

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Title: Friday, June 1, 1979 10:00 a.m.

Ministerial Agreements

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 201
The Alberta
Family Institute Act

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce The Alberta Family Institute Act.

This Bill would establish an institute that would help us in the province find out problems with respect to the family unit and the divorce rate in Alberta. That institute would make recommendations to this Legislature.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Farmers' Advocate.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table four documents required by statute. First, the Public Accounts in three volumes for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1978; as well, the Public Service Pension Board report for the year ended March 31, 1978; the Public Service Management Pension Board for the year ended March 31, 1978; and finally, a tabling pursuant to Section 16 of The Municipal Capital Expenditure Loans Act.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Alberta Opportunity Company for the year ended March 31, 1979.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 108 students from grade 8 of the Brooks junior high school in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers: Mrs. Preston, Mrs. Spence, Mrs. Redpath, Mrs. Ressler, Miss Tarney, Mr. Weinmeyer, Mr. Nicholson, and Mr. Korothosi. They have one driver, Mrs. Vi Erion. She didn't drive them all here. There's quite a number of them. I don't know where the rest of their drivers are. We have both galleries pretty well packed. I would ask them to rise at this time and get the recognition of the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Attorney General. It deals with the Dr. Talibi situation — I'd use that term. I'm referring to the agreement between Dr. Talibi and the former Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. My question to the minister: have charges been laid, or has a decision been made on whether charges will be laid, with regard to this affair?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the first caution I want to offer the hon. Leader of the Opposition is the use of the word "charges". In the minds of most people I think that indicates some criminal type of charge might be laid. What is being spoken of in this case is only the possibility of civil proceedings, which I expect will take place. They have not yet been commenced. As a matter of fact, this morning I am checking with the officials in the department as to the progress of the statement of claim in that case.

In order to be perfectly clear as to what is proposed, I might add that unless I am advised to the contrary, and with weighty reasons, the intention would be to file an ordinary civil statement of claim on the part of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission or the government, whichever is the appropriate plaintiff, against Dr. Talibi for moneys received and not accounted for.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Attorney General. What is the status of the agreement between Dr. Talibi and the former minister?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that the effect of such an agreement is still unclear. It will no doubt be an issue in any court proceedings that follow, which I'm sure will follow, as I indicated. I would be very surprised if Dr. Talibi didn't raise the question of the agreement as a defence in the case.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question to the minister. At what stage is the government's consideration with regard to action that may or may not be taken with regard to the former minister in light of entering into the agreement?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no intention at any point up to the present time, or from what I know now for the future, that Mr. Miniely would be involved in any proceedings that we would commence.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Has any legal advice been sought from outside the Attorney General's Department, from other members of the legal community, with respect to the impact the agreement signed between the former Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, Mr. Miniely, and Dr. Talibi will in fact have on the case?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the overall conduct of the anticipated proceedings in this case, which are, I believe, about to be commenced, would be the joint responsibility of a senior department official with an outside legal counsel to work with.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pursue one further question and ask it either of the Attorney General or the Premier. It deals with that part of the agreement entered into with Dr. Talibi by the former minister, in getting outside government legal advice and not using the legal services of the Department of the Attorney General.

My question to the Attorney General is: what is the practice of this government with regard to entering into agreements? Is there not a directive to all ministers that agreements must receive the clearance of, I would assume, the Department of the Attorney General prior to being signed by a minister on behalf of the people of Alberta? What is the government's practice on that?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think two issues are involved here, one of which is the mere question of the practice in regard to the use of outside legal counsel. There is a general practice that, where possible, the services of solicitors in the Department of the Attorney General will be used by departments.

However, there are a number of cases where that is not the best answer for the particular legal job to be done, so outside legal counsel is retained in a number of cases. They would number in the hundreds per year, I would think. The Attorney General is normally consulted on the question of retaining outside legal counsel in any one of these cases, unless it be very minor. However, a minister does retain a reasonable amount of flexibility. That's necessary in order that a minister be able to act in accordance with what he thought were the most urgent demands of any particular legal problem he might have.

So clearly ministers do consult outside legal counsel without full consultation with the Attorney General in certain cases, primarily where their time is a factor. In the particular case involved, of course I'm not in a position to say precisely what passed between my predecessor and Mr. Miniely, but my impression is that the steps Mr. Miniely took in respect to the agreement at the time in consulting outside counsel and not consulting the Attorney General were against the normal custom followed by the government, and clearly against the normal custom followed by members of the Executive Council in seeking outside legal aid.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I can, to the hon. Premier. Has any guideline or policy been set with respect to the question of ministerial agreements which may in fact prejudice the capacity of the government of Alberta to collect funds owing the government of Alberta, without prior consultation either with the hon. Premier or, more particularly, with the Attorney General's department, or both?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if I can refer specifically to the hon. member's question, the practice which is well known and accepted is that if there is a case where there is an agreement absolving a citizen of some financial responsibility to the government, then that is an obligation the minister has and clearly understood to take it to the Treasury Board of the government. In this case that was not done.

Tourism Study — Grande Cache

MR. R. CLARK: I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Last

October the government commissioned MTB Consultants Ltd. to conduct a study of the tourist potential of the Grande Cache area, including the Willmore Wil-demess Park. Has the study been completed, and will the minister release the study to the public?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the study has been completed. It is presently in the department, and I expect to be receiving it for review within the next two weeks.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm sure it was simply an oversight on the minister's behalf. Mr. Minister, can you give us an indication that it will be released to the public as soon as the minister's had a chance to peruse the report?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, as soon as I've had an opportunity to peruse it, the intent would be to make it available.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment. Was the Department of Environment not only involved in making a decision whether the study would go ahead, but did it have input into the study's terms of reference?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should refer that to the former Minister of Environment, since he was possibly involved in the initial discussions. At the present time I have no knowledge of whether Environment was involved.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think in a circumstance like that, I'll take notice of the question and provide the information to the hon. member.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the Premier. Would you be prepared to take notice and ask the same kind of questions of the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife with regard to consultation that took place before?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to do that.

Education of the Handicapped

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Education relating to the committee responsible for planning the deaf/blind educational facility for Alberta. First, I would like to ask the status of that committee's progress. Second, I would like to ask ...

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for St. Albert. I'm not sure we have finished with the second question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. Member for St. Albert, followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

MRS. FYFE: I would first like to ask the hon. Minister of Education the status of the committee responsible for planning the deaf/blind education program for Alberta; and secondly, what plans the Department of Education has to accommodate children with this condition within the educational system.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, following comments made earlier in the week, I had expected to be deluged with questions respecting the education of the handicapped in the province. Such has not exactly come to pass, although I appreciate the question from the hon. member opposite.

A committee is indeed studying the development of a facility in the province for the multiple-handicapped, one of whose handicaps would be sensory. I think you are referring to that committee rather than a committee studying a facility for the deaf/blind. The proposed facility would be for students with handicaps other than deafness and/or blindness, and that committee is hard at work and operating within the time line that was suggested by my predecessor, now the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

In the meantime, there is a demonstrated need in certain particular cases, and the department, in co-operation with school boards and private agencies, is responding to demonstrated need on what is admittedly a short-term basis. One such relates to early childhood services provided for students who are multiple-handicapped, including among their handicaps a severe or profound loss of hearing. Perhaps three or five such students are in the metropolitan area of Edmonton, and I have approved the initiation of an early childhood services program to be operated within the facilities of the Alberta School for the Deaf, commencing this September, to provide a program for multiple-handicapped youngsters, one of whose handicaps is severe or profound hearing loss.

Rental Housing

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Could he indicate whether the government is monitoring the rents being charged in Alberta on decontrolled units?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, The Rent Decontrol Act provides that total rent decontrol will be effective a year from this June and that suites, as they reach upper limits of rents, come out of decontrol. As a result, the suites out of control are no longer part of the control procedure or part of the concerns of the decontrol board, except that we do receive the odd complaint with respect to rental increases that may occur on these.

However, I wouldn't want to leave the impression with hon. members that we are in fact monitoring rental increases, because that might also leave the impression that we are not serious with respect to the decontrol process entered into by the passage of The Rent Decontrol Act.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister's department have any recent statistics on rental vacancy rates in Alberta?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, a number of sources of statistics deal with vacancy rates, and they all provide different figures. Some exclude from their calculations facilities less than six months of age; some exclude duplexes. So you have different statistics setting out the vacancy rates. But perhaps the common thread that applies to all of them is that the vacancy rate is in fact increasing.

Pest Control

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Environment, regarding the severe attack of tent caterpillars upon trees in the acreages and farm area west of Edmonton. Will the Department of Environment make available spray chemicals to affected landowners, since it appears they cannot obtain the chemical from the local Agricultural Service Board?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether that comes within the total parameters of the Minister of Environment. Under the Department of Agriculture, provision is made under some circumstances for acquiring chemicals and making them available. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture may want to comment on that. However, I would simply take the question as notice. I realize the severity of the problem in the area he is commenting on.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. While the minister is taking that as notice, maybe he could also take the second question as notice. It's regarding the obtaining of permits so that these landowners can spray. I understand that some very severe restrictions are placed on obtaining permits, especially with the spray thuricide. People are indicating that they cannot obtain a permit to spray with this, but this is one of the better chemicals for getting rid of tent caterpillars.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice too. But I just want to remind the hon. Member for Stony Plain that under The Hazardous Chemicals Act, we do have in place a number of restrictions which are necessary because of the problem of the carcinogenic nature of the chemical. Again, I think we would have to be very cautious about issuing permits which may be of considerable danger in particular to human hazards in this area.

Governors' Conference

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It flows from his announcement today that he will be attending the western governors' conference in Idaho on June 11 and 12 of this month. Is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether the other premiers of western Canada, in particular the Premier of British Columbia, were also invited to this conference?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my information is that they were not; that they made a decision to invite a premier from western Canada and made the invitation to the Premier of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the release the Premier indicates informal discussions. Has the Premier been invited at any time to address the conference?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, I have. But as I understand it, the way they operate is that it can be either a formal address or an informal meeting. I chose the informal meeting, which is a breakfast meeting, as an opportunity to have a discussion with the entire group of some 13 governors.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether in addition to the 13 governors there will be any other officials of the United States government at this conference in an advisory role or as observers?

MR. LOUGHEED: My understanding is that as a matter of practice there are representatives of the federal U.S. government at a meeting of this nature. In discussions I had with Governor Judge of Montana with regard to the matter, he advised me that because energy was a very important subject, as was international trade, they anticipated they would have such representatives.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In view of the discussion on energy and other trade items, is it the intention of the Premier to request the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to accompany him as well as the Minister of State — I believe it is — for international trade relations?

MR. LOUGHEED: I have some difficulty with the long title, but no difficulty with the capacity and ability of the minister.

They will be involved in a very extensive briefing book for me on this occasion. I've discussed the matter with the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade, and he will be providing me with direction and advice. The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and I have held discussions. But they will not be accompanying me on the trip.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Will there be any discussions with both the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce prior to and subsequent to the Premier's visit to the governors' conference?

MR. LOUGHEED: They will be notified of my attendance at the meeting. There won't be discussions in advance. There might be discussions subsequently.

Athabasca University Relocation

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It has to do with the relocation of Athabasca University. In light of the fact that there was considerable interest before the election and still is, can the minister indicate when a decision will be made as to where Athabasca University will be relocated, if it is relocated?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the question of the location of Athabasca University has been under consideration by the government for some time. Since assuming the portfolio, I have received a number of representations from interested individuals, communities in and about Edmonton and further away.

It is a rather interesting exercise, I think, going on at the present time, in that there is a very real interest in having this very successful advanced education institution located elsewhere than in Edmonton. At the same time, I think it is quite clear that we must carefully assess the needs of the institution and the requirements

for certain aspects of their undertakings that are not found in the normal university setting. Therefore it would appear that it will be some little time yet before a final decision can be arrived at.

However, I do want to underline the fact that it is a matter of real concern to me and to the department, and we'll be carefully assessing it in an ongoing nature, not only with my department but with my colleagues in cabinet and in caucus.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when the applications are coming in, is the minister in a position to indicate just how far away from a major centre such as Edmonton the university could be located?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to advise that at the present time. Indeed, some of the interest expressed in this very successful postsecondary institution in the province has come from a good distance. I can assure hon. members, however, that I'm not giving any active consideration to moving the facility to Medicine Hat.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister advise whether he has received any opposition to moving Athabasca University from Edmonton?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite fair to say that I have received some opposition to that proposal.

MR. APPLEBY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I realize that the hon. minister has met with a number of the governing authorities of postsecondary institutions in the province. I wonder if he's had an opportunity to meet with the governing authority of Athabasca University.

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the course of my first few weeks in office I have indeed met with, I think, 21 boards and governing agencies in the province, including a very useful and meaningful meeting with the board of Athabasca University. I indicated to them at that time, however, that I was not there for the purpose of making a decision or announcing a decision.

At that time I did receive representations from them, though, as to the desirability of meeting certain needs of that particular university. As members of the House are aware, Athabasca University is a distance-learning institution and therefore has particular needs that are not necessarily found in other institutions. Those will have to be carefully assessed in making a decision.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that members of the Assembly, and I'm sure the minister, have received representation from Athabasca University wishing to indefinitely postpone a relocation, can the minister indicate what reply was made to that communication?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, a request for an indefinite postponement means never. I think it is fair to say that a decision will be made within a reasonable time to resolve a matter of great interest not only to Athabasca University and its students and staff but also to other interested people throughout the province,

including the municipalities that have made representation. So I don't think that matter is likely to be postponed beyond a very reasonable period in the future.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just a short, short question on the "reasonable" period — seriously, Mr. Minister, because there are communities making representation and communities that have not made representations and may want to make them now. Can the minister say if it's going to be this fall or next year? Is it a six-month period we're looking at? Can you narrow it that close?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've said it won't be postponed indefinitely, but I'm not prepared to say how soon "reasonable" might be.

Government Appointments

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Has the Premier had or planned any discussions with Allan Warrack with regard to employment with the government or any consulting opportunity?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, following my view with regard to that matter, if we could have the effective services of Dr. Warrack in the public service of Alberta we would certainly encourage it.

MR. NOTLEY: In the public relations department. [interjections]

Railway Rights of Way

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it seems I've got the attention of the opposition. I didn't know what that was all about. I thought I was making some mistake.

Anyway, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. I would like to ask if there has been any negotiation between the federal government and CPR for the government of the province of Alberta to obtain ownership of rights of way from CPR or the federal government?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer that question to the Minister of Economic Development.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. member and to the House that those discussions on abandoned rights of way were hung up by the stubbornness of the former federal Minister of Transport in not transferring the property to the Crown in right of the province as recommended by Mr. Justice Hall. We would hope that that would be an early agenda matter with the new government,

Light Rail Transit — Edmonton

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might address a question to the Minister of Transportation. Mr. Minister, could you advise the House as to the state of negotiations between the city of Edmonton and the department about improving the LRT facilities in Edmonton, specifically the south line, as a result of the government's program announcements during the election?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I've had no direct representation, but I will take the question as notice.

Government Air Travel

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Government Services deals with the manifest for government aircraft that was filed in the House last week. Having regard for the fact that there are a large number of flights between Calgary and Edmonton, both PWA and Time Air, and noting that close to 80 flights between Edmonton and Calgary were made by the two King Airlines last year, what guidelines are set out by the government that determine when regular flights, both PWA and Time Air, would be used as opposed to making the decision to take the King Air on flights between Calgary and Edmonton?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I think the general guideline would be the matter of the ministers' schedules, the occupants' schedules, and the question of the timing of the PWA flight. We have to bear in mind that we do have the aircraft there. It's a matter of judgment and discretion as to whether to use the government aircraft or a commercial flight.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, having established that there are no guidelines, could we go on to a supplementary question to the minister. What guidelines does the government use with regard to members both of the government and of the public service in taking members of their families and so on along on flights on the government aircraft? Could the minister table those guidelines in the Assembly?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, just to respond to the assertion that there are no guidelines, the guidelines, as I've said, are not rigid, not hard and fast. They are ...

MR. NOTLEY: Very flexible.

MR. McCRAE: They are a matter of discretion and judgment, exercised by the ministers in this government in a very satisfactory fashion, I would think.

DR. BUCK: The record indicates that.

MR. McCRAE: With regard to the question of families travelling, if that was the second part of the hon. member's question, generally — and again this is a matter of some discretion and judgment — families go along if they are associated with the particular reason for the trip. That can be in several fashions. The family member may be specifically involved in a platform presentation, or the gathering may be of such a nature that it's simply appropriate for the minister or other members of the group travelling on the flight to have their families with them. I think that's the kind of thing that Albertans would accept: that many, many functions do have or should have the involvement of a person's family.

Here's another situation, Mr. Speaker, and that is having regard for the heavy, heavy schedule of members of government, and particularly ministers' weekend schedules. They are away from their families so very, very often that it is sometimes appropriate for

them, in an opportunity to be with their families, to take their families with them on their trips.

MR. NOTLEY: For an airplane ride.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, in light of your indicating early in your second remarks that in fact there are guidelines, would the minister be prepared to file copies of those guidelines with the Legislature?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I've tried to indicate that there are no written hard and fast guidelines. We exercise judgment and discretion in trying to determine who should best use the flights.

In regard to the flippant remark of the member opposite about people going for an air ride, surely that isn't necessarily regarded as a pleasurable thing — just getting up and riding around in an aircraft. If it is for the hon. member, I suspect he has a lot more time than the rest of us.

Cold Lake Oil Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll resist prolonging the conversation with the hon. member across the way and ask the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources when the government of Alberta expects the report of the Energy Resources Conservation Board on the entire Cold Lake project.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to give a firm time line as to when we might receive that report. I don't believe the hearings are yet concluded. And of course until we know that, it's difficult to forecast the date of the completion of the report. I would hope, though, that we would get it by this fall.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the government given any consideration, or has the government asked Mr. Getty as a consultant to give consideration, to the time frame which would be required after receipt of the report before a final decision on the project is made by cabinet?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I think the nature of these projects and of the discussions that must go on before final decisions are made with respect to proceeding is simply such that one can't give those kinds of time lines. Discussions need to go on between the government and the participants in the project, and with the federal government. I don't think there's any way one can reasonably forecast when those discussions might end.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. At this time, prior to receipt of the ERCB report, have any preliminary discussions taken place between the government of Alberta and Imperial Oil with respect to commercial terms, possible tax changes, and infrastructure costs?

MR. LEITCH: There have been a number of discussions with the proponents of that project. I believe they cover all the items included in the question; certainly they cover the majority of them.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Is the government at this time, in terms of assessing its position, specifically reviewing equity investment, loan investment, and a portion of infrastructure costs, somewhat similar to the Syncrude example?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, on all those items we do not have a closed mind. But what might come out of those discussions or deliberations is something I wouldn't want to predict now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. At this stage has an assessment been made by the government of Alberta specifically of investment on an equity basis, a loan basis, or a portion of infrastructure costs? Has any consideration been made at this point in time by the government, specifically with respect to the work Mr. Getty has undertaken for the government of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman used two words: "assessment" and "consideration". I would think "assessment" wouldn't be appropriate; in the sense that those are things we have that would be part of our deliberations during the course of discussions with respect to this project, "consideration" would be accurate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister or to the hon. Premier. In terms of the time line, will the government facilitate a debate in the Legislature on the question of the Cold Lake project before final approval is given by cabinet?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, we would not. We would follow the practice we did in Syncrude, where we would negotiate the commercial terms in the best interests of Albertans as we see them, present this to the public of Alberta through the Assembly, and answer any questions in the Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Maybe you can get another CBC TV show.

Community Colleges

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. If they're going to move Athabasca college, I wouldn't want the minister to neglect the possibility of moving it halfway and putting it in Brooks.

The minister made some comments to the effect that there could be an extension of the community college into the Brooks area. Could the minister comment as to what stage it's in, or if there have been any steps in this direction?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in my discussions with the board of governors of Medicine Hat College, as part of my series of visits, strong support was expressed at that time for Medicine Hat College moving some of its facilities and services to the town of Brooks. I understand that process is presently under way; discussions with town officials and other representatives of interested organizations in Brooks. Of course that decision will be made by the board of governors in consul-

tation with the program services division of the department. Quite frankly, I have tried to encourage the board to carry out those discussions and hopefully to work toward providing additional regional services by the colleges.

This is one of the examples of the way colleges throughout the system in the province can provide additional educational services at the postsecondary level, and I'm supportive of that decision of the board at Medicine Hat College to proceed with their investigations.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether this program could be carried out in the year 1979?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not exactly certain whether that can be achieved for the fall of this year, but I do know there is a great deal of interest and that the Medicine Hat board and administration are pursuing the provision of services to Brooks in a very active manner. I'm sure they will attempt to do so at the earliest opportunity. Given the availability of funds, which have been provided to most of the colleges in the province to deal with increased enrolments and increased services being offered, hopefully it can be done by this fall. But I cannot guarantee that to members of the Assembly.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would this involve capital expenditure, or are there facilities in Brooks at present that will facilitate this type of move?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I can't provide that information. The question of facilities that would be utilized by the college in provision of service would be a matter for negotiation by the college with school boards and other agencies in the town of Brooks, perhaps on a lease basis. But at this stage, it's premature to indicate that there would be any capital expenditure. Certainly the matter is presently under investigation and review. I'm encouraging the review to continue, and I'm hopeful the results will be favorable. But at this stage it's far too premature to predict any capital expansion or expenditures.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

Water Pollution

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Environment. It is to follow up a question asked by the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn the other day, about the quality of the water in the Bow River in and downstream from Calgary. Because some of the water doesn't meet what are called water quality objectives, I wonder whether the Department of Environment would consider posting the part of the river that doesn't meet these water quality objectives, for the protection of the public.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it might be difficult for the Department of Environment to do this, because water qualities vary throughout the year. They may even vary within specific areas. For example, the standards required for bathing may be entirely different

from the standards that would be set down for water consumption. These situations vary from place to place and throughout the year.

I wouldn't close the door on the suggestion of the hon. Member for Little Bow, but I would say at this time that it may be difficult to do this.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Could the minister give the Assembly a commitment to have a look at it immediately and follow it up, and report to the Legislature whether something can be done, whether a facility can be installed to improve the quality of the water? Would the minister act on it? I don't think he can make a judgment standing in his place here in the Legislature, as he has done.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Environment is reviewing the quality of water on an ongoing basis. We set some pretty specific guidelines with regard to treatment. As I said yesterday, the study with regard to the Bow River and the conjunction with the Oldman is going on. Rather than get too enthusiastic at this point in time, I'm hopefully anticipating an interim report on that specific area this fall.

DR. BUCK: You made a bad choice, Premier.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the minister. In the meantime people are drinking that water and using it as a recreational facility. Isn't there some immediate interim step the minister has at his disposal to do it, in light of the fact that the city of Calgary has no jurisdiction over the river because this area's not described as a recreational area? It's in the hands of the department.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I agree with the member when he suggests that people are using this particular area for drinking water if it is not being properly treated. I would simply say that I hope no one is using this particular area as a source of drinking water unless they have had the department of health review the actual contamination of the area. In co-ordination with the municipalities, we set pretty strong guidelines and direction with regard to the quality of drinking water. I would presume anyone using water from this source is using it through a treatment source.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has elapsed, but since I've already recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry perhaps we could deal with his question. And the hon. Minister of Transportation would like to answer a question asked yesterday.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

University Construction

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Mr. Minister, students have been turned away from the Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce — there's a quota system — and the university has an application before the department for the construction of a large building on campus. Could the minister

advise the House as to the state of the decision-making process in the department about that building?

MR. HORSMAN: Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have to await the capital budget of the department, which will be coming very soon. I don't want to indicate anything at this stage as to what will or will not be approved. I do want to indicate, however, that the department is well aware of the rapid expansion in demand for graduates in the business and commerce level. That, of course, not only at the University of Alberta but at other institutions in the province, reflects the economic life of this province.

Grande Prairie Air Terminal

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question from the hon. Member for Grande Prairie yesterday: the status of the terminal building is that it will be ready for occupancy in three weeks; but then the federal people will take over to move the electrical components, so that it will probably be fall before it's totally operational.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order that arose out of the wording of a motion submitted by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview the other day, there is some lack of parliamentary precedent on the point. But in Alberta, as hon. members know, it has been the custom for some time to phrase or word motions for returns in the form of asking for an order. That is a well-established custom in the Assembly. In addition to that, there was a further precedent some years ago — actually on November 4, 1976 — when a motion was passed which directed the government to do certain things.

In view of that established custom, it would seem rather presumptuous of the Chair to intervene with regard to a wording of that kind, and the matter should be left to the House.

Under the circumstances, I would suggest that the debate proceed with the motion, or the amendment, as worded.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS 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 30: Mr. Batiuk]

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the throne speech debate, I would like at the outset to join the many others in congratulating you on your re-election as Speaker. I know that the unanimous choice is indicative of your past performance, and I wish you well in your tedious task.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. members for Three Hills and Calgary Forest Lawn for moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne, and for how eloquently they presented it.

I would also like to pay tribute to the hon. Lieutenant-Governor. I am aware that he will not accept a reappointment to his position. I have enjoyed and appreciated his co-operation, and would like to wish His Honour and Mrs. Steinhauer many years of good health.

I am thankful too, to the electors of the Vegreville constituency for re-electing me to represent them. I am also very proud to be on the team of the government.

This year marks 25 years since my first involvement in any government, and that was being elected to the local school board. A few years later I was elected to the Lamont school division, and then to the county of Lamont. I was its first reeve after its inception as a county. I must say that I enjoyed the work at that time, and was quite happy with some of the things that happened, improvements and progress in the county. I was pressured many times to seek the seat in the Legislature; however, it did not encourage me too much. However, I want to assure hon. members that my decision to do so in 1971 was not because of the lucrative indemnity paid to Members of the Legislative Assembly.

I recall very well in 1965, when I was chairman of the Lamont school division, sitting in the Jubilee Auditorium, one of approximately 1,200 persons at an administrators' seminar. The Premier of the day, in addressing us, bluntly told us that within 10 years 85 per cent of the population of this province was going to be in Edmonton and Calgary, and that nothing could be done about it. It was a sad thing to hear. However, since he said nothing could be done, I held no hard feelings. I saw that was already the trend, because my home town of Mundare, which had had a population of over 1,000 some years ago, had dwindled to approximately 500.

The annual meeting of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties in the middle of November 1970 was the first time the association had invited the Leader of the Opposition to speak. While I was sitting and participating — and I'm sure there were some others, because I know other members of the county council were there — the Leader of the Opposition stated that should his party form the government, that trend would be reversed. It could be done; it wouldn't be easy. It would cost money, and it would not stop the two cities from growing, which was not the intention. But he assured the councillors that if that trend grows, at least Edmonton and Calgary would not grow at the expense of rural Alberta.

It was that day, when the Leader of the Opposition of the day finished, that I went up to him and said, Peter, I've been pressured to run for M.L.A. Nominations are two weeks away. I'm going to stand for nomination, and if I make it I'd like to get on your bandwagon. And that has materialized.

I must mention the environment centre in Vegreville. He didn't promise that in particular, but that is one area of decentralization of government services to reverse that trend. When the environment centre is completed this year, it is going to be a laboratory incomparable to any other on the North American continent. Over the last couple of years, other provincial governments have indicated they want to participate in its research.

As read in the throne speech, it's expected that the Environmental Laboratory and Research Centre should be completed and functioning this fall, but I am sure the official opening may take place in 1980. This might be a good time for me to invite all hon. members to make a trip to Vegreville for the official opening and to see the progress of our commitments. Furthermore, it being the seventy-fifth anniversary of our province, should our Legislature be sitting it may even be well to recess and spend the day in Vegreville.

Another area of the Alberta government's regionalization is with telephones. Within the last 14 to 15 months, nearly 60 people have been transferred to the Vegreville region. The nice part about it is that nobody was forced to go. There were openings, they were asked, and all of them went voluntarily.

I must say that many times it has been brought to my attention that with the large majority of our government, it's easy governing for the Premier of this province. To some extent it may be, Mr. Speaker, but it's not always so. The larger the caucus, the more difficult it may be to control. When we look at some of the dissensions suffered in political parties, whether provincial or federal, and compare our solidarity, I think the Premier can be proud of the accomplishments of our government. I am really proud to be one of them.

I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is not in his seat, would be glad if he could stand and make the same remark about the party he represents. I am going into my third Legislature, and I'm very proud that never has one of the members of our government had to leave his seat because of a conflict of interest. That's why I mention that I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition would be glad if he could stand and say the same thing about his party.

MR. R. SPEAKER: You'd better touch wood.

MR. BATIUK: I normally like to participate in the throne speech every year, and particularly this year because there are 29 new members. I hope I too can inform them about my constituency. If I can't, maybe at least I can confuse them. But I must say I really enjoyed them. I don't think there was ever a year that I enjoyed the throne speech debates as I did this year. They were so informative and interesting. Yesterday when I was talking to one of my colleagues I said, if a man came from Mars, landed in this Legislature, and spent one week, he would know Alberta very well.

The Vegreville constituency is a very important constituency, geographically located centrally between Edmonton and Lloydminster. It is in a rich agricultural area, and the number of master farmers and farm family awards over the years is indicative of the importance of agriculture in the area. True enough, in the Vegreville constituency you will find some of the best land, but also some of the poorest land. However, even the poorest land is being utilized for cattle grazing

and so forth, and agriculture stands very high as a main industry in the constituency.

But along with that, business is very important. We have a lot of professional people who are doing exceptionally well. Sometimes when I look at the number of people who have left or are still in the constituency, and their contribution to society, I think they have done very well. Also politically, Mr. Speaker, when I look at how many ministers we've had in this House during our term of office who were raised in the Vegreville constituency — the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, the former Minister of Housing and Public Works, the former Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and I know the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs actually had his early education in the area — I think the people have made a good contribution.

There are many annual activities in the constituency. I would like to mention a few, and maybe invite you to see one of them when you have the time — the annual three-day Ukrainian Cultural Festival held in Vegreville. As I mentioned earlier, our constituency is important and successful. I think it is so successful because we have people of every ethnic group. Their co-operation in working together and even competing means a lot to the success. Also, the past president of the Ukrainian Cultural Festival was Mrs. McKenzie, so it just shows you it's not necessary that a Ukrainian person be the president.

Since our government has provided an airport in Vegreville, we hold annual air shows. This is another area that draws thousands every year, because they have good performers; last year the Snowbirds were in attendance. We also have an annual three-day agricultural fair, which is very successful. Last year they celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of their exhibition, and Her Majesty participated. Also, Two Hills has an annual rodeo. It is a three-day event sponsored by the Lions of Two Hills. I must say I attend every one of them, and the one in Edmonton, and I feel that the Two Hills rodeo is superior to Edmonton's. So here again may be a chance to visit Two Hills.

I feel I just can't get away without mentioning the election a little. I know very well that the media has given coverage to the opposition, and probably rightly so. There was nothing wrong with that. But one thing that really perturbed me was some of the election promises. The Leader of the Opposition promised that if they should form the government, they would take the Legislature on tour. This sounded ridiculous to me. As I said, the media have supported them, and rightly so. But one of the writers on Tuesday, January 23 — and I'm going to read a little section of it:

Moving legislature a costly proposal

The provincial election hasn't been called ...

but Sacred leader ... has already [promised] an election promise of stunning silliness.

Mr. Speaker, maybe "silliness" is not the right word. During our election campaign, I know our Premier and some of the ministers made half a dozen promises. But we are starting to fulfil them, and those promises are essential to the people in the constituency. I get requests about them from time to time, whether it's the pioneer home improvement program, the assistance to handicapped, assistance to first-home owners, the debt retirement plan, and others. But nobody has ever asked whether our government would consider moving the Legislature around the province. Sometimes I find it

very difficult to visualize how a person can become leader of a political party and make such statements. I just wonder how some are even elected to that position, whether their names are drawn out of a hat or what.

As usual, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has gone. But again I feel quite thankful to him that he has come to the constituency at least half a dozen times. It seems that wherever he went, I got the biggest support. But for *Hansard* I'm going to read a little clipping from the February 19 *Journal*:

'John Batiuk (sitting member for Vegreville) and his colleagues are ... looking for a pat on the back. They don't need a pat on the back, they need a kick in the pants,' ...

If the hon. member were here and told me that he'd like to, over the weekend I'd bring him a couple of pairs I don't need any more, and he could kick at them all he'd like.

But what really bothers me is that if a member or a person, a leader of a political party who is alone in the House, goes around willing to kick people around, what would he do if he were the Premier of this province?

DR. BUCK: He'd just give them positions, John.

MR. BATIUK: Here is another area that really is a little amusing. It says:

Mr. Notley said that 'for the last eight years, it has been my honor to be one lonely petunia in an onion patch. After eight years ... I deserve some help.'

Well, it's good to look at it that way, but if it were my version, Mr. Speaker, I would have said the "lonely thorn" in a petunia patch.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned there are many good things in the constituency, but there are some needs also. I think the greatest need now is a water distribution line. With the growth of our communities, it seems there are difficulties with the supply of water with all the line from Vegreville, even into the Clover Bar constituency up to Bruderheim.

When I look back to 1974, the Vermilion River, which supplies water to the town of Vegreville, flooded Vegreville and there were millions of dollars of damages. The following two years, the Vermilion River was so dry that the Department of Environment was assisting the town of Vegreville to pump water from sloughs adjoining the river so the town could have enough water.

Just for information purposes, Mr. Speaker, the Vermilion River originates about six miles south of Holden, and that was drainage ditch number one in 1917. From there on the river is deeper in places, it's wider, and in some places it's only about 2 or 3 feet deep. Right now I doubt that anybody could go to the river and find enough water to wash their feet. As I say, even if there were enough water, that water would be too dirty to wash them. But this is the way the situation stands.

I am thankful to the former Minister of Environment who conducted the regional water study. To me it seems that the water study is favorable, and we'll look strongly to have these communities provided with water from the North Saskatchewan River. Chipman, in my constituency, has been hauling water from Bruderheim for the last year, and it's a very costly venture. The town of Lamont also gets its water from

Ross Creek, and if it weren't for some of the rain during the summer they'd be left without water. The only thing is that they have good water. It's pasteurized when it reaches their place — it runs through 38 pastures. [laughter]

I must also say that we need some more nursing home accommodation in both Vegreville and Two Hills. Because of our care for senior citizens, they are living longer and will need more attention in the future. I believe that within the next couple of years we will have adequate accommodation for our senior citizens. But the nursing home needs are there. They are quite acute; there's quite a long waiting list. So I would also suggest that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care take a strong look. They have come as delegates to the previous minister, but this is something he'll have to look at.

Along with that, some roads need attention, but that's general in the province with more and more vehicles. When we notice 13 million vehicles are registered, far more than there are adults, it shows that the roads are used heavily and need more attention.

In bringing these things, our constituency also has some concerns, and I think it may be appropriate to mention some of them. One of them is the future fate of the Two Hills Chemicals Company. Chemcell opened their operations, providing chlorine, in 1952. As time went on it appeared it was not profitable enough, and Chemcell wanted to dispose of their chemical company. They were actually going to close it. At that time, in 1974, under the wisdom of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Peacock, he was able to negotiate and buy a 51 per cent share for the government of Alberta for \$1.

From 1974 until now, it has been operated by Dow Chemical and, true enough, the financial statements every year show there is no profit — the company is not losing anything — and they have indicated a number of times that they would like to shut down the plant. So for these last few years they actually have been operating it for the sole purpose of giving employment to the 45 to 50 people who work there. Most of them would be left without work.

However, what really bothered me was that this year, in the 28-day period before the election — I must say it was closer to one week before the election — I was alerted that one of the candidates from the Vegreville constituency was in the Two Hills area trying to organize a strike with the workers at the chemical plant. They were very close to it. True enough. When I was made aware — I think the apostle from Spirit River was there also and helping — I thought I must get back to the people, as it was mentioned that they were threatened — the candidate did that — but that was not right. I brought the light to the people who were working, that the plant was operating just for their employment, it was not making any profit, and if that 0.5 per cent more would have helped them so much and they'd go on strike, I knew for a fact that the doors of the Two Hills Chemicals Company would have closed and 45 people would have been without work.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to visualize how either a candidate or a leader of a political party would have the audacity to try to organize a strike with a big risk of having 45 to 50 individuals lose their livelihood just to gain a couple of votes.

However, I am glad they took my advice. They

stayed on. The plant is operating. Dow Chemical is indicating that they don't want to operate. But just two weeks ago the Minister of Economic Development and I made a tour of the plant. Knowing the ability and capability of the Deputy Premier, I have a strong feeling that that plant is going to continue to operate, or he will probably find something for it.

So here again I think that is one of the concerns. There have been some concerns, and a good number of them over the past years, not only in my constituency but throughout the province, and even beyond. When I have been on tours, whether in Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, many have brought to attention that they're very strongly opposed to the abuse of unemployment insurance and social assistance. Mr. Speaker, I do agree with many of those remarks. But I want to make it very clear that there is nothing wrong with social assistance. I think that individuals who are destitute, maybe one-parent families, somebody who is hurt, has health conditions, need and deserve to be looked after. Many times I have even acquired a feeling that some should be getting more assistance than they are. But it's the abuse, I think, that bothers a lot of people.

Just this Monday, in the *Edmonton Journal* I read:

Millionaire happy to collect his [unemployment insurance cheques]

Bob Wright won \$1 million in a Provincial lottery ... on New Year's Eve, but he still collects a \$220 unemployment insurance cheque every two weeks ...

Revenue Canada spokesman ... said Wright can continue collecting unemployment insurance benefits as long as he is qualified.

Mr. Speaker, I always felt unemployment insurance was originally created to provide people with assistance should they be laid off, but not if a person leaves his own work, quits his job one day and then qualifies for unemployment insurance. I've lived with that. I experienced that as reeve of the county of Lamont a number of years ago. Some of the people who worked on the road joined in the summer. There was nothing for them to do during the winter, and they did live on unemployment insurance. But I asked one of them, whom I was quite fond of and who was a real good worker: why not get on the snowplough for the winter and you'll be able to work year-round. His answer was, you know, I can get almost as much money from unemployment insurance looking through the window as I would get working on that snowplough. So this is what it is.

I still think unemployment insurance benefits are good if a person is laid off or something. But a person wins \$1 million one day and the next day resigns from his job and gets unemployment insurance. I think this is very bad. I feel that such abuse — unemployment insurance is step one, social assistance would be step two, because persons such as this who work six months of the year and depend on social insurance for the other six months will, in time, be looking forward to living year-round without doing anything.

We in the rural areas particularly see the abuse of social assistance occasionally. We know just about every person, and we know who's drawing social assistance. But I think back even a few years ago, when I asked one of the persons locally to come and give me a hand on the farm. I was willing to pay him professional wages for common labor: no, I'm sorry, I'm sick. Yet every day at 10 to 10, this same person is

waiting at the corner store for the doors to open so he can pick up his spirits. When he goes there, every morning he marches like a soldier. Probably, after a few swigs, he may wobble like a duck. But this is what you get, and I'm sure all hon. members have this brought up to them.

I just think back to last fall's session. When we had a free Wednesday evening, I went to see one of my friends in Edmonton whom I went to school with. Shortly after I got there, discussing, what comes up? Abuse of social assistance. I did try to defend that maybe it's not always so, because many times people feel it's abused when it isn't. He just pointed across the street and said, in that house there's a lady with four children, presumably deserted by the husband, yet he comes there every evening. And sure enough, as we sat, it got dark and he came into the house. I had expected to see probably a sickly looking person, meek. Who do you think I saw? A 6-foot fellow probably weighing 200 pounds, healthy as ever. The first thing I asked my friend was, does he go only into that house, or does he go and look after the whole block? [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, I only feel sorry I didn't know about him sooner. If I had, I would have invited him to Vegreville last year to the seventy-fifth anniversary of the agricultural fair, where Her Majesty participated in the judging. I'm sure she would have presented him with a ribbon.

Another interesting thing happened in the community, and it's something worth knowing. One of the high school girls became pregnant. This is nothing unusual. It happens in many parts of the province. Maybe the day isn't too far away when it's going to be traditional for a girl to have a baby or two before she completes high school. But anyone in such a predicament needs attention, and I was really gratified to see a social worker make his usual trips to the girl. I know that in the past there have been cases where because of such incidents suicides were attempted, and maybe some of them were successful. I thought to myself, the next time I see Miss Hunley, the former Minister of Social Services and Community Health — because that was during her time — I'll have to tell her what dedicated staff she has. But it never came to that, because that counsellor just came about three or four times and not any more. And do you know what happened? Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, the mother became pregnant. I don't want to make any accusations or assumptions, but the talk in the community was that the counsellor was the culprit. Maybe so. Somebody had to be. The student didn't have a husband; neither did the mother. She's a widow.

I can see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members are finding my presentation maybe entertaining and amusing. But the crux of the whole thing is that the people of this province have been feeding four mouths over the last little while and are going to continue doing so for a good number of years. There's nothing to guarantee that as time goes by maybe even additional mouths will not be added. Who knows? Maybe the counsellor will return again to the community.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that the Attorney General, who was the Minister of Health and Social Development in the early '70s, brought in an incentive program to help people on social assistance get off. I think it was successful, because some people I knew, who I felt would be on social assistance

for the rest of their lives, have changed. Today they are earning a livelihood, and I feel they're making a good contribution. So in reference to the program the Attorney General brought in some years ago, I think with 79 masterminds in this Legislature, maybe we could expand that program.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things I would like to bring into my remarks. The clock shows it's time. The thing is, I don't normally get up to speak too often. I would ask the indulgence of the House if they would allow me another few minutes.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BATIUK: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to commend our government for selecting and appointing Mr. Dowling as Commissioner for Alberta's 75th Anniversary Celebrations. After our election in 1971, Mr. Dowling was appointed Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Tourism. During his time he was in charge of the RCMP Century Celebration. I must say, those celebrations were exceptionally successful. There were two projects in Vegreville. One is that Easter egg dedicated to the RCMP. It's attracting people from all over the world. If one only saw the guest book, how many thousands of people visit that every year. That was one of the projects Mr. Dowling really supported — not only Mr. Dowling. I would like to say there was a grant of \$25,000, but that project cost well over \$250,000. The department of architecture in Utah provided a professor, Dr. Resch, and others, at a cost of over \$200,000 so they could work and plan that project.

I know for a fact that people from the Vegreville area, individuals and groups, had written to the Premier stating that there should be a portfolio of tourism. After the 1975 election, Mr. Dowling did get a portfolio, Business Development and Tourism. But the people in Vegreville still weren't satisfied with it, and now there is a portfolio of Tourism and Small Business.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but if he would agree, perhaps the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs might revert for a moment to the Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS** (*reversion*)

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. It is a pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a number of students from the grade 9 class of the McLennan school in the constituency of Smoky River. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Brochu, some bus drivers, and parents. I would ask that they all stand in the members gallery and receive the traditional welcome of the Legislature.

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

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, in continuing, I must say that during the last number of years tourism has become our third biggest industry in this province, very close to second. I think Mr. Dowling did a tremendous job. No doubt others could have been appointed commissioner; there may be others just as capable, but I don't know of any. Knowing Mr. Dowling's capabilities, I think the government of this province did exceptionally well in selecting him.

Mr. Speaker, when I participated in the state of the province address last fall, I never expected we would have an election before the spring session, and I didn't bother giving any recognition to some of the people in this Legislature who deserve it. One is the former Minister of Housing and Public Works. I think he did tremendous work during the time of his tenure, whether with Environment or Housing and Public Works. But I'm glad that the person who took his place is probably also wearing his shoes, because he's fitting in very well.

As I say, I'm mentioning those who have served here from 1971. I think our Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is going to do very well. He has been an excellent Minister of Municipal Affairs, an excellent Minister of Environment, and I'm sure that this heavy portfolio is going to get the same.

I mentioned earlier the Attorney General, some of his good programs, the past House leader. I particularly want to show my appreciation to Mr. Farran, who was really a hard worker. When there was anything to be done, he just made sure it was done.

The same with the Deputy Premier, last of all. Many times we are told, if you need something and you can't get it, go to a drugstore. It's the same with him. If I was ever in a bind or anything, I'd go to him. He never turned anybody down. He sure helped. Earlier I mentioned the Two Hills Chemicals Company. With his ability and capability, I am sure he is going to see that it's going.

Mr. Speaker, one more. I must pay tribute to the former Minister of Culture, now the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade. I think his programs over the last number of years helped very far in reversing that trend from an urban to rural shift. Even though his programs may not have been very big, very expensive, they were many. When I look at the number of community halls that would probably have been shut down, at his little programs to assist with up to \$2,000, many of them are operating today.

Another area is the financial assistance for cemeteries. It wasn't very much. I look back to the cemetery where my parents rest. It's an early one, from 1902, but it probably has been neglected because some of those resting there have no family around. But that \$2,000 program was an incentive. The local people put up another \$10,000 to \$12,000. It would be worth while for anybody driving down Highway 16 to stop in. Every time I go by it makes me think of Flanders Fields, really kept up. So it's an incentive for the people to get involved.

Mr. Speaker, since I've taken so much time, it's been a pleasure, and I thank the members for allowing me those few extra minutes. I'm going to look for their

co-operation, as I've received in the past, and wish success to all the new members.

Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate you on your reappointment to office. As a member of the opposition, I certainly feel we receive fair treatment, and was most pleased when you accepted your responsibility once more.

In my remarks this morning I would like to make a few comments rather than a comprehensive speech. I feel that some areas in the Speech from the Throne need to be referred to. At the same time I feel that I'd like to give new ministers being placed in their responsibilities a little advice, and lay the groundwork as to how I see they can accept their responsibilities.

The overall thrust of government, as I see it, should be one of assisting and supporting individuals in whatever endeavor they may undertake in Alberta society. I feel that in the role of government we must be careful not to infringe on or interfere in the responsibilities that individuals or groups of individuals in this province take. With that basic premise, I'd like to assess some of the programs and some of the thrusts emanating from the government at the present time that have been referred to in the throne speech.

One of the areas of priority in this government that should certainly receive more recognition and more money at the present time is transportation. As an interjection I'd like to say that I'm most pleased to see that the hon. Member for Chinook has been appointed Minister of Transportation. I believe he has the underlying philosophy that should be inherent in the total government, and certainly one I respect and accept. I think that in his responsibilities he will capably carry out that philosophy. But I think in a time when we as a Legislature have funds, when we have money available to us, we should place a higher priority on highway and urban transportation in this province. We should support that minister in providing more funds in his budget.

Why do I say that? I say it because we are in a relative sense wealthy. At this point in time we have the opportunity of building the basics of this province, such as highways and urban transportation — material benefits that will be of benefit to this province for many, many years ahead, because a good transportation system will service us for a long period of time. I can only encourage this Legislature to give him full support in the upcoming budget, that we support him for a significant increase in his budget in the following fiscal year of his responsibility.

That's the first comment. Secondly, in the area of parks programs, I was very pleased to see that the minister has indicated in the Speech from the Throne that he wants to reclassify the parks system in the province. I recommended that to the former minister four years ago, and have raised it in this House a number of times. But at the present time in Alberta we have a very significant and obvious vacuum in the area of park facilities to provide recreation for the people of Alberta. People are not saying the facilities have to be sophisticated, or have a lot of facilities, but something very basic.

I can give the example of one area in my constituency. Many people from the city of Calgary travel to that area. Over the last four or five years the local Lions Club and recreation board have attempted to meet the

needs of these outside people. But a year or a couple of years ago, they gave up. They said, there's no way we can discipline the people, no way we can keep the garbage clean, no way we can even have any space for our local people to use. But when you assess that particular situation, what did the people from Calgary really want? They wanted the outdoor space of rural Alberta. They wanted to be away from the noise of the city. They wanted to park their trailers, have some firewood, have a campfire, and maybe a boat on the lake. They wanted the garbage picked up and disposed of. But they didn't ask for elaborate facilities such as camp kitchens, boating facilities, shelters, and things like that. They were not asking for that type thing of thing.

So this whole area between the sophisticated provincial park and the local municipal park is a vacuum in the province of Alberta. I'm sure many other areas are exactly the same. What would be the cost of providing that kind of facility? I haven't assessed it exactly, but I'm sure \$50,000 or less would put a truck and a man in there, and some basic tools that the man could use, summer employment for students — a minimal expense that would meet the needs of not only urban but rural Albertans. We could build and supply many of these across the province of Alberta, and have an adequate facility to meet the needs at the present time.

I can give an example. We started a municipal park in my home town about 10 years ago. Through the co-operation of the local citizens and municipality, we have put money into it. It's just out on the open prairie, but we have people from Lethbridge, Calgary, Brooks, and all over Alberta travelling there to just park their trailers. We don't ask for any money, but most of them leave us a donation every year just out of courtesy. But this little facility — a caretaker, one truck, and a few tools — would add an awful lot to that park to meet the needs at the present time.

I can be critical of the government when \$600,000 has been spent this past year on the Stamp Around Alberta program. If that \$600,000 had been spent on this kind of park system across the province of Alberta, people in Alberta would have moved around and had the type of facility they want. I am sure and feel very confident, in an assessment just off the top of my head, that only about 1 per cent or less of the people who received those Stamp Around Alberta passports were motivated to travel Alberta. I'm sure that 99 per cent — some of them were stamped, but they were going anyway. The big percentage were thrown in the garbage. I don't think that kind of gimmick is the type of thing we need in the whole realm of tourism in the province of Alberta. It's the presentation of facilities to meet the needs of people, and they'll think for themselves. We should only support them, not try to deceive them into travelling and stamping around Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, talking to the hon. Member for Whitecourt, the newly appointed minister, I'm sure he has this kind of concept in mind. Certainly I'll be observing that, and supporting him totally if he is able to initiate that new type of program across the province of Alberta. As information for the hon. minister, I've observed that departmental officials have felt that either you have a sophisticated park or no park at all. It's been a little difficult for them to comprehend and see the control of the type of facility I'm recommending and that I hope the minister has in mind.

Your former minister said, once we start initiating this intermediate type of recreational park, we're going to receive a lot of pressure to have them placed into provincial park status. Certainly that's going to happen. Maybe that's a stage of maturing we have to accept. As politicians, that's part of the pressure we have to accept from the general public. Hopefully over a period of years, maybe 20 years from now, those areas may be classed as a more sophisticated type of provincial park.

In the area of agriculture, I feel that one of the most pressing problems we have at the present time is interest rates faced by some of our young farmers. A number of them whom I helped receive ADC loans in the last couple of years are finding it very difficult to make repayment under the high interest of the guaranteed loan. I certainly would recommend to the minister, in his responsibilities — and we talked about this earlier — that he review that whole program and look at possibly a fixed-interest loan that could be made available to beginning farmers in situations where there are father-son transfers of farm responsibilities. Why do I say that? I think it reverts to the basic principle I started with: if as a government we can support individuals, or people in their own community or their own endeavors, then they'll carry on and take on their own personal responsibility in this province. So I'd certainly like to urge that on the minister at this point in time, in his review of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation.

I have one other comment for the minister in the area of recreation. I haven't had difficulty in the last year, because most of the recreational facilities and the facility grant have been distributed in my constituency. But one review I would request of the minister is a review of the senior staff and some of the consulting staff in his department, because I found them to be a real delaying factor in initiating and building some of these recreational facilities across the province.

What I'd ask the minister to consider in his departmental organization is that more responsibility be transferred to the regional level. I think the best example was the former Minister of Transportation in his decentralization of responsibility to his regional transportation officers. Those regional transportation officers have done an excellent job. They made local decisions, met local needs, and solved problems before they had to go from the regional man to another regional co-ordinator, through the deputy minister and to the minister. The load taken off the minister has been very significant. I would have to say that in using a regional transportation officer out of Lethbridge, for example, our man has solved a multitude of problems, because he has had some control over setting regional priorities and being able to make regional decisions. He's done an excellent job.

So I highly recommend that, one, you review the use of these consultants in your department. I think some of them have outlived their usefulness. Secondly, look at the possibility of a regionalized, decentralized, not only decision-making but budget-making kind of responsibility. You have some good men in Lethbridge — because I know that region — who could make decisions for you in that area.

One other area I'd like to comment on is health care and hospitalization. Certainly in this Assembly the minister has raised that we face a lot of difficulty in coming to grips with rapidly increased costs. But I

believe that, like transportation and the transportation system, this is another area where we as a government are the only ones who can really meet the needs of the people in health care. And it is going to be costly. I think the case I raised the other day — and I'm sure there are other examples — of a senior citizen worried about being able to get into a hospital shouldn't exist in the province of Alberta. Access should be readily accessible at all times. I'm sure a lot of people are going to be concerned with headlines such as in the May 24 edition of *The Lethbridge Herald*. The hospital board there has had to reduce its budget or reduce a \$100,000 deficit, because that was the only way they could handle the situation. So what are they doing?

Day surgery at the hospital will be limited to two operations a day from Monday, June 25, to Monday, July 23 . . .

A 19-bed minimum-care medical ward will be shut down for July and August, accompanied by a closure of the day psychiatric program during the same period . . .

Those types of things cause a certain anxiety in the public, and they raise the question: why does this happen in the province of Alberta, when we have the funds available to us as we have? Now I must agree that to be responsible, you do have to draw some kind of guidelines. Hopefully, in considering his portfolio and his responsibility, the minister will consider that this is a high priority and that his first answer to the boards across the province of Alberta isn't always no.

The other area I'd like the minister to consider very, very carefully is the whole area of rural hospitalization in the province of Alberta. I've felt, and the rural hospital boards I've talked to feel, that there really isn't due consideration, particularly in the capital facilities of some of our rural hospitals. I think what happened over the last four years was an unfortunate thing. In his early responsibilities, the former minister very capably visited most of these hospitals, and I thought it was a great idea. In that visitation, the feeling was: yes, you need some renovations; yes, we may look at a new hospital; my door is always open; we're going to get this thing off the ground and really move.

Well, it didn't happen in the four years, and we've reached other kinds of financial difficulties in that period. So expectations were raised; expectations have not been met. At the present time, there's a feeling that the larger hospitals are going to receive most of the recognition and most of the funds for capital hospital funding across the province of Alberta.

I certainly hope that in his responsibility, the minister recognizes that such rural centres — and I'd like to name the two I'm most familiar with, Taber and Vulcan — can receive adequate capital funds to renovate or even build new facilities. There has been a promise of a nursing home at Taber, for example. I'd like the minister to review that decision and possibly look at a new hospital and maybe using the older hospital for the nursing home facilities, because I know the board has second doubts. But the type of politics and decision-making that were going on about a year and a half ago forced the board into accepting that kind of decision. It was either accept that or forget it, you're not getting anything. That was the feeling they had. I'd appreciate very much if, in his review of these capital expenditures, the minister would look at the Taber hospital in that light.

I know the minister has received representation from

the Vulcan hospital board with regard to a new facility. Certainly I support that and would like the minister to look at that request as openly as possible. That is my concern at the present time. I'm sure that as we move through the next four years of this Legislature, I'll be making further comments with regard to that. But that is my feeling at present.

One of the other areas this government will be facing in the next few months is certainly the area dealing with the constitution and federal and provincial affairs. I think at this point in time, it's difficult for the government to make decisions. We all have to wait until the Prime Minister-elect is Prime Minister and has his feet on the ground. But he may never have them there; we don't know. But I think it's time for not only the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs but the Premier to review the positions we established in earlier legislatures, and review them under the present circumstances.

I think we have to ask questions such as: does the government still hold the same view on Senate reform? Are there new circumstances so that we have to assess that particular area? Does it still believe in choosing Supreme Court panels by a lottery system, with no necessary regional balance in each of the draws? Did the Premier intend to signal any change in position with the recent statement to the Canadian Export Association that Canada is changing to a nation of 11 governments? What did he really mean by that particular concept? I think we should define that in this Legislature again, before we make our new presentation to Ottawa.

Does the Alberta government anticipate any change in its approach to Ottawa with this change in federal government and the new terms of reference that hopefully are clear and established by the Prime Minister-elect? Are we as Albertans going to take a different position? Some of the feelings of Alberta people are that our Premier says, I represent the concept of Alberta, but not Alberta in Confederation. The question of whether he's a big westerner or a little westerner comes into the matter of discussion. People perceive it as an image. Maybe in his actions he's really saying, I'm thinking of Canada first and Alberta's place in Canada. I'm sure it's incumbent upon the Premier to accept that responsibility and clarify that not only to the people of Alberta but to other Canadians, and particularly to the people of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I think those are some of the important questions we have to raise and discuss in this Legislature.

At this point in time, I want to welcome all new members of the Legislature who are here. I certainly have appreciated the contributions they have made as new members. I think you're off to a good start. Hopefully we'll give you a year to get your feet wet, and at that point we can be a little more critical. But I certainly welcome all of you as additions to the Legislature. On our side of the House I know we look forward to working with you, not only as opponents but certainly as persons wishing to co-operate and build a better province of Alberta.

MR. RUSSELL: In entering the debate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to confine my remarks to the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I'm assuming it's appropriate to do that, in view of your ruling this morning. I must say I'm somewhat puzzled that the hon. member isn't in his seat after the

eloquent plea he put up to get his amendment placed before the Assembly. Then, having received your considered decision this morning, I guess he's found it inconvenient to stay in the House to hear the remarks that might come about as a result of his amendment.

DR. BUCK: Same as the Premier did.

MR. RUSSELL: I see a little chirpy chipmunk is back with us again for another four years. [laughter] Some things just never change, Mr. Speaker.

In speaking to the amendment, I think it's important to look at what it really says. I'm assuming it doesn't say what the hon. member who proposed it means, because he says he wants this Assembly to "direct" the "government to initiate a wide-ranging study" — not to finish it, or report back, or with a view to implementing, but simply to initiate it. I don't think that's what he meant. But that's what he has written down, so that's what we'll debate.

Aside from the general motherhood aspect of the amendment — that is, the desire always to do better, and that could apply of course to any program of government and any government anywhere — I also think it's slightly contradictory. On the one hand it calls for "developing new, cost-effective delivery systems", and on the other hand it involves "*eliminating regional disparities*". Depending on whether or not you wish to eliminate regional disparities by bringing all areas up to the highest level in existence or by bringing the high areas down to the lowest level of existing services, that's contradictory with respect to the cost-effective portion of the amendment. So I'm going to speak against it and urge members of the House to vote it down.

I want to say though, Mr. Speaker, that we as a government and as a department recognize there's always room for improvement in this field of endeavor and service. In voting down the amendment, I don't want it to be interpreted that we're standing pat or saying things are fine just as they are now, because of course that's not the case with respect to any department. But the way it's written, I'm wondering if this is a logical amendment to the throne speech. I submit it isn't. Perhaps the remarks the hon. member had in mind would be more appropriate for the budget debate. In any event, in speaking against the amendment I want to give some evidence that there are things going on which would, I think, make the thrust of the hon. member's amendment unnecessary.

Let us first look at the situation today. As a result of a recently passed Act by the former Legislature of Alberta, we have established a relatively new Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's well known that it has either developed, or is developing, a series of policies with respect to a number of facets of health care and health care delivery systems.

I'd particularly like to mention the Act and its reference to committees. In the Act there is special reference to a policy advisory committee to the minister, which is established, and in many ways its duties are supposed to carry out what the amendment is asking us to do. A following section of the Act also permits a minister to establish *ad hoc* committees to deal with special or important matters relating to health care.

I mention those committees, Mr. Speaker, because they have been established in both cases, both the standing committee and the *ad hoc* committees. They have

and are continuing to report. Again I submit that that's a duplication of what is asked for in the amendment.

The policy advisory committee to the minister established under the Act was chaired by the MLA who is now the Minister of Transportation, so that position will be changed. Other than that, the committee is continuing its work.

Another committee deals specifically with the economics of health care. That is ongoing, and we've received interim reports from that committee. We've also received a report from an *ad hoc* committee on rural health care facilities. Soon to be established — it hasn't been announced yet, but I might as well make reference to it today — is a special committee on utilization rates with respect to the beds and facilities in Alberta. We have a number of distinguished Albertans who've agreed to serve on that committee and report back.

I just want to make a side comment on the matter of utilization, because the speaker preceding me in the debate made reference to rural health care facilities. Mr. Speaker, one thing that does disturb us, particularly in the matter of utilization, is the fact that in some of the smaller rural hospitals the utilization rate is relatively very low. It tends to be much higher in the metropolitan centres. So you can see the conundrum there in attempting to provide a system of good health care, with a minimum of regional disparities, when you get that utilization difference. Of course the utilization difference also reflects upon the back-up services with respect to personnel and other supporting physical facilities.

So when considering the amendment, I think it's important to look at the existing situation, in fact, as concerns the organization of the department, and the establishment of a number of special committees that are either at work or have already reported on a number of specific, important aspects of health care.

I think another very important issue that should be mentioned when considering the thrust of the amendment is the matter of research in health care. We have, as you know, both as a campaigning political party and, more recently, as an elected government, said very strongly what our commitment is to the field of medical research. All hon. members are expecting to see that very substantial commitment made during this session of the Legislature. That will supplement and complement the well-established applied research programs already in existence, particularly in the fields of cardiac care and cancer.

I should not pass by the matter of health care research without also giving some mention to the substantial funds from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund that have gone into capital projects, particularly in such areas as the Health Sciences Centre here in Edmonton and the children's hospital in Calgary, both of which I think we're going to be able to recognize with pride as being leaders and in fact the very best of their kind in this part of the world.

I've dealt with organization, utilization, and research. I'd now like to talk about budgeting for a moment, because I think there's an inference in the wording of the amendment that budgeting and costs might be improved. Mr. Speaker, it would be puzzling to wonder what more we might do with respect to trying to instil in the existing system more elements of cost effectiveness than we have now. The attention and

the challenges that are being given to local boards with respect to their hospital budgets, in both an operating and a capital budget sense, are very large indeed. I'd be quite willing to accept suggestions as to what more might be done by getting either the department or the responsible boards to examine more closely the effectiveness of their budgeting and their spending.

We're told constantly that it's not enough, yet on the other hand we're asked to initiate even more means and methods of cost control. I believe there is a limit to what you can do. We've tried to recognize, in a regional and a growth sense, the special needs that some hospitals might have with respect to cost effectiveness by way of the appeal decision for their annual budgets. I think that system will work well.

I also want to talk a moment about beds. I think people interested in health care systems throughout the world are now recognizing that simply providing more beds is obviously not the best answer to providing effective health care systems. During this debate I won't talk about prevention programs; that is, trying to encourage citizens to maintain good health and thereby not have to enter the system. We should also look at the demographic trends in our own particular region and give very careful consideration to the number of beds that those involve.

I want to talk about beds, because the matter of regional disparities is mentioned in the hon. member's proposed amendment. It's not a simple matter in the mathematical sense, Mr. Speaker, to resolve regional disparities on a straight bed per unit of population basis. Going back to my earlier comments about the population trends in the different regions of the province, we know for example that in the areas of new or accelerated growth, in many cases there is a younger segment of the population with different kinds of illnesses and different kinds of bed requirements than in the older, established parts of the province where you may get a higher percentage of senior citizens. In that case, you're looking at instances of trying to provide for the active or acute-care beds on a shorter term basis, with a longer term look at the nursing home and auxiliary hospital beds. There, again, the government has done a pretty good job to date in balancing on a regional basis those various kinds of beds required.

Of course the beds aren't effective unless there's a good transportation system to link the various levels of service. Here, again, I think Alberta is doing as well as any other province in the initiation and support of that kind of transportation service. Not only have we recently got going a very effective program throughout the province in the training of ambulance personnel, but we've established an emergency air ambulance system for Alberta which is second to none. I think our ground transportation system, although good, could still see some improvement, and we're working on that. Members can expect to see further discussion of that matter in continuing days of this Legislature.

That leaves us with a matter of planning facilities, Mr. Speaker. Again, notwithstanding the criticisms levelled regarding moratoriums, or negative decisions with respect to particular building programs, I think we have developed an excellent process for assessing, not only on a specific municipal basis but also on an overall provincial basis, the capital projects that are involved in any particular community's needs. Just as important, we've been able to tie in a system of predict-

ing fairly accurately the ongoing operating requirements that future legislatures will be looking at when this particular Legislature approves those capital projects. And that's important.

It's a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that today, June 1, is the day we're discussing this amendment. It's also the day hospital boards throughout the province have been told the temporary moratorium that was in effect has been lifted. Following today we're expecting to receive the requests in an organized way from hospital boards throughout the province. This will enable them to understand the system, and certainly give us as legislators a better idea of what our total requirements are liable to be. From initial indications, I'm afraid they're going to be staggering. There are going to be some very difficult decisions for all of us to make, no matter what side of the House we're on, with respect to commitments to those kinds of facilities.

The other component of the health care system, of course, has to be the professions involved in providing the various kinds of service. Again, I think Alberta can hold its head up high with respect to its relationship to or support of any of the services. The comments just yesterday of the registrar of the College of Physicians and Surgeons were very interesting, about the migration of doctors to Alberta on a national basis because that profession finds Alberta an attractive place to work. We're trying to keep it that way. We're trying to support it by our establishment of medical research programs and very vigorous encouragement of the supporting science industries that relate to medicine.

That's a quick overview, Mr. Speaker. I shouldn't close without mentioning the other health care services provided by the Department of Social Services and Community Health and the various programs carried out by the local health units. The very important program of home care, and the prenatal and well-baby clinic programs are important to all our communities.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying we recognize that in an important field like this there is always room for improvement. It requires vigilance and care in guarding the interests of our citizens. We will do that. Turning down the amendment does not mean we will not do that. I think our record also proves we will not do that and have no thought of doing that.

I want to repeat that I find difficulty in supporting the amendment by its particular wording. That's of course what we must vote on. But I do urge hon. members to vote it down.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of duty and responsibility that I rise to give my first major address to this Assembly. I might say that I am honored to be here as the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Calgary Currie, and that I appreciate very much the discussions that have gone on before and the speeches that have been given prior to mine. I congratulate all of those speakers.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment. I realize it's a traditional thing to do, but I think in this Legislature we are particularly fortunate to be able to carry out that tradition with one so capable of handling the job.

I would also like to give my best wishes to the Lieutenant-Governor, whom I've had only a brief opportunity to deal with in my few weeks in this Legisla-

ture, but whom I've been extremely impressed with. There was much in the Lieutenant-Governor's address which will be of importance to the people of Calgary Currie. I'd like to address those issues as I get into my speech.

I'd first like to say that I very much enjoyed the speech by the hon. Member for Vegreville. I think he had some excellent points and ideas, and I'd like to deal with some of the issues in my term in the Legislature. I appreciate those comments.

I thought that the comments of the hon. Member for Little Bow, despite the side of the House he sits on, were very well thought out. There were certainly some issues that he dealt with well.

With respect to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, as a new member I didn't realize that small animals, particularly "chirpy chipmunks", were allowed in the Legislature. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we should have the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife look into that situation. [laughter]

Before I get into the details of the Speech from the Throne, I'd like to give you, as most members have done, a brief outline of Calgary Currie. I think Calgary Currie really is a microcosm of urban communities in Alberta. Any problem found in most of your urban communities, and the hopes and desires too, can be found in Calgary Currie. The Killarney, Glengarry, and Altadore regions in the north part of the constituency are on the edge of the inner-city area and have some of those difficulties. Most of the people in that district are employees rather than employers; most of them are not rich. I may add that I live in that particular area. A good percentage are single parents, almost 40 per cent in that district.

As you move farther to the centre of Calgary Currie, you find the constituency stabilizes in terms of economic base and the time which people are staying in their homes. Sarcee and Lincoln Park are those kinds of communities. But also in the centre part of the constituency you find Currie Barracks, a military strength of some 2,000 men, which we're sure the federal government located there to emphasize the importance of the Calgary Currie constituency.

Also in that central portion is Mount Royal College, which graduates some of the most brilliant students in the province. I may add that I attended that college in years gone by. This Legislature will be looking at recommendations from the college for expansion, and I'll be talking to those when they come up.

Just before the last election, we annexed the southern part of the constituency — the communities of Lakeview, Lakeview Village, and north Glenmore — from the Calgary Glenmore constituency. I may add we did it completely without the military strength located in Currie Barracks. The constituents in the Lakeview district are again basically middle-income individuals. There's quite a mixture of people there, and a fair number of new Canadians moving into the district. In Lakeview Village and the north Glenmore area we have representatives of the professions, the managers, the owners of companies in Alberta. That's the more affluent and rich part of the constituency. When we annexed that area, we also took with it the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, who lives in the Lakeview Village district. While, as the government party whip, he's one of my most troublesome constituents, we none the less are honored to have him in that area.

As well as the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, Calgary Currie has a number of very prominent citizens. The mayor of the city of Calgary, the chairman of the board of education, the Ward 11 alderman, and a number of other prominent Calgarians and, indeed, Albertans have chosen to live in Calgary Currie. We've been represented in the past by the hon. Fred Colborne, who distinguished himself in former administrations, and the hon. Fred Peacock, whom many of you know as a former colleague and Minister of Industry and Commerce in this government. Perhaps our greatest honor is that at one time the constituency, at least in part, was represented by the hon. Member for Calgary West, the Premier of this province.

As you can see from the kind of representatives my constituency has had, the people of Calgary Currie are rugged, hard-working individualists. Above all, they want to maintain individual freedom and responsibility and the right to work on their own initiative. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and happy to note that those particular points were indeed in the Speech from the Throne, inherent in the legislation recommended, and I think an indication of the philosophy of this particular government.

I'd like now to deal with the specifics of the Speech from the Throne, to start in particular with labor/management relations. In the north part of Calgary Currie, as I mentioned, the people are predominantly employees. Labor/management is an area I'm particularly interested in. It can be said to have somewhat of a labor background. My father is, and has been for many years, a member of the plumbers and pipefitters union, my wife a member of CUPE, and I was a member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers prior to starting my own business and going into management.

Having been on both sides of that, and having constituents in large numbers, both in organized and unorganized labor sections and in the management area, I feel there's essentially no difference in terms of the desires, wishes, and goals of the person, regardless of where he stands in our work force. There's also no difference in the kind of government they want, as emphasized by the vote of March 14, where in fact the predominantly labor sections of my constituency voted for this government in even more overwhelming proportions than the largely employer sections of the constituency.

I believe very strongly that my constituents think it's time for an end to the adversary system of labor negotiations. Mr. Speaker, we're gratified to note that 95 per cent of all settlements in this province have been without using the strike mechanism. I believe we can now look at options to deal with that, primarily in this province, because we have very responsible leadership on the part of management and labor. One alternative is labor courts. You know, we can't translate those directly to this province. I'm not naive enough to think that any kind of program used in other parts of the world could be translated directly into action here, but the concept of having two parties sit down and a judgment made that will not require either one to go out and take an action that will harm the worker, the manager, or society as a whole, is a direction we have to consider.

In addition, in more of a long-range fashion, I think we have to look at some of the philosophies indicated in books by economist Louis Kelso: *The*

Second Income Plan, *The Two Factor Theory*, and *The Capitalist Manifesto*, which indicate ways which we might consider to involve the employee directly with some aspects of management, perhaps even with an equity position in companies. I would personally favor establishing a body, a committee of labor leaders, management people, and members from this Legislature, too, to take a look at that aspect, to bring these three groups together, hand in hand, to develop a mutual approach to our economy and our society. I think we've done excellently in that area compared to almost everywhere in the world, but we still have steps we can take.

Mr. Speaker, the other area I would like to deal with specifically is the International Year of the Child. While hon. members have dealt extensively with that area in their speeches, I would specifically like to suggest a couple of directions we might also consider during this year. I think that though the rights and the responsibilities, even of children, are indicated in legislation in many areas in our government, we should consider enshrining those rights in a children's bill of rights in this, the International Year of the Child. I'll be discussing that with my colleagues in the future.

Then we have to take a look at ways of ensuring that our responsibility toward children is carried out and, where the system breaks down, that we have a mechanism for dealing with that system. In that light, I may be discussing with my colleagues such concepts as a child welfare commission or a review board that can look at that kind of situation.

When you discuss children, Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can do so without taking a look at the family unit. Again, that's something which has been emphasized by people in this Assembly and which may be particularly close to me, because my family did not stay together throughout my life. While that's probably true of many of us, and the difficulty that that causes is not easy to define, I don't think any of us who have been through that can feel it's a positive situation.

I'm most troubled by the real trend I see in Alberta today toward the single-parent family and divorce. There's an obvious breakdown of the family unit as we know it traditionally. I don't think we've yet taken a look at the impact that's going to have on this community. We have based most of our laws and directions on the assumption that the family unit is a constant and that it will always exist, and I'm not sure that current trends show that. As I mentioned earlier, almost 45 per cent of one part of my constituency are now single parents. I think we have to deal with that very specifically. That's why I introduced *The Alberta Family Institute Act* this morning, and we'll be debating that in coming months.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the areas in the throne speech that interested me and that I wanted to talk to. They're some of the problems and concerns that I've seen. I'd like to turn to the more positive side of my time in this Legislature.

As I stand here today, I feel that the excitement, the enthusiasm, and indeed some of the dreams and wishes that are current at this crossroads in the history of our province, were present back in 1905 when we were first formed. As I stand here, I think of Governor General Earl Grey and Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier coming out and declaring this place a province in

1905. There was an excitement then, an enthusiasm. I think it was capsulized fairly well by the then Prime Minister, who said, "I see everywhere hope. I see everywhere calm resolution, courage, enthusiasm to face all difficulties, to settle all problems." As was true then when people were flowing into the province — a new frontier, a new place to go — we have people flowing in again today.

Because of responsible management on the part of this government — and in fairness, partially on the part of the former government — and because of our fortunate position with resources, we now are in an extremely positive economic situation. That doesn't allow us to deal just with the problems today, the difficulties facing us now, or to administer justice today, but it gives us the opportunity no government that I can recall in the history of the world has had before; that is, to look at the problems we're going to have, to look at how we can deal with those and how we can invest what in my mind is the most far-sighted political judgment ever made by a government, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, in the future of this province, and project a blueprint for tomorrow. I think it's an exciting concept — awesome and, to some extent, frightening — that we can create a blueprint for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a member of this Legislature at this time in history and to sit with men and women, many of whom I believe will be legends in the history of Canada. I look forward to those responsibilities.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to rise and join others of this Assembly in extending congratulations on your re-election to that distinguished office you now hold as Speaker, distinguished perhaps even more in Alberta because, as a result of your performance, you have won yourself a leading position amongst Speakers of the world.

As well, I'd like to join members of this Legislature in congratulating the Lieutenant-Governor, the Honourable Ralph Steinhauer, in recognizing the service he has given with distinction to the people of Alberta.

I'd also like to welcome all new members to this Legislature. I'm sure they will find their presence here as exciting and meaningful as I have since my election in 1971. And truly, new members, the excitement never ceases. I want to thank my constituency supporters for the contributions they made during this long term in assisting me in what I hope was a very good role in representing them. I certainly hope to continue that way in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I view this third term of Alberta's history as a new era for Alberta. In order to indicate clearly why I feel it is a new era, perhaps it is necessary to do a historical review of our time in government in this province since 1971, because each term had some special successes and meanings. When the election campaign was on in 1971, in preparation for that election we said that now was the time for Alberta to make a change, to embark on some very new and bold directions to bring about a change in Alberta's history.

Mr. Speaker, I think we did that. Perhaps we did it with a greater impact than Albertans at that time and even today realize, because events have taken place at such a great pace that one has continually had to run at what we might say top speed, to be able to keep up

and recognize the changes and the impact of where we're going. The life styles for all citizens in Alberta changed. They changed not only because we individually and personally made that determination but because of the new activity, the new freshness of attitude, outlook, of the government. There was a change in dreams for Alberta. Dreams not in sleep, but dreams in possibilities of taking our place in this nation and making our impact by assisting the whole nation to make its impact on the world nations.

In that first term, in that new era, we embarked on reorganization to recognize that if our direction and dreams were to come true, there had to be some very extensive motions of redirection. Policies changed, new programs were brought about, innovations, and social reforms: all of these brought about changes in employment, changes in opportunity of employment. In that first era, we recognized that Alberta was on the threshold of something different, something new. Alberta needed to be on the threshold of something different, if it was going to have the everlasting impact on the lives of its citizens. We recognized that there was a time when finally we were able to have an impact and a redirection in the worth of this province, in its people and its resources. We seized upon that time, that initiative. We brought about a change in the prices Albertans finally received for their resources. That gave us the ability to forge ahead to create a new state, a new people, and a new possibility of dreams — a future that would direct and have an impact on the lives of those who were to come.

But in embarking on these new directions, in recognizing that we could not continue to build on our agricultural base, that there had to be alternatives and a time when the alternatives were available, we had to recognize that that impact of industrial change and growth had to have its day and its balance with our environment. So the very first era of the 17th Legislature laid its groundwork for Alberta.

In the second term, the 18th Legislature, realizing that we had put so many tentacles in motion in all directions, and it wasn't enough to put these tentacles in motion and then let them fall into a maze of confusion and inadequacy, there was a recognition that the first era set a base. But unless you gave proper support and development to that base, the base would be meaningless and would not come forward with the impact that was intended. In that second term we said that leadership was going to be extremely important in the province of Alberta. It was one thing to set in motion many new policies and programs; it was another to see them carried out to their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, we recognized that what we had set in motion in the first era of this province would give us great potential but great problems in the second era, because it was the second era that gave us the kind of monetary support that would enable us to flesh out our ideas, our policies, and our programs already in place. But more than that, that new monetary viability was going to put on this government a kind of strain never before experienced by any government in any other nation.

In giving life to a host of forgotten areas, dying communities, we gave them perhaps an overexuberance, an overexpectation — which is all wonderful — but also gave them a sense of ease with which they were able to cope with their problems. And new problems are presenting themselves, in wanting more than

should realistically have been demanded. That is perhaps the nature of man. The more we have, the more we seem to need. Maybe personal drive, initiative, and enterprise fall by the way when all or many of our problems can be solved in a monetary way.

In the second era of this province we experienced pressures from within and from without. The pressures from within were for more of the same and other kinds of assistance, which perhaps were being moved forward earlier in their time. But the pressure from without was that not only in this province was it a new era, it was developing into a new era in the nation. There was a kind of envy of our new-found wealth on the part of those around us. So in taking our place in the leadership of attempting to balance the inequities that have existed between the central part of this nation and other regions, one of which we are a part, the envy was expressed in strange ways as though the monetary position should preclude us from requesting and wanting a balancing of the inequities, which really were not that much with respect to monetary inequities, although the end result was that the people of provinces in regions outside the central part of the nation were paying for those inequities not only in services but in dollars.

In our leadership at home we had put in place many programs for our citizens. I'd like to recap some of them. In our priorities we recognized that a human resource was one of our most precious ones, and that some inequities existed there. So in the second term we set our priorities with people: senior citizens, the handicapped, and the young and their education. These priorities followed the initial priority in the first term of the era with respect to the protection of human rights.

With regard to some of the initiatives taken for senior citizens, I know that the matter of housing was a very important one. Today we see support for provision of housing facilities of every nature or kind that is deemed necessary or desirable to house our seniors. For those who do not live in their own accommodation, but in rented accommodation, we recognize the need for their support with our renter rebate program, which is being increased, with the Legislature's consideration, to \$500 a year.

Many community service programs were put in place to assist, not to take over but to play in concert with, the volunteer aspect of our citizens, which I would say leads the nation in its attitude and its contribution. Albertans were being given the added consideration of major reductions in personal income tax, which are the envy of the nation. Pension adjustments were made on many levels, particularly for those who have suffered through accidents in the workplace and have had their income capabilities curtailed. I think the major steps in agriculture, irrigation, and transportation were long overdue, but were more extensive than one readily recognizes.

Apart from initiatives in many other areas, we have moved into this third term, the 19th Legislature, which I now refer to as the new era — Alberta's leadership in this nation. I believe that the contribution of this province, its leadership in attempting to assist in the resolution of the problems to keep this nation together, to put equities in place, will be written in history books. It will be recognized that our leadership was not one of self-interest or self-centredness, but one on behalf of all the provinces and the people across the

nation — yes, in the interests of those in central Canada as well, for we cannot pit one area or region of the nation against another. It will be difficult, and claims will be made that we have no interest in those in the central part of Canada. But we have, for we all want to be recognized that we are all Canadians of equal status, and that there is no animosity or envy regardless of where one lives.

Many of the programs being brought forward have a particular significance to the citizens in my constituency. I will not outline them one by one, because that has been done by other members. But I would simply like to reflect on the housing programs which will now enable a lot of the citizens in the lower income level in my constituency finally to own a home, and the support for senior citizens, not only in housing but in a very broad area, particularly social programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone from one era to another. The new era is Alberta's leadership in the nation. Although the face of this province has changed in many ways, from a prime agricultural province to one of diversity, in all those changes there is something about this province that remains constant.

I would like to read a poem, Mr. Speaker, which perhaps best describes that constant existence of this province. The poem is called *Prairie Sentinels*, for it will go back and tell us where our roots are and will continue to be.

Those — elevators stand silent as sentries
guarding the wealth of summer stored within.
They stand on guard overlooking the rolling
prairie stubble —
How many years of the cloying, choking dust of
wheat?
of the birds chirping, pouncing on the grain?
Or the rattle, rumble, clickety-click of train —
first steam, then diesel — and silence?
The wagon rut trail transformed into singing
pavement
its town grew — now shrivels . . .
The wheat of Canada's West housed here then off
to ocean and across — on a one way journey.

And the sentinel stands day and night, by sun, by
moon
the grain heats, condenses, rustles — the mice
attack
the wind, blows past
What would the West be at morning, noon or night
without the elevators which stand silent
watching man pass?

Mr. Speaker, this poem is from the pen of our own David Carter, Calgary Millican. I think it is very appropriate for Alberta's history.

Thank you.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to revert to an earlier order of business in order

that I might file with the library of the Assembly copies of a summary report of A Study of the School System Secretary-Treasurer in Alberta. If I have the leave of members, I'd like to make a brief description of this document.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, this document was commissioned by the Department of Education, and the study was conducted by Peat Marwick & Partners. I regret the main report is not available at this time; as I said, I'm tabling the summary report. I'm doing that because interested school officials are meeting in Banff on

Monday. I propose to make the summary report available to them at that time and, given the fact that the House is in session, I would like it to be available to members in advance.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, just a word in regard to the business on Monday. The proposal is that the throne speech debate continue, and if there's an opportunity for the second reading of some Bills, we would begin that. The House would sit on Monday evening as well as in the afternoon. I move that we call it 1 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:56 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

