

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, October 12, 1979 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10:00 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this morning to introduce guests from the United States, Mr. and Mrs. Maurer. She is a member of the legislature of Maryland. She and her husband are on a busman's holiday visiting various legislatures throughout Canada and the United States.

I think they're seated in the members lounge. Would members please accord them the usual welcome.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 37

**The Social Development Amendment Act, 1979
(No. 2)**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Social Development Amendment Act, 1979 (No. 2). The purpose of this Bill is to complete the package of legislation relating to the handicap benefit, and specifically to provide a top-up amount for a handicap benefit to handicapped persons who are eligible for and in receipt of a social allowance, and to permit the department to recover overpayments of social allowance of amounts not exceeding \$500, by deducting monthly amounts not exceeding 10 per cent of the value of basic necessities from social allowance payments or handicap benefit payments.

[Leave granted; Bill 37 read a first time]

Bill 32

The Bread Repeal Act

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise in my place to introduce Bill No. 32, The Bread Repeal Act. At the outset I'd like to assure hon. members that this is not a money Bill, and the word "bread" in the Act is to be given its traditional meaning.

I'm pleased to introduce this Bill, Mr. Speaker, as a fresh piece of legislation, being an example of deregulation. By passing this Bill, we will be giving stale legislation the bun.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a slice. [laughter]

MR. SPEAKER: On the assumption that the hon. minister is not going to make it illegal to eat bread in the province, would all those who agree with the motion for first reading please say aye.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

Bill 35

**The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund
Special Appropriation Act, 1980-81**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, before introducing this Bill I wish to table, pursuant to Section 5(3) of The Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act, the required letter of designation from the president of the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I request leave at this time to introduce Bill No. 35, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1980-81. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of the Bill is to transfer 30 per cent of the depleting revenues of oil, natural gas, and coal in Alberta to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund from the General Revenue Fund. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, such a Bill has never been presented by a treasurer or minister of finance to the elected assemblies of Alaska, Norway, Holland, Venezuela, or the United Kingdom.

[Leave granted; Bill 35 read a first time]

Bill 48

**The Attorney General Statutes
Amendment Act, 1979 (No. 2)**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 48, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1979 (No. 2).

Mr. Speaker, this Bill relates to a number of pieces of legislation within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General. Brief mention of each of them: there are slight formal changes in respect to The Commissioners for Oaths and The Notaries Public Acts, relating to the manner in which documents are to be completed. It's proposed The Evidence Act be amended to revise procedures in regard to the bringing in of expert witnesses when they appear in court to give their evidence. Under The Mechanical Recording of Evidence Act there is a provision to allow re-recording of certain evidence which under that Act is now taken by cassette tape.

Under The Public Trustee Act changes are proposed that would change the limits — in respect of the size of estates for which summary administration is within the power of the public trustee — to revise the dollar amounts of those limits upward, in accordance with current trends in the value of property. It's proposed to amend The Provincial Court Act in order to give the clerk of the court the desired flexibility where cases which are to be tried in respect of small claims court are set down for trial. The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act is proposed to be amended in order to have the manner of replenishing the fund from the General Revenue Fund made more administratively workable; the principle does not change. Under The Land Titles Act proposals are to remove certain requirements that have long been in the statute in regard to the bonding of certain employees of the Land Titles Office.

[Leave granted; Bill 48 read a first time]

Bill 40
The Partition and Sale Act

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I further request leave to introduce Bill No. 40, The Partition and Sale Act.

This Bill would codify existing case law in Alberta, which has evolved over the years from some ancient statutes in force in Great Britain, in respect of the partition and sale of land — referring, of course, to those circumstances under which the owner of land who is the owner along with at least one other person may be entitled to have the land partitioned in the sense of providing individual titles for the different owners. At the same time, the legislation will provide for the quieting of certain titles to land, which have been under a cloud as a result of a combination of recent court proceedings and one or two pieces of previous legislation.

[Leave granted; Bill 40 read a first time]

Bill 52
The Chattel Security Statutes
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I further ask leave to introduce Bill 52, The Chattel Security Statutes Amendment Act, 1979. This is a modernization step, in the full sense, in an area that affects large numbers of consumers.

There are three principles to the Bill. First, certain requirements in regard to registration and the details of the records kept in respect of registration of documents securing interests in personal property are proposed to be moved from the statute to the regulations, in order to make it easier to accord with modern business practices as they change from time to time.

Secondly, the Bill introduces the idea of a financial information statement in addition to the requirement to file the document itself. It is a proposal that in the long run is aimed at simplifying the type of document and type of information required to be filed.

Another provision, Mr. Speaker — the third consequential, substantial principle — is that a personal property notice might be filed at the Land Titles Office in respect of personal movable property which has become affixed to the land.

[Leave granted; Bill 52 read a first time]

Bill 50
The Alberta Health Care Insurance
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 50, The Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 1979.

The Bill has two main features. It governs administrative definitions and procedures for the collection and payment of health care insurance premiums. Secondly, the Bill defines senior citizen benefits, previously defined as extended care benefits. They will now be considered basic benefits for senior citizens in the province of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 50 read a first time]

Bill 53
The Department of Education
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 53, The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1979.

The purposes of the Bill are fourfold. First of all, there is a redefinition of the word "board" in the Bill and in the Act, in order to achieve greater conformity with other legislation under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education.

Secondly, there is a redefinition of "private school", in order to comprehend and encompass the operation of schools we now identify as type four private schools in the province; that is, schools which do not use certificated teachers or do not follow the curriculum of Alberta Education.

Thirdly, there is a change in the powers which may be granted in the conduct of an enquiry under The Department of Education Act. The Bill would allow, at the discretion of the minister, an enquiry to be conducted by an individual who would have the powers that are vested under the official inquiries Act.

Fourthly, the Act is amended to allow a by-election to fill vacancies on a board, following upon the successful conclusion of the work of an official trustee.

[Leave granted; Bill 53 read a first time]

Bill 39
The Private Vocational Schools Act

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 39, The Private Vocational Schools Act. This Bill will repeal The Trade Schools Regulation Act, which has been in effect in Alberta since 1942, and bring into much better shape, we believe, the relationship of the government and private vocational schools now providing very valuable service to Albertans. Hopefully in the future their position will be more clearly defined.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of principles in the bill, which I will deal with as we proceed to second reading.

[Leave granted; Bill 39 read a first time]

Bill 43
The Co-operative Marketing Associations
and Rural Utilities Guarantee
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 43, The Co-operative Marketing Associations and Rural Utilities Guarantee Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of this Bill is to extend to customers and members of utility-sponsored co-ops the same benefits that they previously enjoyed and that are presently enjoyed by member-sponsored co-ops.

[Leave granted; Bill 43 read a first time]

Bill 49
The Cultural Development
Amendment Act, 1979

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 49, The Cultural Development Amend-

ment Act, 1979. This Act will describe the authority of the minister in general rather than particular words, and will allow the minister to enter into contracts on matters relating to the cultural development of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 49 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: While the hon. minister is in the business of the day, would the Assembly agree to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A group of 17 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre is seated in the members gallery, with their teacher Ann Nikolai. As the centre is located in my constituency of Edmonton Centre, it is my pleasure to introduce the students to the Legislature and ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, could I revert to introduction of visitors as well?

MR. SPEAKER: We'll be coming back to that item shortly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**
(*continued*)

Bill 54
The Provincial Parks Amendment Act, 1979

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 54, The Provincial Parks Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of the Bill is to permit the Department of Recreation and Parks to develop recreation areas within the province.

[Leave granted; Bill 54 read a first time]

Bill 38
The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 38, The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Amendment Act, 1979. The principles of the Bill are to allow a minister of the Crown to table the annual report of the commission, and to permit the disclosure to a medical examiner of information regarding a patient. That would permit information to be used in a proceeding at a public inquiry under The Fatality Inquiries Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 38 read a first time]

Bill 34
The Teachers' Retirement Fund
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, The Teachers' Retirement Fund Amendment Act, 1979. This Bill will propose five technical changes requested by groups and individuals affected by the Bill. They will allow for the continued equitable and efficient administration of the Teachers' Retirement Fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 34 read a first time]

Bill 42
The Public Contributions
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Public Contributions Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of the Bill is to more completely define the operating framework within which charitable organizations solicit funds from the public.

[Leave granted; Bill 42 read a first time]

Bill 33
The Revised Statutes 1980 Act

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 33, The Revised Statutes 1980 Act. Basically this Bill will allow the Chief Legislative Counsel, as has been somewhat of a tradition approximately every 10 years, to consolidate and revise the Revised Statutes of Alberta, 1970, and the public Acts of Alberta enacted after December 31, 1970, and on or before December 31, 1980.

[Leave granted; Bill 33 read a first time]

Bill 41
The Licensing of Trades and Businesses
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker I request leave to introduce Bill 41, The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of the Bill is to provide that regulations respecting bonding may be prepared in a manner so that the amount of any bond required by any applicant for a licence or a licensee may be discretionary.

[Leave granted; Bill 41 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, 43, and 50 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the annual report of the Cultural Heritage Foundation for the year ended March 31, 1979.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Edmonton Belmont I would like to introduce a visiting class from grade 10 from the M.E. LaZerte school. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Hrychuk and Mr. Saik, and are in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly at this time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are they?

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**
Federal Agencies

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Provincial Treasurer, in the absence of the Premier. The question flows from a statement made yesterday in the House of Commons by one of the federal cabinet ministers that deals with the privatization of several federal government agencies — the statement by the hon. minister in Ottawa that provincial governments would be welcome to bid on some of the federal agencies that the federal government plans to turn over to the private sector.

My question to the Provincial Treasurer, in his capacity both as Provincial Treasurer and on the investment committee: has the Alberta government made a decision as to whether it will bid on any of the proposed federal Crown agencies which are to be privatized?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we would not contemplate making bids in respect of any of those agencies.

MR. NOTLEY: You should have them provincialized.

Income Assistance for the Handicapped

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a second question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It deals with the matter raised in the House yesterday by my colleague the Member for Little Bow regarding assured income for the severely handicapped. Is the minister now in a position to indicate to the Assembly the method the department is using in arriving at the assistance that will be available to severely handicapped people?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I felt that question was dealt with yesterday in the absence of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister: The minister indicated at the close of question period that net income was considered. Are the spouse's responsibilities with regard to other items considered in that net income, such as a responsibility for special facilities for the handicapped partner?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. I did indicate that net income was examined; that's take-home pay.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In cases where financial obligations cannot be met by the family — the spouse and the handicapped person as such — will those types of things be considered in bringing about consideration of the final payment to the handicapped person?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated this spring when the program was being debated in the Assembly and during discussions with various handicapped groups as well as members of the media, in addition to the assured income for the severely handicapped there will be, for those individuals who require extra financial assistance, the ability for those needs to be met through social assistance. In other words, prior to the introduction of this program a number of Albertans did receive assistance through social assistance. If I may use as an example an individual who under the social assistance program has needs of \$500 per month, the first \$370 would be met by the assured income for the severely handicapped program, if he qualifies for it, and the remaining \$130 would be provided through the normal social assistance programs.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In cases where not only the AISH program but the social assistance program applies, has the minister streamlined the application process so the handicapped person doesn't have to fill out two forms, meet with two social workers, and go through a lot of red tape?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we've attempted wherever possible to ensure that the program is not a duplication of the existing social assistance program. However, we are using the same social workers to do the work, and with the exception of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary the same appeal panels will be used. It's our intention to reduce — to use the hon. member's terms — red tape as much as possible.

It must be recognized that we're using a different criteria base for the assured income for the severely handicapped program than for social assistance. There's a very basic reason for that. Under the Canada assistance program, all provinces share with the federal government a program of social assistance across this country. That's why we have the differential.

As I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to receive social assistance one needs an income test and a needs test, as well as an assets test. This program providing assistance to the severely handicapped requires only one of those three tests, and that's the income test.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. Would the minister assure the Assembly that by the end of this month he would review the program in its present application and presentation to the handicapped people in the province of Alberta, as to whether it is meeting all the needs, and that the way the spouse's income or financial obligations are being assessed is prohibiting some of the handicapped people from receiving benefits much needed at the present time? Would the minister undertake that obligation to report by the end of this month?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, from the time the Bill was introduced I've stated that there would be an ongoing review of the program. I'm sure the hon. member appreciates that as of October 1 the information began to flow through the department's offices to severely handicapped individuals across this province. We're now beginning to see some of the results.

As I've said, fine-tuning will be required as the program develops. I intend to be in a better position prior to December 1. That's the date we anticipate the first cheques will be provided to Albertans eligible for the program. If some matters need to be addressed, I'll certainly be discussing those with my colleagues.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the answer could have been very simple. Would the minister accept the responsibility to report to this House by the end of the month, by October 30, as to the present status and considerations given, in the consideration of these applications, to the financial obligations and the ability to pay of the spouse who is not handicapped? Yes or no? Will the minister do that on his own initiative?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking me to give a commitment that we will review the lower and upper limits for both singles and couples — and those limits were decided upon after a great deal of deliberation by the government caucus. As I've said, they are the most generous in Canada. We as a caucus will be reviewing those regulations over a period of time. But surely, before we make any assessment, some proper time needs to elapse.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to mention again the fact that there is an appeal approach, through the local appeal boards, so individuals who feel their case has not been properly met by departmental officials, have the right to go before their peers and state their case. As there are with social assistance, there will be examples of decisions by the appeal boards to reverse a decision made by the department. That's part of the process.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister, for clarification. Could the minister advise the House whether this severely-handicapped program is based on a model from another province in Canada?

MR. BOGLE: As I've stated, Mr. Speaker, no program offered by any other province provides the kind of enrichment this program does.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the minister. They can break their arm and pat their back, but the fact is that some of the handicapped people in this province are not benefiting . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the hon. member a question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: This is, I should think, the post-post-final supplementary of the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that, because I certainly didn't intend to pursue the question any further than my initial one.

Would the minister consider reporting to the Legislature about the severely-handicapped program by the end of this month with available statistics and information, rather than to his caucus behind closed doors? That's all I ask.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I was asked to consider that and I'm prepared to do that.

Medical Fees

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It concerns the question of balance billing. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether it is the position of the government, going into negotiation this year with the medical profession, that there is a need for a catch-up fee schedule?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that will be determined through the course of negotiations. Those negotiations are now under way, so I don't want to comment on any details of them until they're completed. But to try to respond to the hon. member's question, I think we pointed out very clearly to the doctors that it would be open and straightforward negotiation, and if they felt they had a case that showed there was some merit to the argument that they deserved a catch-up recognition, then it would be their responsibility to prove that.

We also indicated to them that any statistics or data we have relating to their services or income would be freely exchanged, and we hoped they would do the same.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the intention of the government to prohibit the principle of balance billing within the medicare system — as opposed to the system in Ontario, where medical practitioners have to remove themselves from the system — as a matter of government policy during the spring session, or whether that move would simply take place were a satisfactory agreement not arrived at between the medical profession and the government, and then the system of balance billing prevailed on a widespread basis?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question, I believe the answer is what I told the annual convention of the Alberta Medical Association. We believe the negotiations now under way should lead to a position where the desire of most physicians to practise balance billing would disappear. We further said that if it persists, it's going to be up to the profession to regulate the rascals who still might be present within the profession. Following that, by the time of the next spring session, if some physicians still feel as a matter of principle that they're entitled to balance bill, we would then bring in opting-out legislation which would require them to opt out of the system if they want to balance bill.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it the government's position that, after a reasonable period of time to see whether the profession itself can regulate this, any balance billing within the system will lead to legislation, or in the

government's view would there be an acceptable level of balance billing?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I believe there's some public confusion about the term "balance billing". If the hon. member is referring to some percentage or quota that we would tolerate across the board during the routine course of billing, the government wouldn't find that acceptable. However, if there is extra time or extra service billing, which is justified in specific cases where extra time or duties are performed and the fee schedule really doesn't recognize fairly the payment required, I believe we would accept that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the government taking any steps to review the 1977 amendments introduced in this House by the previous minister, which removed the provision in the Act for an agreed-upon index in providing medical fees?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we're attempting to set up a permanent, all-round consulting process with the medical profession whereby matters like that could be discussed. I put to the Alberta Medical Association the idea that I was anxious to see the system used by the province of Ontario with a seven-person committee consisting of three government people, three members of the profession, and one citizen at large as independent chairman, who would deal with the matter of fee schedules when those were renegotiated once a year but deal with other matters during other parts of the year. I think that would come within those terms.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Bearing the minister's answer in mind, is the government's position to reopen the 1977 decision and reintroduce the indexing formula so that we don't find the profession falling behind on office overhead?

MR. RUSSELL: Not specifically, Mr. Speaker, although I think we'd be open to any suggestions put before us. The government has put to the association the proposition that we would like to negotiate overhead and professional fee separately insofar as the fee schedule is concerned.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the minister. The minister indicated a formula for negotiation patterned on Ontario. Would it be the intention of the government to set out both the bargaining process and the commitment to that kind of approach — equal from both sides with an independent chairman — in the form of legislation?

MR. RUSSELL: We haven't considered that yet, Mr. Speaker. This will have to be mutually agreed on, and the Alberta Medical Association has asked for further time to consider that specific proposition. I believe it's fair to say that any system we use is only as good as the people who participate in it. So we're open-minded with respect to what model is used. We've put forward our suggestion, and we're waiting for the final response of the association.

Hopper Car Purchase

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. It's with reference to his ministerial statement about the government's commitment to purchase 1,000 hopper cars. Could the minister advise who will be retaining the ownership of these hopper cars once this transaction is completed? Is it the Wheat Board, the railway companies, or . . .

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, it's our intention to establish an agency. They will remain the property of the government of Alberta.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Since the government is going to retain the ownership, can the minister advise whether there's going to be any identity on the hopper cars?

MR. R. CLARK: Blue and orange.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good idea. Thanks, Bob.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, actually we hadn't given it any thought, but in view of that suggestion, we'll take that under advisement.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, since we already have that information on the color of the cars, I would like to ask the minister whether these hopper cars are going to be used only for the transportation of grain, or could they be used for other agricultural commodities such as fertilizers, chemicals, or anything else?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the initial plan is for the transportation of grain. We had hoped they'd be deployed throughout Alberta and used in a reserve sense in conjunction with the inland terminals.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, the hon. Member for Camrose, and a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in light of that agenda, my supplementary may be long. It's not as frivolous as it started out to be.

Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary to the Minister of Economic Development. According to the Hall report, a number of cars presently available stand in the yards either empty or loaded about 60 per cent of the time. I wonder if the minister has plans to assure this Assembly that the Alberta cars — the orange and blue cars — are not sitting in the yards 60 per cent of the time. What plans has the minister to assure us that that won't happen? Number two, has the minister made arrangements with CN and CP to move our cars on first preference? And will the cars be used only for the shipment of Alberta grain, or will they be for western Canadian grain?

MR. PLANCHE: In reverse order, Mr. Speaker, on the last question: we hope they would be used primarily for the shipment of Alberta grain. The answer to the second question is no, I have not. I don't remember what the first question was.

AN HON. MEMBER: Utilization.

MR. PLANCHE: Oh, the utilization problem. I don't know that you can make an assurance like that, Mr. Speaker. We would be hopeful that these inland terminals would afford us an opportunity to use block trains and cut down the turnaround time, providing that terminals can receive them in the same sequence at the other end. It would be part of the negotiation with the Hon. Don Mazankowski and Dr. Horner that cars would be available for those terminals, and a large percentage of these cars would be dedicated to inland terminal use.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, over the past few years one of the arguments the railways have had for increasing the Crowsnest Pass freight rates has been that they need increased revenue to replace their equipment. Will the purchase of these hopper cars by the Alberta government ensure that the Crowsnest Pass freight rates will not be increased?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I think he is opening up a considerable avenue of debate, which could be done on another occasion.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I please rephrase the question. Does the purchase of the railway hopper cars have any impact on the negotiations and relationships of this province in its discussions with railways in regard to the Crowsnest Pass freight rates?

MR. PLANCHE: We would hope so, Mr. Speaker. It has to be understood, however, that Saskatchewan has a position on the Crow rate; they'd like to have the statutory rates kept in force. But we feel that once we are in a position of ownership of some rolling stock, it should give us the ammunition to participate vigorously in those discussions.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was curious as to where these cars will be manufactured. Will you be insisting they be manufactured here in Alberta or western Canada, or will they be manufactured in Montreal?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the placing of that order has not been done yet. I'll expect to get some professional help in that area. As I understand it presently, there are two facilities capable of making these cars within Canada. Within their ability to deliver in a reasonable period of time, we would expect to place the order in Canada. At present there is no one in Alberta who could manufacture 1,000 hopper cars.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, following the example of the Member for Little Bow, perhaps I will try to squeeze two into one question. But the first question, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. I didn't think it was going to be necessary. But I was going to observe that I hoped it wouldn't become a precedent to ask a block train of hopper questions.

MR. NOTLEY: It was provocation to suggest that I would ask two.

But to the minister, Mr. Speaker: is it the position of

the government of Alberta that the direction and control of these cars should be under the Canadian Wheat Board, under the new transportation commissioner, determined by the government of Alberta in consultation with both the commissioner and the Wheat Board, or what?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the problem is this: the international marketing of grain is extremely competitive. We have hundreds of thousands of people in Alberta who depend directly on the sale of grain for their livelihood and well-being. It's our intention to deploy these cars in such a way that that thrust is responded to with the minimum amount of regulation and the maximum amount of utilization. The spirit of negotiation will revolve around that.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, for clarification. In view of the fact that the Wheat Board has jurisdiction over export grains, are we in fact looking at Wheat Board disposition of the cars, as I think has been the stated position of the government of Saskatchewan with respect to their 1,000 cars?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I don't have enough knowledge to answer that question, other than to repeat what I said. Our whole negotiation will be geared toward maximum utilization of cars and maximization of profit for our growers.

Nursing Education

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Could the hon. minister advise the House if there was any consultation between the minister and the nurses' association prior to the decision being made on the proposed expansion of the post-R.N. baccalaureate program at the University of Alberta?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I attended the annual meeting of the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses in Calgary during the spring sitting of the Legislature and had some preliminary discussions with them. I think it's important to point out that there was a good deal of discussion and consultation between the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses and my predecessor and the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, as well as other ministers, prior to the change in portfolios last March. Of course I am reviewing that material, and have been for the last several months.

In addition, I would like to point out to members of the Assembly that I met with the president of the nurses' association and their executive secretary, along with other members of my staff and the Legislature, to discuss the decision that had been made and to point out the reasons for the approval of the program at the University of Lethbridge and the reasons we chose to request that the University of Alberta reconsider its allocation of resources so that it might expand its program. That meeting took place recently. There were two meetings, in fact. One was interrupted and the other, I might add, was a very interesting exchange. For those members of the Assembly who have not met the new president of the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, I assure you that she is dynamic

and tough. I look forward to a year of interesting discussions with her and her association.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the House how much expansion was proposed, and will it adversely affect nursing delivery in the province?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the proposal from the University of Alberta was to expand the post-baccalaureate degree program from 72 to 144; in other words, to double it. The proposal from the University of Lethbridge was to start at 20 and expand to almost double that number. As I said, that program was approved because it was new programming.

I did suggest to the association that we might consider a change of name of the program, because it tends to be rather confusing. Really it means that the nurses and people within the advanced education institutions wish to move forward on the recommendations of the Alberta Task Force on Nursing Education, to move toward providing more baccalaureate nurses in Alberta from the present position of about 10 per cent of the total of 15,000 active practising members in the province.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The previous question was in regard to an adverse affect of the decision the government made on the question of nursing education in Alberta. Yesterday in response to a question on nursing education, the minister indicated that there is no question that there will be a strain.

My question is: what steps is the government taking to ensure that this training will not become onerous for the people of Alberta and that there will be no need to import nurses from other provinces to meet the demand for this type of nurse until 1990?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, at present the programs for supplying nurses to the people of Alberta through our educational systems include a number of public colleges which provide diploma courses leading to the common designation of R.N. In most cases those programs are filled and, in many cases, expanding. In addition, as I mentioned, at a number of training hospitals in the province there are programs still in effect. At the present time they are the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Those programs are supplying a sufficient number of nurses to meet Alberta's current and projected needs.

There is a perceived need to expand the training program past the basic registered nursing designation to a baccalaureate level, and we have received requests for expansion in that area. I think it is fair to say that in its position paper on the task force the government has indicated that we will move new programming forward.

The point I wish to make is that with the University of Lethbridge program we have added significantly to the capability of providing that baccalaureate training. I think it's fair to say that, as well, we encourage the University of Alberta to enlarge its program within the existing global funding provided by this government to that institution, which as I indicated the other day is one of the most handsomely funded institutions of its kind in Canada.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister could advise if the University of Alberta presently has a quota system in accepting nurses into its program.

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the present time the quota is 72. The request was to double that quota and, to do so, the request was for additional funding for a specific program.

As a matter of basic principle, it is not my intention or my hope to start dealing with individual faculties at each institution in order to achieve enrolment increases where there are quota faculties. If we do that, all members of the Assembly will indeed be involved indeed in a very complicated manner, which in my opinion would seriously infringe upon the very well established autonomy of the institutions.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this question.

DR. PAPROSKI: [Inaudible] indicate what baccalaureate positions are presently available in the province relative to other provinces, considering the population difference?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at hand. However, I will try to obtain the information for the hon. member and, if necessary, circulate it to other members of the Assembly.

Grain Terminals

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. It concerns the establishment of Alberta Terminals Ltd. Could the minister indicate whether there will be other shareholders in the company, or will it be owned exclusively by the Alberta government?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is no contemplation of shareholders other than the Alberta government, primarily because they are not a paying proposition. It will be our intention to bring them to a level of use, or at least a level of proficiency where they can be used. Perhaps we'll have to do some upgrading to make the total system balance from one end to the other. At that time we may rethink that position.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate the full purchase price of the terminals?

MR. PLANCHE: I'll take notice of that, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development. Can the minister indicate whether plans are being made to build an inland terminal in northern Alberta?

MR. PLANCHE: At the present time there are no plans to do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate who will be managing the operation? Is there an understanding with the employees at this time? Will they be keeping the employees who were with the terminals in the past?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, at the present time a competition for the management of the terminals is being undertaken. We hope the employees will stay. The offer has been made.

Recreation Areas

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct to the Minister of Recreation and Parks a question with regard to recreation areas. Could the minister indicate how many recreation areas will be allocated in the coming year, and what type of budgeting is proposed?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, of course the subject of budget is something we'll have to wait for. It's not that time of year yet. I have plans for a number of recreation areas, but at this time I wouldn't be able to be specific with a number.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister accepting proposals on recreation areas at the present time? If so, is there a set format for proposals, or is the format just a general approach, whatever the local community desires as a recreation area?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my hope that applications or submissions from the province at large would come to me. Of course we would sort these out on a priority basis. The need would come first, and if we can join some type of agreement with the local community ... I'm sure I already have in my files one from the hon. member. I have some 50 or 60 requests. I've looked at some of them, and I've travelled the province. I have no firm set as to numbers or locations at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Three Hills followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

Exchange Program

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Threehills, I would like to ask the Minister of Education a question with respect to the initial reaction of the department and the public to the program the minister introduced this spring, providing exchange for students and administrators between the province of Quebec and Alberta. Secondly, are any plans now being made to extend the program?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'm very appreciative of the fact that this has been brought to the attention of the Assembly.

Currently 23 high school students from Quebec are attending school in Alberta in a variety of communities from north to south. They are going to be here to the latter part of this year, and in February 1980, 25 students from Alberta will travel to Quebec and study

there for four months. I would say that the initial reception to the program, and certainly to the individual students, has been extremely positive.

We are inclined to the view that it would be desirable to extend the number of students participating in the program. But to be fair, it's too early to come to a conclusion about that, because it is going to depend on what the experience of this year demonstrates in their ability to move from one jurisdiction to another, study in a setting unfamiliar to them in a language with which they are not completely comfortable, and do well academically. We expect them to do well academically. If we achieve our expectation, like my colleague in Recreation and Parks I will be going to Treasury at an appropriate time and asking for some assistance to expand the program in terms of participation with the province of Quebec and with other provinces, because I think it would be beneficial to be doing the same thing with other provinces.

Hospital Construction

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care inform the Assembly as to the status of the proposed hospital for Innisfail?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we asked them to start over on their drawings for the Innisfail hospital during the summer, because I think everybody agreed, after discussions with their building committee chairman, that a better plan could be developed. Although they were disappointed at the delay, they were very responsive and are doing that.

MR. R. CLARK: What choice do they have?

MR. RUSSELL: The plan has been developed, and I understand they're ready to commence working drawings within a month. At the present time we're going over and reviewing with them the additional staffing requirements as a result of the new program.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs would like to supplement some information given previously.

MR. NOTLEY: Julian! It's your turn. You're on.

DR. BUCK: Don't worry about that judgment ... [inaudible].

MR. KOZIAK: I see that my friend from Fort Saskatchewan is here.

DR. BUCK: [Inaudible] counting ballots, Julian.

MR. KOZIAK: I was just worried about what we would do with the buckwheat in the bread that we're repealing. [laughter]

CNIB Agreement

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview posed a question in connection with the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, and the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower accepted the question on my behalf, for which I thank him. In discussing the matter

further with the hon. member yesterday I received some enlightenment, so that I'm now in a position to provide an answer to the question.

The exemption which the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to in his question was provided under 166(3) of The Companies Act, as I understand it, back in 1955 when both the hon. member and I were still in high school. To my knowledge, that exemption has been provided to approximately 140 companies incorporated outside the province of Alberta that do not carry on business for gain or profit. The exemption is such as to alleviate the requirement for these companies relative to the filing of reports required of other extra-provincial companies and the payment of appropriate filing fees. Those reports generally disclose such information as the registered office of the company, the directors or officers, and matters of that nature, but do not go so far as to include financial statements.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I was required to check with the hon. member before providing the answer was that I had understood from the question that he might have been referring to The Public Contributions Act, and no exemption to the filings required under The Public Contributions Act has been provided to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run out of time for the question period, but if the Assembly agrees perhaps the hon. Minister of Economic Development might supplement some previously requested information.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Hopper Car Purchase (continued)

MR. PLANCHE, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Clover Bar. The precise purchase price was \$7,040,000, which included the investment, upgrading, and some operating capital.

MR. SPEAKER: Might the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry be permitted to revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I feel like an eager beaver this morning. Members might remember that earlier this morning I introduced the grade 10 class from M.E. LaZerte, and they were not in the gallery. They are now, and I would ask them, with their two teachers Mr. Hrychuk and Mr. Saik, to stand and receive the recognition of the Assembly in the usual custom.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

15. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the

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

[Adjourned debate October 10: Mr. R. Clark]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, this Friday morning I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate, which has traditionally been referred to as the state of the province or the state of the nation debate. I look forward to taking part in that debate, as I'm sure a number of other members are.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat disappointed the Premier is unable to be here this morning, because a number of the things I want to say relate very directly to some of the comments the Premier made earlier. So I would ask the indulgence of the members, perhaps on a later occasion when the Premier is here, to remake two or three points I want to make this morning. I believe it would be better for the Premier to hear the comments himself than to get word by way of the people from the Premier's office in the gallery, and that kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to congratulate the new Minister of Economic Development, but I see he's no longer here. I still want to congratulate him in his absence. I believe he has a tremendously important responsibility and very big boots to fill. I'll have a great deal more to say about that later in the course of the debate this morning. But to the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, Mr. Planche, with whom I've had the opportunity to serve on at least one legislative committee, I look forward to his contribution as the Minister of Economic Development in the province.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would be somewhat remiss if I didn't say — and this may sound rather strange coming from me — that I'll rather miss Dr. Horner in the Legislative Assembly. I recall Dr. Horner when he sat on this side of the House and on the government side of the House, and there was no more eager person for a cutting debate. On the other hand, I found there was no minister you could go to when you had a problem that affected his department who could get things straightened out more quickly than could Dr. Horner. I say to the members of the government that Dr. Horner will be missed by this government, not only for his ability to cut through red tape and to see the views of people from a very unsophisticated, down-to-earth point of view, but his influence as a rural M.L.A. in this government will be very sadly missed. That's no disrespect to the Minister of Agriculture or to the Member for Stettler or the Member for Taber-Warner, who sit in the front row. But I believe Dr. Horner and his rural point of view will be very much missed by this government.

Mr. Speaker, two terms the Premier used in his remarks on Wednesday this week were "that just won't wash" and something like "bold strokes". So I'd like to use those two terms on several occasions in the course of my remarks this morning: "that just won't wash" from the standpoint of some of the things the Premier tried to peddle in the Assembly on Wednesday — diversification, hospitals, and some other areas — and "bold strokes" from the standpoint of some of the things we have to look at in this province as we enter the 1980s.

Frankly I was somewhat disappointed that on the occasion of the last session of this Assembly, as we leave the 1970s and move into the 1980s, we didn't get more of a glimpse of what the Premier sees for Alberta in the

1980s, other than more foreign investment and more tar sands plants, other than being all of a sudden pretty satisfied with the progress of diversification, pretty satisfied with social programs, and other than a great many complimentary comments about the government's programs. Frankly I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that on this occasion, the last sitting of this Assembly prior to the 1980s, we would get some sort of glimpse of the 1980s as the Premier sees this province.

This morning I'd like to break my remarks down into four basic areas. First, some general comments about the state of the nation assessment by the Premier; secondly, some comments with regard to some social problems I think we have to face in this province in the 1980s. I want to make it very clear to all hon. members: I don't lay the responsibility for social problems at the doorstep of the provincial government on every occasion, or on many occasions. But it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes the provincial government's responsibility to give some leadership in these areas.

The third area I want to speak on, Mr. Speaker, is land use, because I believe that to be one of the serious problems of the 1980s in this province. Fourth is the question of diversification within this province.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the general comments of the Premier. In addition to expressing my disappointment about the Premier's not taking this opportunity to give us his vision of Alberta in the 1980s, I simply refuse to accept the Premier's comments in this Assembly last Wednesday about health care and hospital construction in Alberta. After he had talked about the \$575 million worth of hospital construction going on, he said, "Nothing like that is going on at all in the rest of Canada." Then two paragraphs later: "There is no comparison in the rest of the country."

As we leave the 1970s, I think it's time we levelled with Albertans as to what has happened in health care in this province during the eight years this government has been in office. The Premier had the undiluted gall to stand in the Assembly this Wednesday and say that we have a record hospital construction program going on now in Alberta and that there's nothing like it in Canada. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you and other members of this Assembly: no other province in all of Canada, either, has as miserable a record in hospital construction as this government has had over the past eight years. We've had freezes on hospital construction coming out of the former minister's ears. We had freezes, then small melts, then we had freezes again. For the Premier to stand in the Assembly in the last session of the '70s and take great credit for \$575 million worth of hospital construction, when we've frozen hospital construction in this province for the past several years, is being less than frank with Albertans.

The hon. Member for Innisfail knows well that for the last two elections a new hospital has been promised for that constituency. We find out this morning that that hospital has been sent back to the drawing boards. The minister says, the board took it rather well. What choice does the board have?

So, Mr. Speaker, let's stop this foolishness, saying how great we are when it comes to hospital construction in 1979 when we've done virtually nothing from '75 on. In the 1976 budget there was a commitment to spend \$100 million a year on rural hospital construction. That hasn't been met one year since then.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Nothing done in Lethbridge, High River.

MR. R. CLARK: We can go to a variety of constituencies, as my colleague from Little Bow says.

So now we have a new planning manual. When we talk about hospitals, one of my constituents on August 24 this year was put on the urgent list to get into the General Hospital in Calgary. He has now been told by the General Hospital and his doctor that the earliest he can possibly expect to be in that hospital is December 1. Now that's something to be proud about.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Go out and see what's in the kitty, Lou.

MR. R. CLARK: That's really something to be proud about. Or a doctor in Red Deer says to me that when we put people on elective surgery we know very well they're not going to get into the Red Deer hospital. In Edmonton we had the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, who is not in his seat either, come before the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee and belatedly admit that we're going to have fewer active treatment hospital beds in the city of Edmonton after the new Health Sciences Centre at the University of Alberta comes on stream than we have now. And we're not going to have new active hospital facilities in Edmonton until the early 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, the government can pat itself on the back all it wants about health care and hospitals, but the people out there know this government has a miserable record on hospitals. We're reaping the benefits of more than four years of mishandling negotiations with the medical profession. We now have a confrontation.

Mr. Speaker, the government can't say we didn't tell them these things were coming, because we repeatedly told the former minister. So when the government pats itself on the back about \$575 million worth of hospital construction — yes, we've frozen it for so many years that we had better get going. Yes, \$575 million includes the Health Sciences Centre, which was virtually ready to go to tender in 1971 and didn't go to tender till '77 or '78.

MR. R. SPEAKER: They just keep rebudgeting.

DR. BUCK: Good thing the Queen opened the Grande Prairie hospital.

MR. R. CLARK: Yes, my colleague says it's a very good thing the Queen came so we got the sod turned at Grande Prairie.

MR. NOTLEY: The cornerstone's laid. She has to come back before it's built, though.

MR. R. CLARK: We could go from Fort Vermilion in the north and across this province. But not only in rural Alberta; we're falling behind in Edmonton. We have long waiting lists in Calgary. We have problems in Lethbridge. Grande Prairie — well, Grande Prairie can tell you what the situation is.

So when the Premier pats his government on the back about its health care and hospital construction record, Mr. Speaker, to use the Premier's own term: that just won't wash.

Moving on to the second area, education, I want to make two comments. I see the Minister of Education is not in his seat either. I raised with the minister during the spring session the very acute problem of vocational and educational opportunities for young people in junior high school who are having serious problems. But in fairness to the minister, he has at least met with a number of groups. I am very hopeful he's moving in some direction there.

But I say to all rural members of this Assembly: get out and talk to your guidance counsellors, high school principals, and superintendents and ask them about the kinds of problems they're having with junior high school students. We simply don't have the kinds of vocational opportunities in junior high school. This isn't common just to my constituency. The Member for Three Hills knows the situation well in the county we both have the privilege to represent. Check with the Calgary and Edmonton boards, and you'll find sizable lists of junior high school students waiting to get into those special facilities in Edmonton and Calgary. There was a time when rural boards could send their students to the cities; that isn't possible now. Surely, as we enter the 1980s, that has to be an area in education where there has to be a major emphasis.

Mr. Speaker, secondly in the field of education, I'd like to deal with the comments about Alberta becoming the brain centre for Canada and North America. I think that is a desirable goal, but let's look at the record for a moment. Where did we stand in 1970? Some 20.5 per cent of our population between 18 and 24 years of age was involved in postsecondary education programs, including the universities, NAIT, SAIT, and the colleges. If you want to take 1972, when the Conservatives had had some time to deal with the system, there was 19.9 per cent. Whatever year you want to use, 1970 or '72, very close to 20 per cent of our people between 18 and 24 years of age were in postsecondary educational institutions. Today, 17.7 per cent of the young people in this province are involved in postsecondary education. One of the members on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund [committee] readily admitted that when you look at the participation rate of Albertans in universities, we're equivalent to Newfoundland.

As we leave the '70s and move into the '80s, that really isn't the kind of emphasis we need if we're going to become this brain centre for Canada or North America. So when the Premier talks about the great strides we're making in that area, Mr. Speaker, I simply say, in the Premier's own words: that just won't wash.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Premier's comments, I'd like to touch on a third area. I was pleased to hear the Premier speak in the Assembly on the question of the Quebec referendum and the discussions with the province of Quebec. I think it's important that that be on the record and, in fairness, I commend the Premier for placing that on the record in this Assembly.

The fourth general comment I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, deals with what I think one could call the advice the Premier gave the new federal Conservative government. I've been waiting for some time to see how this government is going to handle the fact that we have a Conservative government in Ontario and a Conservative government in Ottawa. And how are we going to try to put some distance between this gov-

ernment and the federal Conservative government, just in case things don't go so well at Ottawa, and between themselves and the Conservative government in Ontario? We saw that start to develop on Wednesday, when the Premier gave his advice to the Prime Minister as to what really should happen. Without trying to be disrespectful regarding the comments the Premier made, I think any member in this Assembly, and a great number of people outside this Assembly, could have looked at the last federal Conservative platform, then sat back and made some comments about how we've got to build on the strengths of this country, not continue to shore up the weaknesses.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Sounds like Joe.

MR. R. CLARK: This balance of payments deficit has to be dealt with; we've got to control government spending; more foreign investment; we've got to learn more from other countries around the world.

DR. BUCK: Same speech writer.

MR. R. CLARK: And we have to be resolving our grain transportation system. My colleague from Fort Saskatchewan says, the same speech writer.

Mr. Speaker, this effort to put some distance between the provincial Conservatives and the federal Conservatives should be seen for exactly what it is: simply a rehash of what the federal Conservative government said it's going to do. Let's not kid ourselves. Many members in this Assembly helped elect that federal Conservative government.

DR. PAPROSKI: Hear, hear.

MR. R. CLARK: The Member for Edmonton Kingsway says, hear, hear, and I give him credit.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you do, Bob?

MR. R. CLARK: But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Transport, and the new grain czar coming from the province of Alberta, it just will not wash for this government to try to put a great distance between itself and its federal cousins.

MR. NOTLEY: Possible ambassador to the States.

MR. R. CLARK: Yes, we even hear rumblings about one of the dearly departed from this Assembly going to become the Ambassador to the United States.

DR. BUCK: He's got too many directorships; he couldn't afford to take the job.

MR. R. CLARK: However, that's another issue.

Mr. Speaker, let's not try to kid the troops on this effort to put distance between the federal Conservative government and this government.

The last general comment I want to make deals with the Ombudsman's report. Mr. Speaker, members will recall that during the spring session one of the most heated issues dealt with the very unfortunate raid on the Metis colonies by officials of the Department of Social Services and Community Health. At that time, we asked the minister to apologize. The minister refused. We expressed our lack of confidence in the

minister. The members on the government side expressed their confidence in him, for what reason I can't understand. Then, Mr. Speaker, we got the Ombudsman's report. In fairness, I give the minister credit: he was man enough to apologize to the settlements, albeit belatedly. But he apologized and I give him credit. But I found it very difficult indeed to understand the minister's attitude Wednesday, when virtually nothing has been done with the other recommendations the Ombudsman made, other than apologize to the people of the settlements.

As we leave the '70s and move to the '80s, if there was ever a need to move out a black mark on a government and start the 1980s from a fresh standpoint, with this Bill of Rights hanging here in the Assembly, certainly this was the opportunity for this government to have made some amends to the Metis people of this province. And apparently nothing has been done.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said he hadn't even hired additional people from the Metis population of Alberta yet, and the basic reason was that they didn't want to come to Edmonton. It seems very sensible that the way we've decentralized government offices in many areas, wouldn't it be logical to decentralize the offices to some central area likely in the north-central part of the province?

MR. NOTLEY: Who says they don't want to come to Edmonton?

MR. R. CLARK: Well, the minister says they don't want to come to Edmonton. That isn't what the Metis people themselves are saying. But if that were the case, the logical thing would be to get involved in some decentralization. I get the feeling the government isn't prepared to trust these people to move in that particular direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks. From the standpoint of hospitals, it just won't wash to pat the government on the back the way it did.

From the standpoint of education, all of us, regardless of what constituency we represent, had better become far more aware of the problems we have in junior high school, especially as far as vocational opportunities for young people who are not academically inclined are concerned. If we're to become this brain centre we hear about from time to time, let's be very well aware that we have a smaller percentage of Albertans between 18 and 24 participating in postsecondary education today than we had eight or nine years ago. That's not moving in that direction at all.

I commend the Premier for levelling with the Assembly, and with the province of Quebec, on the Quebec issue.

We on this side simply don't accept what I see as a very transparent attempt to put some distance between the federal Tories and the provincial Tories.

As far as the Ombudsman's report is concerned — and I make this plea to every member in the Assembly — surely between now and the end of this year, by whatever mechanism the government chooses to use, you can at last start to make some progress with the recommendations made by the Ombudsman as far as the Metis people are concerned. Surely you can do that. The Ombudsman isn't a member of the opposition; he's an employee of this Legislature. Surely, as we leave the '70s and start the '80s you can move in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to some of the social problems we may have to face — will have to face, in my judgment — in the 1980s. About two and a half years ago, our offices commissioned a study of social needs in the inner cities of Edmonton and Calgary. Basically the bottom line in that study indicated that development is not a cluster of benefits given to people in need. Rather, development in those inner city areas is a process by which the population acquires greater mastery over its own destiny. We tabled in the Assembly copies of the report. My colleague the Member for Little Bow made gallant efforts to get the then Minister of Social Services and Community Health at least to sit down with the groups involved, to start to attack these problems before they become gigantic.

Mr. Speaker, I make this plea to all members of the Assembly, but especially the urban members. Look across all of North America today. As North Americans we haven't been very successful in dealing with our downtown core problems. I don't lay that blame at the feet of this government, the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, nor do I blame the federal government, be it the past or present government. There are many factors, and it's a very, very difficult area. But if there's one place in North America where we can use the examples of North American failures and successes, it should be in Edmonton and Calgary, two of the fastest growing centres in North America.

I'm not suggesting that the answer is to throw more money in those areas. Pretty obviously, it isn't that more money is needed. The report our offices commissioned made that point very clearly, too. It's a matter of some kind of co-ordination, bringing the various groups together and working together.

Now, I suppose one can say that the community chest should give that kind of leadership, or the federal government or the city or the province should give that kind of leadership. But it does seem to me that with that kind of leadership not forthcoming — and we're not asking for any additional money — here's a logical area, as we enter the '80s, for this provincial government to become actively involved in.

I get the very definite feeling from the Premier's remarks on Wednesday that there are so many areas the Premier and his government are so very proud of during the 1970s. In fairness, this government has done a number of good things during the 1970s; I'm quite prepared to admit that. But they had the money to do that, more money than any government on this continent.

MR. JOHNSTON: And the ideas.

MR. R. CLARK: The minister from Lethbridge East says, and the ideas.

DR. BUCK: Run out of those.

MR. R. CLARK: In some areas I would concede that. But when we look at social areas, wouldn't it be nice just once to hear this government really doing some major pioneering in an area like the inner-city core, or some of our major social problems in this province; that, rather than Alberta being the place of oil and tar sands and natural gas, Alberta was in addition a world leader in some of these other areas that deal with people problems. I think that becomes one of the great challenges this government has to face during the 1980s.

I've said several times in this House during the past number of years that we've become overinterested — we've put blinders on and looked at resource-based projects and problems, and we've let many of the people problems slide past. As we leave the '70s and go to the '80s, when it comes to people problems, especially in the downtown core areas of our two largest centres, here's an area where this government can give some very definite leadership. The hon. member behind me suggests that's a very valid comment.

The place we should really start is to sit down with the various volunteer organizations in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, who are quite prepared to sit down with our people in doing this work, and attempt to sort out many of their problems relating to no co-ordination between the federal government and the province, so that we'd get better use from the taxpayer's dollar. One of the great problems is that there is so much overlap and lack of co-ordination that many of the taxpayers' dollars simply aren't being used for people problems, but are used in the shuffling of paper. That's the first place to start, in my judgment. My colleague the Member for Little Bow did his level best to get the former minister to sit down with those people and the local governments in Edmonton and Calgary — and absolutely refused. That's the place to start.

Mr. Speaker, moving from the area of social problems to the area of land use. In the course of the Premier's remarks on Wednesday, he talked about the strength of our agricultural industry in this province, and that agriculture would continue to be part of the very foundation of Alberta. I doubt if there's a member in this Assembly who doesn't agree that agriculture will have to continue to be part of the very foundation of this province. I represent a rural riding. I'm sure many urban members would share the point of view, though, that agriculture must continue to be part of the pillars of this province.

Mr. Speaker, when I see the good agricultural land that's being taken out of agricultural production forever, I become very, very concerned. At considerable public expense, we had the recommendations of the Land Use Forum. If my recollection is accurate, the Land Use Forum was headed up by Dr. V. Wood, the former deputy minister of lands in this province — I'm sure all members in the Assembly who know Dr. Wood have a high regard for him — Mr. Jack Davis, an engineer and a very successful Calgary businessman known, I'm sure, to many members of this Assembly; and Mr. R. H. Brown, whom I know the government knows well, because Mr. Brown was the president for many years of the rural municipal organization in the province, and is now a member sitting on the Edmonton annexation hearings. So they're three very respected individuals. We got the Land Use Forum report, and precious little — from this report has been dealt with.

One of the major recommendations of this report was that there be some sort of land-use secretariat. Now to me, Mr. Speaker, that is an admission — no, it's a conclusion from the three gentlemen who did the work that there was a real need for land-use planning, a land-use clearing house in this province. One of the overriding recommendations in here calls for the establishment of a land-use secretariat. Recognizing how difficult it is to have these things done at a departmental level, it recommended that that secretariat be tied to

the Executive Council. Whether you agree with all the recommendations or not — I personally don't — I certainly don't think there's an Albertan who can't agree with the recommendation dealing with the need for land-use planning.

Mr. Speaker, if agriculture is to continue to be one of the pillars of this province, then as we leave the '70s and move to the '80s we had better start to do some very serious land-use planning. To use the Premier's own words on Wednesday this week, it isn't going to be easy. But let's start by designating those areas of prime agricultural land which will continue to be for prime agricultural use in this province. I know there are going to be conflicts between municipalities, individuals. But the route we're going in land-use planning is very similar to the Ontario example. So often we follow Ontario. Just an aside: on occasions we like to give people the impression we're fighting with Ontario all the time.

DR. BUCK: If they have an election coming.

MR. R. CLARK: But so often we follow Ontario's example. This question of land-use planning seems to be another area, Mr. Speaker, where we are doing that. Talk to people from Ontario and ask them how successful they've been preserving agricultural land in the Niagara peninsula, other areas of Ontario. Or while the ministers are travelling around, sometime when they're in the agricultural parts of the United States, stop and see how unsuccessful they've been in land-use planning.

Mr. Speaker, as we leave the '70s and get into the '80s, land-use planning is clearly an area where this government can give leadership, not just in Alberta, in Canada, but in all North America. If we don't do that, and do it early in the 1980s, part of the legacy and heritage that this government is going to leave to this province as we move to the '90s is that our agricultural industry will be very seriously hurt as a result of continuing to take much of our prime agricultural land out of production. This would also be a help to our municipalities, because at least they'd know what the possibilities were, where they could grow.

In concluding my remarks on land use, I'd say to members that there is no panacea; it's not going to be easy. But my gosh, you have 74 members in the House, three years left in the term, and more money per capita than any other government in North America. Certainly you have the guts to do something in the area of land-use leadership.

The Minister of Agriculture in a recent speech in Calgary expressed some of the same concerns about taking our prime agricultural land out of use. I'm not being critical of the Local Authorities Board and the city of Red Deer. But all one has to do is look at the southeasterly direction the city of Red Deer is moving. The Member for Innisfail knows very well that that is some of our best agricultural land. The option at Red Deer — and I don't say, use the Red Deer example on all occasions — may very well have said, what do we do as far as moving along the river areas? If we do that, that's going to call for a great deal of additional money.

My suggestion to this government is that once we're prepared to say, publicly and officially and without any reservations, that a high priority of this government is to preserve agricultural land, then

where the decision is made not to let municipalities go in the direction of simply taking good agricultural land out of production, the province and the people of Alberta are going to have to help that community pick up some of the additional costs. Obviously it's more costly to move in some of the areas I'm suggesting. But it seems to me that is a legitimate call upon the wealth of this province if we really mean what we say about keeping prime agricultural land available for agriculture.

So, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the second great challenge this government faces as we leave the '70s and go into '80s is the need to get on with the job of land-use planning. We have the land-use report. It's going to be tough, but let's start. There'll be times when we'll disagree in this House about the way we're going. But I think Albertans would be quite understanding of differences of views, once the initial steps are taken.

Mr. Speaker, the third and last area that I want to talk about is diversification. I regret very much that the Premier is not here this morning — almost this afternoon. On the question of diversification, in 1972 approximately 35 per cent of the province's income came from resource development. In 1979, according to the Provincial Treasurer's budget, over 50 per cent of the total income of the province will come from non-renewable resource development. From 1972 to 1979-80, we've seen our reliance on non-renewable resource revenues increase by 15 per cent. However you cut diversification, that says to me that we now have a heavier reliance on our non-renewable resources than we had in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's comment in the Assembly indicated that very great progress had been made during the past year and in fact during the past few months. The Premier said, and this is on page 11 of the Blues:

We made very good progress in economic diversification over the past year, more progress than I'd expected, particularly in these last months.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be very, very blunt here. The Premier told this Assembly this week that we've made very good progress in economic diversification over the past year, more progress than he'd expected, especially in the last months. Yet the department set up after the last election centring around Dr. Horner the Deputy Premier, has been taken apart to a very great degree. Many responsibilities that were to rest with the Deputy Premier and Minister of Economic Development have now gone to various other ministers.

Mr. Speaker, I simply will not accept the fact that we have made the kind of strides the Premier refers to. Further, I'm at a loss to understand the Premier's recent conversion to the great success we've had in economic diversification. If the Premier had felt that way some five months ago, why in the world would he have set up the Department of Economic Development? Why in the world would he have placed the Deputy Premier in that position? Why in the world would we have passed this legislation on July 4?

The legislation was passed July 4, and by the end of September Dr. Horner had left. When this legislation was discussed before the House started, I recall that stories in some daily papers, particularly the *Edmonton Journal*, alluded to this department that was being made directly for Dr. Horner so we could really get on with the job of economic diversification in Alberta.

That was the government's feeling right after the election, or during the election campaign. Then within six or seven months, we have the Premier standing in this Assembly saying, we've made remarkable progress during the last year and especially during the last months. Mr. Speaker, that just doesn't wash.

Mr. Speaker, I can only speculate as to what really happened. But I get the feeling, and it's only a feeling, that Dr. Horner shared the idea of diversification that many Albertans have; that is, that diversification means strengthening those parts of Alberta's economy which are not tied directly to our non-renewable resources. In the last few months, when he found out that this government doesn't really share that point of view, I guess you can say that in the traditional Dr. Horner manner, he went to where the action was . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Rubbish.

MR. R. CLARK: . . . to try to straighten out the grain transportation system. An hon. member behind me says, rubbish.

DR. BUCK: That's what he was told to say.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I remind members in this Assembly that during and right after the last election campaign, there was this tailor-made department for Dr. Horner, the Deputy Premier, with a real emphasis on diversification, other than non-renewable resources. Now, we're being told in this Assembly on Wednesday of this week that we've made such great progress over the past year and especially over the past few months. I'll let each member draw his own conclusion. I've told the members what my feelings are. I said to this government earlier this morning that I think they're going to miss Dr. Horner in this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. CLARK: And they're going to miss Dr. Horner a great deal more when they have some foresight, vision, and ideas about real diversification in this province.

I must say that in my role as Leader of the Opposition I have likely been more critical of Dr. Horner in this Assembly than any other member — on the Purnell affair, on the Export Agency, and so on. But I give Dr. Horner credit in a number of areas. And I don't see anyone on the front bench, with due respect to the new minister, who has a feel for and an understanding of the kind of diversification that I think many Albertans think of when they talk about diversification.

Mr. Speaker, what are some of the things we have to do, from the standpoint of looking pretty earnestly at economic growth in this province? In closing, I want to make six points very quickly. Several years ago in this Assembly we were promised an oil sands policy. That oil sands policy is not in place. It's needed very much in this province, not only from the standpoint of the industry. Albertans and Canadians need to know what kinds of opportunities they'll have for investment. Alberta and Canadian business people need to have some understanding of the rules of the game as far as future oil sands plants are concerned.

Secondly, if this province is to become the brain centre we're told it's going to become, we have to have

a science and research policy in this province. Mr. Speaker, you will remember several years ago in the Speech from the Throne that reference was made to a science and research policy, and we had nothing forthcoming. During the 1970s the Alberta Research Council, the agency which several years previously had developed the process used initially to extract oil from the tar sands, has fallen increasingly behind in its ability to be a leading research organization in this province. The Member for Calgary McKnight has been appointed chairman; again we're promised a thrust in this area. The second thing that has to happen is a research and science policy for this province, and some money to back it up.

Mr. Speaker, another area of our economic lifeblood in this province is the tourist industry. I'd recommend to this government that Travel Alberta see getting people to the province of Alberta as its prime responsibility; that Travel Alberta make a lump grant yearly to TIAALTA, then keep out of TIAALTA's operations within the province; and that Travel Alberta spend its very best efforts trying to encourage people to tell the rest of Canada and other areas, certainly including Pacific Rim countries, what Alberta has to offer. But it seems this government simply can't resist the opportunity to have its strings every place. I frankly think they should get out of TIAALTA's way, go a lump sum grant to TIAALTA, let TIAALTA divide it up among the various zones in the province, and get on with the job the province should be doing there.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, with regard to gas exports. On previous occasions in this Assembly I've commented that I believe our priority should be to make natural gas available first to Albertans, second to Canadians and, third, if there is sufficient to export, outside the country. Despite some problems in this rural gasification program it is one of the good programs this government has brought in. But I believe there are still areas in the province where Albertans don't have natural gas.

Secondly, we should be saying to central Canada quite forcibly that they should be looking at making the change-over from oil to natural gas as an energy source. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should be exporting additional gas to the United States at this time. But what's happening now is that a large number of small Alberta and small Canadian companies that have been in the vanguard discovering much of the new natural gas in Alberta are now having a serious cash flow problem. We've raised this matter several times in the House. In fact, we asked the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources in the spring session what steps he was going to take in that area, and he was considering some steps. But he hasn't taken any yet.

But you know where the greatest foreign investment exploration is going on right now as far as the gas industry in Alberta is concerned? On 8 Avenue in Calgary. You have some multinational companies sitting back and doing their exploration right there, picking off Alberta and Canadian companies because they don't have a cash flow. The government may not like the idea of taking the royalty in kind or other propositions, but while this government sits here and fiddles its thumbs on that issue, foreign investment is coming in and buying up those Alberta and Canadian companies that don't have a cash flow, that have very serious problems. I know several propositions have been put before the Minister of Energy and Natural

Resources. As we leave the '70s and go to the '80s, from the standpoint of our long-term economic development in Alberta, something certainly has to be done about that area.

As far as small business is concerned, I think we can really refer to small business as the blood, sweat, and ingenuity of Alberta. There isn't a group in this province, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be more seriously hit by the high interest rates than the small business people.

I understand that the idea of a school of small business attached to one of the universities or colleges is working reasonably successfully in Germany and Japan. They are actively involved in research related directly to small businesses. There is teaching, student-based consulting, and people who have been successful in small business initiatives are brought in from other areas of the country or even the world. That's the kind of thing we could be doing here, in addition to considering seriously some interest shielding for small business in this province, given the wretched interest rates small businesses face today.

Mr. Speaker, my concluding suggestion on diversification is that as far as agriculture is concerned, I'm sure many farmers across the province will be very surprised at how rosy the agricultural picture is in Alberta, according to the comments made by the Premier this Wednesday. My colleague the Member for Little Bow will be speaking to that matter later in the session. But I'm sure many farmers will read with a great deal of interest the very good agricultural situation Alberta farmers are in, according to the Premier.

MR. BATIUK: A thousand hopper cars.

MR. R. CLARK: The Member for Vegreville talks about 1,000 hopper cars. That sure helps to pay 15, 16 per cent interest rates to the Agricultural Development Corporation on guaranteed loans. That's about as far as the thinking has gone in that area.

In conclusion, as we leave the '70s and move to the '80s, as a province we are in an extremely fortunate position. This government has to realize that as far as people programs are concerned we have some serious problems. This government must also realize, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at the period between 1972 and 1979, our reliance on non-renewable resource revenue has increased 15 per cent in this province. Under any reasonable assessment of economic diversification, that simply says we have become increasingly dependent upon non-renewable resources during this time.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Premier may tell members in the Assembly and members of his own caucus of the great strides we've made in diversification in the past year, especially in the last few months. I simply say to the members: where were the Premier and the members of this Assembly when all the ballyhooing was being done about this new Department of Economic Development, headed up by Dr. Horner, the department that has now been very seriously weakened?

Mr. Speaker, as we enter the '80s, let's pause, stop slapping ourselves on the back quite as much, look earnestly at the problems of people, of land use, of diversification, of the leadership we can give to all of North America, and be thankful for the 1970's.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to support the motion

presented to this House by the hon. Premier two days ago.

Before beginning my remarks, I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on a job that's not only been well done, but which I think, is one of the outstanding jobs in the position in the British Commonwealth. Recently, a number of us had an opportunity to meet with and discuss the various techniques used in different legislatures across western Canada. I think those who had that privilege realized even to a greater extent the kind of respect that the Speaker of this Legislature has throughout the country. My final comment in that regard is that I think the recent innovations you have initiated in this House to increase the decorum of our Assembly I think are accepted, encouraged, and in fact supported greatly by all members in this House.

Mr. Speaker, before dealing with some of my prepared remarks, I'd like to deal at some length with the speech by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in response to the motion. Unfortunately, I notice the member has left the Assembly. In any case, for the record I'd like to congratulate him on a couple of areas. I think we all appreciated very much the recognition he gave to the former hon. Deputy Premier of this province. I'm surprised that in reading past records of the House I can't find similar comments. None the less I'm sure we all appreciate those statements very much, and agree that he will be missed here very much.

I'd also like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on a number of comments he made with respect to program areas we could get into. Good ideas do not come from just this side of the House, or indeed this political party, but in fact from all areas. In his comments the hon. Leader of the Opposition presented a number of ideas — I wouldn't say the majority, but a number — that merit some thought. I particularly like the school for small business idea, to suggest one.

I agreed with the Leader of the Opposition when he indicated that social problems in our urban areas are something we must very seriously consider in coming years. There's no doubt that the kind of growth that has been and will continue to be experienced by this province must be carefully considered in terms of its social impact on the people. I agree with that orientation.

However, I must take exception to the indication he gave, or the innuendo, that the government has not begun to consider that area. If we take a look at social service programs throughout the province since this government came to power in 1971, clearly there is close to a 500 per cent increase in the kinds of funds allotted to social service programs. We've moved to expand the regional mental health councils in attempting to involve the communities, as the hon. leader suggested, in bringing together community groups, and in planning for the future. Indeed, while I agree that we have a long way to go, a lot to look at, and we will have continuing difficulties throughout the years, I believe this government has taken steps to recognize and deal effectively with those problems.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury also commented to a great extent on land use and agriculture. While he indicated that he felt the government had not moved in that area, I did not hear any details with respect to the kinds of programs we initiated through

the new Planning Act and regulations, which were a direct result of the Land Use Forum, and a variety of other programs with Environment, Agriculture, and other government departments.

Mr. Speaker, while those particular comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition disagreed with my well-being somewhat, when he began to deal with such issues as medical care and hospitals in the province, I am afraid I got fairly incensed. Maybe I can attempt to equal the indignation expressed by the hon. leader. No doubt that's a problem area. It always has been; it always will be. But this province has spent more in that area than any other government in the country. This province has, and traditionally has had, more hospital beds than any other province in the country.

In a former occupation I sat upstairs with members of the news media, and I recall talking to Marc Lalonde, the former Minister of National Health and Welfare — by no means a supporter of this government. He told me that he couldn't see how we could possibly fund the number of hospital beds we had; that in fact the program was by far the most extensive in this country.

The vague, indefinite suggestions by the Leader of the Opposition on that matter quite disturbed me. He outlined a few specific areas. I think at any time in the history of this province, and any time to come, the hon. leader will be able to outline specifics, and I'll probably agree with some of them. But this province has moved in medical care, in hospital facilities, and we are continuing to do that through expanded programs throughout the province. I clearly don't feel the hon. Leader of the Opposition was giving the people of Alberta a correct impression of what is taking place today.

Education was another area that concerned me. He outlined specifics with respect to vocational programs in junior and senior high schools. Indeed, he could have probably gone on to look at a number of other areas where people in the educational community think we need more. Perhaps we do. Again, in all areas we can talk about the need for more, the need for better, the need for comprehensive development in bringing together programs. But since this government came to power in 1971, the budget has increased threefold — better than threefold; 330 per cent — for educational programs. That's an achievement that certainly wasn't recognized by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks.

I don't want to continue at great length with the hon. leader's remarks. I may say that he attempted to goad us into suggesting that we are creating a difference between ourselves and the federal government. I, along with other members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, certainly supported the federal Progressive Conservative Party during the campaign last May, and am proud to say I did. I don't think any of us wants to create a distance from Ottawa. We want to be closer, if anything. We want to work hand in hand with the federal government to ensure that the people of Alberta have the best possible representation at all levels.

Of course, there are going to be differences. The national government represents a variety of people and provinces, which requires it to take stands at times that we may disagree with. I hope we can work all those out and work together. Certainly distance is not something we're trying to create. If distance comes about,

it's a matter of opinions between two different governments, two different groups of people, two different bodies of representatives of the people of Alberta and of Canada.

Finally, with respect to the hon. leader's remarks — and I could go on at some length — I don't understand how he didn't see the vision of tomorrow in the Premier's remarks the other day. Perhaps he was unable to put them together with remarks of past years, and take in context the kind of detail the Premier outlined in his very eloquent speech. Surely the heritage fund and the kinds of investments we're making today, the medical research foundation, the Kananaskis development, the diversification programs ... Despite the hon. leader's contention that we're not moving in that area, surely we have pushed and will continue to push very much for diversification, and I think I can speak for all my colleagues. As the Premier said Wednesday, we have an obligation to remain with an emphasis on the energy area. At this time in history we can get the best possible return for our investments in that area. We can contribute to the rest of the country, and indeed to the rest of the world in some instances, the kind of energy that's required. But we do stand for that diversification and are moving in that area.

I disagree completely that the Department of Economic Development has been in any way watered down. Certainly PWA, a transportation facility, was put under the Minister of Transportation. Certainly Disaster Services, which I didn't consider to be an essential element of the Department of Economic Development — although it's an essential program — was transferred to an appropriate minister. And may I say that while we'll miss Dr. Horner very much, and while he will be a great loss to this government, I have a great deal of faith in the new Minister of Economic Development. I know we all do. I'm sure we can look forward to some aggressive and very innovative projects on his behalf. He's a member of my constituency, Mr. Speaker. I had to make those comments. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I would like to emphasize my support for this motion through the kind of support that has been generated in the constituency of Calgary Currie. I don't know if we're representative of the rest of the province. I expect, at least in urban communities, we are to a large extent. The different categories of people in Calgary Currie probably fairly represent those across Edmonton and Calgary. Throughout the summer, I had the opportunity to be in very close contact through a number of processes which I'd like to describe briefly.

Mr. Speaker, after returning from the last session I had an opportunity to deliver a report to all the constituents of Calgary Currie, along with a survey asking their opinion on eight different questions regarding this province. One of the questions wasn't: do you support the government in what it has completed? Amazingly, at least to me — I'm partisan, but I still am amazed — in a question that read, what do you feel should be done with the heritage trust fund, clearly 60 per cent of the respondents indicated that the government of Alberta has handled it in the most effective manner, and that they wish it to continue in that way. There were other suggestions and ideas, but 60 per cent unsolicited support indicated that. Other questions, which I will probably deal with in more detail in coming speeches in this Legislature, indicated similar

results.

When I delivered that report, Mr. Speaker, I also delivered an invitation to the people of my constituency to come and question me and give their response to our programs in four community halls throughout the constituency. I had four different town hall kinds of meetings. I believe I can clearly say, and any objective observer would say, that it would be difficult to find that fewer than 70 per cent of those people at any given meeting did not support the government to a great extent.

A variety of issues were brought out on different topics. They dealt anywhere from national unity to different kinds of personal difficulties with medical care, day care observation, nurseries, equity investment in the heritage fund, liquor laws, Kananaskis Country, the Family Institute Act — an Act that's very close to my heart — senior citizens' programs, the MLA pay increases. All those topics were discussed at some length. But throughout those discussions, though there may have been individual concerns and thoughts regarding programs, the support for this government and the programs it has initiated in the past years was obvious and apparent.

I initiated two advisory committees to myself: one consisting of all community association presidents in the constituency of Calgary Currie, who met twice and discussed problem areas. On each occasion I asked them if they were happy with the direction of the government. While each of those people inevitably said yes, but we have this concern or another concern, the support was there for this government in even stronger measures than I noted during the election. I have an education advisory committee consisting of a cross section of home and school association people, and that group gave me a similar response.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I knocked on approximately 1,000 doors in all parts of the constituency. Again, to me the support at the door was greater than I received in a door-to-door campaign during the election. On that basis, I support very much this resolution before the House today. I believe that the people of the province of Alberta still support this government in perhaps even greater numbers than they have in the past.

Before closing, I'd like to deal with one issue the Premier dealt with in his address: Alberta's involvement in the Quebec referendum issue. It seems fairly far removed from a lot of Albertans today. The Quebec referendum debate has been raging for some time, and I'm not sure that we as a people really have a feel for what's taking place there. I had some involvements in past years through my involvement with the news media. I have known Rene Levesque and have had the pleasure of discussing Confederation and some of its problems with him before he was elected and once since — and with other leaders in the province of Quebec, the current Liberal leader, and the current leader of the Union Nationale. So I guess I have a sensitivity to what's taking place there that some people may not have time to look at.

Let me give you my impression of what has taken place in Quebec, and my opinion as to why there's a reasonable chance the present Parti Quebecois government could win the referendum scheduled for April or May next year.

If you were a resident of the province of Quebec in the late '60s, early '70s, you likely were not a separatist.

All statistics show that 80 to 85 per cent of the people had not espoused the separatist cause in that province. At that point, you saw Rene Levesque as an interesting, sometimes exciting, fairly dynamic leader, who you likely felt was a leader of a French group that would never really take power.

But there's evidence to suggest that the people of Quebec became continually disgruntled with the administration in office at that time. If you were a member of that province, you likely went from looking at the Parti Quebecois and their leader as a fringe group, to a possible positive alternative of good government. When he was elected, he was not saying, elect me and I'll separate us from Canada. But he was saying, I will give you a right to vote on the separation issue, and meanwhile I'll give you good government, which you may not believe you've had over the past few years.

So, together with the frustrations which French-Canadian people have felt in terms of distance in culture and distance in language — which I compare with our frustrations in distance in miles from Ottawa, the difference in our population, and the colony aspect that was originally in the east — they voted for a Parti Quebecois government, not on the basis of separation but on the basis of good government and the right to vote on that issue.

The government then proceeded to provide for some time what some people may say is good government, and is now saying to the Quebec people: not only are we not going to take you out of Canada on a separation issue but we want you to vote for something called sovereignty association, in which we can have the benefits of Confederation and still have the benefits of the new country we want to create, called Quebec. If you don't quite agree with that, don't worry. What we want you to vote for next May or June is the right for me to talk about that, to negotiate sovereignty association with the rest of the country.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have a lot of respect for the Parti Quebecois government in Quebec, but I feel it's dishonest. That may be a strong term, but I feel it's dishonest for them to use the present approach with the people of that province.

Unless the individual citizens of Canada located in Quebec are made aware that sovereignty association is not acceptable to this government, or any other in Canada, that they cannot be part of Confederation economically and not politically, that if they give Rene Levesque that right to negotiate, it will confuse the current structure of Confederation for years to come. We're certainly not going to accept sovereignty association, and I believe the federal government will not, and they've so stated on a number of occasions, and other provinces in this country will not. We'll be stuck in a position where the people of Quebec will have said, we want to talk about sovereignty association. We will know that's an impractical and impossible direction. Confederation will be ill-defined, and Alberta will have difficulty negotiating at federal/provincial conferences with the assistance of Quebec on provincial issues, because Mr. Levesque will still be seeing himself as leader of a potentially separate country.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I very much support the concept of Alberta becoming involved in the Quebec referendum issue to some extent. I think we have to be extremely careful with that direction. Certainly the people of Quebec have to make up their minds. We

don't have the right to tell them what to do, to tell them to vote for or against sovereignty association. But I think we have the obligation to make them aware of how we feel about sovereignty association.

Even greater than that, we have the obligation to bring them to us in terms of having them understand the similarities between our provinces. Traditionally in Alberta and Quebec, we have stood for the right to determine our own destinies in constitutional matters and in many areas, though we may not have recognized it in past years. Whether or not we recognized it, Quebec has been very much the balance that has kept Confederation together in a lot of different ways, which is ironic, given their current direction.

I was doing some calculations the other day, and I note that if you subtract Quebec from the rest of Confederation — in other words, you deal with a restructured Confederation — and take into account our present population base, the province of Ontario, in the central part of our country, would have 46 per cent, almost 50 per cent, of the voting power in Ottawa. Without every other province's total agreement, we'd have a great deal of difficulty in ensuring that provincial rights are maintained and that those programs which are naturally better for the people of Ontario and less beneficial, to say the very least, to the people of Alberta are not looked at.

In my opinion, at this stage in our historical development Quebecers are important brothers and sisters of ours in Confederation. We have to make that apparent. How do we do that? There are a number of mechanisms, Mr. Speaker.

I think we might consider some television shows, not telling them how to vote but telling them of our feeling on sovereignty association, what similarities we have with their province, and how we believe we should be standing together as a country. I think we could potentially send a letter to each household, though there are problems associated with that. It's something our Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department will have to assess carefully.

One idea I particularly like and have been discussing recently is the idea of Albertans getting together, those who understand Quebec, who are fluently bilingual — unfortunately, that won't include me — spending a month learning of Alberta's position and the background, then perhaps 20 people going to Quebec to act as resource people, where requested, to let them know our feelings, in community halls and forums throughout the province of Quebec. I think it would be a challenge for our business community and our institutions to second people to that cause for perhaps a three-month period. Through our government department we could send some of our people to ask where we might be most beneficial in terms of giving information, providing a resource base — not running a campaign.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of my ideas on the Quebec issue. I very much appreciated the Premier mentioning that in his Wednesday speech.

In closing, may I just say that I very much support the resolution before this House. There are areas to look at and directions we have to consider in the future. But the people of the province of Alberta believe, as I believe, that good government has been provided and will continue to be provided by the leadership of this province.

MR. APPELBY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly regard it as a privilege to be able to participate in the debate on the resolution introduced by our hon. Premier respecting the operations of this government since the spring adjournment of the Legislature. I regard the speech given by our Premier as an outstanding review of the developments in this province over that period of time, a very comprehensive, factual and statistical outline, but also a very clear indication of the progressive manner in which this government has moved to reach the level we have attained in the economy of this nation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that this morning the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned his respect and regard for Dr. Hugh Horner, and that sentiment was echoed by the Member for Calgary Currie. The Premier also mentioned the fact in his remarks.

My constituency has neighbored the one represented by Dr. Horner in this Legislature for some 12 years, and my association with him goes back many years before that. I have regarded this association as one of the great benefits I have enjoyed throughout those years. Many a Saturday morning I have driven from my home in Athabasca to Barrhead to be briefed by Dr. Horner on some problem or difficulty I was having, and never in any circumstance did I have occasion to go away not feeling better and satisfied and more capable of doing the things that had to be done.

I know he will be missed in this Assembly. There's no doubt about that. But I'm sure none of us is selfish, because all of us realize he has gone on to do a job that is very extensive and very necessary. We wish him well, because this job has to be done, and we know he has the capabilities to do it the way it should be done.

I would like to congratulate the Member for Calgary Glenmore, who has assumed the responsibilities held by Dr. Horner. I'm sure every government member in this Legislature has complete confidence that the new minister, with his outstanding abilities in that area, will continue to build a strong, new department that will be a very decisive factor in the future of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition expressed some concern that the Premier did not outline in his remarks the blueprint for the 1980s. Of course in some ways this is like putting the cart before the horse. Before you move ahead, you have to assess where you are. In my estimation there was no better time than this fall sitting to review where we have gone and what we have achieved in this decade. I think that when we approach the new sitting of the Legislature in the spring, the throne speech will give a pretty clear indication of the directions this government will be moving in the 1980s.

The Premier, I think justifiably, indicated some things that have been achieved and the condition of this province in the matters of low unemployment, more retail sales than the general average throughout the country, 20 per cent of the new jobs in Canada in the last year. I think these sorts of things indicate very clearly our position as far as the 1970s are concerned.

Looking at some of the Premier's comments — and of course I don't intend to comment on all of them, Mr. Speaker — he mentioned some things that I wanted to express my thoughts about too. One of these was the \$4.5 million program announced by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower for training of the handicapped. I think it was very important that the

suggestion was made when that came out that this funding would be not only for the retraining and education of the handicapped themselves but for training the necessary personnel to do this type of work.

Mr. Speaker, we have had difficulty in this province over the years finding this type of professional and technical person who could train in this manner. This applies not only in dealing with people who are physically handicapped and need occupational therapy, but also in the field of mental health. Today we have severe shortage of people like psychiatric nurses, psychologists, social workers trained in the mental health field. I know a number of government positions are not filled at the present time, particularly in the rural areas I am interested in. We don't have the people to fill those spots, and I'm pleased that some sort of program has come into effect.

I'd like to just comment on decentralization in the province, Mr. Speaker. I had the privilege, with some of the other members of the Legislature, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, to attend the opening of the Pine Ridge nursery at Smoky Lake. I'm sure the Member for Redwater-Andrew looks with a great deal of pride on having obtained such an institution within his constituency. Certainly that is an admirable achievement. That nursery cost something in the nature of \$13 million, but it has a number of things that are unique, and many innovations in the way of forestry development. Not only are they producing, as the Premier said, 20 million seedlings a year — by the way, that doesn't supply all we need in Alberta because we're harvesting 25 million trees a year, but we do have forest management people in the areas and we have other systems of reforestation — they're also going into the research area.

I think this is something we have to continue to emphasize and to fund in a manner extensive enough to supply the needs of people involved in research, looking at the matter of tree development, genetics, seed selection, those sort of things, so that in the future we can reforest our areas and hopefully reproduce the trees in the forests on a shorter cycle than we are doing today. By some of this selective development of seed, they have already been able to obtain seeds from a number of trees that have developed much more rapidly than others. Hopefully this will spread out until we have a reforestation program in the future that will have a much shorter cycle.

During the past year I had occasion to drop in on the Vegreville research centre. I can see that the Member for Vegreville, as well, has to be very proud of having that facility in his constituency. The expansion of vocational training at AVC in Fort McMurray is something I'm sure the member from that area, also, is proud of.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention the fact that in the town of Athabasca, while we have a very beautiful setting, very friendly people, all the services and amenities, we need, we seem to have reached a plateau in development. Over the last five or six years I don't believe the population of Athabasca has increased by more than 50 people. My suggestion would be that in the decentralization program of this province, there is really a very great need to look carefully at Athabasca for something that could be done for that area.

The Premier spoke in detail on diversification, and the Member for Calgary Currie also spoke on the

emphasis on the non-renewable resource. But I don't think we have any apprehensions in that respect, Mr. Speaker, because we know that without doubt we're going to be moving into the area of synthetic oil extraction. More processes are coming on stream, and we will have feedstock for many many decades down the road. We will also have natural gas in large quantities, and when that is done we can go into the gasification of coal. So we have to appreciate the fact that that will be ongoing for many years to come, beyond our lifetime I expect.

However, let's not lose sight of the fact that as you travel around this province, Mr. Speaker, you see in many small communities the development of small industries. True, many of them are agriculture-related: you have your cheese factories, alfalfa plants, and small abattoirs, but you also have others. I now have in my constituency, in the town of Westlock, a firm that manufactures culverts for road construction. I have another that is building log homes, Saddlenotch Industries. These are the types of industries that are really creating the employment throughout the province that is building up the general economy. I think we have to remember that industries can flourish and be successful in these small centres as well. I have every confidence that that factor will continue to develop in the future.

There has been a great deal of progress in the field of transportation, particularly this year because we have had such marvellous weather this fall and construction has gone ahead practically all through the season at a very rapid pace. It's unfortunate that there has been a shortage of asphalt, and we haven't been able to develop the hard-surfacing program to the extent that was planned in the spring budget. But we could be doing more in the field of transportation, Mr. Speaker. Although I know there is some hesitation in thinking that we may fuel the inflation rate by tendering too many contracts, we also have in the province a great many smaller contractors and owner-operators with one or two or more pieces of equipment, who are not in a position to bid on the larger contracts. I think we should be looking toward these people to do a great deal more of the work, especially on secondary roads.

I'd like to mention one particular highway that always causes me some concern, Mr. Speaker. Highway 2 enters the province of Alberta in the Cardston constituency in the very southern part of the province, and it departs from this province in the Grande Prairie constituency in the far northwest. On the whole Highway 2, there are only 33 miles of non-hardsurface road, and those are in the constituency of Athabasca. So I would hope and I think that progress is being made in that direction. I'm sort of in a chicken-and-egg situation with that one. They tell me that road isn't used enough, so it doesn't need to be improved. Then other people say, well if it were improved it would be used more. That's the difficulty we are in with Highway 2.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with other members of the caucus forestry committee, I had the pleasure of participating in the forestry hearings this summer on the Berland-Fox Creek proposal. These were held at Fox Creek in the Whitecourt constituency, and at Grande Cache in the Edson constituency. This was an exciting experience, I'm sure, for all of us on the caucus committee. It was amazing to see the interest that was displayed by the people who had proposals to

develop that block of timber. There are 3.5 million acres of timber in that area, but I think there is some misconception, particularly among the public of this province, regarding the size and quality of that timber. The greater part of that timber is what is known as small wood, and it is really not satisfactory for use in the ordinary sawmill/processing type of operation. A great deal of it will have to be debarked, made into chips, and go into some form of fibre-processing industry. This is one of the reasons the government has to be very careful in assessing the proposals that have come in, and deciding which will do the best job of utilizing that resource in the best manner possible.

It's also interesting to note that in British Columbia at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I believe they have allocated their last available timber which can be utilized for lumber or pulp processing. They're very close, if they haven't reached that point already. It is only natural that these people are now looking towards Alberta. Not only do we have this large tract of timber in the Berland-Fox Creek area, but we have two or three more that are still not assigned. I think this indicates even more the reason we have to be very cautious in the approach we take to the development of this timber and the future it will provide for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say I was somewhat disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition didn't place more emphasis on the stand he or his people have taken on national unity, and on the role Alberta has taken on the matter of sovereignty association, which was so well outlined by my colleague from Calgary Currie. Perhaps he could also have mentioned the stand we have taken on the statements made by the Premier of Ontario regarding our oil and gas resources in Alberta. The Premier asked for views from members of this Legislature. He asked that if people diverge from the viewpoint he had expressed, they indicate what other means might be taken. I think that was important.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a situation today where we are Albertans but also Canadians. I think the outline the Premier gave us in this House this week indicates that position very clearly. My colleague from Calgary Currie has outlined some things we might do as Albertans who have a great concern for the future not only of our province but of Canada. We have to keep the thought foremost in our minds that Canada as a nation is a concern.

I'm afraid we have a cloud hanging over the nation today, not only in the matter of the Quebec situation but in the statements and suggestions made by the Premier of Ontario. We all have to keep very cool minds and be very cautious how we handle this, so that we do not inflame that situation within the nation. We also have roles we can play in helping people in other parts of Canada, as my colleague has suggested, in trying to understand one another better, so that we will continue to have unity. I'm sorry the Leader of the Opposition did not emphasize that he feels just as strongly, as we have expressed here this morning, that thought about Canadian unity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I move to adjourn debate.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's not proposed that the House sit in the evening on Monday. As to the afternoon business, we propose to call the same motion again and get some idea how many hon. members would like to participate in it. If it doesn't occupy the full afternoon, we would begin second readings of the

Bills introduced today. Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:54 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]