

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, March 24, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 201****An Act to Amend The Individual's
Rights Protection Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to request leave to introduce Bill 201, An Act to Amend The Individual's Rights Protection Act. This Bill would have the effect of permitting affirmative action within the original spirit of The Individual's Rights Protection Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

Bill 205**An Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 205, An Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act. This Bill would allow the Ombudsman to investigate privately run facilities that are under contract to the provincial government.

[Leave granted; Bill 205 read a first time]

Bill 207**An Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act (No. 2)**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 207, An Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act (No. 2). The purpose of this Bill is somewhat similar to the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Bow Valley, with the exception that in addition to all contract facilities under the Department of Social Services and Community Health, it would specifically include private nursing homes.

[Leave granted; Bill 207 read a first time]

Bill 208**The Freedom of Information Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 208, The Freedom of Information Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to extend the present laws of Alberta to provide a right of access to information in government records, recognizing the principle that government information should be available to the public. The Bill also recognizes that all exemptions to the principle must be clearly limited and specific.

[Leave granted; Bill 208 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file copies of the appraisals of the Canadian component of Mr. Beny's photographic collection, carried out by Mr. Jim Enyeart of the Center for Creative Photography in Tucson, Arizona, and Mr. Phillippe Garner of Sotheby in England.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the annual report for 1979 of the Forest Development Research Trust Fund.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, sir, and to members of the Assembly some 30 students of Grande Prairie Regional College. With them we have Diana Bacon, the Federation of Alberta Students' representative; Jason Zahara, the vice-president of the students' council; Lake Sagaris, executive officer of the Federation of Alberta Students; and Peter Vogan, the student housing officer at Grande Prairie Regional College.

Mr. Speaker, they are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized and welcomed to this House,

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure to present to you and to members of the Assembly the grade 6 class of J. A. Fife school, situated in the heart of Edmonton Belmont. There are 48 students in attendance today. Accompanying them are Mrs. J. Bauerfind and Mr. Don Poohkay. I would request that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly. They are seated in the public gallery.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 45 students from one of my favorite schools, the Calder elementary school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Sephton and Mr. Townend. They are seated in the members gallery. I'd like them to stand and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a class of 12 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre in Lac La Biche. They are accompanied by their instructor Mr. Ed Mardel. I would request that they rise and receive the cordial welcome of this Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of
Hospitals and Medical Care**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to advise hon. members of the details of a major program of hospital construction for Alberta.

The program is to be commenced immediately in communities throughout the province, and has three major thrusts: one, to build additional new hospitals; two, to expand some existing hospitals; and three, to renovate and upgrade existing hospitals as required.

This comprehensive program has a current estimated

value of \$350 million, a magnitude unique to Canada.

It has been developed in response to applications requested from local hospital boards during the latter half of 1979. It also includes further major initiatives by the province, in Calgary and Edmonton, in order to provide significant numbers of additional new beds in the metropolitan regions.

The projects announced today are in addition to others currently in various stages of planning and construction, and valued at \$570 million. Further to that, the three major health care facilities funded by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund represent an additional \$350 million investment.

Mr. Speaker, this means that with today's announced program, the province's current commitment for hospital capital projects totals \$1.25 billion. When the ongoing annual operating costs are further considered, that commitment becomes one of major significance for our government.

I would like now to comment briefly on some important specific details of the program.

First, wherever possible, hospital facilities are being maintained in local communities, rather than implementing regionalized development.

Second, we are proposing to some local boards unique initiatives for standardized expandable core hospitals for their communities. This should ease the administrative burden for those boards and result in savings of time and money.

Third, the new metropolitan hospitals initiated by the province will be innovative in several respects. Two community hospitals, each of 400 beds, will be built in Calgary and another 400-bed hospital in northeast Edmonton. The latter is in addition to the new Mill Woods hospital announced earlier. This means that four boards will be involved in the administration of these hospitals, and they will be required to share programming and planning services as well as repetitive construction techniques.

Fourth, we are asking our metropolitan boards to develop co-operatively a blueprint for ongoing hospital development in their regions. The Calgary and Edmonton area hospital planning councils will be given the assignment of completing metropolitan bed requirement studies. The studies will be funded by the province and are necessary to establish guidelines for long-term planning.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the program announced today contains 19 projects of renovations and upgrading, 12 additions to existing hospitals, and 19 new hospitals. Decisions have been deferred to a later date on 20 other applications of less relative urgency.

I am confident that the development of these facilities will assure Albertans of continuing excellent health care.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment on the ministerial announcement. I would say: Mr. Minister, my initial reaction to the announcement you have delivered to the Assembly this afternoon would be indeed very positive. I take from the announcement that this will mean 19 new hospital projects in the province and some 27 other projects which — and I trust all projects — will be dealt with with dispatch.

Mr. Minister, perhaps later on in question period today, or at a very early date. I look forward to being able to find the details of which hospitals are involved. But on the surface, in somewhat of an unaccustomed role I commend the minister and trust that this will be the start of us, in this Assembly, earnestly looking after

health care needs in this province, which in many areas have fallen woefully behind. I commend the minister.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Child Care

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It follows the answers the minister gave in the House last Friday, when he stated that child welfare workers at the northern residential treatment centre were not advised of the treatment being administered to their charges. Will the minister state whether it is the standard policy and practice throughout the province for psychological treatment to be administered to permanent or temporary wards without consulting the child welfare workers, who are in fact the legal guardians of the children and, as such, are responsible for those children's welfare?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated on Friday that when the allegations were brought to the attention of the child welfare workers in the Peace River area on or about November 13, 1979, the administrative director at the office insisted that the offensive practices be terminated. That was followed by a meeting with the board on November 16.

Mr. Speaker, one reason this government decided to appoint the Cavanagh Board of Review to look at the whole area of child care in Alberta is clearly to review the current practices, procedures, and policies involved in the administration of The Child Welfare Act. That is the first and the most important of the nine recommendations put before the Cavanagh Board of Review. We certainly want a review of current practices; we want to learn from the Cavanagh Board of Review as to those procedures and where it feels improvements should be made to the system as operated within the province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Will the minister indicate to the Assembly whether the youngsters at the northern residential treatment centre who were treated by the psychologist without prior consultation or approval of that treatment from their social workers, who are their legal guardians in this case — was this an isolated example in Peace River, or in fact is this the practice across Alberta today?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the practices outlined in Dr. Thompson's report and deemed by all of us to be offensive and unacceptable, were developed by the coordinators for the privately operated facility and were approved by the psychologist who works with the department's mental health division in that area. The child welfare workers were not involved in either discussions on the types of therapy to be administered or the practices or procedures used. Of course, once they were made aware of those, appropriate action was taken the same day.

As I've indicated, we've asked, through the board of review, that this matter be reviewed very carefully and earnestly. We look forward to the recommendations that may be made by the board of review.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. How many other children who are permanent and temporary

wards of the government of Alberta are receiving psychological treatment not authorized by the social workers who are their legal guardians?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. leader is looking for a number, of course, as he knows, there is another means of getting that information and giving an opportunity to go into statistics which is not afforded in the question period.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'll rephrase the question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly that no other children who are either temporary or permanent wards of the province have received psychological treatment without the approval of their child welfare workers, who under the law of this province are those children's legal guardian? Can the minister assure us that no children other than the ones he's now admitted in Peace River have received psychological treatment without prior consultation and approval of their guardians?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the practice which has been used in approximately 14 other facilities which offer services similar to those which were offered at the privately operated centre near Peace River — the normal approval process has been through the mental health branch of the department and the psychologist, or team of psychologists, which is the situation in the majority of cases. We feel that there is certainly a great deal of concern about the approximately 6,000 children who are wards of the province and the approximately 14,000 we have some responsibility for, either as direct or partial guardianship. One of the reasons I initiated the internal review on Monday, March 10, was to ensure that the offensive practices at the centre near Peace River, as described in Dr. Thompson's report, were not in fact being condoned or permitted in any of the other facilities either operated by or funded through the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the Assembly and the people of Alberta take from that answer that, of the 6,000 children who are permanent wards and the 14,000 who the minister indicated the department has some responsibility for, all those 20,000 children could possibly receive psychological treatment without the prior approval of their legal guardian? Is that what the minister is telling us today?

MR. BOGLE: Just for clarity, Mr. Speaker — and I may not have described the figures accurately for the Leader of the Opposition — the total number would be approximately 14,000. Of that 14,000 approximately 6,000 are wards of the province. But very clearly, Mr. Speaker, the primary reason for the internal review, which commenced on March 10 ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret interrupting the minister. He is not obliged to answer the question, but ...

MR. R. CLARK: If he wants to, he should be allowed to.

MR. SPEAKER: That's true, but there is some problem with giving answers which are not really directly related to the question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister what direction or advice he has given to psychologists and staff at child care institutions throughout the province, including institutions that have a contract with the department, that they all must consult with child welfare staff before administering treatment. What direction has now gone out to psychologists and to all child care workers on administering psychological treatment?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the department has always relied on the advice of professional people in terms of the kind of therapy which should be prescribed. One of the reasons we're moving with the Cavanagh Board of Review — and it's indicated clearly under item 3 — is that we review that process.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. On page 12 of *Hansard*, the minister indicates that the chief deputy minister confirmed from telephone interviews with various operators of the facilities that no such practices were being permitted or condoned. Can the minister assure the House that in that particular memo there was a very clear statement from the government that before any behavior modification techniques were to be tested, tried, or carried on, the child welfare workers who have the legal responsibility for the children would be formally notified, so we don't get into the situation that occurred at the northern treatment centre?

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, without prejudging the results of the Cavanagh Board of Review, the entire purpose of the internal review is to ensure that these practices were not being permitted or condoned in any of our facilities. That process is well under way at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The question relates directly to communication from the department through the system. Was there any statement from the department that, pending a report by the Cavanagh Board of Review, before any behavior modification techniques would be used the child welfare workers involved would have to be notified?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, following our discussions of March 10, there's been much greater interaction between the child welfare workers and the other parties within the department responsible for this entire area. That goes without saying.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I'd like to ask what specific written guidelines for acceptable therapy the minister has relayed to child care institutions within the province, and what specific forms of treatment have been prohibited.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the types of therapy that we are assured are not being condoned or permitted are those which may be deemed offensive, such as those described in Dr. Thompson's report.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House when the government anticipates receiving the findings of the Cavanagh Board of Review?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we've very deliberately not placed any time lines on the Cavanagh Board of Review. However, it has been made very clear to Mr. Justice Cavanagh and the members of the Board of Review that we welcome interim reports by the same.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether there was any review by the department of the whole question of behavior modification prior to the controversy in Peace River and the government's decision shortly before the Legislature convened to appoint the Cavanagh Board of Review? In the history of the Department of Social Services and Community Health have there been any prior studies of the implications of behavior modification?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, studies have been undertaken by the department and, on a contractual basis, through the department. I might mention that we're currently working on an excellent report pertaining to standards submitted by the association of child care workers in the province. We're currently reviewing that and will be making it available to the Cavanagh Board of Review as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic. A considerable number of members were not reached on Friday for their first question, and I would hope we wouldn't have to repeat that today. If there's time left at the end of the question period we can come back to this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The final supplementary then to the minister. Has there been any discussion between officials of the government of Alberta and the government of Saskatchewan with respect to that province's intent to develop a declaration of rights for use in residential centres, that would specifically set out not only the problems we saw in Peace River but also other rights for wards of the province?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question of rights of children has received considerable attention, more recently at a meeting of deputy ministers of social services from the western provinces approximately two weeks ago. The item and possible moves by various governments were thoroughly discussed, but I have not seen any draft legislation or proposals that might be put forward by the government of Saskatchewan.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary to clarify a point the minister made on Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: Suppose we come back to that at the end of the question period. I'm concerned because one supplementary can lead to another, and there may well be time at the end of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Can the Speaker indicate to the Assembly just what the criteria are for the Speaker deciding when he will allow supplementary questions to go on? In all fairness, we do not seem to have an indication of when we can pursue supplementaries and when we cannot pursue supplementaries.

To fulfil our role as opposition members I think it's important for us to know when we can proceed with supplementary questions and when we may be cut off.

MR. KING: Read *Beauchesne*, Walter.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it would be really difficult and quite unfair to all hon. members, including the hon. members of the opposition, if we were to have a hard and fast rule which would say, so many supplementaries. On a previous occasion I mentioned in this Assembly that parliamentary tradition, at least until recent years, has been that all supplementaries are *ipso facto* out of order. That rule has since developed in many parliaments to the point where the number of supplementaries is at the discretion of the Chair, and in exercising that discretion a number of factors have to be taken into account. For example, if we're having one of those afternoons where we might feel it necessary to advertise for business in the question period, then of course there could be a long list of supplementaries. But if there is an afternoon when a considerable number of members wish to ask questions, I think the supplementaries have to be curtailed a little more.

Now in this particular case, to be quite specific, seven supplementaries were asked by the member who first posed the question, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and four supplementaries were asked by other members. Having regard to the custom of allowing up to two or three supplementaries in some parliaments, that isn't really a bad record.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the point you made is that you may have to solicit questions, but the next order of business goes on if there are no more questions. I would also like to say, very very simply, that if I were sitting on the government's side and wished to have a discussion curtailed, I would put down 25 backbenchers to put questions on your list, sir. Using that mechanism they could very simply cut off the supplementary questions that we have, because you have your long list. I'm saying very humbly, Mr. Speaker, that that would be a mechanism a government could use very easily to cut off questions from the opposition's side.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday last you permitted the discussion to go on for at least 20 minutes. Today we have other questions to ask. I say in all humility [interjections] that I believe we should be ... I know you people over on that side of the House wouldn't know what humility is. But the mechanism could be used as I have described it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we certainly have supplementary questions to ask and we should be allowed to ask them.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The hon. member suggests a conspiracy, suggests duplicity on the part of hon. members on the government back benches. I think the hon. member should be asked to retract that. Secondly, he should be asked to read *Hansard* of last year, when we went through a similar debate. If he were able to refer to *Hansard*, he would read your decision and have that benefit for his reference.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would listen, I said that that possibility exists. So read the *Hansard* there, rookie.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I might just add a word on the subject. I have listened with the greatest care to the hon. Member for Clover Bar — as one is always obliged to do — and perceive something in his remarks that is disturbing; that is, that during question period, one individual member of the Assembly has a greater right to raise a matter of concern than any other member because of his position as a member of the opposition. Allowing for the normal courtesies that parliaments grant to all their members, and taking into account the practices that have arisen with respect to the opposition, it has never been suggested that a government member was in any sense a second-class member.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make that point and to indicate to the hon. Member for Clover Bar that individual members in this Assembly are entitled to equal respect and equally to catch the eye of the Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, no one on this side of the House has suggested that members on the government's side are second-class members. If they feel that, that's their problem. But it's certainly never been alleged by members on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that over a number of years the general tradition in most parliaments within the Commonwealth has been to recognize the very special responsibility of opposition members to raise questions in the Legislature. That doesn't preclude government members raising questions. At the same time, as I recall the debate that took place last spring the assertion was made that there are issues which are of sufficient controversy and importance that leeway should be exercised by the Chair to make sure that there is an adequate venting of those questions. As I recall, reference was made on more than one occasion to issues in the House of Commons that consumed the entire question period, even though the normal rule in the House of Commons is two supplementaries.

But there are issues of sufficient importance. While that perhaps places the Chair in the difficult position of arbitrating those decisions, Mr. Speaker, nevertheless it seems to me quite clear that when issues of the magnitude of the implications of the northern residential treatment question arise, there should be full opportunity to make sure all the questions are asked, including questions which the hon. members from the government's side may wish to address to the minister in question.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly it might suffice to add that if it is a reprehensible tactic of hon. members of the government side to put a lot of questions or to indicate that there are many of them wanting to ask questions. I suppose that is a tactic available to them. I'm not sure to what extent there is any obligation by the Chair to use a fairly considerable experience in politics to try to find out what's behind various tactics. But it does occur to me that there could also be a tactic open to the hon. members of the opposition, whereby they might contrive to ask a long host of supplementaries in order to prevent government members from being recognized by the Chair.

I'm not suggesting that that has happened on either side of the House. But insofar as the possibility of tactics being adopted is concerned, it's equally open to both sides of the House. It doesn't really make it any easier for the Chair to try to exercise discretion in some instances.

If this topic, to which hon. members of the opposition wish to give considerable emphasis ... If we go back to Friday, and today, I think we'll find it did in fact receive

a great deal of attention. I can't really say that there hasn't been sufficient justice done to the topic. That doesn't mean to say that if time permits or in a future question period if hon. members wish to go back to that topic again, so be it.

While I am on my feet, in view of the remarks that have been made it wouldn't be unfair to remind hon. members that, recognizing the function of the Opposition, a practice has been adopted in this House — which is not sanctioned by *Standing Orders* in any way — of recognizing the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the first two questions in each question period. In many instances those two questions have been followed by a host of supplementaries.

Grande Prairie Regional College

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. The question results from the group of students who made their way down from Grande Prairie to Edmonton today, who the minister missed the opportunity of speaking to this morning. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly if the residential accommodations at the Grande Prairie community college will be included in the budget, recognizing that we have now had announcements on hospitals? I would hope we would have the same kind of announcement as far as Grande Prairie is concerned.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I regret this is not April 3, when the question could properly be answered. Representations have been made to me and to other members of the government — certainly by the hon. Member for Grande Prairie — with respect to the housing situation at the Grande Prairie Regional College. A decision has been made on that subject, but the announcement of the decision will have to await the outcome of the budget speech by the hon. Provincial Treasurer on April 2.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I regret that a long-standing personal commitment with my family prevented me from being on the steps of the Legislature this morning. I received no notice of the intention of the students to come here until late Friday, and I was unable to re-adjust my schedule. At that time I advised the representative of the Grande Prairie students that I would be unable to be here to meet with them. However, I understand that my hon. colleague the Minister of Education, in an acting capacity, was able to meet with the delegation, subsequent to the representations on the steps.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the discussion we have just completed, I have one very brief supplementary question on this issue. Has the minister received representation from the Northern Alberta Development Council urging him to move ahead with the residential accommodations?

MR. HORSMAN: I couldn't say specifically, although I have received many representations from the hon. Member for Grande Prairie. Whether he was making those representations in his capacity as member for the constituency or as chairman of the Northern Alberta Development Council, I couldn't reply at this particular moment. However, I can assure the hon. members of this Assembly that the hon. Member for Grande Prairie has been diligent in his requests to me, not only with respect to this

particular point but indeed last year when we made an additional \$50,000 grant available to Grande Prairie. At the time I first met with the Grande Prairie Regional College students and board, the hon. member was instrumental in obtaining the additional funding to assist, in this current year, with additional funds to that institution.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Have there been any studies compiled by the department or has the minister discussed with the faculty of Grande Prairie Regional College the impact of the enrolment drop this year, which I believe is 9.5 per cent, and the concern of the people in the college that a further drop in enrolment would jeopardize the ability of that particular institution to provide many of the courses which are presently being offered students in the Peace River region?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have had many representations on the problem relating to the boom that is taking place in Grande Prairie and the effect it is having upon enrolments at Grande Prairie Regional College. There are of course several factors, and student housing is an important one. But the availability of jobs in the region is also a major contributing factor, and so it goes. I think the proper course of communication, which I have had, is with the regional board of governors. I have held many meetings with the chairman of the board, who has made these representations to me with respect to housing and other factors associated with enrolment at that college.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can report to the Assembly that these matters have been given very serious consideration by my department and me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the particularly tight housing situation in Grande Prairie at the present time and the impact that the expiration of rent control legislation will have on the market, will the government's commitment to the grant of \$50,000 to subsidize rent be subject to regular review? Is the \$50,000 figure, in fact, subject to review in the interim period, while we are planning, hopefully, for the objective of the board to bear fruit; that is, for the construction of a residence facility at the college?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think I should report to the Assembly that as a result of the \$50,000 which was made available, additional accommodation for 123 students was arranged. The average occupancy for the academic year was 119. As of this date we have not yet received a request from the college for the funds, but we understand that by the end of the fiscal year, which is coming up very quickly, \$30,000 will have been utilized in this extra accommodation. The balance will be made available for the college board in subsequent months, particularly during the summer months. As far as the board representations are concerned, we anticipate that additional requests may come forward following the experience of this year.

Water Management

MR. R. SPEAKER: My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Last fall the minister indicated that a

comprehensive water policy would be announced in Alberta. I wonder whether the minister could indicate whether that policy will be announced this spring, or when will it be announced?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the comment that a comprehensive policy would be announced. I recall saying that we were working on developing something that might be useful. As I mentioned once before, if any detail is required I would refer the question to the Minister of Environment, to whom we report.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Environment. In the throne speech it indicates that the minister will be making announcements on the Oldman River study. Could the minister indicate that those announcements will be this spring? Will they be announced along with construction programming as well as rehabilitation dollars?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, if we don't get too many supplementaries in the next few months, I hope the announcement will be this spring. It will take into consideration the total problems of irrigation throughout southern Alberta.

Hog Marketing

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and ask him to outline to the Assembly the considerations that led the government to the conclusion that after three major reports and numerous briefs on the pork industry in Alberta, the Foster committee should be commissioned to do yet another study, as opposed to establishing a public inquiry, as requested by the Pork Producers' Marketing Board, to review allegations of packer collusion in the purchase of hogs in Alberta.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, over the period of years, the hog marketing industry has certainly enjoyed the usual ups and downs, both pricewise and indeed with the problems that go with marketing in general. Some time ago a study was completed, the Hu Harries report, which was done purely on the economic aspects of hog marketing. The problem that appeared to be facing us at the present time was the physical aspect of the marketing system itself. The administrative procedures involved in marketing, the input towards that marketing by both packer and producer, had led to a breakdown and to what was not considered an orderly marketing system.

It was on the basis of a review of the system as it existed, and to have the opportunity to discuss with all sides, both packers and producers — and that's the producer board itself and producers at large — to have the opportunity of doing a physical review of the existing marketing system, and to review those areas where either a packer or a producer, or collectively, felt some improvements could be made . . . In general, the review was an opportunity to bring together those parties which are involved in the total system — in other words, the packer and the producer — to discuss the areas of common concern. Hopefully the recommendations and input to come will provide us with the opportunity of establishing a system or a modified system of what existed and perhaps back to an orderly system of marketing within the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly whether he had an opportunity to apprise himself of any of the evidence of the Pork Producers' Marketing Board with respect to the suit that board has launched against the packers in this province? Was the minister given access to any of that information?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the board made some material available to me in regard to the litigation which they announced. I think the information that was made to me personally has been made to several other areas as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the minister's review of that legislation, did the minister refer that to the law officers of the Crown to determine whether the matter could be expedited by the calling of a formal public inquiry, as opposed to a long, drawn out suit through the courts? Was any consideration given to that matter after the minister had an opportunity to peruse this evidence he made reference to?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the information that was made available to me wasn't of a nature that would be used in litigations of any kind. In establishing the review, it was not the intent to interfere in any way with the hog marketing board's litigation, which it had already announced. Their operation, obligation, and right to start any action they saw fit did not interfere, nor did we wish to interfere, with the orderly review of the actual marketing practice itself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of public statements by the board requesting a public inquiry, can the minister advise the Assembly why the government did not choose to go the route of a public inquiry, in view of the fact that this would have expedited the entire question of the challenge and the allegations that were made by the board with respect to the buying power or monopoly power of the packers? My question very directly to the minister is: why did the government not entertain the possibility of a public inquiry to pursue this matter quickly?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the hog marketing board had initiated an action against the packers, in light of the problem that lay ahead of agriculture — in other words, our responsibility to the producers for an orderly marketing system — and in light of the time frame normally tied to a public inquiry, the problem that existed was not of the nature which would have been covered totally by a public inquiry. We feel the independent review would give us the opportunity for the information that is required to initiate back into one form or another a marketing system that will be orderly and still not interfere with the operation or the action that has been started by the board itself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, if I may. Is the minister in a position to advise the House whether he has had an opportunity to review the amended regulations with respect to the powers of the Marketing Council over the board, in view of the concern expressed by pork producers throughout the province that in fact the council now has de facto power over almost every conceivable aspect of the board?

I raise the question notwithstanding the minister's assurance on Friday. Has the minister had an opportunity to refer the amended regulation, particularly the legal implication of the words 'each case', to determine the extent of the power now given the Marketing Council over the everyday affairs of the hog marketing board in Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the Marketing Council has always had certain powers to operate marketing boards within the province. I've seen the change to the regulations, discussed the intent of the Marketing Council in relation to the new interim system of marketing, and am still of the same opinion that restrictions to the board are only in the area where the system of marketing, as it existed, has a temporary freeze, has been replaced with a modified system of marketing. That is the basic intent and the only intent to hinder or change any of the operations the hog marketing board had and enjoyed in the past.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture give a clear undertaking to the Assembly this afternoon that should legal opinion find that the amended regulation goes somewhat further than the minister's intention, the government will modify the position to in fact restrict the council's power only to that aspect of deciding on bids, which the minister alluded to last Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will read the *Hansard* text of the question he has just asked, I think he will find it to be a classic example of a hypothetical question. The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Prior to asking my question, if I may be permitted to comment on a point of order that was raised earlier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We're running short of time in the question period. Perhaps there would be little purpose in reviving a discussion on a previous point of order.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Does the minister have information which would indicate whether the Alberta marketing system could have an effect on the price of pork? To clarify, is it a North American market, a Canadian market, or an Alberta market? Where is the price established in North America? Would you have studies to indicate that?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we monitor the North American market on a daily base. The American market, the Toronto price, and the Alberta price are very, very close together.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. It flows from the comment the minister made in response to the question earlier about the lawsuit which had been announced by the hog marketing board. Is the minister in a position to assure the Assembly that it was not the minister's intention that the action taken by the Marketing Council would prevent the hog marketing board from having access to funds so they could proceed with that action if they so chose?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the move that was made on behalf of the Department of Agriculture was made,

first of all, with the independent review. The Marketing Council has provided a recommended change in the marketing procedure. I see where either one should interfere or hinder the hog marketing board's area of responsibility or direction in the action they have started.

75th Anniversary

MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the hon. minister responsible for the 75th Anniversary with regard to Homecoming, conventions, and seminars. Could the minister advise the Assembly on the number of invitations which to date have been sent out to former Albertans, relatives, and friends?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, if I can just go back to the start, we sent out roughly 700,000 invitations to Alberta citizens, asking them to submit names of friends, relatives, and former Albertans. To date, we have received approximately 200,000 names for the invitations to go to. Of that, 170,000 invitations have been sent.

MR. MACK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise what has been done to promote Alberta's 75th Anniversary in inviting others to join us in Alberta's historic period?

MR. ADAIR: To date, Mr. Speaker, we participated in the Lord Mayor's procession in London last fall. I should point out again for members that Sir Peter Gadsden is a native-born Albertan, born in Mannville. That was followed up with a visit to the province of Quebec and participation in the winter carnival. We were also involved with the Calgary Olympic Development Association in a presentation at Lake Placid relative to the international people who may be coming to the province of Alberta during 1980.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

2. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that this Assembly do resolve itself into Committee of Supply, to consider, when called, the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[Motion carried]

1. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the message of His Honour the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor relating to interim supply and all matters connected therewith be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

Committee of Supply

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order.

Schedule "A" Sums Required in the Interim for the Service of the Province of Alberta for the Twelve Months Ending March 31, 1981

MR. CHAIRMAN: Today we have before us, I believe, 134 resolutions. If the committee agrees, I propose to read the number, amount, and purpose. If at any time anybody wishes to raise a question or comment, I hope not to go too fast and you'll be able to do so.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

Legislative Assembly

1 — Support to the Legislative Assembly	\$2,660,093
2 — Office of the Auditor General	\$1,958,671
3 — Office of the Ombudsman	\$174,155
4 — Office of the Chief Electoral Officer	\$126,190

Advanced Education and Manpower

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,121,111
2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions	\$155,920,433
3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$9,040,065
4 — Financial Assistance to Students	\$4,224,941

Department of Agriculture

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$6,701,205
2 — Production Assistance	\$12,727,430
3 — Marketing Assistance	\$2,948,958
4 — Rural Development Assistance	\$11,577,427

Attorney General

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,260,757
2 — Court Services	\$8,518,854
3 — Legal Services	\$3,792,713
4 — Support for Legal Aid	\$1,490,940
5 — Protection and Administration of Property Rights	\$3,506,319
6 — Fatality Inquiries	\$585,803
7 — Crimes Compensation	\$246,906
8 — Public Utilities Regulation	\$598,155

Consumer and Corporate Affairs

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$535,576
2 — Consumer Relations and Education	\$1,073,236
3 — Business Registration and Regulation	\$1,494,198
4 — Regulation of Securities Markets	\$609,971
5 — Rent Decontrol Administration	\$47,871

Culture

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$623,180
2 — Cultural Development	\$6,486,317
3 — Historical Resources Development	\$3,707,412
4 — International Assistance	\$1,621,865
5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations	\$23,647,891

Economic Development

1 — Economic Development and International Trade	\$3,618,542
2 — Financing of Alberta Grain Terminals	\$825,000

Education

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,282,666
2 — Financial Assistance to Schools	\$235,987,080
3 — Regular Education Services	\$2,747,151
4 — Special Education Services	\$2,677,257

Energy and Natural Resources

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$3,583,834
2 — Resource Evaluation and Planning	\$2,327,943
3 — Minerals Management	\$3,885,412
4 — Forest Resources Management	\$14,533,310
5 — Public Lands Management	\$3,615,819
6 — Fish and Wildlife Conservation	\$5,103,262
7 — Oil Sands Equity Management	\$147,760
8 — Foreign Ownership of Land Administration	\$72,707
9 — Oil Sands Research Fund Management	\$598,666
10 — Petroleum Marketing and Market Research	\$843,662

Environment

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$1,169,733
2 — Pollution Prevention and Control	\$24,214,024
3 — Land Conservation	\$6,739,258
4 — Water Resources Management	\$14,603,430
5 — Environmental Research	\$1,263,372
6 — Overview and Co-ordination of Environment Conservation	\$385,110
7 — Interdisciplinary Environmental Research and Services	\$2,916,757

Executive Council

1 — Executive Council Administration	\$973,840
2 — Occupational Health and Safety	\$2,563,226
3 — Workers' Compensation	\$3,513,972
4 — Support To Native Organizations	\$615,952
5 — Personnel Administration	\$2,059,959
6 — Natural Sciences and Engineering Research	\$3,815,130
7 — Energy Resources Conservation	\$11,320,000
8 — Women's Information	\$55,513
9 — Multimedia Education Services	\$5,151,964
10 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response	\$683,392
11 — Public Service Employee Relations	\$94,565

Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

1 — Intergovernmental Co-ordination and Research	\$1,032,773
--	-------------

Government Services

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$734,953
2 — Building Operations and Maintenance	\$24,096,739
3 — Government Transportation	\$1,071,498
4 — Supply	\$840,002

5 — Public Affairs	\$1,841,190
6 — Computing and Systems	\$335,402

Hospitals and Medical Care

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$7,194,650
2 — Health Care Insurance	\$55,760,760
3 — Financial Assistance for Active Care	\$202,194,530
4 — Financial Assistance for Long-term Chronic Care	\$21,044,888
5 — Financial Assistance for Supervised Personal Care	\$19,277,610
6 — Financial Assistance for Capital Construction	\$41,669,807

Housing and Public Works

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$548,460
2 — Operation and Maintenance of Waterlines	\$297,000
3 — Planning and Acquisition of Accommodation	\$27,063,300
4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects	\$82,168,400
5 — Policy Development and Financial Assistance for Housing	\$16,953,420
6 — Housing for Albertans	\$14,557,290
7 — Mortgage Assistance	\$2,146,320

Labour

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$371,240
2 — Labor Relations	\$1,294,729
3 — General Safety Services	\$3,373,854
4 — Industrial Relations Adjudication and Regulation	\$220,206
5 — Individual's Rights Protection	\$287,414

Municipal Affairs

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$1,293,411
2 — Financial Support for Municipal Programs	\$78,801,545
3 — Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan — Rebates to Individuals	\$12,245,538
4 — Support to Community Planning Services	\$5,035,851
5 — Administrative and Technical Support to Municipalities	\$4,349,809
6 — Regulatory Boards	\$276,018
7 — Co-ordination of Northeast Alberta Programs	\$99,000

Recreation and Parks

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$700,627
2 — Recreation Development	\$11,213,416
3 — Provincial Parks	\$8,746,038

Social Services and Community Health

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$14,017,885
2 — Social Allowance	\$61,919,042
3 — Child Welfare Services	\$17,187,605
4 — Specialized Social Services	\$2,294,982
5 — Benefits and Income Support	\$32,350,560
6 — Vocational Rehabilitation Services	\$6,708,852
7 — Services for the Handicapped	\$23,774,353

8 — Treatment of Mental Illness	\$18,256,521
9 — General Health Services	\$10,177,455
10 — Community Social and Health Services	\$25,885,286
11 — Alcoholism and Drug Abuse — Treatment and Education	\$4,223,184

Solicitor General

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$960,907
2 — Correctional Services	\$14,381,182
3 — Law Enforcement	\$18,203,267
4 — Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing	\$6,921,382
5 — Control and Development of Horse Racing	\$674,169

Tourism and Small Business

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$227,723
2 — Development of Tourism and Small Business	\$3,489,991
3 — Financial Assistance to Alberta Business via Alberta Opportunity Company	\$1,633,500

Transportation

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,102,734
2 — Construction and Maintenance of Highways	\$134,846,797
3 — Construction and Operation of Rail Systems	\$6,000,000
4 — Construction and Maintenance of Airport Facilities	\$3,491,248
5 — Specialized Transportation Services	\$3,275,686
6 — Urban Transportation Financial Assistance	\$43,105,161
7 — Surveys and Property Acquisition	\$2,293,773

Treasury

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$521,519
2 — Statistical Services	\$528,066
3 — Revenue Collection and Rebates	\$10,988,527
4 — Financial Management, Planning, and Central Services	\$6,516,378
5 — Public Debt Service	\$7,143,972
6 — Public Service Pension Administration	\$33,911,629

Utilities and Telephones

1 — Departmental Support Services	\$410,570
2 — Utilities Development	\$19,192,775
3 — Natural Gas Price Protection for Albertans	\$50,853,863

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer wish to move the votes be reported?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPELBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981:

Under the Legislative Assembly: \$2,660,093 for support to the Legislative Assembly; \$1,958,671 for office of the Auditor General; \$174,155 for office of the Ombudsman; \$126,190 for office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Under the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: \$2,121,111 for departmental support services; \$155,920,433 for assistance to higher and further educational institutions; \$9,040,065 for manpower development and training assistance; \$4,224,941 for financial assistance to students.

Under the Department of Agriculture: \$6,701,205 for departmental support services; \$12,727,430 for production assistance; \$2,948,958 for marketing assistance; \$11,577,427 for rural development assistance.

Under the Department of the Attorney General: \$2,260,757 for departmental support services; \$8,518,854 for court services; \$3,792,713 for legal services; \$1,490,940 for support for legal aid; \$3,506,319 for protection and administration of property rights; \$585,803 for fatality inquiries; \$246,906 for crimes compensation; \$598,155 for public utilities regulation.

Under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs: \$535,576 for departmental support services; \$1,073,236 for consumer relations and education; \$1,494,198 for business registration and regulation; \$609,971 for regulation of securities markets; \$47,871 for rent decontrol administration.

Under Culture: \$623,180 for departmental support services; \$6,486,317 for cultural development; \$3,707,412 for historical resources development; \$1,621,865 for international assistance; \$23,647,891 for 75th Anniversary celebrations.

Under the Department of Economic Development: \$3,618,542 for economic development and international trade; \$825,000 for financing of Alberta grain terminals.

Under the Department of Education: \$2,282,666 for departmental support services; \$235,987,080 for financial assistance to schools; \$2,747,151 for regular education services; \$2,677,257 for special education services.

Under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources: \$3,583,834 for departmental support services; \$2,327,943 for resource evaluation and planning; \$3,885,412 for minerals management; \$14,533,310 for forest resources management; \$3,615,819 for public lands management; \$5,103,262 for fish and wildlife conservation; \$147,760 for Oil Sands Equity management; \$72,707 for foreign ownership of land administration; \$598,666 for oil sands research fund management; \$843,662 for petroleum marketing and market research.

Under the Department of Environment: \$1,169,733 for departmental support services; \$24,214,024 for pollution prevention and control; \$6,739,258 for land conservation; \$14,603,430 for water resources management; \$1,263,372 for environmental research; \$385,110 for overview and co-ordination of environment conservation; \$2,916,757 for interdisciplinary environmental research and services.

Under Executive Council: \$973,840 for Executive Council administration; \$2,563,226 for occupational health and safety; \$3,513,972 for workers' compensation; \$615,952 for support to native organizations; \$2,059,959 for personnel administration; \$3,815,130 for natural sciences and engineering research; \$11,320,000 for energy

resources conservation; [\$55,513] for women's information; \$5,151,964 for multimedia education services; \$683,392 for disaster preparedness and emergency response; \$94,565 for public service employee relations.

Under the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs: \$1,032,773 for intergovernmental co-ordination and research.

Under the Department of Government Services: \$734,953 for departmental support services; \$24,096,739 for building operations and maintenance; \$1,071,498 for government transportation; \$840,002 for supply; \$1,841,190 for public affairs; \$335,402 for computing and systems.

Under the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$7,194,650 for departmental support services; \$55,760,760 for health care insurance; \$202,194,530 for financial assistance for active care; \$21,044,888 for financial assistance for long-term chronic care; \$19,277,610 for financial assistance for supervised personal care; \$41,669,807 for financial assistance for capital construction.

Under the Department of Housing and Public Works: \$548,460 for departmental support services; \$297,000 for operation and maintenance of waterlines; \$27,063,300 for planning and acquisition of accommodation; \$82,168,400 for planning and implementation of construction projects; \$16,953,420 for policy development and financial assistance for housing; \$14,557,290 for housing for Albertans; \$2,146,320 for mortgage assistance.

Under the Department of Labour: \$371,240 for departmental support services; \$1,294,729 for labor relations; \$3,373,854 for general safety services; \$220,206 for industrial relations adjudication and regulation; \$287,414 for individual's rights protection.

Under the Department of Municipal Affairs: \$1,293,411 for departmental support services; \$78,801,545 for financial support for municipal programs; \$12,245,538 for Alberta property tax reduction plan — rebates to individuals; \$5,035,851 for support to community planning services; \$4,349,809 for administrative and technical support to municipalities; \$276,018 for regulatory boards; \$99,000 for co-ordination of northeast Alberta programs.

Under the Department of Recreation and Parks: \$700,627 for departmental support services; \$11,213,416 for recreation development; \$8,746,038 for provincial parks.

Under the Department of Social Services and Community Health: \$14,017,885 for departmental support services; \$61,919,042 for social allowance; \$17,187,605 for child welfare services; \$2,294,982 for specialized social services; \$32,350,560 for benefits and income support; \$6,708,852 for vocational rehabilitation services; \$23,774,353 for services for the handicapped; \$18,256,521 for treatment of mental illness; \$10,177,455 for general health services; \$25,885,286 for community social and health services; \$4,223,184 for alcoholism and drug abuse — treatment and education.

Under the Department of the Solicitor General: \$960,907 for departmental support services; \$14,381,182 for correctional services; \$18,203,267 for law enforcement; \$6,921,382 for motor vehicle registration and driver licensing; \$674,169 for control and development of horse racing.

Under the Department of Tourism and Small Business: \$227,723 for departmental support services; \$3,489,991 for development of tourism and small business; \$1,633,500 for financial assistance to Alberta business via Alberta Opportunity Company.

Under the Department of Transportation: \$2,102,734

for departmental support services; \$134,846,797 for construction and maintenance of highways; \$6,000,000 for construction and operation of rail systems; [\$3,491,248] for construction and maintenance of airport facilities; \$3,275,686 for specialized transportation services; \$43,105,161 for urban transportation financial assistance; [\$2,293,773] for surveys and property acquisition.

Under the Treasury Department: \$521,519 for departmental support services; \$528,066 for statistical services; \$10,988,527 for revenue collection and rebates; \$6,516,378 for financial management, planning and central services; \$7,143,972 for public debt service; \$33,911,629 for public service pension administration.

Under the Department of Utilities and Telephones: \$410,570 for departmental support services; \$19,192,775 for utilities development; \$50,853,863 for natural gas price protection for Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous leave to revert to Introduction of Bills in order that the Provincial Treasurer may introduce the interim supply Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the request for unanimous leave?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS (reversion)

Bill 15 The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1980

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 15, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1980.

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 Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides moneys for the operation of the Legislature and the government during the weeks ahead.

[Leave granted; Bill 15 read a first time]

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

Moved by Dr. Reid:

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

To His Honour the Honourable Frank Lynch-Staunton, Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Alberta

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

[Adjourned debate March 21: Mr. R. Clark]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to lead off the debate on the throne speech this afternoon, might I say my expectation was that the interim supply wouldn't take quite so long.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that following the announcement made by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care this afternoon — and I will pay more fitting tribute to the minister in a moment — when I found that in my own particular constituency two projects which my constituents have labored rather long for are going ahead to the tune of some \$14 million, I think it's good that I've had some time, as my colleague to my right said, to come down off my high. On a serious note, I would say to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care a very genuine thank you for today's announcement. I say this specifically on behalf of my constituents; I am sure my colleagues will have some reactions as far as their own particular constituency situations are concerned. I take the opportunity to do that, even though this is more the opportunity of the Leader of the Opposition than of an individual MLA. But I'd be remiss if I didn't pay tribute to the minister, and to the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Three Hills. In this case I think it is fair to say both hospitals serve our constituents, and I'd be less than fair if I didn't say thanks to the government member from Three Hills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to become more involved in what is more fittingly the opportunity to lead off the throne speech debate from this side of the House, at the outset I want to pay tribute to Alberta's new Lieutenant-Governor, and wish His Honour the very best in his tenure as Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Alberta. I've had the opportunity to know his three predecessors, the late Hon. J. Percy Page, the Hon. Grant MacEwan, and the Hon. Ralph Steinhauer. I feel confident that Alberta's new Lieutenant-Governor will follow the example set by those three predecessors. I wish him the very best in his endeavors as the Lieutenant-Governor for the province of Alberta.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is the tradition to pay one's respects to you, sir, and I take the opportunity to do that, regardless of the discussion we had in question period this afternoon. That is not saying that in the course of this session there won't be more experiences like there were this afternoon, but my respects to you, sir, nevertheless.

Mr. Speaker, I very much enjoyed the remarks made by the mover of the motion, the hon. Member for Edson, Dr. Reid, and the seconder of the motion, the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods. I commend them on contributions to the debate that I think indicated their sincerity when it comes to representing their constituents. I congratulate the two hon. members, one, on having been selected and, second, on the contributions they've made.

In my own particular situation, I suppose each of us looks forward to a new session from different vantage points. I have looked forward to the opening of this session from a somewhat different vantage point than I have other sessions. I must say that as I stood in the hall of the Legislative Assembly, saw His Honour inspect the honor guard, then the royal salute was played — first the strains of God Save the Queen, then O Canada — I think everyone who was in the building when that happened stood a bit straighter, much taller, and I would hope much prouder as Canadians.

On that note I'd like to commence my remarks, Mr. Speaker. I sense that we in Alberta and in Canada are

entering a very difficult and at the same time very exciting period in the history of this province and this country. We are in this year, as members on all sides of the Assembly know, celebrating our 75th Anniversary as a province. We are also within weeks of a decision on the referendum in the province of Quebec. Just a few days past, two former Conservative members of the Legislature in Saskatchewan left that party and now sit in the Saskatchewan Legislature as independent members, as I understand the situation, committed to seeing western Canada taken out of Canada and associated more closely with the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of this year, while we reflect upon Alberta's fortunate position during our 75th Anniversary, we would be foolhardy indeed if we did not recognize the tender nature of what holds Canada together. Wherever we sit in this Assembly, I hope there would be at least one thing we would agree upon: that we are Albertans, but we are also Albertans who see Alberta continuing to play a very strong role in Canada for as far as any of us can see ahead.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of the debates which will follow on oil pricing and many other issues, we in this province . . . And I want to make it very clear I'm not suggesting that Alberta back off one bit from the agreement reached with the former government of Canada. It seems to me a Conservative government representing the people of Alberta could not justify to Albertans or other Canadians an agreement that would be less than what was agreed to by the previous Conservative administration and the province of Alberta. But in the course of reaching that agreement, let's also remember that we in this province have a very major responsibility as to the future make-up of our country in the years that lie ahead. I for one would hope that in the course of this spring session we would hear many more members in this Assembly express their views on the question of Alberta's role within Canada.

I want to make it abundantly clear as I leave that portion of my remarks that I for one would have no truck at all, no part at all, in the kind of action taken by the two independent members in Saskatchewan. I would hope that no member in this Assembly could find their way clear to follow that kind of direction. I am not for one moment suggesting that's the case. But I think it would be very helpful for members to think the matter through clearly and from time to time express views on that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to move into the second portion of my remarks. I want to deal with a number of the initiatives my colleagues and I will be placing before the members of the Assembly at this session. I want to conclude my remarks today with some objectives that I think Alberta should strive for during the 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, we have already announced, using the first question in the Assembly and the first question again today, what we consider to be one of the most important issues facing this session of the Legislature: the treatment of institutionalized children in the province of Alberta. The four of us in the official opposition by no means know all the answers about the proper treatment of children. But we on this side of the House, and I hope members on the government side too, do have some knowledge about how children should be treated and how we should treat any people in this province: as human beings, Mr. Speaker, as people with feeling, with emotion; yes, with weakness, and also with strength. Institutionalized children are, for the most part, children who

haven't had the same kinds of opportunities the rest of us have had. They're victims of circumstance all too often; they're victims of adults all too often; they're victims of parents all too often, or others who've never given them the treatment they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not a social worker; I'm not a psychologist. I can't tell you exactly how institutionalized children should be treated. But I'm a human being, and I think that's all one needs to know, almost instinctively, to enable one to have some feel for how children should be treated. In a word, they should not be humiliated.

I guess I'm a small-c conservative, believing that our society is a very fragile creation, a delicate product of a long period of social evolution. What holds that together, Mr. Speaker? It's respect, plain and simple, respect for each other and respect for ourselves. I suggest that a principle which must underlie the treatment of all institutionalized children in this province is that they must be shown respect by staff, and thus be taught by example to respect themselves and to respect other people.

Mr. Speaker, when I reflect upon Friday's question period in the Assembly, I note with a great deal of concern the comments made by the minister Mr. Bogle, who unfortunately is not in his place this afternoon, when he indicated that yes, treatment had been administered to the young people in the Peace River treatment centre without the approval of the social worker, who in this case was the legal guardian. We find out today in the question period — I took the minister's answer to mean that it is the practice, not the exception, across the province that we have not been getting the consent and approval of the legal guardians of these wards, these young people we're entrusted with. We've not been getting the approval from the social workers who are their legal guardians before they have been receiving treatment. From where I stand, that's totally and absolutely contrary to the trust placed in the Department of Social Services and Community Health by the courts of this province, and cannot by any point of view be disregarded.

Mr. Speaker, in question period on Friday, the hon. minister related to the report on the northern regional treatment centre by Dr. A.H. Thompson, regional consultant, Alberta mental health services, Grande Prairie, Alberta. At this time I'd like to table a copy of the report for the library, because I think it's important that people who later choose to follow this debate know what we were talking about on Friday when we couldn't get answers from the minister about the kinds of things that went on in that treatment centre. Anyone who wants to look at some of the details can look at Dr. Thompson's report, which will be in the library.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Member for Clover Bar asked the Premier a question last Friday about "immediate change on the ministerial level in the Department of Social Services and Community Health". The Premier said:

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening very carefully to the question period today, and I believe any fair-minded individual would be impressed with the sensitivity, the feelings, and the awareness of the Minister . . .

Mr. Speaker, the awareness of the minister? This kind of thing was going on for several weeks, maybe even longer than that, and the minister didn't know about it. The awareness of the minister? Was the minister aware of the raid on the Metis files? Talk about the awareness of the minister: was he aware of what was going on at Westfield? I simply can't understand how the first minis-

ter in this province can say he has confidence in a minister, and confidence in the awareness of the minister, when within the course of the last year we've had those three incidents in the department, and in every example the minister wasn't aware.

Mr. Speaker, during the session I will move a resolution condemning the treatment reported at the northern residential treatment centre and censuring the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Today my colleague Mr. Mandeville introduced an amendment to The Ombudsman Act allowing the Ombudsman to intervene in such issues as those arising at the northern residential treatment centre.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should make just one other comment in relation to the amendment proposed by my colleague. I for one wish very much that the Ombudsman had erred on the side of those children in doing an investigation, rather than having been somewhat constrained by the legal niceties of the situation. It would seem to me that in 1979, the Year of the Child, the Ombudsman might well have erred on the side of these young people who are temporary or permanent wards of the province. It's my hope that either my colleague's amendment or an amendment from the government side of the House will remove any doubt as to whether the Ombudsman has future responsibility in that area. I for one would have supported the Ombudsman without question to have moved and looked at that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, the second area I want to touch upon as far as initiatives by the official opposition are concerned deals with the question of interest rates. I've already drawn the attention of the Assembly to this matter last Friday, a matter which, in our opinion, is getting more difficult for many young families in this province to face every week that passes. Before the session opened, I announced my belief that the provincial government should provide mortgage interest to Albertans at 12 per cent per annum, a rate higher than is presently being earned by the heritage fund, yet low enough to prevent thousands of Alberta families from losing their homes.

Last Friday, after you made your ruling, sir, we designated the motion on the Order Paper:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to assist those Albertans facing hardship as a result of the renegotiation of the mortgage on their principal residence at substantially increased interest rates.

That is the motion for designation by the opposition this Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, while we talk about problems with the 25,000 families who have to renegotiate mortgages this year, let us not for a moment forget those people involved in small business in this province who have to get operating capital at 17 to 17.5 per cent. Or let us not forget those people in agriculture who, rather than being able to get loans from the Agricultural Development Corporation — I'll have more comments on that in a few minutes — are being told to go to the conventional lending institutions and pay 1 to 1.5 per cent above prime. We are simply doing a disservice to those people. When in this province are we going to decide to invest in Albertans? Certainly agriculture, small business, and home ownership have to be three areas of major priority, as far as looking at the kind of Alberta we're going to have at the end of the 1980s, or at the end of the next 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at housing costs today, we see the need for an ever-increasing number of mothers to go out into the work force. The most recent figures I have

been able to lay my hands upon are that in Edmonton, 51.5 per cent of females over 15 years of age are out in the work force. When I say out in the work force, that excludes that very major responsibility of homemaker. They are gainfully employed in the city of Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, what implication does this have for our social services, especially day care? We've come to the conclusion that these figures are going to place a fantastic drain on our day care facilities, not only in Edmonton; you can go to Red Deer, Calgary, other areas in the province. When the estimates of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health come before the House, we will be pressing him to accept a number of our suggestions as far as day care is concerned, because when we look at what it's costing people to acquire a home or keep their families together at this time, there is going to be greater and greater need for day care facilities.

If he were here, I would like to serve notice on the minister that all this talk going around the province right now about a re-evaluation of preventive social services — if the re-evaluation means we're going to stop supporting day care, cut back even more than we're doing now, and if the rumblings I hear across the province in Grande Prairie, Peace River, Red Deer, Edmonton, and Calgary that what we're going to do with PSS is change the concept, spend a large portion of that PSS money on our senior citizens, and take that money away from things like day care programs and preventive work on that side of the ledger: I can't think of a worse thing a government could do as we enter the 1980s. That, Mr. Speaker, is put to you as bluntly as I can.

It would be idiotic now not to continue the concept of PSS. If the government is prepared to look at the last 13 years or 10 years — however long it's been — broaden out the program. But to think even for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that we would get away from the preventive aspects of PSS — that would be a pretty sad way to start the 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, during this session we'll have a number of questions for the hon. Minister responsible for Culture with regard to the 75th Anniversary celebrations. I say to the minister: I note that those responsibilities have now been somewhat spread out, but any way one slices it, the Minister responsible for Culture will be the minister ultimately responsible for what happens in the 75th Anniversary celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, I might say we look forward with considerable enthusiasm to the time when the minister will have hired all the necessary staff, organized her offices, and established communications with groups applying for grants. Of course I appreciate that this may take a few months yet, but at the rate we're going we'll be well into the second half of the 75th Anniversary before we have those things done.

MR. NOTLEY: We'll make the 100th birthday.

DR. BUCK: We're trying for the 100th.

MR. R. CLARK: We're trying for the 100th, my colleague from Fort Saskatchewan says.

Mr. Speaker, the official opposition announced its proposal for 75th Anniversary funding some time ago. An important part of that was a children's hospital in the city of Edmonton. We will be reporting back to the Assembly very shortly on the response we've had from people in the northern part of the province as far as that project is concerned. But might I say to hon. members on

the government side of the House that I think they would be very, very wise indeed to sit down with the people involved in the effort to move a children's hospital forward in the northern part of the province and to do whatever individual members can to have this project move ahead at the earliest possible date. I can think of no more fitting tribute to the last 75 years of the province than to make that children's hospital a lasting 75th Anniversary project.

Later on in the session, Mr. Speaker, we will be introducing a resolution dealing with that matter also. We will be presenting to the Assembly the interests of a number of Edmontonians on that particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of oil sands, I think it's fair to say that this government's approach to date has basically been a plant-by-plant approach to oil sands development. It's our intention sometime during this session to present to the Assembly what we think would be a reasonable oil sands development policy for the province of Alberta. We're past the stage now where we can go on a plant-by-plant approach. Such critical issues as pace of development, people services, environmental concerns, front-end spending, the role Albertans can play from the standpoint of investing directly in future tar sands plants: those kinds of questions have to be addressed by this government.

Diverting for one moment, Mr. Speaker, I found it rather interesting that on a recent tour I made into the northern part of the province, there seemed to be great enthusiasm for the understanding of the former Deputy Premier and the former Minister of Energy and Natural Resources as to what their interpretation of front-end financing had been. But when you deal with the present administration's interpretation of what front-end financing is with regard to projects in the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area, there's a totally different understanding. I think it would be fair to say that a number of people in the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area rather wish that Dr. Horner had not departed to Winnipeg and that Mr. Getty were still in the government. There is a very definite feeling there that they understood what front-end servicing meant. Certainly a totally different understanding has been put forward by the present government.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the course of this session we will be tabling what we think would be a reasonable policy as far as oil sands development is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to one of my favorite topics, Willowglen electronics and the Alberta Energy Company, I've been interested but not surprised to hear the recent revolting developments within the Alberta Energy Company pertaining to Willowglen Company. Specifically — and I'm sure it's no surprise to many members on the government side of the House — Willowglen has gone broke, or is in the process of going broke. I recall being assured during the fall of '77 that this government's involvement with Willowglen through the \$1 million AOC loan was a very carefully considered decision. The assurance came from no less a personage than the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, who has since promoted his ability to administer things to directing Alberta's 75th Anniversary celebrations. That's who we got the assurance from.

I will again ask this Assembly to pass an amendment to the Alberta Energy Company legislation which will make it possible to have accountability here in this Legislative Assembly. I hear some mumbling from across the way, Mr. Speaker. It may be all well and good for Mr. Mitchell, the president of the Energy Company, and cer-

tain members of the front bench to meet at the Petroleum Club in Calgary and talk over what's going on in the Alberta Energy Company. But there are a lot of people in this province who aren't members of the Petroleum Club, and they are all represented here in the Legislative Assembly. This is where accountability should take place, not some place else. And after the assurances we've received from this government about what an up-and-up arrangement the Willowglen electronics deal was . . .

If it hasn't already been released, it will be released very shortly, Mr. Speaker: I would rather regard as prescribed reading for a number of members on the government side if they were to spend a couple of days at the courthouse in Calgary and go through the discovery, the information filed during the court case between Dr. Wright, the founder of Willowglen electronics, and the testimony given by Mr. David Mitchell and a number of other people from the Alberta Energy Company. It would be most interesting reading, not only for Mr. Dowling but for a number of those other individuals in the government's front bench who don't think there's a need for some accountability.

I'm under no illusion, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going to support enthusiastically my amendment on the Alberta Energy Company. But that doesn't lessen the rightness of the move or the need for that kind of accountability to be built into the Alberta Energy Company.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to agriculture — I'll withhold some of my comments until the Minister of Agriculture is in his place — let me say three or four things. When we talk of the kind of Alberta we want to see at the end of this decade, agriculture clearly has to play an important role. So does small business, so does tourism, so does non-renewable resource development; no question. But we were promised at the session last spring that the Minister of Agriculture was going to undertake some major changes in the Agricultural Development Corporation. Virtually nothing has happened since then. In fact, many people who are presently applying to the ADC are now saying: we thought changes were going to be made some time ago; we don't know when these changes are coming; we don't know where the whole thing sits.

There are a large number of farmers across this province, Mr. Speaker, who are paying very, very high interest rates. They are being forced into a very desperate situation at a period of time when we are lending money to people outside the province at a great deal less than we're lending to farmers within this province. Now, any Conservative who wants to get up and try to defend that, I'd be very pleased to arrange a group of farmers for you to sit down with in virtually any rural constituency in Alberta.

A lot of people in agriculture are in a situation where a single bad crop can bring financial disaster. Mr. Speaker, we are also in a situation where, prime agricultural land is being withdrawn from agricultural production in this province. I think it's important that members realize that at the very most, less than 17 per cent of the total land mass in the province is Number 1, 2, or 3 agricultural soil. Edmonton's annexation itself, if it's all approved, would take 20,000 acres of Number 1 soil in this province out of production virtually forever. Class 1 soil represents only 12 per cent of the land mass in this province.

Mr. Speaker, during the spring session my colleagues and I will again try to convince the government that we've got to move on some debt shielding for people in agriculture. I make the point to the government members

once again: surely we can lend money to people in agriculture at interest rates better than those at which we're lending money to other provinces in Canada. Surely we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, as far as agriculture is concerned, a second objective of ours in this session is to get out on the table in this Assembly the facts with regard to the take-over of the hog marketing board.

I never cease to be amazed at the way this government is able to reward former cabinet ministers. Just in the past week we have seen two more of those rewards.

DR. BUCK: Old Lougheed buddies.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Dickie, the former minister of energy, is now going to apply his abilities . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Considerable abilities.

MR. R. CLARK: His considerable abilities, I assume. It was unfortunate, if they're so considerable, that he was never able to speak when he was minister of energy. But Mr. Dickie is going to be applying his talents to medical research work in Alberta.

Then we have the former Attorney General, Mr. Foster . . .

MR. NOTLEY: World-renowned hog expert.

MR. R. CLARK: . . . who laid upon us the Laycraft inquiry. Now, all of a sudden he is going to be the person who is going to conduct yet another investigation into hog marketing and the whole pork industry in Alberta. The last time I recall Mr. Foster in the Assembly, I would say he was quite a responsible Attorney General. But his abilities in the area of the pork industry really leave me totally beyond understanding.

DR. BUCK: Pork barrelling.

MR. R. CLARK: My colleague says something about pork barrelling. Of course, I would never want to suggest that this government would do that.

DR. BUCK: Never.

MR. R. CLARK: But when you look at the number of studies we've had in this pork industry, the last thing we need is another study. If that's the route the government wants to go, then go the route of a judicial inquiry, so the producers can put what they have out on the table too. Then let's sit down to calling a spade a spade. But this kind of manoeuvre we're going to be involved in now will end up being a great stall. Isn't the end of June the suggested date that it's going to be finished? Bunk. If the hog producers in this province are expecting to get some answers from that inquiry and then, once the inquiry is finished, if it takes the Minister of Agriculture as long to deal with those recommendations as it has to deal with the changes supposedly coming forward with the Agricultural Development Corporation, we should be looking at about a year from now, and Quebec will have more of the pork production in Canada.

One of the very serious concerns about agriculture that all of us have to face is that an increasingly higher percentage of agricultural production is being taken over by other provinces in Canada. The most recent information I have is that Alberta is producing a smaller portion

of Canada's total pork output; a very good likelihood that same kind of thing is going to happen as far as dairy production is concerned. The legacy of the '70s may very well be that Alberta has produced a smaller percentage of the total agricultural output at the end of the '70s than at the start.

I hear the members on the front bench snickering. I'd be quite prepared to arrange a meeting for them with the hog producers, or a number of dairy farmers, or people trying to get loans through the Agricultural Development Corporation who have been told to go to the banks and pay 17.5 per cent. You can snicker to them. It's no laughing matter at all.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, I had the opportunity to tour four of the anticipated and present growth centres in the province outside Edmonton and Calgary. I was in Peace River, Grande Prairie, the Cold Lake-Grand Centre area, and Red Deer. I believe we must learn two lessons from what is taking place in those areas now.

One lesson has to be that surely we can plan better for the next Cold Lake-Grand Centre than we have to date in that area. One of the points that's made very often to me every time I go to that area is: why didn't the local government people know about what was happening prior to the announcement being made in Edmonton? Why was it that virtually all sorts of people in Edmonton knew about it before local governments did and had a chance to prepare for that?

One of the things we must do in the future — whether it's the next Cold Lake-Grand Centre, the next Fort MacKay, the next Peace River, or wherever — is to take into trust local governments in those areas. Those people aren't foolish. They're every bit as able as we are in this Assembly. When major developments of the kind we're talking about are going to go ahead, they deserve to know about them ahead of time, to have a chance to do some preparing so that their municipalities are not caught with every speculator going by and picking up land. I would say to members of the Assembly: remember, the people who elect those local governments — which so often in this Assembly we don't trust — are the very same people who elect us to this Legislative Assembly.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have to learn from the kind of development that has taken place, whether it's in Red Deer where they've had from a 6 to 9 per cent increase in the last four or five years, phenomenal growth — I would say the people in Red Deer have basically handled that growth very, very well. They're to be commended. The people in Grande Prairie right now are grappling very diligently, I think, with very rapid growth.

But it seems to me this government has the idea that we can't make some concessions to rapid growth areas. We're absolutely going to have to if we're to prevent unnecessary problems in the future. When you look at the housing costs in Grande Prairie today, the possibility of a young couple being able to acquire a home there without both being committed to work for a tremendous number of years is very, very unlikely.

So if we've learned nothing from the growth centres we've had to date, let's apply the fact that those local government people — be they school boards, municipal councillors, or hospital trustees — are as able and as concerned about their communities as we are. We have to take them into our confidence if we're going to prepare this province and those rapid growth areas for the future.

Secondly, those growth areas are going to have to get special kinds of consideration. We look at a place like

Peace River. If my memory is accurate, in about 1984 or 1985 a very important decision is going to have to be made: whether or not the *in situ* plant in the Peace River area will move ahead. If it does, it means tremendous growth in that area. Now is the time we should be sitting down with the people in the Peace River area and doing some of the planning, putting some of the infrastructure in place.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that will call on Members of the Legislative Assembly on both sides of the House to resist the opportunity to say, but you have 300 serviced lots over here that aren't being used this year or next year. It would seem to me that that would be the kind of criticism the government could fend off very easily. Yes, and we get a snicker once again from the government benches. Even I have enough confidence in this government that it could defend something like that. If it were 500 or 1,000 lots in a place like Peace River, it would be money well spent, rather than always playing catch-up and never being ahead of the game when these developments come down the pike.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think there are some goals or objectives that we as a province should aim for during the 1980s. I for one don't plan to be here for all the 1980s. But I would say there are at least six goals which I think would be very much in the best interests of Alberta.

We should get serious about truly diversifying our economy in this province. The pillars of that diversification, in addition to our non-renewable resources, should be small business, the tourist industry, and agriculture. Let's not try to kid ourselves that we're doing a great job of diversification when we talk about the petrochemical industry, not realizing that's part of the non-renewable resource base in this province. That should be one of our targets at the end of the '80s: let's see where we will be in comparison with where we are now as far as real, meaningful diversification is concerned.

A second, very desirable goal, in my opinion, is to get really serious about decentralization of government in this province. It doesn't mean telling universities where they're going to locate. It doesn't mean taking over hog marketing boards one morning. It doesn't mean making the Local Authorities Board process more inward looking. It doesn't mean keeping government tighter and tighter, more and more closed. It means trusting those people out there across this province, whom we trust on election day but not very much after that. If the argument is good to put to Ottawa, the argument is very valid as far as this province is concerned as we move through the 1980s.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, during the first 75 years of this province, the great emphasis has been on resource development, with good justification. I think we'd be very wise during the '80s to make a very firm commitment that people are our most important resource. We should invest in the people of this province and make the 1980s the decade of people resources.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, as an objective or goal I would see us maximizing the opportunity for individual Albertans for ownership in future tar sands plants, not through the Alberta Energy Company or some other government vehicle, but making as a term of condition for future plants going ahead an opportunity for individual Albertans to have as a part of their heritage a right to acquire or purchase shares in future tar sands plant ventures.

Fifthly, I'd like for us in this province to be leaders in Canada in what I refer to as the public right to know,

rather than being dragged into the 1980s on that particular issue. I should say, though, in fairness to the government, that it was a refreshing move last Friday when the Minister of Government Services tabled the public opinion poll. That was a move in the right direction.

Sixthly, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to re-emphasize the point I made in my opening remarks. I see us living in a strong province, and as Albertans we play a strong role within Canada in making Canada strong. If we cope with internal problems in both Quebec and Saskatchewan, and some of the long-term economic grievances for western Canada, I hope that both Alberta and Canada can be tremendously exciting places in the 1980s.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Member for Edson and the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods for moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne in this 75th year of our province. I would like to congratulate you too, Mr. Speaker, on your commendable handling of the House, sometimes under some trying conditions.

The Lieutenant-Governor no doubt was proud to read the speech in this 75th year of our province. He has seen many changes since he came here at the turn of the century with his family.

There are those who would like to play down the 75th celebrations. I can say, however, that it is an honor for me to speak here today in the throne speech debate, and say I believe the 75th committee is doing a commendable job. If those who would be so negative about the 75th would become involved and focus on the many worthwhile projects going on throughout the province, they might find they are in the minority.

Along with the projects the 75th committee is sponsoring, the municipalities this year will be spending upwards of \$42 million on projects they believe are needed for their communities. This will leave a legacy for the coming generations. Many things have been done in this province since 1905, when we were known as hewers of wood and drawers of water. Things have changed. Alberta is fortunate in having been endowed with an abundance of natural resources: oil, gas, rich agricultural land, forests, and the list goes on. However, we must never lose sight of the fact that as elected representatives we are here to serve the people and to be sensitive to their needs and recognize that our role is also to foster a good economic climate throughout the province.

I was pleased to see our government emphasize four priorities in the Speech from the Throne: hospital construction, housing, manpower training, and highways and roads. These will greatly assist my constituency.

I would now like to speak about some of the things that are going on in my constituency. Oil and gas, which have helped the economy and made it very buoyant, have led to rapid growth in the north, particularly in my constituency. This has also brought many problems to the forefront, which should be considerably lessened by some of these four priorities. Exploration and service companies in the Deep Basin near Grande Prairie have based their operations in Beaverlodge and Grande Prairie. This has placed upon the municipalities unusual demands for services, recreation, housing, and transportation. For example, the town of Beaverlodge has considerably expanded; twice in the last year or two it has had to go for annexations for subdivisions. So great was the town's expansion that it will be forced to go to the Wapiti River some 14 miles away for its water supply. This expenditure to the community is in the neighbourhood of \$5 million.

This is an example of some of the problems it is causing for some of the municipal governments.

With the amount of gas in the Elmworth gas field, we have feedstock for a fertilizer plant in the north. I would like to mention that the need for fertilizer in northern Alberta and the B.C. block could very well handle a fertilizer plant. My understanding is that fertilizer will become short by 1985, and I would like to put on record that I think the next plant should be built in northern Alberta to use up some of those sulphur and gas supplies.

Another problem related to oil and gas exploration is the heavy traffic in the north caused by drilling and exploration. Many of our municipal and market roads were built to carry farm loads of 45,000 pounds. Today heavy equipment and trucks haul loads of 120,000 and more — three times what the roads were built to stand. It puts an unfair burden on the municipalities to try to maintain these roads on the very little extra revenue they get from that. I would urge the government to expand the resource road program and assist municipalities with extra funding where heavy drilling and exploration are being carried out.

Because of heavy oil activity in the Beaverlodge area, we have another problem. B.C. trucks are coming into Alberta, taking work away from our Alberta truckers because of licensing restrictions in the province of B.C. I believe this is an unfair disadvantage to the people of northern Alberta, because the B.C. government has scales on its borders checking every truck that goes in. We do not; we have a couple of men through the Solicitor General's Department who try to maintain check on licensing, but are unable to because of the vast area they have to cover.

While I am speaking, I would also like to stress the need for the five-year block funding on our primary and secondary roads in the province, an expansion of the resource road program, and an intensified rehabilitation program for the primary and secondary road system.

The intense drilling between Grande Prairie and Grande Cache also creates another problem. The oil companies and lumber companies working near the Kakwa River will need to build a bridge across that river. With co-operation and an early announcement of Highway 40, I believe several million dollars could be saved if those oil companies and the government shared the cost of the bridge across the Kakwa River. I'm not saying the total road should be built at this time, but if we were to have the proper alignment and do some of it in conjunction with the oil companies, I believe we could save some money.

The drilling sites and pipeline extensions have been taking a considerable amount of good farmland out of production, with the targets in the drilling areas being in the centre of the quarter. As you realize, if you take approximately 10 acres out of the centre of the quarter, you're removing a good portion of good farmland. Through the two associations in the Grande Prairie area, we're hoping we can convince the ERCB to move that target area to the northeast corner, thereby cutting down that farmland waste by at least half.

If we continue to use up our good farmland around urban centres, oil sites, and pipelines, I think we are going to have to make provision to open up more Crown land and more homesteads. If we are going to continue to supply the nation with food, I think we must make provision to replace that land, preferably by homesteads. I believe there is also a move for younger people to go into farming, but land prices today make it virtually

impossible for them to get started. Under the present lending programs, if their parents have money, they're unable to qualify for loans. In his report to the House later, I hope the minister will have something that might handle some of those concerns.

I would now like to speak about housing in Grande Prairie. Last year the rate of housing starts doubled and ranked third in the province next to Edmonton and Calgary. This still has left almost a zero vacancy rate, creating other effects on the area. The new housing programs will greatly assist my area. Because of lack of accommodations, businesses are unable to get skilled and semi-skilled labor.

A labour-need study completed last August pointed out that the city was 1,100 workers short, with a forecast of 2,500 this summer. This has created increasing wage hikes. One recent example was a cafe operator who advertised for waitresses at \$10 an hour. This changes the complexion on salaries throughout the area.

In advanced education, I would like to mention that because of high rents in Grande Prairie and the lack of student residences, this year enrolment in Grande Prairie Regional College has not increased. But I don't think student residences totally have caused that. Because of high wages in the area, I think many students are deciding to go out to work for a few years while the wages are high and maybe carry on their education later.

I believe nursing training should be taught in Grande Prairie college and Keyano College because of the critical shortage of nurses in northern Alberta. In the case of Grande Prairie, I believe that if those courses were started fairly soon, nurses could complete the clinical portion of their training later, when the Grande Prairie hospital is completed.

Grande Prairie Regional College has also carried on very successful woodlands training courses. I believe these courses should be expanded, and probably will be, to help supply the personnel that will be needed in the Berland timber area and the Fox Creek area.

I would like to mention a few things about my constituency. I'm proud of the community of Hythe. Hythe, in the west end of the county, continues to grow. As I mentioned last spring, that village built and paid for their own senior citizens' lodge. Now they are going to build a 25-bed nursing home, which they will pay for themselves through Alberta Home Mortgage financing. Until a few years ago, this community was struggling for existence. But with the several gas plants, the nearby village is starting to grow. The replacement of the Hythe hospital, in the announcement by the minister today, to be built in conjunction with the nursing home, will greatly benefit the people of the west end of my constituency. On behalf of the constituents in that area, I would like to thank the minister for his announcement here this afternoon.

Another centre in my constituency that has been growing rapidly, and that has recently been elevated to town status, is the town of Sexsmith. When the rapeseed plant was placed in Sexsmith, it had an impact on the village. It has continued to grow, with the employees of the rapeseed plant and as a bedroom community of Grande Prairie, to town status today. I have tried to give you an overview of what has happened in my constituency in the last year, and some of the problems that growth has brought.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke after the throne speech last year, I spoke about the people of Grande Prairie and the nearby communities who were looking forward to the 1980 Winter Games. As I stand and speak now, I am

proud to say that the Alberta Winter Games, carried out at the end of February and early March in the city of Grande Prairie and the town of Sexsmith, and assisted by surrounding areas, were truly a successful event. Through community spirit and volunteer participation, over 2,300 athletes attended for the full three days and took part in the various events. Over 3,000 volunteers were used to put on those games, and they carried out those games under the direction of a board of directors. This group carried on a very successful telethon in which they raised \$105,000 in 24 hours. The directors and volunteers are to be congratulated for that hard work. After paying for the games, they expect to turn over to the city a legacy of about \$100,000 for some future sporting facility.

I am proud to represent northern Alberta as the chairman of the Northern Alberta Development Council. The branch is now located and settled in Peace River as a further step of decentralization by this government. Although some were opposed to the move at the outset, such as we are hearing from the staff of Athabasca University, our branch staff thoroughly enjoy the advantages of living in a small centre. And once Athabasca University is moved, I think those people who are against it will finally realize there are many advantages to living in a small community.

On March 3, 1980, we held a dinner for some members of the Northern Alberta Development Council who were retiring. The new members have been appointed and will meet early in April to carry out the work of that council and to represent their various regions. This time we were able to get a better representation across the northern Alberta development area through the appointment of members to that board. The council will continue to listen and monitor needs of the northern Alberta citizens and make those needs known to government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if the vigorous economic growth of the north continues, we will become a very important participant in the general economy of this province. Along with the rest of the province, northern Alberta is also fortunate to have the abundance of oil and gas, rich agricultural land, and forests, which bring a better way of life and those economic conditions I have mentioned.

I am proud to represent my constituency in this dynamic province in our 75th year as a province of Canada. I might close by saying I am proud to be a Canadian, I'm proud to be an Albertan, and I'm proud to represent the constituency of Grande Prairie.

Thank you very much.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I please move to adjourn debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the motion by the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, this is the second opportunity I've had to speak on the Speech from the Throne. It was just a little over a year ago that I was elected to this Legislature, and shortly thereafter I spoke to the first Speech from the Throne in my legislative experience. Many people spoke before I did, and I listened very carefully and attentively to what they had to say. Each one would invariably get up and commend you on your appointment. At that time, since I was new to the Legislature and wasn't that familiar with your responsibilities or that well acquainted with you, sir, I didn't know if it would be appropriate for me to make any comments, in that they wouldn't be heartfelt. But after being here a year and seeing you in the leadership you've given this Legislature, your well-reasoned rulings, your deliberation, your graciousness, your consideration, and the equity and fairness of your rulings, I can say that your appointment was very worthy, sir, and I appreciate the opportunity I've had to serve under you in the last year. I look forward to three more years of the same.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my comments to two aspects of the throne speech. The first is in regard to the Crowsnest Pass freight rates, and the second is in regard to national unity.

The Crowsnest freight rates are conspicuous in the throne speech inasmuch as they're not even mentioned. The reason I'd like to talk about them is because of the comments made in regard to agriculture; that is, the government's declaration that it intends to pursue the initiatives it has already started in improving the grain handling and transportation system. In my opinion the approach outlined in the throne speech is a good approach. It talks about three particular areas: the Prince Rupert grain terminal, the purchase of hopper cars, and the inland terminals. I say it's a good approach because it takes an overall viewpoint in regard to the problem. More often than not when we deal with problems we look at only particular or specific components and don't pay enough concern or attention to the overall situation. I sometimes refer to the Crowsnest Pass freight rates part of the grain handling and transportation system as the Linus syndrome. There was an old farmer named Linus, who had difficulties with his crops. There was a plague of locusts; there was drought; there were hail storms. His only cry was to raise his arm to the sky and say, damn the CPR.

Now I think it is too easy to do something like that and say that the problem with our grain system today is just the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. I don't believe that's the only problem, but the Crow rates are receiving a lot of attention today from railways, producers, governments, the Canadian Wheat Board, cattle growers' associations, whoever you'd like to name. I'd like to review the Crowsnest Pass rates a little, to bring us to a common understanding today and try to identify where we are going with them, and then lead into the question of national unity.

The Crowsnest freight rates are nothing new. They originated or were initiated in Canada in 1897 in response to a definite need in our country. The first was a need for transportation facilities in southwestern Alberta and southeastern British Columbia through the Crowsnest Pass. That area of our country is blessed with many raw materials: minerals, forest products. At the end of the century, many railways wished to serve that area: the Burlington Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Kootenay & Elk, among others. But all these were American railroads, and the commerce of our country was being

directed north and south, whereas at the time there was a national desire to see our economy develop in an east-west direction.

So the federal government reached an agreement with CP Rail. In return for promising the railway \$11,000 a mile, plus \$3.6 million or thereabout, plus multiple land rights, a line was built west from Lethbridge to Nelson, British Columbia. In return the railway set a freight rate for the carrying of grain and flour to various points from the prairie provinces.

Between 1897 and 1925-27, that agreement was amended, abrogated, revised, chucked out, and brought in many times. So the Crowsnest Pass freight rate agreement really came to an end. But in 1927 it was replaced by an Act of Parliament which incorporated low rates in perpetuity for grain, flour, and similar by-products moving from the prairies to export points.

That freight rate set in 1927 still exists today. It has not changed and is a very low rate. In railway parlance that rate is about half a cent per ton mile; that is, for one ton of product carried one mile the shipper would pay half a cent. In comparison, the next lowest railway freight rate is about 2.6 cents per ton mile, or roughly five times as high as the rate on grain. Most rates, however, average much higher than that. The highest class of rate is about 4.5 cents per ton mile, which is about nine times as high as the price of grain.

Now something went wrong somewhere, and the railways began to scratch their heads. If they were only getting this low rate for grain, and it was a rate set in 1927, what was happening to their profit margin? Or was there one? That question was answered for them in 1961 when the McPherson royal commission on transportation initiated some of the first costing procedures for railways. Railways were never really cost conscious. They were revenue conscious. They weren't too concerned about their costs as long as they were making money overall.

As a result of that cost commission, it was discovered that the railways were losing money on the movement of grain. Now railway people may not be the brightest people in the world, but certainly they weren't going to continue hauling grain at a loss. So they started to neglect the service they gave the grain industry. As a result, today it is generally agreed that the physical plant railways possess is inadequate to service the western grain industry.

For the last 20 years the railways have been lobbying for change in the Crowsnest Pass or statutory freight rates. However, they've been alone. They haven't had much support until just recently, I'd say the last five years, maybe 10, when it came to expert opinion. Generally the public would not support them. But now there is a lot of public support for changing the Crowsnest Pass or statutory freight rates, and that support is coming from the farmers, the producers themselves. They've seen their industry grow since the turn of the century and prosper through the wars, but now they're faced with a situation where they have an excess production situation. They can't sell all they can produce.

There are many statistics to substantiate that. But one good comparison they make, which I would like to relate, is the performance of the Canadian export industry relative to the American. In 1940, Canada was exporting approximately 4 million tons of grain and grain products, whereas the United States was exporting only 3 million tons. So in 1940, Canada was ahead 4 to 3. In 1950, the numbers had changed. The United States was exporting 7 million tons and Canada only 4; we were behind 7 to 4.

In 1960, the score had changed again. The Americans were exporting 14 million tons and Canada 5 million tons. Ten years later, the score had changed dramatically again. It was U.S. 29, Canada 9. In 1979, the score stood at approximately U.S. 100, Canada 10.

If I was a farmer, I too would ask the question: what has happened between 1940 and 1970? In 1940, Canada was winning 4 to 3. In 1979, the Americans had far outpaced us and were winning 100 million tons to 10 million tons. Surely we Canadians have missed out somewhere. But where does the blame lie? Is it with the Canadian Wheat Board and its marketing practices? Is it with the terminals, the congestion at the ports? Is it with the railways, the grain elevators, the farmers?

Too often we point our finger at just one component and say, there's the problem, or, if we fix up this particular item, we won't have the situation as it is any longer. I commend this government for not doing that. This government hasn't pointed its finger at one component. It has identified and looked at the entire system, and has taken action in all areas and will do well there.

The problem we have today, regarding the Crow rates, is how do we change them? What's the difference between the cost of moving the grain and what the railways are getting? Various estimates of this have been made, and it's difficult to determine with any precision how much money the railways are losing. It depends on whether we or the railways are doing the costing. There's no general agreement on the exact range. Some people feel it may be \$200 million a year shortfall, whereas others feel the shortfall may be around \$400 million.

In any case the question has to be asked: who should make up this difference, and to whom should the difference be paid? Should it be paid to the railways? And if the railways are paid that money, will there be any assurance that they will improve their physical plant so that the western grain industry will be adequately served? Should the money be paid to the producers? And if the money is paid to the producers, is there any assurance that there will be a natural and efficient allocation of their efforts and resources? Who should pay the money? Should it be the federal or the provincial government? Is the prairie industry in need of a subsidy? Should the national interest be to support the prairie economy?

There are a lot of questions associated with this subject, and a lot of questions that need answers in the short term if we're to have an efficient, well-run system in the long run. As I pose these questions, I wish I could give you the answers. There aren't any easy answers.

One thing that comes clear to me as I discuss this subject is the broad nature and scope of the situation. It doesn't involve just the producers. It doesn't involve just the railways, the terminal people. It doesn't involve just one province. It involves a lot of provinces, and the federal government as well, which leads me to national unity, the second question I wish to address. Just where do the jurisdictions lie, and where do we as individual Canadians stand in the solution of this and associated problems? Canada has always had a history, whereas its citizens have been groping for their identity. When I was growing up and going to school, the major question was: who are we; what is a Canadian?

In the early 1970s, Mr. Speaker, I was a resident of Montreal, Quebec. Montreal is a beautiful city; it's a very nice place to live. I especially enjoyed the culture of the French-Canadian people. But I was in Quebec at a very trying time for them. At that time legislation for language rights, or language Bills — whichever way you want to

look at it — was just being introduced. I had two children. My son was five and my daughter three. Both of them would be going to school shortly, and the legislation would impact on their education. My daughter now attends a bilingual school in Calgary, and has gone to a bilingual school all her life. But she's gone to a bilingual school by choice. In Quebec she wouldn't have had that choice.

An unfortunate thing that happened to my family while we were in Montreal in the early '70s was the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte, a former Member of the National Assembly, and of the British official James Cross. Having lived in Quebec for that time, and having enjoyed it and the people, it was very disappointing for me and very disconcerting, very disruptive, for the whole country when Pierre Laporte was murdered.

But after that event, after discussing it with my wife, it didn't take me much time to decide to leave Quebec and come back to Alberta where I was born and raised. We could live and do the things we wanted to do without fears such as the Laporte thing and language legislation. We wanted to be free to do our thing, to develop in a country, a province, an area where a man could do what he wanted to do or a person could be responsible for his own success or failure.

I think that as grave as that situation was in the early '70s, that's behind us. I believe it was a very traumatic experience for Canada. But I also believe that, one way or another, Canada has been going through these types of experiences since Confederation. We've always had one group or region, or one crisis after another, where we've asked ourselves, who are we and are we going to stay together?

Western Canadian separatism is not new. We've always had western separatist rump groups. The CCF was one. The Social Credit had its origin that way as well; you might say NDP and the farmers' associations too. So we're back there today, and we have a crisis before us in terms of oil pricing, the constitutional jurisdiction over these matters. Having gone through these others, I'm not that unsettled by it, because I know that we as Canadians will resolve this issue in our own way, and we will go on being a country, being Canadians. I don't mean to say that I don't support this province's stand in terms of getting fair market value for our production. And certainly I support the very tough, hard negotiating position taken by the Premier of Alberta. I think that's the only way we can go.

I think this is a time in our country's history when it would be well for each of us — each Member of this Legislative Assembly, every Albertan, and every Canadian — to ask a question of himself. I will ask that question from an Albertan's point of view. I think we as Albertans have to ask ourselves: are we Albertans living in Alberta, are we Albertans living in Canada, or are we Canadians living in Alberta? There's no doubt in my mind where I stand on this question. I'm a Canadian living in Alberta. I'm a Canadian strong, I'm a Canadian free, I'm a Canadian independent, and I'm a Canadian who loves his country.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, it's a great honor to me too, to stand here and represent the Vermilion-Viking constituency, and speak to the throne speech. I'm not a rookie like some of the others. This is my fifth year; in a couple of days it'll be a full five years, and I've enjoyed it very much. I would have to agree with the other speakers, particularly the speaker from Calgary Buffalo, on how

well you have carried out your function as Speaker of this Legislature.

Growing up through the years, I never could imagine that I'd ever be in this situation or in this Legislature, having to account for some of the things that happened. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that with the throne speech and the things that are in it, in particular those things that most affect my constituency — I suppose I'm one of the very fortunate representatives in this government who can boast that in the announcement by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care this afternoon, we have two new hospitals, one being constructed at Viking, which is going to be a great boon to the town and area, and another at Vermilion, well on its way.

I have to commend the minister for making decisions and doing things, and laying it out very, very well so we all know where we stand when it comes to hospital construction and other health care facilities. I really admire the man and the role he has taken in dealing with a very touchy situation.

In hospitals, as in other health care, I think we have to keep very mindful of the balance and costs that are in store. Having spent a lot of time during my life in the hospital — a lot more than I would like — and without saying anything nasty about any one hospital in particular, I just can't help but sincerely compare the care, attention, treatment, and welfare you receive in a smaller rural hospital, and the larger, more streamlined hospital, albeit much better in technical terms of medical care. In actual patient care, there is absolutely no comparison between the care you'd receive in a small rural hospital and in a large urban hospital. I don't mean that in any way but good. I'm just so happy that the minister has taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, and made these decisions to continue with a vigorous hospital program.

I'd also like to commend the Minister of Housing and Public Works on his straightforward, honest approach, and the fact that he does care and listen in the area of housing. Innisfree is a very small village in my constituency, and we've asked for senior citizens' housing because there are a few families who no longer wish to live on the farm, or are no longer able to, and want housing. It's just so easy to get four units out there. It's a start, and the people are really, really happy that we have a government that listens and, in particular, a minister who listens. I'm just so thrilled about that.

Our four priorities in the Speech from the Throne were hospitals, housing, and manpower training. Over the weekend I talked to two different businessmen about other matters. Both of them had apprentices going to Lakeland College, staying right at home. There's a very critical manpower shortage in every area in the province, and by being able to take their apprenticeship right at home, these people were able to go back and work on weekends and in the evenings, and help the business out and really keep things rolling.

When I took my technical training in Calgary, I remember that by the time I got home on the weekend I was just about ready to turn around and go back. Not that I didn't want to come home; it was the fact it was such a long drive and I couldn't really be of any assistance other than maybe to kiss my wife and hold the kids for a while, and be reminded that I'd have to change a diaper every once in a while. So to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and those before him who have made this possible, I can assure you that we in the country really appreciate it.

Our fourth priority was highways and roads — not that

there are only four priorities in the throne speech. Although I've grumbled, and have certainly been grumbled at on many occasions, about the condition of our roads, when you stop to realize that the vigorous growth we've had, the complete underbuilding of roads — at the time, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that any person in charge of road building would probably have thought they were adequate. But with our superheated economy, with a sort of 'megafeeling' in everything, and with the heavy trucks and the extra-heavy drilling and other activities, our road system just hasn't been able to take it. We're very pleased that on our secondary road program last year, many miles of 881 were built to heavy standards, good standards which will take modern traffic for many years. On 881, 619, and 870, there's more work to be done. I have to compliment the Minister of Transportation and his predecessor. However, I can't let it go by, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, without nagging the minister a little about the condition of Highway 41. We've just got to do something for a few miles there, and continue with 36 a bit too, along with a few other roads we won't get into tonight. Having said that, and probably lost 10 miles of paving I was expecting this year, I will try to deal with agriculture.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo was eloquent as always in how he described the Crow rate and what it meant to us out here on the prairies. But I have to remind our city cousin it isn't just the Crow rate. There are many things. It's not just the railroad, as he said, although I think I could sometimes agree with the farmer when he swore at the railway. If you have to swear at somebody, it's either the railway or the government, and I'd just as soon he swear at the railway. But I believe our government has made the right step. In fact, I'm sure that if we start at tidewater and work the system back, look at Prince Rupert and iron out all the problems, or what little problems there are, a lot of the major problems like the Crow rate may very well disappear if we can get the grain moving through the port.

As well, we're going to have to take a look at our grading methods, the pricing of our grain on date of delivery, and whether it's a delivery made just because you want to clean out your bins or whether it's because you're asked to bring in a particular sample or grade of grain. I think we have to build more incentive into actual grain delivery at the farm. Even though we have to have incentive for the railway to haul grain from the prairie elevator to the seaport, we also have to have incentive for the farmer to do exactly the same. There's just no question that it goes hand in hand.

We've heard a lot in the last few months and in the last few years about interest rates and their steady increase. It probably couldn't come at a worse time for us out here on the prairies, particularly in Alberta. It affects every one of us. It's a serious concern, and it's certainly a situation we've got to deal with. I don't know how we're going to deal with it. I've certainly got some ideas that I won't expound tonight, but we must look at interest rates and a number of other things in the overall Canadian sense. Although I agree that we should be united as a nation, we can't talk about national unity without looking at some of these problems together. I certainly wouldn't want to see us trade off our natural resources or our renewable resources for a benefit on interest rates unless it affected the whole country. We shouldn't have to pay just to get a benefit that probably ends up costing us a lot more money.

Mr. Speaker, I know some changes are going to be

made in interest rates and in helping the young homeowner, the young farmer, and the young businessman. But in all this we mustn't forget those other people, usually around my age, who are in business. We can't afford to expand; certainly, interest rates are up to discourage people from borrowing. But some people are in a position where they have to borrow. So we have to look at the entire field. We can't just look at the homeowner and forget about small business and larger businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say how pleased I am with the growth of our parks and our tourism industry in this province. In my area we have the Battle River and Lakeland tourist zones. Both are thriving areas and mean a whole lot to our overall economy. We're very fortunate to have in Alberta so many different types of scenery for our people. With the Stamp Around Alberta program and the number of people visiting and staying here in Alberta, it's just tremendous. I don't suppose another province in Canada can honestly say they have turned around tourism and had it stay at home, as has happened here in Alberta.

I would probably be remiss if I didn't mention how very pleased I was to hear that Athabasca University was moving to Athabasca. We always wondered why the Member for Athabasca seemed to be losing hair. I suppose it will grow back now. But if we're going to have a diversified economy and prove to smaller centres that we're prepared to decentralize, we must continue to decentralize. Early in this government's life there was a great decentralization program: the Agricultural Development Corporation, the Alberta Opportunity Company, the environmental centre at Vegreville, and many, many other things. It needs a real blockbuster — no offence — like the Athabasca University move, to make people realize that this government is committed to decentralization. Some people are going to grumble about it and maybe leave, but overall I'm sure it will certainly pay off in the end.

Before I wrap up this evening, I'd like to point out quickly to our city cousins that 90 per cent of all the machinery we use on farms in Alberta is imported. We have to start taking a much more serious look at what we are doing with machinery manufacture. Now I know there was a remark by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I certainly didn't want to make a personal attack on what he says, although there was lots of room and scope for that. He mentioned a particular loan where something didn't work out and I thought, if this government isn't willing to take chances on businesses — whether it's in the tourism industry, in machinery, in young farmers or young businessmen, or whatever — if we don't take chances and are not willing to underwrite some losses without being harangued, badgered, and bullied because we have taken a chance, and we do all the smart things, lend money the smart way, and have lots of security for everything we do to keep people off our back, then I don't think we're much of a government or much for leadership. I think we have to encourage the Agricultural Development Corporation and the Alberta Opportunity Company to say, okay, we will take those chances, we'll get burnt. We should be prepared to accept higher losses in our loans to businesses and individuals. God knows we take high enough risks in our housing loans and some of the other ones. I think we have to be prepared to take a greater risk in some of our businesses and farms.

I was listening to an engineer one night talking about businesses. He's in business himself as an agricultural machinery manufacturer in this province. He said that 60

per cent of Canadian growth in employment is by companies with 20 employees or less. Sixty per cent of the total growth in employment is in these smaller companies. Of this, 83 per cent was with 14 employees or less; of that, 50 per cent employed four or less. So we have to take a look, not that we're doing that badly. I'm told that we're probably doing much better than anyone else in Canada in this regard, but I think we can do better.

I don't think a person ever works as hard as when he has to meet a payroll or explain something to his wife. I think we can get much more production out of people if we can encourage them and show them that when they get ready and have the management skills and have saved a little money, then they can probably come to the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation or the Alberta Opportunity Company, and we can overcome some of these disparities. I'm not talking only farm machinery but every other sector.

Before I wrap up, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just point out to hon. country cousins: somebody is going to get up tonight or later in the throne speech and talk about solar energy and what we are doing to utilize solar energy. Well, I'd like to point out that farmers are the greatest users of solar energy. They are net savers of solar energy in growing of crops. I would like to suggest to people that we can probably do better in other energy fields than concentrating and spending too much time worrying about solar energy, when I believe our farming people out here are doing as well as anyone in the world in the utilization of solar energy.

Thank you.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and join in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As I do, I'd like to make some prefatory comments. I'd like to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor, the Honourable Frank Lynch-Staunton. I thought he delivered a very fine speech to the Assembly. It's a real pleasure to have that gentleman with us and serving the people of Alberta. I'd like to congratulate the hon. Member for Edson. He delivered a very fine speech kicking off the debate, and gave us a very fine report of developments in his constituency and in the province. The hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods gave a similar kind of speech, where he reported on progress in his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I think we in the Assembly would all agree that the growth in all areas of the province is truly remarkable. I think that's a real credit to the administration of the province and the Executive Council. It's a real pleasure to be associated with this government.

This evening I'd like to give not so much a report on developments in the province and a litany of the physical developments. I think we're all aware of the opportunities and the growth taking place. I recall that not so many years ago when I was born the province had 1 million people. Today, 28 years later, it has 2 million. I'm reminded that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has produced a study showing that in about another decade the province will reach roughly 3 million people. That's an enormous pattern of growth; it's a real challenge and an opportunity. In our 75th year, that is really a remarkable accomplishment. It's remarkable because our history is a short one. It's remarkable because so much has been accomplished by so few people in a virgin territory where settlers first arrived 75 or 80 years ago. It's even more remarkable when we think not in terms of the physical developments but the values

we've maintained: freedom and peace, prosperity, and the development of a society.

I'd like to address two aspects in my speech this evening: Canadian unity, with a perspective on some accidents and problems in history; and why it's so important that we re-adjust Confederation for the future, not just for ourselves in Alberta but for the country as a whole.

If you'll bear with me, I'd like to take you back to the Seven Years' War in the 1750s and '60s, and tell you the story of an empire that collapsed and a confederation modelled on the same model the British used to develop their American colonies, which inevitably led to the disruption of that empire and which I feel may well lead to the disruption of Canadian Confederation, based on the same structure. If you remember back to 1759, when Wolfe was scaling the cliffs of Quebec, his colleagues, like Clive in India, were doing much the same sort of work, bringing vast new territories into the British colonial empire. Until the Seven Years' War in 1750, Britain truly had a federal empire. By that I mean it had a central parliament which dealt with matters of a general concern and local legislatures or assemblies in each of the Thirteen Colonies, and other colonies as well, which dealt with matters of a local concern — very similar to the set-up we have today with a central parliament in Ottawa, dealing with matters of a general concern, and legislatures like this one that we are all so proud to be members of.

However, after the war, Britain found it necessary to reconsolidate its colonial empire. It had so much territory, so many new subjects, that it had to develop a new framework, a new system. Remember, too, that the theory of the British Empire was to have a mercantile economy. By that I mean the colonies were to provide raw materials and ship them to the mother country in return for finished or manufactured goods which were processed and sent back. I suggest that we have a similar set-up in Canada today.

The British had two choices after the Seven Years' War. They could have centralized, as they did in a series of laws we're all familiar with if we've studied the history of the American Revolution: the Stamp Act, the Navigation Act, a number of measures to restrict the autonomy of the local legislatures and bring them into the orbit of the central parliament. Britain made a fundamental mistake when she moved in that direction and, as a result, lost her first empire.

Today we have a government in Ottawa that is moving in similar directions to restrict the autonomy and ability of local legislatures to develop their respective territories. As the central Parliament restricts the activities of the local legislatures, it forces the legislatures — the people in this Chamber and in other chambers, the National Assembly in Quebec — to dig in their heels and reassert their rights.

The Declaratory Act of 1766 was one of the chief mechanisms Britain used to restrict rights. They adopted a theoretical approach to federalism in their day. The theoretical approach was that Parliament at Westminster had the absolute right to do anything it wanted and could override the legislatures in the colonies. Some of the words used are that the colonies:

... have been, are, and of right, ought to be subordinate unto and dependent upon the Imperial Crown and Parliament of Great Britain.

Further, they went on to say that Parliament had:

... full power and authority to make laws, and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the

colonies and [the] people of America in all cases, whatsoever.

That's not so different from some of the wording you'll find in the British North America Act under the peace, order, and good government sections, the powers of general taxation, and the powers to appoint a Supreme Court that would interpret the constitution. That power rests with the federal or central government.

It's my thesis that the road Britain travelled in 1765 is the same road the central government in Ottawa is travelling today. If anyone has studied history, the value of the study of times past is that we don't necessarily repeat the same mistakes our forefathers did.

Let's look at Canada and trace its history and compare what's happened. Canada was born out of the American Revolution. It was the territory that chose to remain loyal to the British Crown. It thought of itself not as Canada, but as part of the British orbit. Until 1812 it still considered itself part of the American colonies. Canadians in 1812 believed firmly that if they gave good government to the people of British America, the people of the United States would come to their senses and return to the British Crown. There was a fundamental belief that the republican system, which was a new experiment, would not work, and that the American colonists would come back to the mother country, penitent and accepting of the British system. It wasn't until 1812 that Canada woke up and realized there was a country to the south that was determined not to return to the mother country, and that Canada would have to exist on its own as a separate political jurisdiction.

Of course we're aware that a war was fought in 1812. It was a saw-off. Canada, though, suffered economically. It really wasn't a viable economic unit. Some of the responses to that problem were attempts in the 1820s and '30s to develop and organize the western territories, Ontario as we know it today. Canada became part of the colonial empire of Britain under the same mercantile philosophy, shipping timber, wheat, and furs to the mother country in return for manufactured goods. At the time, Ontario, Quebec, and the maritimes were not that sophisticated economically or politically, and that was a role they could accept.

They ran into problems when the British passed the Corn Laws of 1839 and basically told the Canadian colonists that they were not going to be given preferential treatment for those products they were exporting to Britain, for which they were being given a protective tariff. Like any other jurisdiction, they had to compete with the Americans or any other people who could provide those same services: fish, lumber, furs, wheat. They would compete on the world market.

As a result there was a union Act in 1840, when Canada tried to consolidate. We sought out reciprocity in 1854, because we had a disastrous economic situation, and reciprocity buoyed the Canadian economy until the American Civil War. We were in search of a new motherland. If we couldn't use Britain as a motherland or centre of our colonial mentality, we adopted a new country. We still have that problem today. But we were rebuffed by the United States at the outbreak of the Civil War. Reciprocity was broken off, not by us, from our free will, but by the Americans, who didn't want our problems. So again Canada suffered economically.

What was the result? Canada created its own colonial empire. And here's the rub: Upper and Lower Canada used the model of 1765, that was so disastrous, to set up the new territories it had acquired from Britain. It cen-

tralized authority in a parliament, gave it overriding powers, gave it the mandate to people the west, reserved to itself control of the natural resources, the land. I mentioned that in the British North America Act of 1867, it set up overriding powers of the central government to control commerce, taxation, and the interpretation of the constitution. Really you could say, as W.L. Morton phrased it so well just 30 years ago, that Confederation was set in motion to benefit central Canada. That was its fundamental purpose. The western territories and the maritimes were to be thought of as a colonial hinterland and nothing more. W.L. Morton went on to say that until that fundamental purpose is altered, Confederation will always be unequal and unacceptable to the western territories.

In the last 40 years, the west has developed into a relatively sophisticated and mature community. It's sophisticated economically, and we're witnessing burgeoning economical growth. The petrochemical complex being built in Fort Saskatchewan comes to mind; the industrialization we see all around us, new textile plants, oil and gas discoveries, the tar sands. In Saskatchewan, we have potash and uranium being developed to supplement an economy based on wheat and oil. Manitoba is developing its economy, and so is British Columbia.

We're seeing the growing self-sufficiency and economic diversity of a society. As it grows and becomes more sophisticated, it becomes less and less acceptable to run our interests in a way that is subordinate to the central authority or Ontario. Going back to W.L. Morton's point, until Canada's fundamental purpose is altered, we get unequal treatment. That's unacceptable to a free people — and our heritage is freedom, peace, and liberty. We in Alberta are seeking to become full and equal partners, rather than simply the preserve of an imperial authority to the east which chooses to control our economic destiny to their advantage. Basically, we're saying we don't want to be a colony anymore.

In 1980 we have problems and we have opportunities. It's my belief that Canada is at a crossroads. It can continue the same route that Britain chose in 1765 to administer its colonies, or, as the most recent prime minister of Canada — not the present incumbent, but the great prime minister of late memory — the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, from this province, said, Canada is a community of communities. That's a fundamental difference in approach to the country as a whole as we know it. Canada is a community of communities, of equal partners. We have to strive, not simply for Alberta but for the whole country, to change the fundamental purpose of Confederation.

The reason we have to do that, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to assume our responsibilities as Canadians and as members of a world community. We have to contribute to the rest of humanity and to the arts, humanities, and sciences. That's our real desire. It's not a selfish goal, simply to be more prosperous, to drive bigger cars and have bigger homes. Rather, I would suggest and hope it's that we want to assume our rightful role in the world community so we can make a meaningful contribution, because there is no other purpose to life other than to make life better for our children and for the rest of the world. That, I think, is the basic goal of any mature community.

We cannot live up to that responsibility unless we have the economic and political ability to accomplish those goals. That's really what we're asking for. It's not a selfish desire to accumulate wealth; it is an opportunity or an

attempt to make meaningful contributions to our children and to the rest of the world. We see that, Mr. Speaker, in the medical sciences centre we're developing at the university, and the Alberta Research Council, which is making important strides in development of energy technology, not solely for our own advantage, although that's certainly important, but for the rest of the world. For example, there are important tar sands deposits in Madagascar and Venezuela, and in other parts of the world, and our strides will benefit them as well.

I know that this Legislature applauds the leadership of the Premier and the Executive Council for their work to strengthen and diversify the economy, to make this a more sophisticated society, to take our rightful place in the world, and to make our contributions to the world community. To do that we have to help other provinces seeking to change the fundamental purpose of Confederation. It's simply not acceptable any longer, Mr. Speaker, to be part of a colonial hinterland, and that is what we're after.

From this we will have a stronger Canada, a stronger Alberta. As the previous speaker from Calgary Buffalo pointed out, he is a Canadian first and an Albertan second. So are we all. We simply seek to make Canada realize its full opportunities, all the parts and the whole together. We want to accomplish that by making it possible for the parts to have the political and economic destiny they deserve. That is the genius of this administration in its resolve and efforts to meet that challenge. I applaud the contents of the throne speech which so fully demonstrate the burgeoning and growing community we have, its sophistication, and its political desire to become able to express itself more fully.

Thank you.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it is obviously an occasion of great import to us in this Legislature to be able to stand and speak in this Chamber on the occasion of the 75th Anniversary of this province. As we know, the province itself, topographically, is a very interesting mosaic. It embraces parkland as well as heavy forest, foothills, Rockies, and prairie, as well as all the urban and rural centres.

But it is also a province which has a varied and interesting mosaic in terms of its people. In the year I've been privileged to be within this Legislative Assembly, I've come to realize that the members of this Assembly themselves represent a rather interesting mosaic in terms of their own cultural and ethnic backgrounds. We, together in our experience, are the richer for it. It is quite obvious that pioneers came into this province long before 1905. It's also interesting that at the turn of this century there was a great in-migration to the province. It was a time when many people didn't know how they were going to cope with the great increase in numbers of settlers within this area.

Interestingly enough, a good number of those settlers came from the United States. Many come even today. Many of the newcomers came from Ontario and the eastern provinces. Again, that is very indicative of what is happening even now. At the turn of the century, with that massive influx of in-migration, a tremendous number of people came from overseas, from other nations throughout the whole world. Again, this is indicative of the situation within this great dynamic province today.

In the Speech from the Throne, mention is made of a five-year plan for the inventory of historical sites and resources. That is to be commended, especially in this

particular year. I would ask you for a moment to come with me to the Cypress Hills. It will be no surprise, at least to the member who represents that area, to think in terms of an historic site which is there. At the turn of the century there was this great in-migration to that area as well. In that traditionally dry belt area of the province, there were a number of seasons with a tremendous amount of rainfall. So for a time, a fair number of farms and ranches flourished, many more than there are today in the same area. But in the years 1904 and 1905, it was an area served by circuit riders with regard to the church, and they would move through the Cypress Hills and on the fringes of the hills, and encounter places with names such as Walsh, Irvine, Josephburg, Thelma, and Eagle Butte. Many of these places have blown away. They have disappeared. Many of the artifacts that are there now are simply the lonely graves.

It's in this particular area of the Eagle Butte, in Medicine Lodge Coulee in the Cypress Hills, that a small wooden church was built. Over the course of time they used it not only for church services, but also with regard to schools. For at least on two occasions someone put the torch to the local school, so they had to come back and use the church. In the 1940s that particular church was for all intents and purposes abandoned. That was the last time it had any paint applied to it. In actual fact the last services were held there in the late '60s. Then in the last five or six years my wife and I discovered this place. I also discovered that, years before, I had taught school about seven miles from that particular location, and that a good portion of my life had been lived within the range or the ambit of Cypress Hills in both Alberta and Saskatchewan.

In the last three years a number of people have come as volunteers to the good old-fashioned thing known as a work bee. They've come from Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Medicine Hat, and from the Cypress Hills themselves to bring back to life, to restore that symbol of the dedication of settlers of an earlier day. So it is that that cemetery has also been restored. Last year there was a very special ceremony there during May when, thanks to a grant through the department of Culture and the additional donations of other people, a tombstone was erected that listed all the names of the 24 burials that had taken place there.

Now you can say that that's a rather strange topic of discussion within the Legislature, but in actual fact it's a remembrance of the people who went before us and helped build the foundation on which you and I continue to build. There have been times when I have sat on the steps of that church in the Cypress Hills and some of the relatives and friends of the people who are buried there have come and talked freely with me about their relatives buried in that cemetery. Within that valley it's interesting to hear these people share their memories of the early days in this province of ours.

I think of one family. We talked of their parents and their aunt who came from Montana. The parents came as homesteaders and brought along the aunt, who was handicapped. But the aunt had a precious gift. She was a painter, and some of her works of art still exist today. Yet she grew up in a part of the province which many people regard as absolutely barren. Those same people who sat with me on the steps of that church also talked with an ache in their heart of their 19-year-old son, who had been killed on one of the farm access roads in that area.

Those are just tiny glimpses of the forefathers you and I share with regard to this province of Alberta. There's a

tremendous wealth of stories out there. Many of them are being recorded and many more should be recorded. Unfortunately a number will be forgotten. Indeed, we have many founders within this province. There's a great illustrious list. Some of the names that perhaps come to mind as architects of the province would be Haultain, Macleod, McDougall, Trivet, Tims, Lacombe, and many others.

Another aspect of the whole settlement of this province involves our native people. While this province may have been officially formed in 1905, and while a considerable number of people had come into this area in terms of settlement and so-called civilization, most of us remember that the native people had been passing through and sometimes resided in this area of the great plains for well over 6,000 to 8,000 to 12,000 years. There's music in the names of those Indian tribes as well: the Blood, the Piegan, the Gros Ventres, the Stony, the Blackfoot, the Cree, and others. It is interesting to note that within the throne speech there is mention of some efforts being made to work with and on behalf of our native fellow residents of this province, especially with regard to native housing. In the urban areas, the difficult areas for anyone to make transition, and especially our native people, they have the support of the urban referral program in Calgary, Edmonton, Fort Macleod, and Grande Prairie. It is also interesting to note that within this last year, a number of negotiations are taking place with the Department of Native Affairs and individual bands to make certain that the bands within the province have full access to provincial programs and services.

There is another aspect of this situation with regard to our native brothers and sisters. In particular, it deals with the matter of education. For as long as our native people do not have sufficient access to education, it makes it that much more difficult for them to have access to the other goods and services within the developing and dynamic framework of Alberta today. In this regard there are two very interesting examples of special education within the province. One is the Awasis program in the city of Edmonton, under the Edmonton Public School Board, where native children from kindergarten to grade 2 — and by this fall it will be grade 3 — are brought together in Prince Charles school in the constituency of Calder. There they are able to learn and have reinforced the fact that they really have self-worth as individuals. The atmosphere of being with their own people seems entirely conducive to growth, not only in terms of their own self-worth, but also in their willingness and ability to learn at an ever-increasing rate.

Within the city of Calgary there's the example of the Plains Indian Cultural Survival School presently located in the Premier's riding: a very interesting concept which deals with both junior and senior high school, where the age ranges from 14 to 59. Where this school started only one year ago, it now has an enrolment of 90 and looks to have 150 students by the fall of this year. It is also interesting because a tremendous number of those students have dropped out of other schools within the whole educational system of the province, and a number of them have criminal records. They have come back and have learned that they can learn together, and the kind of progress within that school is quite phenomenal.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that last Friday evening the Minister of Education gave indication of his support in terms of people concern in this area. He attended an Indian feast and powwow in the rural area of Edmonton. I'm sure that he and I experienced some

interesting educational growing pains as we sat together in a very crowded hall. We didn't sit. There was no room; we were standing. It was rather interesting to watch some of the ceremonial dances, to listen to the drum beat pounding and pounding through our ears, to see all ages represented, and to see the real business of the native religious ceremony in terms of the sweet grass pipe ceremony being celebrated within Alberta today.

To move on to senior citizen programs within the province, again one should applaud the Alberta pioneer repair program for the considerable number of people it has assisted to stay in their own homes, so they may continue to have their feelings of independence and self-worth. The development of senior citizen lodges and self-contained housing units within the province is further indication of the people concern of this particular government.

This afternoon the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care made that tremendous announcement with regard \$1.25 billion in terms of hospital construction within this province; that whole interesting list of 19 renovations, 12 additions, and 19 new hospitals for this province to help deal with the social concerns of this tremendous growth area of Canada. Again the concern of this government for medical research is obviously yet another indicator of the people concern of this particular government.

With regard to the constituency of Calgary Millican, it continues to be one of the more dynamic growth areas of the city of Calgary. In 1979, Calgary had a registered population of 550,000, and the growth prediction for 1985 is 800,000. In-migration from all Canada and from around the world is obviously there, in terms of the whole city, and certainly within the realm of Calgary Millican.

It is interesting to note that 86 per cent of Canadian petroleum head offices are located in Calgary; suffice it to say that most of those are located either in Calgary Buffalo or Calgary Millican. Calgary Millican stretches from that downtown business core all the way out to some bald-headed prairie adjacent to the town of Shepard. In Bonnybrook, within Calgary Millican, we have that inland terminal. I look forward to touring that in the near future with the Minister of Economic Development. This facility is going to be used to full capacity as a back-up facility to the Prince Rupert terminal.

Within the same riding, in the area known as Ramsay, just a number of weeks ago Canada Packers opened their new boxed beef operation. The Minister of Agriculture was present. It was an interesting place to tour, especially with the fact of the number of people employed there and the finishing of that product rather than having the finishing in places like Montreal or Toronto.

Of course the Stampede is in this great riding of Calgary Millican, and those in the Legislature will be receiving information on that in the very near future. In that same area, the city of Calgary, in terms of making its Olympic bid, hopes to house a portion of the activities of the games. Hopefully in the not-too-distant future, a coliseum will be announced for Calgary, so that the Calgary NHL team will be able to beat the Oilers every time they get together.

In the downtown area of the riding, we have the Alberta Vocational Centre. A number of weeks ago the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and I toured that facility. Two rather interesting things caught our attention. Number one was the tremendous number of English classes for new Canadians. The whole system is overloaded because of the numbers who want to take on English as a language. The other factor we noticed

was that in a number of classes throughout the whole school we had the students stand up and identify which province they had been born in within this country. In nearly every case it was obvious that the majority had been born in a province other than Alberta. The thing is that we in Alberta are being made richer because of the import of these people who bring their varied experiences from across the country.

Mr. Speaker, within the throne speech there were many interesting points. I would like to applaud two in particular. One is with respect to the development of a citizens' resource centre for the handicapped, coupled with the fact that a provincial advisory committee for research for the handicapped will also be established to enable research and demonstration in this field.

There's an area of considerable controversy and certainly considerable discussion within the province. It has to do with group homes. Again the matter, as recorded in the throne speech, should be applauded:

... the development of facilities for the mentally retarded with serious behavior problems will be proposed The development of special housing units in Calgary and Edmonton, and accompanying outreach programs in rural and urban areas of the province, will complement the special unit constructed at Michener Centre last year.

About two weeks ago, in my capacity as one of the visitors of the Health Facilities Review Committee, I was privileged to visit the Baker Centre for handicapped children in Calgary. I know that over the years many visitors with the Health Facilities' Review Committee have suffered trauma when they visited such places as the Michener Centre or the Baker Centre. I'm quite certain that I suffered a certain amount of trauma in spite of my own background in this related area.

For example, I do want to commend the Baker Centre for the work it has done with the kind of facility it has, the age of the facility. When you go now into the Baker facility you are struck by color. You are struck by the tremendous positive use of color, by bright colored pictures, the whole program, the open sunlight. But you are impressed in particular by the obvious loving care that the staff have for their residents.

I would like to bring just two examples from this multihandicapped facility to the attention of members of the House. When we went into one section, there were three residents left in the room because the others were going off to school. This is one of the newer programs at Baker Centre, one to be encouraged and one that gives great encouragement in terms of the ability to train these children. But on this particular day there were three children there because they had colds. One was in his late teens and was mongoloid. He was obviously very upset that we were there. We were there in our capacity, as charged, to investigate situations. We drop in or we go by nature of complaint. On this day we were just paying a normal visit; there was no complaint. But the reaction of this person was such that I felt myself having to withdraw, until he started to move towards me and I reached out my hand. He grabbed my hand and started to climb up my frame. Obviously my first reaction was: it will be interesting to see where I get the bruises. But my real reaction was that there was no way I wanted to get into the situation where I was going to further damage him emotionally. It was rather interesting that a 17-year-old girl who was a volunteer there just walked over and took complete command of the whole situation and everything worked out. But it was a beautiful example of her loving

care, of being in daily personal contact with that person.

On the second floor we came to another room, and there were at least three children who were sitting quietly in small chairs leaning against the wall. They were terribly, terribly thin, because of their physical development. It was quite obvious that there was no way you could really respond with them in terms of a verbal communication. But I squatted down, reached out, and touched one child who, I later learned, was about 14 years old, but looked much more like a 3-year-old. As I touched the child the response came in the eyes, because the child knew that he was being touched, and that it was not aggression. He was concerned. When we deal with this whole gamut of social issues that comes within the Department of Social Services and Community Health, there's a real sense that we're having to test our reality as individuals time and time again. It's fine for us to be here as legislators, whether it be in our speeches, in question period, or in any committee. But time and time again we have to be brought back to the reality of individual needs of persons throughout this whole province of Alberta, whether they be residents in senior citizen homes, residents anywhere within the province, even if they be residents in such facilities as the Baker Centre for handicapped children.

While we are all upset with what has taken place recently in the northern part of the province, nevertheless the vast majority of the facilities in this province are to be commended for their operation. The staff people and volunteers are to be commended and encouraged and, above all, the parents and families are to be commended and encouraged for the kind of relationship they have as they go through life. I also believe that this provincial government and the Department of Social Services and Community Health should be commended because they do care, but they cannot be one hundred per cent perfect.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 1980 is indeed a year to give thanks for the past of this rich and interesting province. It's obviously a time when we should also give thanks for the challenges that confront us in the present day, and for the many opportunities that will face us in the years ahead. But more important, it is a year to give thanks for the cultural diversity of this province, to give thanks for our people resources.

There are pioneers in every age. The pioneers are not just those who came before us. There's a very real sense in which all Albertans today are still pioneers as we are building our tomorrows. All of us are involved in the continual building of this strong and tremendous province of Alberta, and all of us are involved in the building of this strong and tremendous country, Canada, especially as we enter this new decade.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the throne speech debate, I would like at the outset to compliment the hon. Member for Edson and the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods as mover and seconder in acceptance of the throne speech. At this time I would also wish the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor well. Since this is his first presentation of the throne speech, I wish him good health to carry out his term of office successfully and happily.

Each year as we view the throne speech, I am sure that almost every member looks at it, compares it with the past, and looks at what it holds in store for the future. When I think back to 1972, to the throne speech we had in my first year as a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I am sure I, like many others, maybe felt a bit greedy to see what there was for my constituency. However, very

quickly I learned that if you have a good, buoyant, economy in the province, the constituency is going to do well.

Just a few days ago, in reviewing my campaign material from 1975, I noticed that in the seven forums I participated in, I had only two priorities. One was that Alberta get a fair return from the sale of its depleting natural resources and, second, that a portion of that revenue be set aside and invested for future generations, so when there is no revenue from these depleting resources the future generations may enjoy the high quality of life we are enjoying today. I can see that that has materialized to some extent. I am sure that at present we are not still receiving a fair return for our resources; however, the bit we have put aside is showing some merits already. Particularly when we look into the housing programs, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund played an important part, which I hope to elaborate a little more later.

In 1979, before the last election, again in front of the people — and I have a tabloid with me, a message to the people of my constituency. I stated: "If re-elected my highest priorities will be to have a good regional water system implemented and more provision for nursing home patients". True enough, I would like to have, and need, other things: improvement to roads, assistance to municipalities, our schools, and every other area. But these two priorities are the needs of the people of the constituencies. We know that water is one utility people cannot exist without.

I think back only six years ago to the flood in 1974. Half of Vegreville was under water, Two Hills suffered quite a bit, and many farmers were flooded. A number of members of this Legislature, including the Premier, saw the condition. Yet the following two years the town of Vegreville had to request assistance from the Minister of Environment because there wasn't enough water in the Vermilion River to provide for the people. This year we had about two feet of snow over Saturday and Sunday, and for a while I found it difficult to get around, even to get out of home this morning. But the people of Vegreville are really glad, because we had very little snow. If it wasn't for this snow yesterday, they were looking at rationing water early in May this year. So I think the regional water system is very important, and I am glad that it seems to be going ahead. The municipalities involved already have agreed to go ahead with it.

The same with the nursing home. Today the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care announced an addition of 30 to the Two Hills nursing home. I must compliment the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care for several reasons. When he was the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the homeowners' tax discount, the renters' assistance, the other programs: that was all during his time. He was the Minister of Environment and, shortly before the election, commissioned a regional water study which is going to be implemented. Here today he announced the programs under his care. Not to say that he is the only one; many of the ministers have done exceptionally well, and I am glad.

The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care did have a study of the province that showed a need for 55 nursing beds in the constituency of Vegreville. Today, 30 have been announced. I hope that in the not too long future the other 25 that the study recommended will be provided, my priorities will be fulfilled, and I guess I won't be needed around here.

I must say that housing has been exceptional, whether it's the senior citizens' lodges that provide accommoda-

tion for people who cannot very well look after themselves; still more the self-contained units. I think this has become popular over the last number of years, and I trust that in not too long a time each municipality in the constituency that had required and requested will have some self-contained units. Even though this is very popular, it plays a very important part insofar as beginning farmers are concerned.

I've discussed this matter with quite a number of patrons of these self-contained units. A number of them stated that they came to those self-contained units because they were farming, and to retire and move to town they would have to sell their land to be able to provide themselves with a home. These self-contained units made a provision for them to leave their farms to their children, and the family farm could thereby be carried on. I will want to speak more on this, Mr. Speaker. I have a motion on the Order Paper for incentives for beginning farmers. I'll want to elaborate more then.

The senior citizen home improvement program was a great program. Over 1,000 senior citizens in the Vegreville constituency have taken advantage of it. I don't know how many there are in the Alberta repair program; the year is about to come up this summer. But I know many of them have taken advantage. Even though the Minister of Housing and Public Works is not here, I would like to commend the staff of Housing and Public Works for being able to carry out a program the way they have. With approximately 50,000 programs, not one has been charged for fraud. I had really thought that somebody, sooner or later, would want to take advantage. There were probably times when the director of this program was a little bit hard, and I thought, gee, tough fellow to get along with. However, I think he has done a terrifically good job, and he well deserves mention.

The housing starts over the last couple of years have been great for our younger people and to those on very low income. When we look at the population of this country, Alberta has only about 10 per cent of the population of Canada, yet the housing starts for the past year were over 20 per cent. The reason is that Alberta has a heritage trust fund. This provides such programs. I am sure there are many areas in Canada that wish they had a heritage trust fund so they would be able to carry on housing programs such as we have.

I am glad that highways and roads are also a priority in our throne speech. With the abandonment of railways our roads are going to be used more and more. When we look at a 2 million population, there are more than 1,300,000 vehicle registrations. That comes to about two vehicle registrations per person, or maybe more. So the highways are used, and I am glad they have been given a high priority.

Another area I am very happy with is the Two Hills Chemical Company. I know that many members know the provincial government and Dow Chemical were involved and owned this jointly for six years for the sole purpose of providing employment when Celanese Canada wished to close its doors. However, over the last couple of years Dow Chemical indicated that it wanted to close down, that it would close down, because of economic reasons. With the dedicated interest of our past and present ministers of Economic Development, a new industry was encouraged in Two Hills. Just recently Western Truck Body announced the purchase of the Two Hills chemical plant. They will provide employment for at least 25 of those working at present, with the possibility of expanding in the future. I am very glad of this, for the

fact that Kinetic Contaminants was interested in operating a waste disposal plant, and the people of the Two Hills area and abroad opposed it very severely, much more than the people opposed the Calgary Power coal project that was hoped for a few years ago.

Another area I want to mention, and a sensitive area, is the residential treatment centre in Peace River. I had hoped a different attitude would have been displayed. There are over 5,000 children in the various areas, and we find one residential area with only five mistreated individuals. As much as I felt sorry for them and would never have liked to see that happen, I can assure hon. members that the Minister of Social Services and Community Health did not encourage that. I was really appalled to have opposition members of this Legislature making such a big hoax of this particular area. You know, I was even surprised to find members asking the Premier whether he would consider replacing the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I just look at the headlines of the *Edmonton Journal* of March 7:

The question is why and who is allowing it. If the trail leads to . . . Bob Bogle's door, he must be fired.

— NDP Leader.

I'm surprised that the leaders of the political parties would not know it is the Premier's prerogative to select his cabinet ministers and to fire them if he feels he should. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Premier were to name eight of his most competent people in this Legislature, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health would be one of the eight. I just can't see how persons in the opposition could question the competency of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I would even go as far as to say I would not want to count on any of them or myself to try to even come close to the competency of the minister.

While I served on the Hospital Visitors Committee a few years ago, I had walked [through] the institution in Red Deer. I applaud the previous administration; they did do something. Maybe they didn't do a good job of it, but they provided a place for many who were handicapped when there was no place for them. However, when I toured that area I saw that maybe it made no difference where many would be located. But many of the nearly 2,000 in that institution in Red Deer should have been closer to their homes, closer to their parents or relatives, and this is exactly the program the minister has been trying to fulfil.

I am sure that many of these children, severely or not very severely handicapped, are in these institutions because there is no other place for them. Many of them are such that their parents maybe couldn't or even didn't want to look after them. So when we have people from the public looking after them, I can honestly say that whoever has spent a good number of years looking after them sure deserves a good portion of eternity.

When I look at the time when I was a school trustee, I think of one incident when an individual was charged and convicted for cruelty to animals. Within a year and a half he was also charged and convicted for child battery. But let the teacher in the school even raise her voice to his child and she would have heard about it. So it may be difficult on parents to look after children. Many of them have given that up. But people working with them have done a marvellous job in this province, and I commend them for it.

Another area that I would be glad to mention: agricul-

ture is also mentioned in our throne speech. This government has gone a far way to promote agriculture. I notice that since some of our programs, even though the average age of the farmer in Canada is 56, in Alberta it's 45. So I am sure our programs have gone a far way. This year we are to celebrate the 75th Anniversary of our province, and I am glad that the province is looking forward to participation in many ways. The Leader of the Opposition — he isn't here — has made several statements that this program is a fiasco. I do not think so. When I look back 25 years, when we celebrated the 50th Anniversary of the province, maybe everybody didn't like the celebration, by providing two monstrosities, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary. But it was well accepted, and maybe there was a reason for that.

When I think back to 1965, when the Premier of the day stated in the Jubilee Auditorium that within 10 years 85 per cent of the population would live in Edmonton and Calgary, maybe that was the right place to invest the money. What would be the use of putting up anything in some other part of the province where there would be no people? However, I recall very well, in the middle of November 1970, when the Leader of the Opposition, who is the Premier today, spoke to the Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. He very bluntly told the 600 there that should his party form the government there would be a reverse trend, that at that time the rural was shifting to the urban. It was then and there that I decided I wanted to be a member of that political party. Right after his speech I told the Leader of the Opposition that I was interested, and that I was going on his bandwagon.

I have seen that this has materialized. When we look at the population increase in our province of approximately 5,000 a month, the bigger portion is not going to Edmonton and Calgary but to other centres of the province. I think this promise has been fulfilled.

Another area I would like to mention: I am sure every ethnic group in Alberta is going to be celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the province in some way. As a member of the Ukrainian group, I would like to say that the Ukrainians, who form the third largest ethnic group in the province, decided that they too should participate in the celebrations. The reason for this is that it is now 89 years since the first Ukrainian settlers started coming into

Canada, into Alberta. And the feeling is that they have done well for the province but have also done well for themselves. So the council of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee of Alberta decided that a group should be formed, and they asked me to chair it. The name of the art society is the Alberta Ukrainian Commemorative Society. We have decided and already ordered a sculpture which we are going to have placed in the Ukrainian village, which is now owned by the provincial government. This sculpture is going to stand slightly over 7 feet. It's going to weigh over a tonne and is going to cost over \$50,000. We have not applied for funds to the 75th commission. We felt that the Ukrainians in this province should offer this to the province of Alberta as a gift in recognition of what we have accomplished.

Our Premier has already consented to come on August 10 to unveil this sculpture, and I invite every member in this Legislature to take time off. There is going to be an all day program. We expect that there could be 25,000 to 30,000 people there. The Ukrainian heritage village is located in the Clover Bar constituency; however, I was asked to chair this particular group, I guess, because I'm a Ukrainian and still keep a Ukrainian name. [laughter] Secondly, when I was the reeve of the county of Lamont, where the Ukrainian village is located, I gave both moral and financial support to the Ukrainian village. I'm glad of its success, and I would strongly recommend that any member who has the opportunity come and spend the day on August 10.

Mr. Speaker, I see that I've gone just a little past my time. Once again, thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we've had many good speeches tonight, and of the fact that the mind can only absorb what the backend can stand, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 9:52 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

