stand and be recognized in the usual manner.

Thank you.

Head: **CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH** (*continued*)

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate you and the Deputy Speaker on your election as the principal officers of this Assembly. I'd like you to know that we share a warm personal regard for you as our chairman, and your wisdom and independence are certainly well spoken of throughout the Assembly.

I'd also like to congratulate the hon. Member for Three Hills and the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn for their very fine contributions to this debate. I was very impressed, and very proud to be a member of the freshman class after such an introduction.

It has long been the custom of this Assembly for new members to say a few words about their district and, with your indulgence, sir, I would like to continue in that tradition for just a moment. It's a special privilege and honor for me to represent the people of Edmonton Glengarry. The district is in the north-central part of the city of Edmonton, and isn't easily described in terms of buildings, roads, or monuments. It's a relatively new area of the city. For me, Edmonton Glengarry is the people who live there, their hopes, fears, strengths, and energy.

The district is part of a very large urban centre, and by and large shares its characteristics with many others. We have many people from diverse origins, backgrounds, ethnic groups, age groups, settlement patterns, and occupational groups. We have many new Canadians, and they bring to our community a special pride and love of their country. They cherish liberty, freedom, and opportunity, often because the places they have come from haven't had those gifts to offer them. They bring a rich cultural heritage to our province, and values of tolerance and respect for their fellow man.

Edmonton is a city that seems to grow in concentric rings. The older communities lie at the heart, with new subdivisions radiating out, and newer cities like St. Albert, which may soon enjoy the pleasures of being part of the larger metropolitan area, either as part of a metro government or the city of Edmonton. I enjoyed the gentle dig from the hon. Member for St. Albert about Edmonton originally being a small settlement at the time St. Albert was just growing.

But the observation that Edmonton seems to grow in concentric rings is more than just an interesting point. The inner communities undergo serious pressure from outlying areas like St. Albert or newer districts growing to the north. It imposes serious pressures on transportation, social problems, recreational needs, needs for basic services like hospitals. As people and communities age, these changing demands are important and serious challenges to any administration.

The subdivisions seem remote to the new people. People who lack transportation are often isolated. We see that younger people, lacking recreational facilities, often turn to juvenile delinquency. That's a serious problem in my district: I have the dubious distinction of having a district with the highest rate of juvenile delinquency in the city of Edmonton. There's been some suggestion that the youngest member of the Assembly might also qualify for that. [laughter]

But I'm also pleased to note that the government of Alberta is responding to those needs, and I'm very pleased to be part of the Assembly and congratulate the government. Just the other day the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care was out to my district to open the Dickensfield Extended Care Centre. That brings to our area of the community 300 beds, nursing home and senior citizen accommodation in a hospital setting, and it's a very important addition to the community.

In Edmonton Glengarry we have characteristics of both the older communities I was talking about, the communities that have serious problems because of transportation routes being cut through the heart of the district, and newer districts that are putting that pressure on the heart of the city. We have a variety of occupational groups. It's accurate to say that the people I represent are the people who make this province go. They build the buildings and transport the goods and services around the province. They're small businessmen, and they're also involved in basic support services like government and education. So it's a real pleasure for me to try to represent them in the Assembly.

Having knocked on most of the doors of the district in the last year or so — I started in August last year and finished up in near blizzard conditions, minus 40 — I was very pleased to take part in the larger election campaign that finished on March 14.

I want to congratulate the government warmly on their initiatives outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I think the Speech from the Throne is a program of intended legislative action and also a thumbnail sketch of government activity. Clearly we have a very progressive administration in this outline of legislative action. I greet very enthusiastically the new ministry of Economic Development and the programs it would bring. The government's intent is to diversify the economy, an important policy thrust that has continued since 1971. That objective is largely to provide challenging employment to young people in future generations so they do not have to go out of the province, but can seek employment and enjoy the blessings of this province.

Our senior citizens and young families in Edmonton Glengarry were very pleased, I know, by the pioneer home improvement program and the program to assist young families purchasing homes. The grant to seniors, in particular, will provide a sense of independence and security to them. Our senior citizens have contributed a great deal to the province's development, and they deserve a great deal of respect and assistance as they strive to remain independent. By encouraging them to remain independent and in their homes, their pride and self-worth are enhanced.

I'd also like to single out the Department of Transportation and its programs to assist the city of Edmonton and metropolitan areas in developing new interchanges, and transportation assistance to the city of Edmonton.

I think the family units in the province of Alberta are under a great deal of pressure. We have a very rapidly growing and changing community in Alberta. A home, a family, is quite a commitment to the future, I think. A family unit is an act of faith, and we have several clear examples of progressive government in the Speech from the Throne in assisting those family units.

For me, however, the most important program that was announced in the Speech from the Throne is the assistance to the handicapped. The aids for daily living program will provide the physical support so necessary in adapting to a complex society for people less fortunate than their fellow citizens. The assured income for the handicapped program will also ensure that citizens less fortunate than us are provided with the basic means to be independent and self-reliant.

I think the true test of a community's character is the compassion it has for people. When people respect and help their fellow men who are less fortunate because of circumstances beyond their control, I think we have something more valuable than all the riches in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I'm the youngest member of the Assembly. As a student of history and one whose future stretches out, I hope, long and beyond, it's a unique opportunity for me to reflect on where we've been and where we're going. My roots in the Pacific northwest stretch back to the 1830s and 1840s, when my family first arrived here. My great-grandfather, Dr. William McKay, was the first surgeon in what is now the Northwest Territories and Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. He arrived in western Canada from Scotland in 1864. There's a remarkable similarity to the Member for Edson, another Scot who practises medicine. My great-grandfather's practice, though, extended throughout the area the Hudson's Bay controlled. In-

terestingly, his practice centred in Fort Chipewyan, which was then the largest community in Alberta; it was the administrative centre for the district. He met and married a girl of 16 whose family had been here for some considerable time before.

But the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that 100 years ago this province's economy was based largely on the fur trade, and in the intervening time we've developed a province whose economy is rich and diversified, [based] not on the staple trade of shipping furs to Europe, but rather a strong agricultural economy, an economy based on energy and evolving into manufacturing. I think back to the 1860s and what we've accomplished, what my great-grandfather must have seen as he stood on the banks of the North Saskatchewan, roughly where we are today, and I wonder what he would think if he saw us in action — a province, a bustling community of almost 2 million.

One more interesting note is that the first Legislature of the province of Alberta was held in the school that was named after Dr. McKay. This building is on the site of the old Hudson's Bay fort, where he was very active in serving the community.

History is a very real part of our lives, and it gives us a sense of meaning and purpose. I think the province's creation was an act of faith by those pioneers. So when I reflect back, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the enormous trust we've inherited from our forefathers and 'foremothers'. I hope we can prove worthy of their confidence and work together in the future.

This leads me to reflect on why I'm here in this House. My dad taught me that it's important that we leave this place in better shape than we found it. This province has shaped me, as it's shaped all its sons and daughters. Whatever our origins, from wherever we came, we share a tradition of enterprise, of freedom, of mutual regard, and a sense of inherited responsibility for the future. We share a trust. So my goals for the future reflect my concern for the critical choices that lie ahead. As my life stretches ahead, the directions we take now will shape the environment we will pass on to our children.

Mr. Speaker, our democratic system depends on these critical choices being made in an open atmosphere. That, I think, is the real meaning of the democratic process: that decisions be made in public, choosing between various alternatives. Perhaps I could reflect on the Minister of Education sparking a debate — I think it was very useful — on the values of family life education. There we saw a good example of the democratic process in action; people choosing between different alternatives presented, debating them freely and openly. The minister is to be congratulated on sparking the debate. While I might not entirely agree with the reasons outlined initially, I certainly congratulate him on encouraging people to participate in that debate. That's useful.

In 1972 the Club of Rome set off a worldwide debate of a similar nature, on limits to growth. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I question the desirability of growth *per se*, and I have a very sober and deep concern for what it involves. Alberta is a province that is experiencing very, very rapid growth. I think we're going to be reappraising an era of cheap fossil fuels; we're going to be increasingly aware of the environmental limits to development. As raw materials become more scarce, we will come to rely on capital-intensive and hard to exploit resources. We're seeing that process now in the

Athabasca tar sands. I think we have to recognize that we have a responsibility to the nation as a whole to help maintain a very high standard of living and culture, and we have little choice but to develop those natural resources. We cannot beggar our neighbors.

If we're going to meet the goals of national self-sufficiency, I see a need to bring on stream an oil sands or tar sands plant every year to year and a half. Those aren't my projections. Those are the projections of people in our national government who are very concerned about national self-sufficiency in energy. I think we have to co-operate, while setting terms of protection for our society and our environment, because the strains put on our community by that kind of development — a new Syncrude or oil sands plant every year or year and a half — are just enormous.

Conserving our beauty and environment is going to be a real challenge. As our urban population sprawls, the demands on our mountain wilderness areas, parklands, and grasslands will grow dramatically in the near future, and Alberta is going to have to continue wrestling with the need to balance environmental concerns with our responsibility to serve the Canadian people. I do not believe that heavy industrialization is intrinsically desirable for the province. I am perhaps a romantic, but I think we also have to develop a conserver approach to our community and our resources.

Economic realities are always going to discriminate against our province, because we have a very small population far from markets. I think there is a balance, a choice. There are conflicts in values, and here I hark back to the debate sparked by the Minister of Education. We have to consider seriously the alternatives presented before us. Again, I go back to the political process. I think this is the value of having a freely elected Legislative Assembly and discussions held in public. Because as a community we're going to have to meet those choices. They're going to be tough, difficult ones, and they're going to be unrelenting. As we finish one, we're going to be turning to another.

The dependence of Canada on foreign supplies of crude oil is going to be alarming and threatens our national security. We're going to find that forces outside this province's control are going to dictate, in part, the shape of our future.

Domestic supplies of Alberta oil and natural gas must be expanded. Conventional and non-conventional energy reserves must be developed. Tar sands plants, coal, and coal gasification are all economic at \$23 a barrel, the world price for oil. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the spot price of oil we now find on European domestic markets. We're rapidly reaching the point where we're going to have to develop those facilities — tar sands plants, coal projects, and coal gasification — and the strains that are going to be put on the eastern slopes, for example, on the parklands we have come to know and cherish, are going to be simply enormous. We're going to be tackling those problems on a continuous basis. Like it or not, Alberta has a special burden for the country.

The changes my great-grandfather would have seen in the past 100 years are precisely the changes we're going to be seeing in 100 years. As a person who believes in a conservative society, I think the choices involve the need for environmental standards that we're going to have to reassess upwards. We're going to have to look at conservation, and research and devel-

opment of solar and biomass sources of energy, as alternatives to those other choices — coal, coal gasification, and oil sands. Nuclear and fusion power are going to become important, and they're all going to be subjects of continued debate in this Assembly.

If I might just turn for a moment to agriculture, Mr. Speaker, as a city boy I want to recognize the tremendous importance of that industry in our province. Higher fuel costs may force a change in some of our agricultural technology. Organic farming, more labor-intensive techniques, research into improved crops and livestock, and the protection of agricultural land from urban encroachment are all going to be very important.

I am concerned that the very best farmland in Canada and in Alberta is being eaten up by urban sprawl. Here again we have critical choices ahead of us. I'd like to take the city of Edmonton for an example. Here we have a large urban area growing with a dynamism not of its own — from forces beyond — that has choices of where to grow. I suggest that we should, as a matter of policy, direct that growth into areas that are primarily poor farmland, restrict or zone good farmland, and reserve it for all time for agricultural production. Mr. Speaker, we're going to be in a very hungry world in the years ahead, and that trust we share not only for Canadians but the world as well is one that cannot be taken lightly for short-term gain or convenience.

We do have choices and alternatives. Our communities have traditionally been the focus of a lot of growth in population, and they're going to continue to grow whether we like it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very concerned that our metro areas are growing too fast for their own good. They grow not because they want to, but because of the dynamics of forces outside the province, as I've mentioned. This growing need for energy and food in a hungry and demanding world will continue to force these choices on us, and of necessity we're going to have to recognize also that the growth is going to put stress on family units. Transportation problems are never going to go away. I think city traffic problems today will pale into insignificance as we look back, as we grow in urban areas two and three times larger. And grow they must. Our job is to help try to identify those social, economic, and physical problems, anticipate them before they happen, and plan for them.

We're going to have to make other decisions and other choices. These problems may seem complex at this point in space and time. But think back a hundred years, on what the choices, the problems, must have been for our forefathers, and extrapolate that ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we're in a transition phase. The challenge of the twentieth century that remains to us is to make intelligent choices. Fortunately we have fine leadership in this administration, and I am very confident we'll meet those challenges. We have the democratic institutions that will protect the interests of our community.

I want to close with just a few final observations. The genius, I think, of any people is shown not in the construction of buildings, edifices, or monuments. The test of a community's true character is always in the ability to protect the people who are less fortunate and unable to protect themselves. These eternal values of compassion for our fellow man are what I hope will set this province apart in the years ahead. History will

record our pursuit of knowledge and truth as we, I hope, challenge our universities, postsecondary institutions, and young people. Our children are the vital factor in our plans for the future, and man will judge our contributions not in terms of a building or a highway, but rather in the people we leave behind.

Alberta has an unique challenge and opportunity bestowed on it by nature and by the people. In the coming years I'm confident we'll meet those challenges, contribute to the upward march of humanity, and be judged well by our children.

Mr. Speaker, it's a special privilege for me to serve the people of Edmonton Glengarry in the province of Alberta, and I want to dedicate the few talents I can contribute to the critical choices that lie ahead. I think that in this administration and in the Speech from the Throne we can see that those kinds of initiatives are being contemplated and that we're in good hands.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged and honored to address this Assembly as the representative of the constituency of Red Deer. I feel particularly proud to be the successor of the very respected and able James L. Foster, who not only provided superb service to the constituents of Red Deer, but in addition served the people of Alberta with distinction during his two terms of office. He also provided leadership as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and as Attorney General. I welcome this opportunity to thank him publicly for his diligent efforts and for the positive results he achieved as a representative for Red Deer. Alberta most assuredly benefited in many ways due to Jim's participation as a member of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency that has many features and sets of circumstances which make it unique in Alberta and, in one or two instances, in Canada. These unique characteristics will have a great impact on the citizens of Red Deer and of central Alberta in years to come. Consequently, conscientious planning and the timing of future developments of all kinds will play a large role in the continued high quality of life enjoyed by Albertans in this important part of the province.

In order to set the scene, if you will, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to dwell briefly on the recent history of the development of this city. It should be recognized by the members of the Assembly that the constituency of Red Deer has exactly the same boundaries as the city. The area of representation is common to this member of the Legislature and the mayor, city council, and the school board members. So if one were to pay attention to old clichés, it could be said that Red Deer citizens are being overgoverned. On the other hand, this amount of public representation is probably going to be needed in this very rapidly growing city; in fact a city being advertised all over Canada as the centre of most rapid growth on a percentage basis. Some of the statistics just announced as the result of a census held this past April indicate an 8.4 per cent increase over the population of one year ago, which was in turn a 7.7 per cent increase over the previous year. These very high growth rate increases have been going on now for over four years. Red Deer now stands out clearly as the fourth largest population centre in the province: 39,380 persons.

Mr. Speaker, many people will ask why Red Deer has become such a magnet for people from all over Cana-

da, and I feel this bears some explanation. It all began about five years ago, when two major world-scale chemical companies were vying for the ethylene gas to be produced by the extraction plant now nearing completion 10 miles east of the city. One of these major chemical companies placed purchase options on land on the outskirts of the city, and rumors rapidly spread all over Canada that a chemical empire to be composed of cottage-type companies would be established in and around the city. This company was not successful in its bid to purchase ethylene gas and therefore left the area. The company which successfully bid and obtained the 20-year total production from the ethylene extraction plant elected to pipe the product to the Edmonton area for final processing. It should be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that while up to 1,300 workers have been employed in the construction of the plant, now nearing completion, only about 130 persons will be employed to operate it.

In the meantime, because of a depressed economic situation, with high unemployment in other areas of Canada, many unskilled or semi-skilled persons elected to try their luck here and consequently came in their thousands, hoping to be included in the bonanza of jobs they expected would develop in the city — which they did. But in construction not petrochemicals.

In addition, the surrounding towns, all from within a few minutes to not more than 45 minutes' drive away, were also experiencing very rapid growth. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that my neighboring constituency colleagues will inform this Assembly of the specifics pertaining to the population growth in Blackfalds, Innisfail, Lacombe, Ponoka, Rimbey, Rocky Mountain House, and Sylvan Lake. Suffice to say in this address that the combined growth of these towns, as well as the many villages and hamlets, has now created the third largest trading, distribution, and servicing area centred in a smaller city in this province.

Within a 50-mile radius, this population is dependent on the city of Red Deer to provide regional services of many kinds, not the least of which are in the fields of health, social, culture, education, and government departments of all kinds. The people of central Alberta feel that all these services should be available within reasonable driving time, which is possible by virtue of the highway system established many years ago. In most cases this precludes travel, as the crow flies, into Edmonton and/or Calgary. Instead most people must travel from their homes, through or close to Red Deer, before turning north or south to these two large metropolitan centres.

Mr. Speaker, this government is to be commended for recognizing these travel times and for the decentralization policies of encouraging growth in smaller centres in Alberta by transferring many central government departments into the smaller cities and larger towns throughout the province. Red Deer, of course, has benefited from this policy, and the constituents of Red Deer are appreciative of these efforts and its share, in particular a \$59 million regional referral hospital now under construction and a \$17 million provincial services building, which is also well toward completion.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is cause for concern that all the segments that go toward making a fully integrated regional community will continue to fall in place. Many people feel that the next two or three years will be critical for Red Deer, due to the very recent

rapid growth of population and the need to keep a proper growth relationship of the rapidly expanding needs of the community for all the regional services I referred to earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch briefly on the economic uncertainty prevalent in the minds of many constituents; that is, that there is currently under way too much development in apartment, warehousing, and office buildings, and that we are rapidly reaching a very dramatic overbuild situation, particularly when there has been very little corresponding industrial growth to provide long-term jobs to keep the economy operating at a steady pace. In fact, by the very nature of our very rapid population growth, we are moving into a precarious economic condition, and this can only be averted if some stimulus is found to provide jobs in the near future. It is hoped that a rumored twinning of the Alberta Gas Ethylene extraction plant will take place within a short time and that a cottage type of petrochemical industry will become part of the economic base of the city of Red Deer.

It should be repeated for emphasis sake, Mr. Speaker, that by far the greatest number of people currently arriving in Red Deer are becoming engaged in or providing services to the construction industry. In effect a large portion of the people are feeding on each other. To illustrate this point, I would like to cite statistics provided by a recent city economic development report, which states that in 1978, 150 new businesses were established in Red Deer and created 1,278 jobs. However, only eight of these businesses were engaged in manufacturing or the processing of finished products and only employed 148 persons. Now while the public service payroll is fairly stable and accounts for 25.2 per cent of the work force, the present industrial and agribusiness base in the city is not sufficient to sustain a level of employment sufficient to avert a serious economic downturn if the building boom slacks off, which at this time appears to be inevitable. The April census further points out that almost 1,000 housing units are vacant, including nearly 600 apartment suites, for a 12.8 per cent apartment vacancy rate. Yet at this time, 1,000 additional apartment suites are being constructed or are in the final planning stages to commence construction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to cry that blue ruin is staring us in the face. In the long run I am confident that as more and more people come to Alberta a significant number will settle in the transportation corridor between Edmonton and Calgary, thus creating a population nucleus that, by their number, will create not only an ongoing market for goods and services of all kinds but as well will create a work force of persons available for retraining to industrial pursuits in a third major industry, that of manufacturing and processing the raw materials of our two basic industries: agriculture, and oil and natural gas.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, many constituents are concerned that there continue to be activity in the development of a number of projects that have been planned for some time and thus keep many of the present work force employed in construction while the transition is taking place. One of these projects is the relocation of the Red Deer Exhibition from a crowded downtown area to a much larger land area on the south side of the city, easily accessible to Highway No. 2. It is hoped by many, Mr. Speaker, that a new exposition site with larger facilities, with a new name, The Westerner, with

a new constitution that permits province-wide participation on its directorate, will develop a province-wide showplace for agriculture and that it will in fact become a show window to which could be attracted buyers for Alberta-produced agricultural products on a national and international scale, and thus create a whole new industry in this, the most centrally located city relative to the population mass of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few years Red Deer has become a very significant convention centre, able to handle groups up to 2,000 people. It is ideally suited for tourists, as it is located at the juncture of highways 2 and 11, with Highway 11 providing a fourth major traffic route westward to the mountains and to Howse Pass, which hopefully in the not too distant future will be opened up to permit an alternate highway transportation link to move agricultural and industrial products more readily to the large west coast markets.

In many aspects, Mr. Speaker, Red Deer is at the crossroads and will call for assistance as provided for by this government in continuing an extensive arterial road building program, made possible by the new six-year urban transportation plan. The growth of the city in physical dimensions and population, with resulting traffic, is in direct conflict with the present location of the CPR main line, as it winds a path in and out of the Red Deer River valley to the station and freight yards located in the downtown area. Many constituents now living in the west portion of the city encounter much inconvenience by having to cross numerous level crossings in their daily travels. Mr. Speaker, decisions will soon be required to determine whether to proceed with rail relocation to the Highway No. 2 transportation corridor on the west side of the city, or to embark on an extensive program of providing overpasses and underpasses to avoid bottlenecks in the orderly flow of traffic.

While we have spoken at length primarily of economic factors, it should be restated that man does not live by bread alone. And so it is, in the constituency of Red Deer, located in the heart of the parkland area of the province. The winding Red Deer River divides the city into almost two equal parts. In addition two creeks traverse the southern part of the city. Through the centuries these waterways created flood plains to create large level areas on the valley floor in various parts of the city. The river, creek banks, and the valley itself are populated by many hundreds of spruce and other coniferous trees, indeed a most delightful setting in which to have a city located.

A very large percentage of the people living in Red Deer are concerned that this pastoral setting be preserved for the enjoyment of the generations to come. They therefore welcome the emphasis this government is placing on the creation of parks throughout the province. The very high cost of acquiring suitable areas has been prohibitive to most municipal governments, and it is therefore hoped that assistance will be forthcoming from the provincial government in this regard.

While the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission and succeeding city councils have worked diligently to preserve strips of land along the river and creek banks, large areas should be protected as restricted development areas or as parks to ensure that these valuable assets are not lost to land development. Of particular interest at this time is a unique bird sanctuary of 230 acres within the city limits and a

250-acre parcel located on the western boundary of the city, adjacent to Highway No. 11.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the constituents of Red Deer will be pleased with the reaffirmation in the throne speech of this government's policy to provide a continuing high level of support for the performing arts. During the past 10 years many people in Red Deer and central Alberta have been looking forward to a fine arts and performing-arts facility. While the present converted aircraft hangar of second war vintage has provided yeoman service, other building priorities have taken precedence in the growth of the city to date. It is now hoped that, as part of the upcoming seventy-fifth anniversary program, central Albertans will have a long-time dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand to speak in this Assembly today, proud to be the representative of the people of Red Deer in this period of unprecedented vitality and growth. I look forward to the challenges which will face me during the next four years to help in providing sound government not only for all the citizens of Red Deer but for all Albertans as well.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unlike my colleague from St. Paul, to my right, I'm not standing to introduce anybody.

AN HON. MEMBER: Except yourself.

MR. SINDLINGER: Except myself.

I'm very pleased to represent the Calgary inner core riding of Calgary Buffalo. I'd like to congratulate everyone here on their achievements and their accomplishments. I personally haven't quite got over the shock of being here. I'm sure I will eventually. I have been here before, but it's been in the public gallery, observing the members. I must admit that the point of view down here is entirely different. There is quite an atmosphere of austerity and reverence here, and I can assure the Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I don't have to try to be humble while I'm here. I am indeed humble being here. I'm also glad to be here under what I consider the buddy system. I think the welcome you've given me, the hospitality and cordiality I've felt from colleagues and members of the House, will stand well, and I appreciate that very much.

Listening to other members speak on the Speech from the Throne has made me start to wonder what I could say about my constituency. I've heard people talk about the biggest riding, the best riding, the most beautiful riding, and what have you. I guess the best way to start about Calgary Buffalo is to point out that Calgary Buffalo is contiguous to Calgary West, and during the recent provincial election the leader of one of our major parties saw fit to establish his campaign headquarters in Calgary Buffalo. He was very successful. The site and location did him well. He is now the Premier of the province, and the residents of Calgary Buffalo welcome him back for the next election as well.

I'd like to speak about five things today, if I may. The first is senior citizens; the second, school closure; third, transportation; fourth, energy; and fifth, The Year of the Child.

In regard to senior citizens of this province — and there are many senior citizens in Calgary Buffalo — I think that whatever this government can do for them is well deserved. I've travelled extensively throughout

North America, and I've travelled overseas. I've yet to come across a place that is as fine a place to live as Alberta. We are blessed with many parks, libraries, schools, roads, sidewalks, businesses, what have you. But all those things didn't happen by themselves. They're there today because of the hard work of Albertans who have preceded us, and we owe them a great debt of gratitude. I only hope that when we've gone, we can leave as much for our future generations as they have left for us.

In Calgary Buffalo there is the Jacques Lodge for senior citizens and the Spruce Place nursing villa. In the centre of Calgary Buffalo is Kerby Centre. Kerby Centre is the old Mount Royal College campus, which I attended when I first went to school in Calgary. It was turned over to senior citizens for their own use. The guideline, or major criterion, that the senior citizens have for the operation of Kerby Centre is seniors serving seniors.

I listened with a great deal of interest yesterday when we were talking about the aging process. I can't say I understand what aging means, but I certainly understand what it means to be a senior citizen. I also appreciate the comments made in regard to the loneliness and needs of senior citizens. I think it's a worthwhile effort to make sure there is enough opportunity for senior citizens to look after themselves. Just as they say: senior citizens serving senior citizens.

I went to a golf course last summer. As you went out to the first tee at this golf course, there was a jar with tees saying, take them they're free. People did take them; they stuffed their pockets with them; they got up on the tee, and as they hit the ball they left the tee lying there. As you went to every tee throughout that golf course you would find they were covered with golf tees. The point I'm trying to make is that when you give people something for nothing, more often than not that's the value they place upon it.

I think that senior citizens should not be put in that position. As a government we should provide the superstructure for senior citizens to function and do for themselves that which they wish. After we the government provide that superstructure, I believe it's up to the senior citizens, just as it is up to each of us as individuals to provide the walls to that superstructure, the floors, divide up the rooms, or whatever — whatever way we would like to have it.

The second subject I would like to deal with today is school closure in Calgary Buffalo, a matter of major concern. Seven schools are proposed for closure by the Calgary Board of Education, and there are different viewpoints in regard to the closure of those schools. The Calgary Board of Education, of course, is concerned because the schools are there but the students aren't.

Calgary Buffalo is an inner-city area and, like a lot of inner-city areas, it's started to deteriorate. So the Calgary Board of Education is faced with the problem of constructing new schools in the outlying areas where the students now are, and it finds itself with empty classrooms in the inner part of the city. It only makes sense to them to close those schools down.

The city council of Calgary has a different viewpoint in regard to school closure. For some years it has been developing an inner-city plan, the objective of which is to rejuvenate and revitalize the inner-city area. So quite clearly there is a conflict of objectives. The city of Calgary is also trying to develop new alternate uses

for those schools, which is a commendable objective. Yet we still have these alternate points of view.

A third point of view that may be taken in regard to school closure in Calgary is that of the province. The province's overall attitude in regard to schools is that communities ought to have local autonomy. Those within the community are closer to the circumstances, and therefore should be in a better position to decide what to do about those schools. However, I feel we ought to keep in mind that the province is an influential factor in regard to school closure, not only in Calgary Buffalo but in all regions in the province. Whereas the main reason for closing those schools may be that there aren't students in the area—where the schools exist, the fact that the province provides funds for new school construction is an influencing factor. In the months to come I feel that we in the government, the Legislature, ought to bear that in mind.

The third item I'd like to talk about is transportation. The Speech from the Throne talks about a continuing effort on behalf of this government to develop freight rates that would be conducive to economic development in the province of Alberta. This isn't a new initiative by any means; the government has been pursuing this end for some time. There was a period in Alberta's history when the economic development of this province was seriously impeded by what the railways term long-haul/short-haul freight rates.

The classic example of that situation was a shipment of goods from eastern Canada to western Canada. It was possible to ship goods from eastern Canada to Vancouver at a lower freight rate than it was to ship them from eastern Canada to Calgary. In fact some Alberta businessmen found it to their advantage, less expensive, to ship their goods from eastern Canada to Vancouver, take them off the rail car, put them back onto the rail car, and then ship them back to Calgary. That may sound strange, and it may sound like—it doesn't make a lot of sense. But it made a lot of sense to the railways, because the movement of those goods to Vancouver made a contribution to their fixed costs while at the same time covering all their out-of-pocket costs. As I mentioned, that made sense from the point of view of the railways; however, it didn't make much sense from the point of view of Albertans. As well, the consequence of those freight rates was serious inhibition of economic and industrial growth in Alberta.

Through the efforts of this government, those rates have now been eliminated. They no longer exist. But just as that anomaly existed, anomalies in the railway freight rate situation still exist. I'm pleased to see that the government still intends to pursue those ends, so Albertans will enjoy the same privileges and rights in transportation as other areas of the country now enjoy.

The fourth subject I'd like to address is energy. Energy enjoys a great deal of prominence in Alberta, and rightly so. When I started talking about how other members could stand up and say their riding was the biggest, best, or most beautiful, I searched my mind to find something I could say was the biggest, best, or most beautiful in Calgary Buffalo. Well, it just happens that Calgary Buffalo encompasses the core downtown area of Calgary, and most of the main executive administrative offices of the oil industry are located within that area. So I can say with confidence and pride that Calgary Buffalo is indeed the oil centre of Canada. And for those of you who will not accept that, I can say that Calgary Buffalo has the highest

buildings in the province. So that would be the second one.

Many people are involved in the oil and gas industry. It's a very complex industry, difficult to understand. There are those who are still struggling with terms such as throughput, output, shot-put, and whatever. This ignorance isn't restricted just to citizens, or people in or out of the industry.

I recall a time a delegation from the petroleum industry was sent to the Minister of Energy in British Columbia when that government changed. The purpose of the delegation was just to apprise that minister of what was happening in the industry, introduce themselves, and say they were there and, if he needed help, come along. After the pleasantries of introduction, the Minister of Energy started to berate the oil people, saying they were crooks and things of this nature. I don't know if that's true or not, but that's what he said anyway.

The reason he said he didn't feel they were acting in the best interests of the citizens of British Columbia was that he felt they had a monopoly going for them in terms of gasoline for their automobiles. He said, all you oil companies have these gas outlets on this corner or that corner. If we want to buy our gas, we have to pull up to your gas station and you charge us an exorbitant price. He said, if I had my way, this government of British Columbia is going to put a tap just like the water taps on the outside of the houses. When we want to fill up our cars, we'll just pull up to the back of the house, turn that tap, and get our gas out of there. Now in a lot of ways that underlines the uncertainty, the lack of knowledge about the petroleum industry, a very complex industry.

I believe that misunderstanding and lack of knowledge pervades the Canadian political scene today. The major questions in regard to energy are: who owns the energy, and who benefits from it? My response to that is that the energy resources of this province belong to the people of this province. It's up to them to develop that energy in a way that's responsive to the needs of Canadians and in a way that's responsible to the needs of Canadians. The second question: with whom do the benefits from the existence of those energy resources lie? I don't think there can be any question about that. The benefits that will be derived from the development of energy resources in Alberta belong to Canadians. I believe that we as Albertans are Canadians, just as is everyone else in this country.

That takes me to the fifth item I wanted to address, the Year of the Child. Last week we all had the opportunity to stand on the steps of this building and listen to some young boys and girls read the rights in the Year of the Child. I felt that some of the things they said were very inspiring. One of the things they said was that one province does not make Canada. Then one young fellow stood up and said, Premier Lougheed, please step forward. We all thought that was kind of humorous and audacious of the young person, but I think we could take those words and say to ourselves, to our colleagues, to Mr. Speaker, to all of us here in the responsibility we have in years to come: step forward.

There's no question that these are troubled times for Canada from a political point of view. There can be no question of that when there is a government in power dedicated to changing the structure of Confederation. It's up to us to stand forth, take the responsible role

we've been given, and provide the leadership to keep Canada together, to make sure that the future of Canada fulfils the promise that exists today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

3. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the Assembly adopt the following amendment to Standing Orders:
Standing Order 7 is struck out and the following is substituted:

- 7.(1) The ordinary, daily routine business in the Assembly shall be as follows:
- Introduction of Visitors
 - Presenting Petitions
 - Reading and Receiving Petitions
 - Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees
 - Notices of Motions
 - Introduction of Bills
 - Tabling Returns and Reports
 - Introduction of Special Guests
 - Ministerial Statements
 - Oral Question Period (not exceeding 45 minutes)

- (2) When Introduction of Visitors is called, brief introductions may be made, with the prior permission of Mr. Speaker, of visiting parliamentarians, diplomats, officials, and others who are to be specially recognized.
- (3) When Introduction of Special Guests is called, brief introductions may be made of groups of school children and, with the prior permission of Mr. Speaker, of other visitors in the galleries.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there being only one or two minutes left until 5:30, I just ask hon. members to give Government Motion No. 3, the amendment to Standing Order No. 7, the same consideration it was given in the last Legislature. All it does is make permanent the new provisions for the Introduction of Visitors and Introduction of Special Guests.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: I move we call it 5:30.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, could the hon. House leader indicate if there'll be a night sitting on Thursday?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for asking. I intended to give that information now. The answer is, we do not intend to have a sitting tomorrow night.

[At 5:32 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

