

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Wednesday, April 9, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 37**

**The Unfair Trade Practices  
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 37, The Unfair Trade Practices Amendment Act, 1980.

By this Bill, jurisdiction of the Act would be extended, in the case of services provided to private dwellings, to improvements in addition to maintenance and repairs presently provided. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to commence action in the Provincial Court of Alberta is also provided by the amendment.

[Leave granted; Bill 37 read a first time]

**Bill 39**

**The Companies Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 39, The Companies Amendment Act, 1980. The main thrust of this Bill is to allow companies a little more latitude in buying back securities of their own company, and brings it somewhat in line with the Act in Ontario, which is most popular of course because of the main stock exchange in Canada being there.

[Leave granted; Bill 39 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 39, The Companies Amendment Act, 1980, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of Pacific Western Airlines.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in tabling the annual report for 1979 of the Alberta Research Council.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, it's my distinct pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 60 grades 5 and 6 students representing the Princeton school situated in Edmonton Belmont. They are accompanied today by Marilyn Glowski. They are

seated in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 13 fine young grade 9 students from Radway school in the interesting constituency of Redwater-Andrew. They are accompanied by their principal Mr. Gunderson and the bus driver Mr. Holt. They are in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the customary welcome of the members.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 24 students from the Pine Grove school in Edson. They are accompanied by two teachers, Judy Mentz and Mrs. Mahon; by one parent, Mrs. Busch; and by Mrs. Brown, the bus driver. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

MR. SPEAKER: Just before starting the Oral Question Period, there is a matter which is now of record which perhaps I should refer to briefly; that is, last Thursday we had three ministerial announcements on private members' afternoon. As a result, there was a considerable transfer of time from private members to government. I'm not really terribly apprehensive about this occurring often or in the near future, or anything like that. The only concern I have is that it is now a matter of record that that has occurred. I would be concerned if it were considered to be a solid precedent of some kind. It is for that reason that I mention it today and say that I would have great hesitation in following that occurrence as a precedent in the future.

**Quebec Referendum**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What strategy has the government devised for involvement in the Quebec referendum debate?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think it's adequate to report to the House that we have carefully thought through Alberta's position with respect to the very important referendum debate, and that we have carefully considered the moves Alberta will take, in particular the way in which we will attempt to communicate to the people of Quebec our concern with respect to the referendum, which likely will be coming up in May 1980.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What ministers and officials of the government will be travelling to Quebec to meet with leaders on both sides of the debate?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course that assumes that that is part of the strategy. I think it's fair to say, as I reacted earlier, that we have thought through our strategy. We have in place what I think is a very important way in which Alberta will participate or articulate its views. Whether or not we will do it by travelling remains to be seen.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that the first question asked what strategy the Alberta government has devised, is the minister in a position to indicate if the Alberta government's position is not to become directly involved in the debate itself between now and when the referendum is held?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it should not go undetected. I just want to restate again that we have carefully thought through Alberta's position. I think that's the most important step we have made: that we do have a position; we have thought carefully as to how Alberta's leadership within Canada should be seen.

We do have a very important conference coming up in Lethbridge on April 21, 22, and 23, when all western premiers will come together. I am sure most of the national press will be focussing on Lethbridge at that time to have a viewpoint expressed by all western premiers. I think the leadership of our Premier will be important, because of course he will be chairing that conference. But as to how we will participate beyond that, I think our strategy at this point would be not to suggest to the House or others as to how we might participate.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Is the Premier in a position to indicate to the Assembly this afternoon that at the meeting of the four western premiers which will be taking place in Lethbridge, starting April 21 if my memory is accurate, the question of Alberta or western involvement in the Quebec referendum will be the first item on the agenda and the most urgent item placed by Alberta before the meeting of the four western premiers.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the matter of constitutional reform and national unity questions will be very early in the agenda, perhaps the first item, and certainly will be of major significance on the first day of the conference. I might add that the communiques we've had at past western premiers' conferences with regard to this matter, in particular clearly enunciating the position of rejecting the concept of sovereignty association, at Prince George last year and prior to that in Yorkton and Brandon in the previous years, I think have been significant in terms of the national context of the debate.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. At what time and on what occasion is it anticipated that the Alberta government will unveil its strategy on how Alberta will become involved in the debate? Will it follow the conference in Lethbridge?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there is something in that remark which would imply a degree of participation that the hon. minister was referring to relative to the strategy. We certainly will be discussing the matter with the western Canadian governments and the western premiers at the conference in Lethbridge in two weeks. However, I believe — and it would be subject to checking *Hansard* — we have already responded to questions of this nature in this session by stating it is our view that we should not be participating within Quebec, by way of speaking engagements or engagements of that nature, without being invited by the federalist forces to do so. When I speak of the federalist forces, I'm referring to the

forces under their referendum debate which are headed up by their Leader of the Opposition Mr. Ryan, leader of the Quebec Liberal Party.

It certainly is the advice that I've received that if we have a role to play, it will depend upon the way in which the referendum develops in terms of issues. If the issues that develop are energy questions or involve constitutional change and reform, there may be a place for western provinces to participate. In my news conference following my visit with Mr. Ryan in early March, those subjects were raised publicly and responded to by both Mr. Ryan and me.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier. Has the Premier received an invitation from Mr. Ryan to take part in the debate at this time?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no we have not. Our ongoing communication — although subject again to the strategy mentioned by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the constant review and assessment of that, and the discussion of that subject with other western governments in Lethbridge — it wouldn't be our anticipation to be participating in that sense within the province of Quebec during the course of the referendum debate. But that is subject to the qualifications I gave in the previous answer, and keeping in mind statements we've made in the past, Motion No. 204 on the Order Paper today and the legislative debate that will follow from that motion, and our endorsement of the People to People unity petition that was sent by over 100,000 Albertans with the endorsement of the government.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is it fair to interpret one of the basic thrusts of the position of the Alberta government to be that what is done by the province of Alberta in the course of the referendum debate would . . . Perhaps I could put the question this way. In the view of the Alberta government, is it more desirable that any involvement by the four western provinces be on the basis of the four western provinces acting in unison, as opposed to the province of Alberta or other provinces going their own way as far as involvement in the referendum debate is concerned?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, our strategy really involves both. But what should be kept in mind is that the anticipation of the upcoming referendum debate in the province of Quebec has been a matter of ongoing review, action, and response by the government of Alberta for some time now, first of all — if I could summarize — in establishing by way of a communique with the western premiers that the concept of sovereignty association is not acceptable but neither is the status quo, and that a third option of a new federalism for Canada is the approach we as a provincial government favor, and we believe that approach has the support of the other three western provincial governments; secondly, that in terms of constitutional change, the people of Quebec — to the extent that we're able to do so — understand that there are other provincial governments which would like to see significant constitutional change. Our document *Harmony in Diversity*, which was debated in this House in the fall of 1978, is a reflection of that. Thirdly: the endorsement and support of the citizens on the People to People petition.

I would say in answer to the hon. leader's appropriate

question that in terms of overall position, it would be desirable if it could be presented as a western position. However, there may be issues that develop in the referendum, such as energy questions, where it would be appropriate under the circumstances for Alberta to respond to those questions if they occur.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is it implicit in the Premier's remarks that the government intends to consult with the federalist forces in the province of Quebec before defining any detailed involvement within that province on the referendum issue?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, very definitely yes. That's the discussion I've had with other premiers in Canada, that our participation should be under the umbrella of the federalist forces in Quebec. That's the response we've given. That gives me the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to refer hon. members to my answers generally on this subject in *Hansard*, April 1.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Premier. Has the government of Alberta received any indication from the federal government as to when a future constitutional conference can be held? Obviously, one has to await the results of the referendum in Quebec, but has there been any discussion as to the date when both the federal and the provincial governments will be able once again to take up the question of reviewing the constitution?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I refer that question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, to date we have not had any communication from the federal government as to what leadership they might take in calling a constitutional conference. I might just add that I believe I've responded earlier in the House that during the referendum debate and when the question is called by the government of Quebec, they have indicated they would not attend any constitutional conference. So one might draw from that that any constitutional move would take place after the referendum question.

#### **Alberta Hospital, Oliver**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my second question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It concerns the shortages of psychiatrists at -Alberta Hospital, Oliver. My initial question to the minister: what action has the minister taken subsequent to the psychiatrists' rejection of the 9 per cent salary increase in December?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the shortage of psychiatrists is an issue which faces not only the province of Alberta but other provinces and jurisdictions throughout North America. It's compounded by the fact that in addition to a shortage of psychiatrists there is a shortage of psychiatric nurses. Therefore, it has not been possible to maintain all the wards that would be available otherwise.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, on the question of what we are doing about the shortage of psychiatrists in the province, we're tackling the problem in three different ways. First, we're looking at a contract for those psychiatrists currently on staff and are trying to find a way to legiti-

mately recognize the needs and desires of the psychiatrists as well as live within our own programs. Secondly, we are looking at ways to attract psychiatrists from other jurisdictions. That recruitment program is currently under way. Third and more important, but a program that will not bear fruit for some period of years, is an incentive program to encourage more candidates into the field of psychiatry, into that part of medicine.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly if there are still approximately 70 beds at Alberta Hospital closed down primarily because of a shortage of psychiatric services, and if those beds are primarily in the forensic unit?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, Alberta Hospital, Oliver, has a rated capacity of 636 beds. Currently, 552 of those beds are occupied. Therefore, approximately 61 beds are unoccupied at the moment.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether the forensic unit is being operated to capacity?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker. Approximately 20 of the 61 beds are in the forensic unit.

MR. R. CLARK: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Twenty of the 61 beds that are closed down — then approximately a third of the beds in the forensic unit are not being operated at this time. Mr. Minister, is that solely because of the lack of psychiatric staff?

MR. BOGLE: Approximately a third of all beds which are currently closed at Alberta Hospital, Oliver, are in the forensic area. That is primarily due to the shortage of psychiatric nurses; it is compounded by the shortage of psychiatrists.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether the forensic facility at Alberta Hospital at Oliver which is now in the process of being expanded and scheduled to open in 1983 will be opened in 1983? And will the various initiatives the minister has taken, including work at the university, enable us to have sufficient staff by that particular time?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I can't give the assurance that all beds will be occupied by that time. I certainly can assure members of the House that we are doing everything humanly possible to ensure that when the new forensic unit is opened and beds are transferred to it, it will, if at all possible, operate at capacity.

I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that we are currently recruiting psychiatrists. At the present time we're also recruiting psychiatric nurses in other jurisdictions; in addition to that our own training programs. We have 242 graduate nursing positions; 201 are currently filled. Although our training program is going on well, there are 41 vacancies.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister indicate what the department has done to ensure that until the forensic unit is operating at capacity once again, prisoners with psychiatric problems are treated while they are being detained in custody throughout the province?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, some programs have had to be temporarily terminated. Decisions as to which programs should be temporarily terminated have been worked out between officials in our department along with our sister Department of the Solicitor General. In some cases the services that have been provided at Alberta Hospital, Oliver, are now being provided on an emergency basis at the Fort Saskatchewan facility. Again, once additional staff are recruited — and it's our intention that that will be done — the programs which have been temporarily terminated will be reinstated.

#### Community Colleges

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Could the minister indicate if it is the policy of the government of Alberta to encourage the increasing use of community colleges, particularly in the two major urban centres?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I didn't get one of the words the hon. member used prior to stating "community colleges". Perhaps he could repeat the question.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to. The word was "encourage" the use of ... in the two major metropolitan centres.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the programming which takes place at the community colleges or the public colleges in the province's 10 locations is a decision arrived at by the boards of governors at those institutions. I think the short answer to the question might very well be yes, but it is of course a matter determined by and large by the publicly governed boards themselves.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Supplementary question to the hon. minister. If it is the policy of the Alberta government to encourage the use of community colleges, does the government plan to supply the necessary funds for the expansion of Mount Royal College in the city of Calgary?

MR. HORSMAN: Not this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate when he does plan to supply those funds?

MR. HORSMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

#### Child Care

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. With respect to the tragic beating death of Miranda Phipps, is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether he's had an opportunity to ascertain why the Department of Social Services and Community Health was not able to comply with the court order granting custody of the child to the mother which required regular supervision by social workers from the department?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, without accepting the innuendo in the hon. member's question, it's my understanding that on September 5, 1979, the judge, in review-

ing his court order, decided that there was no reason for further continuation of wardship. Therefore there was no request to continue that kind of supervision by the department.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly whether, when the initial order was made granting custody to the child's mother, the government was given the request by the judge that there be regular supervision?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It might be helpful if I give a bit of background to the situation. The grandmother was requested by the mother to be the guardian for the child. After a review by the department it was agreed that the temporary wardship should be with the grandmother. That was done on or about January 24, 1978. The judge gave two six-month extensions to the original order. Thus the child was with the grandmother for a period of approximately 1.5 years. On June 6, 1979, the judge ordered that the child be returned to her natural mother's care, and that there be supervision by the department. On September 5, 1979, that supervision was deemed by the judge to be no longer necessary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what steps the department took between the initial granting of the order in June and the decision of the judge on September 15 that supervision was no longer necessary, in view of complaints from the child's grandmother that during this period of time the ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The child's grandmother is not asking questions in this Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, then perhaps I could ask the question directly and ask the minister if he is in a position to advise the Assembly whether regular supervision took place between the initial granting of the order and the judge's decision on September 15, which the minister alluded to, that supervision was no longer required?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, on September 5, 1979, the judge was satisfied that supervision was no longer necessary, otherwise he would not have issued such an order.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether he's had an opportunity to review complaints given to the department by the child's grandmother that there had been child neglect? Were those complaints officially examined? In view of the fact that there were a number of them over a period of time, why was no action taken on them?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly whether the budget estimate of 20 per cent increase in child welfare expenditures this year will be essentially for homes dealing with juveniles, or whether

that will be made available for the care of infants who must be made wards of the province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Surely we are not going to go over the estimates item by item in the question period to see what they're for.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister then. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the intention of the department to refer the handling of this particular case to the Cavanagh Board of Review, particularly with respect to the level of staffing required to maintain proper methods of ensuring that wards of the province are looked after?

MR. BOGLE: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member realizes that the terms of reference the government has given the Cavanagh Board of Review are broad enough that any matters which relate to policies, practices, and procedures in the administration of The Child Welfare Act are to be reviewed by the Cavanagh Board of Review.

In this particular instance, as I've taken the previous question the hon. member asked as notice, I'll review the matter personally and make that determination as to whether or not we should be referring the matter. If Mr. Justice Cavanagh and the members of his board of review wish to look at that on their own, there's certainly every opportunity to do so under the prescribed terms of reference.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What separate consideration, if any, has been given to the level of staffing with respect to the administration of child welfare legislation in the province of Alberta, particularly in view of the complaints of a number of people working in the field that too few people are trying to do too much?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we're into the broad question of the overall client/staff ratios that affect a number of divisions of the department. I'll be pleased to go through those when we're in our estimates and respond as to how we, as a government, are responding to the legitimate concerns being placed before us in terms of the needs of Albertans. Of course the nearly 20 per cent growth in that division of the department is certainly an indication in dollar terms of this government's commitment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Apart from the possibility that the Cavanagh inquiry will look into the issue of qualifications, what initiatives has the minister taken, over the last year, with respect to the level of qualifications of child welfare workers who make recommendations to the courts on custody hearings, in view of the fact that the courts often take into account the specific recommendations of child welfare workers when making a custody decision? Has there been any specific review by the minister of the professional qualifications of the workers who in fact have to make very, very important judgments and recommendations to the court?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have had an opportunity to meet with the president of the Alberta Association of Social Workers. We are in the process of establishing an agenda for a formal meeting between the executive of

the association and some of my colleagues. At that time we will address a number of the concerns which have been raised.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I have one rather brief supplementary question for the minister dealing with the most regrettable case that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly what the recommendation of the social worker to the court was prior to the judge's making the order on September 15? If the minister isn't aware; perhaps he could check and report back to the Assembly.

MR. BOGLE: I'm not aware, Mr. Speaker. I certainly will take that question as notice, as I have one previous question by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Asbestos Fibre

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Labour or the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation regarding asbestos fibre exposure, a very serious problem in view of the serious health hazard that asbestos fibre poses to workers as well as to those occupying buildings, including schools. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House what action he is taking in regard to this problem and whether any testing has been going on to determine the quantity of asbestos fibres in the schools?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there would be a problem if there were asbestos fibres in the air in public buildings. As a matter of fact we've conducted a number of tests which indicate that that is not the case. In 1979, tests were conducted in a number of public meeting places and in three schools in the Calgary area. There has to be some searching for schools with asbestos fibre in their building materials' composition. Those three schools were selected because they were identified, in fact, to have some components containing asbestos in the building materials. The tests showed that they had one-twentieth of the amount of asbestos fibre content permitted in the air for persons working regularly with asbestos fibre products. So there is absolutely no problem with respect to the schools that were reviewed. As well, none was found with the public assembly halls that were reviewed.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, a short background would put hon. members at ease on this matter, which has had some discussion recently. The great majority of the buildings built prior to 1970, schools and buildings of that nature and to some extent hospitals, are single-storey buildings. Those buildings did not require very much by way of asbestos fibre content in the building materials for fire barricades. In a few hospitals it was required around the boiler rooms, a very contained area. In more recent times where fibre or components containing asbestos were used in buildings such as hospitals, the requirements of hospitals to prevent the development of bacteria and other health problems are such that the materials have to be coated. Because of that, there is no possibility of escape of asbestos fibre into the air.

In 1967 some review of this problem was initiated by the former government. There has been a continuing monitoring ever since, with an effort to discontinue as much as possible the use of products containing asbestos. These were reviewed again in '70-71, and some products were discontinued. In 1975, with the advent of the building standards, they were reduced again to the point where

we now have very few products with any significant asbestos content. In the 1980 building code, which is currently under review and consideration, the use of components containing asbestos is being considered yet again, with the possibility that very, very few, if any, will be permitted, because substitute products are now on the market. Hardly any is permitted now in public buildings, school buildings, or hospitals.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased with those remarks. But as an increased assurance to the Assembly, would the minister indicate to the House that he is satisfied or if he is going to do further testing regarding asbestos fibres in the air, in particular in schools because of the young children involved. I'm talking about all the schools.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, we have no evidence at all to suggest that it is necessary to review all the schools. As I've indicated, the check last year was done on schools known to contain some asbestos fibres in the building materials used. In those schools that were checked, there was absolutely no asbestos fibre content in the air to suggest any kind of problem at all. I think we can rest assured on that basis, but perhaps I can give the hon. Member for Kingsway one further assurance. Having required of the department a thorough review and briefing of the matter in the last 24 hours, I am sure they will be alert to any exceptions they might come across, if indeed there are any, as they do their routine inspections throughout the province.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. In view of the fact, as he's indicated, that there are other products that will substitute very well for this product, I wonder if the minister would also indicate to the House whether he's seriously considering the complete prohibition of the use of asbestos material by our construction industry?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't and wouldn't wish to go so far as to assure that there could be a complete prohibition. The reason for that is that there may be some difficulties in getting substitute products which have the characteristics of asbestos for very limited types of uses. I have been assured that a number of products are permitted for which there are now substitutes, for instance in dampers and that sort of thing for fire separations. And where there are substitutes, there is presently before the Alberta Building Standards Council the suggestion, apparently, that products containing asbestos not be permitted.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's comments that other products can be used in place of asbestos, would he assure the House that if those products are available and are economical — and even if they're not economical, relatively speaking — those other products will in fact be used and, if not, he'll make representation in that regard?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think I've gone about as far as I can go with assurances, given that there's no identifiable problem at the moment. In fact we seem to be a long way from being even close to having a problem, and there is a continued effort to discontinue the use of those products. But I think that's as far as I would care to go at the moment.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering if the minister can assure the House that there is ongoing monitoring and that there will be a policy for ongoing monitoring not just of school facilities but of recreational facilities; for example, ice arenas and commercial buildings. The environmental protection authority released a report last year which suggests that spray-on insulation material crumbles after a period of 20 years. Will the minister indicate what kind of monitoring is being done of those buildings that were constructed in Alberta during that period of time? Is it an ongoing process?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated that there has been monitoring, and some of it did occur precisely in the kinds of buildings the hon. member is asking about. I will certainly have in mind his observation that these products may deteriorate over a period of years and that there might be some possibility of difficulties arising from deterioration. If so, I will assure that there is periodic monitoring to the point necessary to establish whether deterioration is in fact occurring.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the minister for clarification. I understand the minister indicated that three schools had been investigated in Calgary. I also recall his using the term "random sample". My question to the minister: is he in a position to assure the House that all school boards have been duly notified by the department of the concerns with respect to asbestos, and that in fact there will be an examination of each potential building where asbestos could be a factor? I'm sure there must be many more than three schools in the province that would be affected by it.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the hon. member, if I understand his concern correctly, that there is a building standards quality program under way presently for the upgrading of schools to the recent fire standards. In connection with that program, I'm sure the officials will be alert to any of the potential problem areas the hon. member is concerned about. Based on the experience and knowledge we have about the types of products which were used and the way in which they were used, basically between 1970 and 1975-76, it would not appear there's any major problem of any description, in fact probably no problem at all. So I don't think it's necessary to check the air in every school.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question for clarification is: will it be the intention of the government to advise school boards in the province of the concern with respect to asbestos, so that those decisions can in fact be made by the boards, and they may then request testing if they have concerns about particular schools?

MR. YOUNG: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question, I'm being asked whether we'll advise the boards where there's a concern, and I have just stood here and assured the House that in fact on the basis of all the information we have — and we think we've done a fairly thorough job, a job which was initiated based on a concern that the former government had and which has been continued to this date . . . I don't understand why I should be asked to express a concern where there is no concern.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate what monitoring has been going on in the minister's department as to the potential injurious effects the people who do the installations may be exposed to.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, officials in the occupational health and safety division, and through the services of the laboratory, are continually available and are assisting any group or any citizen in the province with analysing the contents of the air. They are continuously co-operating with the officials in the department of my colleague the Minister of Labour with regard to building standards. At the same time, I do want to advise the House that there are many publications that are approved and are being distributed to all citizens in the province, some on asbestos dust by an organization called the Christmas Seal association.

So the public in Alberta is getting sufficient notice about the concerns of asbestosis. At the same time my officials are monitoring and testing all available samples brought to them, and when called upon, be it a school or a recreational facility such as an ice arena or a hockey arena.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question specifically to the minister was: are studies being done on the potential injurious effect to the installers, the workmen, the people who are working with the product?

MR. DIACHUK: That is an ongoing thing, Mr. Speaker. This is why the regulations are being amended to provide for regular medical examinations to monitor the workers' health. At the present time it is being done on a voluntary basis. In the proposed regulations that were reviewed last month, it is the hope that it will be mandatory that workers in these industries be examined on a regular basis, to be able to remove them if some of them find that their health is being affected.

#### **Sugar Beet Industry**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. It is with regard to sugar production in Alberta. Alberta could produce 10 to 15 per cent more sugar than at the present time, but with the closing of the processing plant at Picture Butte, as well as the increased population in Alberta, we're underproducing. I was wondering what strategy or involvement the Department of Agriculture has with regard to this problem.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to discuss sugar beet growing in the province with the manufacturers and contractors of the sugar beet growers and with the growers themselves. Discussing the various problems they were facing as an industry in growing sugar beet, we had the opportunity to discuss the opportunity to sign contracts for production and the problems that had existed over the period of time in transporting the sugar beet to the refinery. I'm very pleased to report that at the last meeting I had with them the growers had met with the manufacturers of sugar and had reached a satisfactory conclusion as to the contracts they had and the method of transporting the sugar beet to the plant itself.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. With regard to transporting the sugar beet to the refinery, is the government considering any type of assistance for the sugar beet grower toward that transport cost?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. On meeting with the growers, they felt the transportation problem that had existed wasn't a problem that perhaps they could handle in signing the new contracts, and have done so.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A final supplementary to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Under the GATT agreement, Canada is guaranteed a production of 25 per cent of the domestic market with regard to sugar. I wonder if the minister has met with federal officials or the new federal Minister of Agriculture to discuss sugar and its processing and production in Canada, and specifically in Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that would generally be the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture. I think he has outlined properly to the Assembly the concerns of the government. But we will take the hon. member's question as notice in terms of the broad perspective of sugar marketing in southern Alberta, as I think you've done through your questions so far.

#### **Edmonton Annexation Application**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister indicate if he is in a position to inform the House when the hearings on the Edmonton annexation application by the Local Authorities Board will be complete?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to give a firm time line, but I've been advised by the chairman of the Local Authorities Board panel hearing that application that it will extend at least into June.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if he has laid out any guidelines as to when the report will be presented to the minister? Will that report be made public at the same time it's delivered to the minister?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, last fall I did say that the report of the Local Authorities Board panel would be made public. I'm not at liberty to suggest when that report might be received by me because, first of all, we don't know when the hearings are going to end. The committee will then need several weeks, perhaps even some months, to write the report. I've asked the committee, in addition to providing an outline of what the committee feels should occur, to provide reasons for its decisions as well. So it will take the three-member panel some length of time to write a report. I've suggested to them that it isn't a matter we want to put any firm deadlines on; we want a good report. So it could well be the fall of the year before the report of the committee is in my hands, and it would be my intention to make it public at that time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister or the government given any consideration to holding a referendum by the affected people before a decision is made by cabinet as to the

direction the annexation will take after the report is in place?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, depending on the recommendations of the committee and the government's deliberation on those recommendations, I would think it's premature at this time to consider what form our decision-making process will take. Indeed, we will be listening closely to the views of the public living in all the affected jurisdictions, including the city of Edmonton. But it's really too early for me to suggest that our deliberations might take a certain turn, that we might or might not have a plebiscite or some type of vote amongst individuals that would indicate their feelings. I think that kind of decision will come well after the report is received by the government.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

DR. BUCK: Can the Premier indicate or will he verify the statement he made that there will be a full debate in the Legislature before a decision will be made by Executive Council on the application?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my memory will not grasp that important declaration the hon. Member for Clover Bar has raised. If he is referring to any answer I gave, I presume it had to do with the question of the nature of a report that was made public when the Legislature was sitting, in which case I think it would be very appropriate to have debate here in the House. On the other hand, if the report were received at a time when the House was not sitting and there was a need for a decision, having regard to all the circumstances, it might be that the government might feel that it had to make a decision in advance of any sitting of the House.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier. It deals basically with the letter the Premier gave me indicating there would be debate in the Legislature before the decision was made.

MR. MOORE: I might briefly supplement the comments of the Premier. Last spring when we were debating changes in The Local Authorities Board Act, I recall very distinctly advising the hon. member that it was indeed one of the opportunities that might exist for a full debate on the matter of annexation. If he would check *Hansard* of last spring, I think he would see reference as well to the commitment that was made by our government and our Premier relative to that debate. The opportunity existed then; there may well be other opportunities.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

9 Moved by Mr. Crawford.

Be it resolved that Mrs. Osterman be appointed, effective December 1, 1979, to the Special Select Committee on Members' Services, in place of the hon. Mr. Planche.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in respect to Motion No. 9, other than making any passing comment on how this will improve the Members' Services Committee, I thought I would just add that the reason it is proposed that it be effective December 1, 1979, is that the hon. member has been performing the duties in respect to that committee since that time.

[Motion carried]

6. Moved by Mr. Hyndman

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government.

[Adjourned debate April 2: Mr. R. Clark]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in leading off the debate this afternoon on Motion No. 6, might I say at the outset to the Provincial Treasurer that I felt he was in fine voice last Wednesday night, and that the comments I made one year ago about the office of Provincial Treasurer being seen in Alberta as a corner from where one couldn't move politically, don't apply here in the province of Alberta, given Alberta's situation.

On a serious note, though, might I say to the Provincial Treasurer that, understandably, there were some very pleasant moments in the budget debate; several for the Provincial Treasurer, if I recall correctly the enthusiasm which he gave, especially to the last page of the speech when he was able to emphasize a number of positive points of the budget. From our side of the Assembly, on the other hand, even though the budget is the size it is, even though there was — might I use the example — a very sizable increase in the allocation for libraries, which I'll have more to say about later on, I'd be less than responsible if I didn't raise some concerns in the Assembly this afternoon.

I'd like to raise these concerns primarily in five areas. I'd like to commence my remarks by dealing with the question of long-range planning. It seems to me that if we look very specifically at the capital portion of the budget, Mr. Speaker, we're in the third year of a one-year program to buoy up the sagging construction industry in the province of Alberta. If members go back two budgets ago, at that time this was really a one-year capital infusion to buoy up the economy in that area. We had the same kind of thing happen last year when the budget came down in June, and now for the third time we have a very, very sizable increase as far as capital expenditures are concerned. If we look at and summarize the last three years, there was something like a 103 per cent increase in the capital budget of the province. Herein lies one of the very real concerns my colleagues and I have; that is, the area of long-term planning. I'll have more to say about that in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The second area I want to raise deals with the question of hospitals, and the third, the matter of roads. As my colleagues and I have said in the House previously, we were pleased the minister rose in his place some two weeks ago and announced a very, very sizable hospital construction program. And I note there's a sizable increase in the budget for roads in this province. But basically, Mr. Speaker, what both those programs do is pick up the slack which has been allowed to develop during the last several years. I notice that there is no reference in the budget to long-range planning as far as hospitals and our commitments there are concerned, or transportation or roads.



Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, I want to make some reference to the question of libraries. As good an announcement as that is — and I commend the minister — when we do something like that, it's appropriate that we stop and ask ourselves: what are the longer term implications? What are the five-year implications? What kind of objectives do we have? What do we hope to have accomplished in five years?

In the course of my budget remarks last year, I made a plea, apparently not too successfully, that the government give some leadership, not just to the rest of Canada but really to all this continent, in some moves into the field of program analysis and into the area of longer term projections than we have to date. When I reflect, there is little or anything of that in this budget. And what's happened in the last year? At least one province in Canada — and perhaps more than one — our neighboring province to the west, British Columbia, has taken some first steps into the area of five-year projections, not only as far as costs and expenditures are concerned, but also as far as revenues are concerned; not from the standpoint of tying the government to those commitments, clearly stating in the document that if the present programs, the present trends, continue, this is where we'll be three years, five years down the road.

Frankly I thought the departed federal Conservative government in Ottawa — the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Crosbie — brought a fresh light to the budgetary process as far as the government of Canada is concerned when they attempted to do some of those kinds of things.

Mr. Speaker, I use the examples of libraries, roads, and hospitals to point out the need for us in this province to start to move in those kinds of areas: longer term projections, then making some judgments on are we or aren't we getting value for the dollar that's being spent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks by dealing with two issues. One is the question of a total absence in this budget as far as those people in rental accommodations in the province are concerned; and last, but certainly not least, I want to make some very brief but very straightforward comments as far as provincial employees are concerned.

We in this Assembly have to ask ourselves how long we can expect the provincial employees of Alberta to be living with guidelines that are falling behind inflation in this province. Last week all members of the Assembly received apples and oranges in a variety of forms. I think that was due, in part at least, to a rather misguided comparison the Treasurer used some time ago. But, Mr. Speaker, unless we're careful and judicious in handling this question of negotiations with the public service, and think very seriously about the position of once again asking public servants to take something less than the cost of living in this province, we run the danger of developing a very militant public service in this province. Mr. Speaker, that would not be in the best interests of anyone, regardless of where they may sit in this Assembly.

Going on to this question of projections, I see no place in the Budget Address where we have long-range projections, particularly in view of the high percentage, some 55.2 per cent, of our revenue in this province which comes from non-renewable resources. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that non-renewable resource revenues are determined for budget purposes on the basis of currently established prices. When members of the Assembly look at the budget before us and look at the projected surplus, they must recognize that the projections are on the basis

of the agreement presently in place with Ottawa. I would assume that even the most conservative of the Conservative MLAs in the Assembly would recognize that there's going to be at least some increase in the prices of oil and gas. My colleagues are committed to the motion by Dr. Buck, that we will discuss tomorrow afternoon. But recognizing that the surplus we're talking about in this budget will be buoyed up considerably, depending upon the success of the upcoming negotiations, I feel confident that the surplus will turn out to be far larger than \$309 million next year when we're debating the budget speech once again.

Mr. Speaker, in my preliminary remarks I mentioned that we've seen capital increases over the past three years. I talked in terms of the third year of a one-year program. Back in 1978 there was a 30.9 per cent increase in the capital budget; in '79, a 41.5 per cent increase; and this year, a 31.1 per cent increase — an increase of 103.5 per cent over the course of three years. But no place in this budget, the one last year, or the one before that do we see any kinds of projections as to what the operating costs are going to be, what the staff implications are going to be. It's a point I've made on at least two previous occasions in the Assembly: during this same opportunity one year ago, and during the estimates discussions of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee some two years ago.

Once again I make the point to hon. members, regardless of where they may sit in the Assembly: it's becoming imperative as we make long-term commitments, be it hospitals, schools, roads, or whatever else, that we recognize what those costs are going to be three, five, and seven years down the road. What better place to do this kind of thing than in appendices to the budgetary documents. A year ago we had the opportunity to be among the first in Canada to do that. Since that time British Columbia and the federal Conservative government have moved in that direction. But we in this province of Alberta have a unique opportunity and, I might say, a unique need to be doing some of this long-term projecting. I simply fail to see that anyplace in the budget, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the British Columbia example, they have budgetary expenditure projections by ministry from '81 to '85. They clearly spell out in their documentation that these are not — in fact, I'll read from page 16 of the document:

IT SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR THAT PROJECTIONS BEYOND 1980/81 ARE NOT THE PLANNED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF THE GOVERNMENT. THEY ARE ESTIMATES OF PROGRAM COSTS AND REVENUE ASSUMING NO CHANGES IN PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND NO ADJUSTMENTS TO TAX RATES OR TAX EXPENDITURES.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is the kind of thing we have to be looking at here in the province of Alberta, not only on the capital and the expenditure side of our budget, but also on the side of the growth, revenue, and commitment of funds as far as the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is concerned.

My office has been having discussions with a variety of individuals who have tried to look at this question of management of wealth like we have here in Alberta. Alaska has some of the same kinds of challenges and opportunities we have. Holland had some of the same kinds of challenges and opportunities during the '60s. Other countries had the same kind of challenges as far as

management of wealth that we have in this province of Alberta. It concerns me very much that if we're not judicious in the approach we take, we'll find ourselves in a situation where we have something that's referred to as the "Dutch sickness", if I could use that, where in fact they totally overcommitted themselves and have had to retrench tremendously. We have the British experience, what they've done with the wealth from the North Sea reserves they found. Obviously on this continent there is Alaska and one or two other examples.

The point I'm trying to make is that we have an opportunity in this province of Alberta and in this country of Canada to give leadership, not only in Canada and on this continent but virtually around the world, as far as dealing with this question of wealth management is concerned. Mr. Speaker, I won't be the least bit surprised if sometime in the course of this debate some hon. government member, or the Treasurer himself, makes the point that we're doing this kind of thing. Then why not do this kind of thing in public? I don't ask the government to lay every last detail before the public of this province. But this province is 75 years old. I think the people of this province are as trustworthy and can understand projections as well as the people of British Columbia. The federal government thought that Canadians could understand, appreciate, and be a part of this kind of planning as far as their budget was concerned. Certainly we in this province are past the stage of questioning the public's being able to handle the question.

So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding the first part of my remarks I want to say that in my judgment it becomes imperative that we start to look very seriously at including medium and longer term projections in our budgetary preparation for the public in this province, not only for MLAs, but the public — the government can put in the disclaimers that it wants, like the British Columbia government and the federal government have — so that there's a far greater appreciation of the trends, of the implications of where we're going budgetwise.

Certainly we should be doing that kind of thing with every new program which comes down the tube. We should be asking ourselves, Members of the Legislative Assembly: what kind of value are we getting for the money that's being spent? Are we getting the best possible value? Some situations where they should be asked would be in an area like Agriculture, for example. Since 1976 the per capita expenditure in Agriculture has gone up \$7 per person in this province. In a very crude form, we should be asking ourselves, are we getting the benefit of that? Is the agricultural community getting the benefit of that? What has been the benefit during the seven-year period?

We go to a situation like Social Services and Community Health. In 1976 the per capita expenditure in Social Services and Community Health was some \$252 per capita in this province. It's now up to \$308 per capita. No one is quarrelling with the additional funds being spent, but the question has to be asked, are we getting value for that additional \$50 per person? What are we doing with that additional expenditure?

Look at another area, Education: financial assistance to schools through the foundation program. In '76, an amount equivalent to \$356 per citizen in the province was going to the foundation program. In 1981, it's going to be \$350. Is it appropriate that as people in this province we're putting \$6 less per capita into the foundation program now than we were five years ago? What's the basis for that decision? I genuinely hope, Mr. Speaker,

that the government isn't doing a seat-of-the-pants kind of thing, that they do have these longer term projections we talk about, that they are really concerned about specific objectives, that they are really doing this longer range planning, certainly up to five years, and hopefully longer than that, with the projections on revenue, on the capital side, and on the operations side. If the government's doing that, and I hope they are, let's make that information available to the public of this province. Let's not try to keep it behind closed doors.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on to hospitals and try to use the announcement that every member in the Assembly was enthused about some two weeks ago when the minister announced the large number of new hospitals in the province. Once again, I commend the minister for the announcement. But wouldn't that be an ideal time to stop and ask ourselves some questions: what's the five-year plan; what are the five-year implications for operating budgets; what are the five-year implications for nurses; what are the five-year implications for support staff across this province? It seems to me that those are the kinds of things we should be moving on at this time, in conjunction with the day to day operation.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, lest any member mistake the situation, there have to be refinements each year, as you get closer to the year you're moving into. I think the hospital situation could have been a prime example where that overall approach should have been used. And if it was used, let's table in the House the documentation for it, so that we're all as wise and we all have as much information as the minister, and so that hospital boards and the public at large across this province have the same kind of information that people have in some other jurisdictions.

With regard to hospital debenture retirement and the announcement that's made in, the budget, during estimates I'd ask the Provincial Treasurer or the hon. minister: as a result of the government making that bookkeeping change — and I say "bookkeeping change" because in the past the debenture funds have been included in the operating budget of the hospital, and the money comes back to the government — will hospital boards have more money for health care? Will hospital boards have more money, so that we'll be able to operate all the hospital beds across this province in 1980? Will hospital boards have more money so we can be assured that nurses will be in their places after April 15, 16, or 17? If the answer to those three questions is yes, then I say, well done. But on the other hand, if hospital boards are simply going to find their budgets cut back by the amount equal to the debenture retirement, then really hospital boards are in no better place than they were before the announcement. It is simply, as I said earlier, a bookkeeping venture.

So it will be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see just what has happened in that particular area. I genuinely hope that that money isn't going to be taken in by the government, that in fact those debentures really are paid off, and that hospital boards are going to get some additional money this year, so we can sit in this Assembly a year from now and say that during our 75th Anniversary year, every one of the hospital beds in this province for which there was a job, was used; not a situation where we have a number of wards having to be closed down, especially in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. If the minister can assure us that that is the situation, that those additional funds are going to end up in the hands of the hospital boards, then this a far more significant an-

nouncement than many hospital boards have deemed it to be initially.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to the third area I wanted to touch on, roads. That is the area where additional expenditures are available this year. But once again, Mr. Speaker, I get back to the need for some long-range planning in the province — perhaps I should use the term "long-range public planning" — at least long-term public financial planning. I refer hon. members to the standing committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, September 17, 1979, when the hon. minister Mr. Kroeger was before the committee. The minister was extremely frank with the members of the committee, Mr. Speaker.

In the course of the discussions we posed the question to the minister: what kind of money would be needed for a catch-up figure if we were really to get the road system in the province of Alberta in the kind of condition it should be in? The minister said, and he cautioned his remarks:

... ballparking now. The catch-up figure that I get, if we really wanted to do a catch-up [job], would be in the order of \$1.8 billion. So \$100 million a year isn't going to catch ... up very fast.

I must concede that I was the member who posed the figure of \$100 million a year to allow us to catch up in this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, here we have the Minister of Transportation giving the Heritage Savings Trust Fund [committee] an honest assessment of what money would be needed, \$1.8 billion, to really catch up on road construction across the province; that \$100 million really wouldn't go very far, as members can readily see. If we're going to do that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, we have to get back to the suggestion I made earlier; that is, to do some longer range planning. Obviously, if road builders in this province are to be in a position to have the tremendous increases suggested, they have to know at least two years ahead. If we're not to have a situation where we run out of asphalt in this province, like we did last year, that particular segment of the road-building industry has to know ahead of time.

The point I want to make is: the reason for this longer term planning and taking the public of the province into our confidence, isn't something that would benefit just those of us in the Legislative Assembly or in the media; it would also be of great benefit to the industry and business people across this province. If, for example, the government in its wisdom next year decides on a five-year road plan that will enable us to [go] some distance towards this catch-up figure of \$1.8 billion, it would have to be part of a very extensive, well thought out, long-range plan.

Not only would it have to be done that way to enable the industry to be in place; it would also be important from the standpoint of members of the Assembly to know what, in the longer term, the operating costs of those roads would be — the maintenance costs. So often, members on both sides of the House, including myself, suggest what we think are darned good ideas that are very popular. But not often enough do we sit down and look at the financial long-term operating side of the ledger. I use highways as an example again. Yes, there is a welcome increase in the highways budget. But if we're to get involved in this catch-up the minister talks about, then we can't go on a year to year basis. I make the point again to the Provincial Treasurer in that light.

And once again I make the point to the Provincial

Treasurer: if that kind of information is being done internally, in the government, then certainly with the staff in the department — similar kinds of preparation have been made in Ottawa and Victoria and several states south of the border; we've got the same kind of initiative not only to go that far, but to go much further here in the province of Alberta.

Last Thursday I found myself in the different position of commending the Minister of Culture for what the minister had done as far as libraries are concerned. The library program, albeit small in the overall scheme of things in the budget, is an extremely important initiative. It's one which I might say I hope started years ago, when the hon. minister Mr. Schmid was worked over the coals — all one afternoon and one evening, I think — because we had the distinction of being either ninth or 10th in Canada when it came to library assistance. We made some small moves in that direction.

But in what I guess I'd refer to as a leap forward as far as libraries are concerned — and we don't only plan to do this with the Minister responsible for Culture, but several other ministers: talk in terms of the five-year projections. What are going to be the operating cost in five years? What's it going to do to the additional public service in the province? What are the implications? The minister nods. I hope that means she's got the information. When we get to those estimates, it's our hope to be able to get the same kind of information in several other departments. Five years hence, we can look back and judge if we've met some of the objectives that were set out. No shame if the minister has to say: look, we've had to change course in midstream. But let's do it out front. If we can make that move this year, I think that would be a very significant move in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, the fifth point I want to touch upon for a period of time is this question of removal of rent controls in the province of Alberta. My philosophy and, I think, the philosophy of our colleagues, is that basically we're not enthusiastic about rent control legislation. To be very candid, we did vote in favor of the rent control legislation presented to the House during the time of the federal government's anti-inflation program. It was on a temporary basis.

But if this budget, from the standpoint of meat and potatoes, day to day issues, has one very, very major shortcoming, especially looking at the urban situations in Edmonton and Calgary — and Grande Prairie; my colleague from Fort Saskatchewan added Grande Prairie — I would say there appears to be little, if any, initiative being taken by the government to alleviate the problems as far as rental accommodations in our major urban centres are concerned. Several things can be done. One of the government backbenchers — the Member for Calgary Buffalo, I believe — raised the question earlier about the capital cost allowance, and has representation been made to the federal government to make some changes there? If the federal government isn't prepared, surely, in this province of Alberta we can work out some kind of scheme as a means of stimulating development of rental accommodations: tax credits or some mechanism to offset the disadvantage and stupidity of Ottawa as far as the capital cost allowance is concerned. That could be done right here in Alberta in 1980.

There are people, and they are not in the Assembly right now, who believe simply that across-the-board rent controls are the answer to the problem. They are not, Mr. Speaker. If we continue rent controls in this province, three years from now we're going to be in much the same.

or worse, situation than we are this very afternoon. If the province is to take some initiative and develop a program, be it tax credits or whatever, as far as capital cost allowance and the province picking up the shortage, that would be one step which could be taken to encourage the development of more rental accommodations right now.

Mr. Speaker, a second move this government could take right now is increasing the amount of money available through the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation or the Alberta Housing Corporation, so that money is available at reasonable interest rates for the refinancing of apartments presently in existence. People who are in the rental business, who are on short-term financing or have to refinance right now, are forced by 16 or 17 per cent interest into a situation where they have to raise rent very much. Unfortunately some proprietors are abusing the situation. If we were to take the initiative as a province and say, we're prepared to make money available at 12 per cent for refinancing under certain circumstances, where the rent wouldn't go up other than on an agreed upon approach, my discussions with developers and people in the industry tell me they are prepared to accept that kind of scheme. That's another thing we could do right now.

A third thing we could do would be to encourage core development in our two major cities of Edmonton and Calgary. Across the continent of North America, there appears to be a move away from the move to the suburbs that we saw in the '70s, and more of a move back to the cores of the larger centres of population. Certainly here in Alberta we've got the initiative, we've got the finances, not to do it as a government, but to do it in partnership with the business community. And the end result will be that we're going to have rental accommodations available to people so that they're not going to pay 35 and 38 per cent of their salaries for rent.

The fourth, and last, thing that could be done by this province right now is to have some program within either the Department of Municipal Affairs or the Department of Housing and Public Works where, as far as rental accommodations are concerned, some sort of subsidization can be available to people on low and fixed incomes.

Mr. Speaker, I know that's going to rankle a number of members. But if we were to do that today, and make money available at 12 per cent for remortgaging and to encourage new accommodations to be built with an agreement that rents would be reasonable, and if we were to put into place an Alberta capital cost allowance that would get around that problem, we would find in a period of two to three years, not the kind of shortage situations we see today, but a far better market situation as far as rental accommodations are concerned. At that time we could move away from the assistance, subsidization, or whatever, to low- and fixed-income people. But I say to members in this Assembly that if this government thinks it can callously disregard what's happening to a lot of people today rentwise, it is frittering much of its urban political base.

I think this government has three choices. One, it can sit and do nothing. Second, it could impose rent controls again. Third, and my preference, is to take some of the initiatives I've outlined this afternoon — that I'm sure members can find fault with — which on one hand will cushion people who are going to feel the worst increases for the next two to three years, but at the same time are going to improve the market place, so that there is investment and new accommodations are coming on stream. I say to members on the government side of the

House — and I suppose I'd be flattering myself somewhat if I thought you'd take my political advice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. R. CLARK: I expected the agreement.

But when you consider that more than 52 per cent of the people in Edmonton live in rental accommodations, the urban political base of this government is becoming very spongy, unless this government is prepared to take some action on the question of rentals.

Mr. Speaker, the last, and very brief, point I want to make in the course of my remarks today deals with the provincial employees. I don't believe this government can continue for very long to expect provincial employees in Alberta to take something like 7 or 7.5 to 9 per cent this year — I think it was 6 to 7.5 last year — and feel they are benefitting from the good life in this province. Earlier I made reference to the "apples and oranges" statement made by the Provincial Treasurer and the presentation made to the Assembly last week. I recognize that from the government's point of view it's a difficult problem. But it seems to me that unless the government is prepared to earnestly sit down and negotiate and be somewhat flexible on that 9 per cent ceiling, we are going to have a large number of very able people leave the public service and go elsewhere.

Regardless of where members sit in this Assembly, we have in this province many very dedicated people in the public service, and they are simply not able to keep pace with what's going on in Alberta. Look at interest rates, look at the opportunities they're going to have to acquire their homes — one can go on. One option for the government is to sit back and lose many of those very dedicated, good people in the public service. Secondly, we're not going to be able to attract new people of the calibre one would hope would go into the public service in this province. The third danger is that we will find an increasingly militant public service in Alberta. Once again, regardless of where we sit in this Legislative Assembly, that would not be in the best interest of any of us.

[Mr. Little in the Chair]

When I make that statement, I want to make it very clear to the public service that I would not for one moment support unreasonable increases totally across the board. But I'm saying to the Provincial Treasurer and to his colleagues in the cabinet that I question very much whether 9 per cent is going to enable the public servants to meet the pace of inflation, to keep their place in the province of Alberta in 1980. I see that becoming an increasingly serious problem for this government and for the people of the province of Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to make a few comments on the budget delivered by the Provincial Treasurer in this Legislature on April 2.

I see the Speaker of the Assembly is gone. I was going to congratulate him for the excellent role he plays as Speaker of the House. I would hope that the member who is now in the Chair would do an equal job. [interjections]

We just heard the Leader of the Opposition deliver his remarks on the budget speech presented here last week. I have some observations to make on what the hon. Leader

of the Opposition said. He talked about a long-range plan for capital projects and operation over the next number of years. He makes the inference that we don't have anything in place to protect the citizens of Alberta if and when the depleting resource of this province runs out. But I'd like to remind the Leader of the Opposition that this is why we put in place the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund in 1974-75. That trust fund is doing what he anticipates should be done. I have full confidence in the Provincial Treasurer, the cabinet, and the Conservative caucus, that this government will put and keep in place the concept of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and what is required for the benefit of Albertans for years to come. He asked the question: are we getting the value of our money from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? I say we are.

The leader also [said] — and I'm not sure what he was getting at — that we're putting \$7 per capita from our provincial budget to the benefit of agriculture in this province. I think it's benefitted quite well, because we have farm income receipts of about \$3 billion in 1979-80, which is a significant income over prior years.

He indicated that we're spending \$308 per capita through the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Mr. Speaker, we have many new programs that account for the \$308 per capita, such as the many programs for senior citizens, a new program recently introduced for the severely handicapped in this province, and others just too numerous to mention at this time.

I'm not sure what he was talking about in hospital construction and long-term planning of hospitals, because we only have to look at the statement the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care made in this Legislature on March 24, 1980. The minister indicated we're going to spend some [\$125] billion on long-term planning for hospitals in the future. So I'm not too sure what he's getting at. I don't think he's looked at the estimates book, where the capital operating expense of hospitals has increased 29.1 per cent and the building of new facilities in this province is going to be increased by 114.7 per cent in 1980-81. I think it's a very significant contribution to the hospital program in this province.

The member also dwelt on the highway budget and what should happen there. He didn't give us any concrete suggestions of what should take place, but he said that according to what the minister told him during the Heritage Savings Trust Fund meetings last year, it's going to take over \$1 billion to catch up. But since 1972 we as a government have tried to catch up on the lack of highways we had in this province prior to that. I think we've made some pretty significant increases. In this year's budget we have an overall increase of 18.1 per cent in highway expansion, which is in concert with the equipment available in this province and the other necessities to build roads.

Regarding the library situation in this province, I remember that when I became a member of this Legislature I met with a Mrs. Wright from the University of Alberta. She came to my office in Stony Plain on a Saturday morning and indicated that they would like to have a meeting with a cabinet committee or something so they could discuss libraries. To that point the library association had never met with any cabinet ministers. I set up a meeting with Horst Schmid. From that time on, the budget for libraries has increased. The announcement last Thursday by the Minister responsible for Culture certainly brought that home. We are from 42 cents per capita when we took over in 1971 to approximately \$7

per capita. I think it's pretty significant in that number of years.

Regarding rent controls in this province, the member indicated he's opposed to them, but also gave the inference that if nothing is to be done we should keep them on. As long as we keep rent controls on in this province, we're going to have no new development and no new diggings for apartment construction taking place in our two major metropolitan areas. When rent controls come off, if the entrepreneur who is building these buildings knows where he's going, I think we'll be in a lot better position and hopefully in two years down the road we'll see an occupancy of over 3 to 4 per cent. The Minister of Housing and Public Works recently announced that they're going to increase the home purchase program to \$500 million, and \$250 million of that will go to the core housing projects, which should see some 4,000 units put on stream here in the province.

I'd like to go on to some of my own remarks on the budget, Mr. Speaker. I think the Provincial Treasurer has to be commended for the research and work he's put into this document, going back to 1906 and looking at the fiscal responsibilities of the first government of this province and the comparison to what's happening here today — fiscal responsibility is still being carried on.

I look at this Second Session of the 19th Alberta Legislature, and I'm not exactly sure what's happening with the members of the opposition. We've seen them very, very weak in the types of questions coming to the front bench members in the question period. We've seen in this budget — and I'm not sure where the money is being spent — \$444,000 for research and office staff for the Leader of the Opposition and the NDP member. I'm not sure where this money is being spent. We sure don't see it coming into this Legislature in the quality of questions or the calibre of speeches being made by members of the opposition.

DR. BUCK: How much for the Deputy Speaker?

MR. PURDY: One question brought up here on April 1 — I don't know whether it was an April Fools' joke or what, but the Member for Spirit River-Fairview brought up about the carving that was hanging on that wall. With so many other issues out in the province, Mr. Speaker, he has to bring in an issue like that. That particular item has been in the House for a couple of years and has been removed for some repair work. But he probably had some alternative motive for bringing it forward; I don't know for sure.

The other day in the House, March 26, the Member for Clover Bar was asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture. He said he was going to ask two questions that were not going to be quite so pleasant. I read over the questions and didn't see anything actually wrong. I thought the minister answered them quite well. So I'm not sure what he was getting at.

We go back to the second day of this session, when the Leader of the Opposition wanted to have a full debate in the House on interest rates. He did not take up the challenge of the Government House Leader that it should be done in his remarks in the throne speech debate. We've heard no other comments on that particular item in this House except for his remarks today on the budget speech. And he did not give us any clear alternatives of what should be taking place.

I'd like now to go on to some of the budget items that will have an impact on the Stony Plain constituency. The

first item I'm going to dwell on is the Department of Transportation. Between the Stony Plain and St. Albert constituencies, we have eight priorities. We have roadways that are a common denominator out there. As a constituency we've had before us, since 1974, the question of 118 Avenue or Highway 16x. The department tells me this year that they're going to let a contract in July to build 12 kilometres of road. But I understand that half a dozen or maybe a dozen portions of land will have to go to expropriation. I'm wondering how we're going to have a contract in place and build a complete system of highway that is greatly needed in that area, because the count right now is 8,000 cars per day on a small two-lane highway. So if we have to go to expropriation — and my constituents know how I feel on it — if we have to expropriate for the benefit to other people, we'll have to go ahead and do it.

Of interest, I think, to all members who live west of Edmonton is that Highway 16 west to Jasper is in dire need of twinning. The last piece of twinning on that highway, from what we call the Smithfield corner to west of Wabamun, was done in 1975. A bit of work was done this year to build six lanes between Spruce Grove and Stony Plain, and work will commence this year between Spruce Grove and Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, at the Winterburn overpass there are 30,000 cars per day. It's extremely higher than Highway 2 south; it's the busiest highway in the province. I'm pleased that we've started Operation 16 out there, to cut down the death and carnage on that highway. I'm sure that since December 1, when that program was implemented through the Solicitor General and the RCMP K Division in conjunction with the many detachments along Highway 16, it's certainly helped to eliminate the impaired driver, the speeding, the vehicle that is not up to standards, and actually got them off the highway. I'm pleased that Highway 43 is going to be twinned to west of Gunn, which is now in my colleague's constituency of Barrhead.

We have a number of secondary roads in the Stony Plain constituency that I know will receive attention this year, and some of them are very greatly needed. One is 635, which is out of my constituency now, but I have had something to do with it. I see the Member for St. Albert smile there, that we're finally going to get that piece of road paved and up to standard. Also work will be done through the resources grant on Highway 770 which, for hon. members, is the road that runs directly south of Highway 43 to the North Saskatchewan River and into the constituency of Drayton Valley. There are a number of others, but time will not allow me to dwell on all of them.

Under the Department of Environment, the previous minister announced that the Sturgeon River basin study was completed. I would like to see some work out there, Mr. Minister, to stabilize the levels of Lake Isle and Lac Ste. Anne, and to assist the cottage owners so that they know from year to year that they'll have a constant level in both those lakes. I'm pleased to see that the Minister of Environment did commit himself this year that if operating moneys are available from the various municipalities on Lake Isle, he will place weed-harvesting equipment on the lake for a year's trial, to determine if weed harvesting is the answer for Lake Isle. The Lake Isle study was completed two years ago, and the weed-harvesting program that should commence in 1980 should help give us a comparison to what is taking place. I'm also pleased that the minister announced last year that they're going to do

another study on Lake Wabamun and some of the things that are taking place out there. Since 1972, Calgary Power has carried on a weed-harvesting program. It'll be interesting to compare the studies of the minister's department in regard to the studies I personally did on that lake.

To dwell on hospitals for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care saw fit last year to put back in place the local board of the Stony Plain hospital. I'm hoping that with the incorporation of that board we will see a greater utilization rate of that hospital. It is down right now, but if we can put emphasis on getting the hospital back to a day facility, as it should have been, we will have back in place an active treatment centre for that particular area.

In the Stony Plain constituency, we have only one nursing home right now, and more are required. It is a 90-bed nursing home, run through the Good Samaritan Society out of Edmonton. We are getting phone calls now, where early settlers who came out and settled in the Spruce Grove-Stony Plain area cannot get into that home because it's being taken up by patients from the metropolitan area of Edmonton and other centres. So I request that we have a serious look, Mr. Minister, at nursing home facilities in many of our areas west of Edmonton.

Senior citizens' lodges: we had a commitment from the Minister of Housing and Public Works in 1975 that a number of these projects would go ahead. I'm pleased to see that the project is under construction in Stony Plain. I see the minister is not in his place, but I'd like to know what's happening with the Spruce Grove home and the Darwell home. Both these were to go in 1977. I know the plans are well under way now, but we've had no concrete action on it since the land was acquired in Spruce Grove. Hopefully by the end of 1980 we will have physical structures in place in both Spruce Grove and Darwell to meet the needs of our senior citizens who can no longer stay in their own homes.

Another subject I wanted to touch on very quickly in regard to hospitals is the northern Alberta children's care centre that a number of members have been talking about, and about which a number of questions have been asked in this House recently. I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that I became a member of this organization long before it ever became in high profile with the government. I support the concept of what the child care centre should be all about. We have in Edmonton right now 500 beds for children in five hospitals, and they're about 60 per cent occupied. We have five emergency departments in these hospitals, but none designed for children.

Putting on a cap that I used to wear a number of years ago, I was in emergency treatment centres a number of times, and I still go into them with the cap I wear with the fire department. It's pretty disheartening to take a child into that type of environment, where you have inebriates, badly injured people out of motor vehicle accidents, burn victims, or whatever the case may be. That type of concept will stay in children's minds for a long time, if they see it. In Edmonton we only have four beds in one hospital for intensive care for children. What is required for northern Alberta is to achieve a level of care and benefit from research in children's diseases comparable to other parts of Canada where children's hospitals are located, Mr. Speaker.

I see that my time is quickly running out, and I have one more subject I'd like to speak on this afternoon before I do run out of time. I'm going to make a few

remarks regarding federal/provincial relationships. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that I'm a federalist first and an Albertan second. You can tell by the tie I have on today. It's the maple leaf tie, the Canadian tie. I think that should say something for itself.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have seen several actions by the new federal government which are directly harmful to interests of Albertans. These actions strain the relationship between Alberta and the federal authorities, but I would like to suggest, as well, that these actions are directly harmful to the well-being of the entire nation. It is very important that this Assembly consider closely the federal decisions and the trend they represent, so that we can offer coherent and well-reasoned alternatives which will benefit Alberta and Canada.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the new federal government reneging on a previous, very sensible, federal commitment to concentrate federal support for the new terminal at Prince Rupert. In the fall of 1979, the federal Minister of Transport committed the federal government to support with funds of \$42.5 million rail embarkment construction and other on-site assistance in order to ensure the speedy commencement of this vital facility, which the Alberta government has supported for some time. The previous federal government assumed this very appropriate role of the national authorities to assist with rail, road, and dock development for a project of such importance. But we now hear from the new Minister of Transport, Mr. Pepin, that the federal government will not hold to Mr. Mazankowski's promise, and that the philosophy of this week is, users pay.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that this new action is nothing short of tragic for Alberta grain producers, for grain producers across the prairies and, indeed, for the Canadian economy as a whole. This latest move will ensure complicated delays and new and unnecessary negotiations which will do no good, and which will certainly hurt improvement of grain transportation facilities for prairie farmers, which have been delayed long enough.

I am sure all members are quite familiar with the need for improvement in grain transportation, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps some figures will re-emphasize the urgency of this situation. It is estimated that the loss of sales last year was some \$600 million, which is up from about \$500 million the year before. The problem is not in production of grain or in the availability of markets for it. It is estimated that 35 per cent of the '79 grain production remains on the farm. The grain is there, Mr. Speaker, the elevators are full. The problem is transportation of that grain.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I'm very thankful, on behalf of my constituents, that this provincial government has set grain movement as a high priority, and has pushed vigorously for some years for construction of port and terminal facilities at Prince Rupert. It is very discouraging, however, to see the federal government setting up roadblocks, and seemingly doing what it can to slow down grain movement in this country.

Another area they've delved into is the rebate of federal income tax for investor utilities. At present, all utility companies have 95 per cent of their income tax rebated. The new federal system institutionalizes discrimination against private investors, because the income tax rebate will be reduced to 50 per cent for private power companies but will remain at 95 per cent for publicly owned

firms. This move is not only blatant discrimination against private investors, but is blatant discrimination against Alberta. Alberta is one of the very few provinces that rely upon large private companies for a good deal of their electrical power. Most every other province uses public firms for production.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Alberta is very well served by Calgary Power and Alberta Power as private firms. It will mean that power consumers in areas served by the two private firms will be hit with an immediate increase of 6.5 per cent on their power bills — this was evident in a news release of April 1 this year — a totally unwarranted and unnecessary increase.

I do not wish to seem unduly suspicious, but I'm beginning to think the federal government is aiming injurious policies at Alberta in a vindictive, specific way. I hope not, but my suspicions are reinforced by yet another unilateral federal action which seems directly aimed at Alberta. I refer, of course, to the announcement by Mr. Lalonde, the federal minister of energy, abrogating a force majeure of the agreement between Alberta and Canada, which ensured the world price for the very expensive crude production by the Syncrude plant near Fort McMurray. What possible rationale could there be for this attacking action? It is beyond me. This move will dig Canada further into a hole from which it may never escape. Instead of moving in a sensible direction, providing a fair price for a resource which is increasing in value because it is non-renewable and depleting, we are moving in exactly the opposite direction. The federal government wishes to provide fewer, rather than more, incentives for energy self-sufficiency.

Besides the questionable morality of breaking that agreement unilaterally, I think this action has other consequences, which are highlighted by a recent news event. I note with interest that Sheik Yamani of Saudi Arabia visited Toronto last week. In a very diplomatic but firm speech, the Sheik attempted to point out to Canada the folly of our ways. He pleaded with us to close the attempt to live in a fool's paradise by keeping our energy prices artificially low. He pointed out that price has proven to be the best tool to encourage conservation. He pointed out yet another obvious: that petroleum is a depleting and non-renewable resource.

I note too that Canada is in the process of concluding the purchase from Mexico of a very sizable amount of oil, yet another foreign source, Mr. Speaker. Canada will pay the world price for that oil, but Canadian consumers will not pay the world price at the pump. A massive federal subsidy will ensure consumers an artificially low price, and the Canadian federal deficit will increase by the amount of that subsidy. What more wasteful way could there be to increase the national debt than to subsidize private pleasure vehicles?

To return to the tar sands, Mr. Speaker, we see that Syncrude, in which the government has an equity interest, has had the rug pulled out from under it. How can they operate on a secure base, or plan for the future, when they don't know what agreements they're operating under? How can they expand when they are receiving considerably less than fair value for a product which is very expensive to extract? Why should anybody invest in Cold Lake or any other tar sands area when this is the kind of treatment they can expect? All these questions have been unanswered by the federal minister of energy, Mr. Lalonde.

I'm very glad that in Alberta we have a very strong provincial government which can deal firmly with the

discrimination of federal Liberal policies. I am pleased to see the continuing wide use of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the days when our depleting resource begins to run out, and I find very thought provoking the emphasis by the Provincial Treasurer in the budget, on the vulnerability of the Alberta economy. Our economy is very vulnerable, Mr. Speaker, and it is certainly not made any more stable by federal Liberal policies.

The emphasis in the budget on the future of Alberta, our economic development, manpower training, orderly but necessary expansion in health care and housing development, is both prudent and far-sighted. The budget saves for the future, but also invests for the future. We have very rosy future possibilities in Alberta, but those years are darkened by the fact that we really don't know what the federal government will come up with next.

Thank you.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, since I did not get an opportunity during the throne speech debate, may I first of all congratulate His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on his recent appointment. Approximately one month ago, I had the honor of having him as guest speaker at an Alberta Cattle Commission social evening in the village of Glendon, located in my constituency. His words of wisdom and advice to the cattlemen of northeastern Alberta were very much appreciated. It was gratifying to sit and listen to someone who has resided in Alberta longer than Alberta has existed, review the development of the beef industry in this province. What impressed me most was to have someone of his seniority emphatically point out to the farmers and ranchers in attendance that Alberta is still the land of opportunity for agriculture and, more particularly, the beef industry.

Mr. Speaker, may I also offer my commendations to you, for your very capable method of conducting this Assembly. It is your fair and just rulings that give this Assembly its reputation for efficiency and decorum. I would also like to compliment the hon. Provincial Treasurer on his presentation last Wednesday night of a very progressive budget.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that when I first stood in this House just over a year ago, I was sceptical of our ability as a government to respond to the problems associated with rapid growth areas. More and more my scepticism has been replaced by confidence. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the hon. Premier and the cabinet for the co-operation I have received in planning for the infrastructure needs of the Cold Lake study area, should the Esso Resources Canada Limited megaproject proceed.

A special acknowledgement to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care for his recent announcement with respect to the hospital capital construction program included in the 1980 budget. The announcement of three new hospitals in the Bonnyville constituency was like a dream come true for the residents of that area of Alberta. Should the Esso Resources project proceed, the Cold Lake-Grand Centre region will be receiving a 150-bed, acute care/auxiliary/nursing home facility at a cost in excess of \$14 million. The community of Bonnyville will be receiving a 125-bed, acute care/auxiliary facility at a cost in excess of \$13 million.

Both hospital boards involved clearly understand that the sizing of these hospitals is based on population projections, should the megaproject proceed. Further, both boards readily recognize the need to scale down these facilities should the megaproject not go ahead. In my

opinion and in the opinion of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, this is a very positive decision on behalf of the hospitals department, in order to be prepared should rapid growth indeed occur. Compare this type of planning to the planning of the Sacred administration in the community of Cold Lake in the 1960s, when they took a hospital to the tender stage and then backed out on building it.

Mr. Speaker, I would be less than honest if I did not state that the residents of my constituency are watching the energy pricing negotiations with eager anticipation. However, the mandate they gave me to represent them in this House was that the Esso Resources project should proceed only if it is a good deal for the local residents, a good deal for Alberta, and a good deal for Canada. I'm not convinced that the federal government of this country realizes that such a project is a good deal for it. I think the hon. Member for Stony Plain outlined that problem quite clearly, and I won't get into it very deeply.

I would like to go on record as stating that the electorate in the Bonnyville constituency stands solidly behind the Premier and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, in their negotiations with the federal government to get a fair return for our depleting natural resources. Along with most Albertans, they believe that Alberta has played her colony role long enough, and now is the time for us to move forward and take our rightful place within Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, the third hospital plan for my constituency, at an estimated cost of approximately \$1.7 million, is a 10-bed, active care hospital in the village of Glendon. The residents of this agricultural village have been working for some time toward a new hospital, and are very appreciative that they were not overlooked as a result of the attention brought to the eastern part of the constituency by the Esso Resources megaproject.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition criticizes this government for using a plant by plant approach to oil sands development. He suggests that such things as pace of development, people services, environmental concerns, and front-end spending should be addressed by provincial policy. This only shows his total lack of understanding of rapid growth areas.

When one considers the totally different bases from which the Alsands project north of Fort McMurray and the Esso Resources project in Cold Lake area are starting, one must immediately conclude that standardized provincial policies will not work. In one instance you have nothing to start from other than the services that can be provided from the neighboring town of Fort McMurray, whereas in the other instance you have a well-settled area with some very well-established communities served by some very capable local municipal councils. In the Alsands case, your existing population is bears, coyotes, rabbits, lynx, et cetera; in the Cold Lake study area, you start with a base population in excess of 20,000 people. As someone intimately involved in planning for the impact of rapid growth on an area, I hope we continue to use our flexible approach and develop special programs to respond to special needs, and fulfil the objective, outlined by the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, that we strive for average communities with average debt loads.

Mr. Speaker, recently in this House the Leader of the Opposition stated that one of the points very often made to him every time he goes to the Cold Lake area is, why didn't local government people know what is happening prior to the announcement being made in Edmonton?



Anyone who lived in the Bonnyville constituency through the '70s, and was aware of what was going on around them, knew it was just a matter of time until the oil and natural gas resources of that area were developed. Is the hon. leader suggesting that our local municipal councillors were not aware of what was happening in their area? I must state that I have a lot of confidence in the municipal councils within my constituency and the capable leadership provided by them.

Mr. Speaker, at the local level the Cold Lake study area is served by three town councils, one village council, one municipal district council, seven school boards, four hospital boards, two Indian band councils, one Metis council, and an array of recreation boards and agricultural societies. These boards and councils are doing an excellent job of planning and preparing for rapid growth should it occur. Please allow me to give a brief run-down of some of the preparations that have already been carried out by the councils in the constituency, in co-operation with our provincial government, supported by many of the segments of the budget presented to this House.

Starting in the east end of the constituency, we have the town of Cold Lake with its beautiful lake-front setting, and approximately 4 miles down Highway 28, the town of Grand Centre, which originally grew as a result of the Canadian Forces Base, Cold Lake, located approximately 3 miles west. In 1979, the treasury branch in Cold Lake was expanded and renovated, and construction was started on a new treasury branch building in the town of Grand Centre. Also, a free-standing courthouse is currently under construction in the town of Grand Centre. The two towns joined together to plan a regional water and sewer system, and succeeded in getting a modified water and sewer funding program applied to their communities to handle what is going to be approximately a \$14 million project.

The breakdown of the financing is as follows: the communities contribute approximately \$3 million under the regular water and sewer funding program, Alberta Environment will provide approximately \$7.6 million, and the provincial government will carry the surplus in excess of the limits of our regular program and pay the interest on it until 1986. At this time, the debt will be transferred to the communities and borne by the population of that date. In my mind, Mr. Speaker, this is front-end financing.

The recreational needs of these two communities of approximately 4,600 people are served by two enclosed hockey arenas, which will be substantially improved with funding received from the municipal debt reduction program from both the town councils and the municipal district, also funding from the multicultural recreation program and the neighborhood improvement program. Currently, the town of Grand Centre is planning an expansion of its recreational facilities to provide a major community hall and an indoor swimming pool, among other facilities. Positive improvements are going on in the Cold Lake provincial park to serve recreational needs.

Nineteen-seventy-nine saw the completion of close to a \$1 million expansion to the John Neil Hospital, located in Cold Lake, under a renovation and mobile unit addition program. This should serve the medical needs of the east end of the constituency until such time as the new hospital announced by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is completed and operating.

The town of Bonnyville, located in the centre of the constituency, is a bustling community of 4,200 people. It

is growing much faster than the population projections we have for the area. This community can probably be viewed as a micro-organism of Canada, in that it has a very active French-Canadian population. I believe it is an important example of how the founding races of Canada can live and work together, build a community, and still retain their individual identity and a pride in their inheritance. It is my sincere desire that we do not lose this unique characteristic of the Bonnyville community as a result of rapid growth. During the past year, Bonnyville has received 20 self-contained senior citizens units, which are now nearing completion. In addition, renovations are being carried out to the original provincial building in Bonnyville. The community is currently putting together a program, in co-operation with the municipal district of Bonnyville and grant moneys from the neighborhood improvement program and multicultural recreation program, to complete its second indoor arena and an indoor swimming pool. Renovations and improvements in excess of \$400,000 are currently being carried out on the St. Louis Hospital in Bonnyville, which should carry this community over until the new hospital announced by the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care in this House is completed.

In the west end of the constituency is the village of Glendon, with a population of approximately 450. At the moment, this community primarily serves the surrounding agricultural area, but soon will undoubtedly be impacted by the oil and gas activity in the area. This community is served by its own grades 1 through 12 school and a full round of recreational buildings, which will soon see artificial ice, and is enjoying substantial growth. The addition to this community of a new 10-bed, acute care hospital will be very welcome.

The municipal district of Bonnyville, which serves the rural area surrounding most of these communities, has recently made some very positive moves in the direction of recreation facilities in the region. They have allocated in excess of \$1 million to the completion and improvement of the four agricultural society buildings in the area, and to recreation facilities in the hamlets of Ardmore, Fort Kent, Therien, and other small rural points. In addition, through their MDR grant moneys, they are making substantial improvements to their fire-fighting equipment, and to their very well planned road network serving the area.

Alberta Transportation completed a very active year in the Bonnyville constituency in 1979, and 1980 appears to be another active year. I'm not going to mention any of the specific road projects in the area, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to point out a road outside my constituency which, I would like to make this House aware, needs improvement. It's Highway 28 from Edmonton to the Fort McMurray turnoff or, if you wish, the junction of Highway 63. Assuming the Alsands project and the Esso project in Cold Lake indeed proceed, the total transportation movement from Edmonton to the northeast has to share that road. Currently it is the poorest, most winding, narrow section of Highway 28 between here and the border. I urge that if we proceed with the projects, we remember that road.

In June 1979, the hon. Minister of Education set up a special steering committee to investigate and report on problems with respect to the delivery of kindergarten to grade 12 education within the constituency. Work of this committee appears to be progressing satisfactorily, and it's my hope that the committee's report will address such problems as front-end financing for school construction

and better co-ordination among the numerous school jurisdictions in the area. In the area of advanced education, Lakeland College has continued to expand its program offerings to meet local needs. This winter saw the offering of pre-employment courses in both plumbing and sheet metal in the communities, and the opportunity for students to complete their first-year apprenticeship training in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, with this type of positive budgeting, things are progressing very well on most fronts to prepare for possible rapid growth, should energy negotiations with the federal government be successful and Esso Resources Canada Limited get its official go-ahead. However, Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that all my constituents' concerns have been relieved. They are still very concerned that along with energy growth in the constituency — which I might point out is happening every day on a pilot basis, even without approval of the megaproject — we also see growth in the tourism and agricultural potentials of the area. This is beautiful lake-land country. We must retain that beauty and the life style that goes along with it. Nineteen seventy-nine saw some substantial improvements in the Cold Lake provincial park, and it appears that 1980 and subsequent years will see greater improvements in park and recreational spots in the constituency.

I'm also deeply concerned that we do not lose or have a deterioration of our agricultural industry as a result of the high profile that energy is receiving in the area. I firmly believe we need to develop special ways of enhancing and promoting the agricultural industry within the northeastern area of this province. The very important announcement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture recently in this House, and reflected in this budget, should go some way to assisting that development. The grazing land improvement program, announced in conjunction with this budget by the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, should also assist agriculture in that area of the province.

Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to close on is this: agriculture is our most important renewable resource, and we must be careful that we do not lose ground in that industry.

Thank you.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to make just a few comments, for a change, on the budget. In particular, since I hadn't risen to speak in the throne speech debate, I wanted to say that I echo the comments, made by many members as to your function in this House, in particular the Member for Calgary Buffalo, who expressed it so much better than many of us can.

I have a lot of concerns about our budget, and they're in very, very general terms. Those concerns were really cemented today in listening to the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The historical overview that the Provincial Treasurer gave so well in his opening remarks on the budget, in terms of the kind of budget we had in 1906, which was just under \$2 million, and the over \$5 billion we have today, which in my understanding, as little as it may be of financial matters of that magnitude, concerns both the operating and capital projects ... When talking to my constituents, in their view and in my view, the amount of money in our budget is almost awesome, in terms of trying to comprehend exactly what we're doing in this province right now, and what it's costing us to do it. If you were to wander into this

Assembly today, I think the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition would almost lead you to believe that we really lack any kind of fiscal responsibility. He gives plaudits in a very small way for some programs, but overall there's a concern, first of all, about lack of programming in many areas. And then, in direct contradiction to that, he speaks to our lack of fiscal responsibility: have we looked down the road — the number of years often mentioned, I recall, was five — have we looked down the road five years to really understand the implications of what we're doing? Well I submit, Mr. Speaker, that indeed we have. In the year I have been sitting in this Legislature as a part of this government, along with my many new colleagues, I think many of us have really begun to have and now have a healthy understanding of what it means to be in the position of trying to bring forth policies that are good for this province, and to somehow look at the future. Since this is our 75th Anniversary year, I guess it allows us a little bit of digression to look at the past — what our forefathers, who came to this province and built it to the place it now is, have done, and maybe also to look to the future and what we might expect.

What would the pioneers, who came here in the early 1900s and are now gone, who would have been at a very industrious and able age in their 20s and 30s, have said about today? Why did they come first of all, and what did they expect of this province and this country?

I submit that, first of all, they had a very fulfilling life, because they had a dream and somehow were able to put into action their feelings and expectations by working. My feeling, from listening to opposition members and others out there in the public who would be critical, is that they are trying, probably without knowing, to remove the kind of dream that many of us have today, by taking over the responsibilities that all of us as citizens should have in paving the way for future generations.

We've had two birthday celebrations in our constituency already, in Airdrie and Trochu. They did a terrific job of looking at the past, through ice programs and a winter carnival, tracing our history and coming up to the present. Sitting there watching those programs makes you have a feeling of nostalgia and what it really means to be a part of this province. Then coming back to the Legislature and looking at all the programs we have and propose to lay in front of this Legislature over the next short period of time, you say to yourself constantly — at least I do — am I keeping the balance between doing things for the people who most need to have those things done for them, and putting in place programs that take away the initiatives I know most Albertans have, and which we shouldn't diminish in any way at all?

I have that concern. I see that sort of thing, the kind of thing I'm most afraid of in terms of taking away initiative and the sense of responsibility that Albertans should have, being constantly eroded by those people out there who would continually say that government should be responsible for almost everything, from the cradle to the grave. I say they are doing the people of this province a disservice when they promote that kind of attitude, which I think can readily destroy the initiatives we have, which have made this province the great place it is today.

For instance, in this balancing act we're doing, I look at the agricultural programs. I look at our responsibility, in terms of an Alberta responsibility, and the program the minister has outlined regarding the beginning farmer. If there was one single thing I heard about most in my travels last year before the election, I heard a concern

about continuity in agriculture: would we have young people continue to stay on the farm, or indeed even come to the farm? I think this program — much credit goes to the hon. minister responsible — will do a great deal to provide that continuity.

I must say that I am very, very disappointed with our federal government in many areas, not the least of which is, right now, an overall hog marketing policy. We see ourselves in a position which pits one province against another, which pits producers against one another from province to province. As farmers I don't think we want that. We want to work with our colleagues in the farming community across the country. We need some federal leadership to see that there is in place the kind of program that gives everybody a fair break right across this country.

The agricultural statistics, interestingly enough — just digressing for a moment: in 1905, there was a budget of something like \$16.5 million in terms of cash receipts; in 1926, \$165 million; and in 1979, estimated, which should be fairly accurate at this point, \$2,927 billion. Now I realize those are the receipts, and it doesn't bring in the total cost of production and so on. But overall, farmers in this province are in a fair position today. That doesn't mean there aren't a lot of concerns in particular areas. But it's certainly important that they recognize they are in a fair position, look with optimism to the future, and keep in place the kind of philosophy we've had over the years, which has actually allowed that to happen.

I believe it's going to be very unfortunate if the provincial government is placed in a position where we have to take complete responsibility in the area of transportation, marketing, and so on; that formerly the federal government, which has been the umbrella we all look to, to be fair and just right across this country, has had. Right now I am very concerned about that, and I think all of us are.

Just a brief remark about hospitals, in terms of specifics. I'm very fortunate — many of us are — in having some of the new facilities in my constituency. I would say that I applaud the minister. He looks as if he's a vision right now, with the sun shining on his face. [laughter] It may be appropriate that I mention him at this time. I don't think the light's come on him just because of that; I think maybe it has something to do with the window up there.

The minister was very fair. Many of us had concerns about how the new facilities would affect the people in our constituencies. Most importantly, I think we have the overriding concern that these facilities be very fairly placed across the constituency. Yet at the same time, we recognize of course that there's an economic way of doing this that must be looked at.

The minister and I had some very long conversations about the particular facilities in my constituency. I could only say I was more than pleased with the outcome of those conversations, because indeed it wasn't an easy decision for him and his department or myself to make, in terms of where those facilities would go. I must be reminded to share with him at another time the kind of congratulations I received, which should really go to him, on where those facilities were placed.

The growth in this province, which has been referred to by so many members already — I understand it's something like three times the national average — doesn't have a great deal of bearing on the agricultural part of my constituency, although certainly in every nook and cranny, farm homes that were vacant for several years now have people in them.

The Airdrie area, right outside Calgary, is a high growth area. The hon. Member for Bonnyville has a great many problems that would be similar to the ones those people in my area experience. I guess what I'm most pleased about is that the people in that area, rather than relying on government, are getting together in a sense of community which is very, very difficult in a situation where there had been only a few hundred people in place as a village just a few short years ago, and now we have 8,000 to 10,000 people in place. It's the fastest growing town in this province, and indeed that must say something about how fast it's growing.

I want to end by saying that I hope that, as in Airdrie, other communities in this province would look at themselves and to each other to form a sense of community and a sense of responsibility to themselves and their community, and not look to government to cure any of the problems that may come forward, and that we all look at all things coming on our plate constantly as challenges and not problems, because I see we have a great future.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have the opportunity to participate in this debate. It is also a pleasure, and something of a habit, to follow the hon. Member for Three Hills. A year ago we were in the same sequence, and I haven't made any progress in getting ahead of her.

I'd like to supplement slightly the remarks already made with respect to the speech given earlier by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I believe his remarks were well responded to by a number of earlier speakers. I would supplement only by saying I was somewhat surprised to hear his constant references and exhortations that we should be following five-year plans. Had that been the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I would have been much less surprised, given the source of the term "five-year plan". But I must confess I was somewhat taken aback. I would only say further that this government does not intend to move in lockstep fashion, but will continue to show the flexibility and the ability to fine tune our economic activities as we have in the past, and I offer my plaudits to the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, approximately one year ago, 29 members of the Assembly, including myself, took their seats in this House for the first time. A year has now past and a great deal of experience has been accumulated by all of us. For myself, I enter what might be termed the sophomore year of an anticipated four-year term with a somewhat different feeling than I had a year ago. A year ago there was the excitement of an entirely new experience, that inevitable apprehensiveness about speaking in this Assembly, and the anticipation of participating in a caucus with representatives from virtually all parts of this province. It was for all of us a very exciting year.

There were, to be sure, some disappointments; it would be less than honest to suggest otherwise. But I think it's fair to say that any disappointments stemmed only from a rather predictable overzealousness, the desire to slay all the dragons at once, and to solve all problems in the first spring sitting. But any such feelings of disappointment, and they were slight, have certainly been superseded by continuing confidence I have gained in the commitment of this government to provide good government in this province, to move boldly and with foresight and, when problems are disclosed, to move with great haste and with true effectiveness to solve them.

In that regard I'd like to offer a compliment to a

gentleman who has been more accustomed to receiving brickbats than bouquets from this hon. member, and that is of course the Minister of Environment. I think that a bouquet is definitely in order, in the reference in both the budget and the throne speech to the government's commitment to initiate immediately a program to remove phosphorus from sewage in rivers and streams throughout Alberta. [applause]

Thank you to the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry; I now owe you a supper.

I trust that this program will be initiated first in respect to the Bow River. I believe it will go a long way to literally saving the Bow, which is a concern of many, many people in this province and particularly in southern Alberta.

Having delivered the bouquet, however, I do reserve the right to question the minister at the appropriate time as to the specifics and the financing, to be sure that we're looking in a complete way at the resolution of this problem. I certainly feel we're headed in the right direction.

There has already been a considerable amount of discussion in this Assembly, both in this debate and in the earlier debate on the Speech from the Throne, with respect to the subject to Canadian unity. Notwithstanding that, I do intend to devote the balance of my remarks this afternoon to that very important subject, because inevitably, when we are discussing Canadian unity and the state of our country, we are discussing the political and economic future of Alberta as well. As I listened in this House a number of days earlier to the various members speaking, and particularly to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I was very taken with his discussion about the love he has for this country of ours, Canada. I felt a tremendous emotional surge, that I believe was shared by many members of this Assembly, and that was no small tribute to his eloquence and sincerity. Certainly there are few stronger emotions than those aroused when one speaks of pride in one's country. Later, as the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry spoke so effectively, I was jolted back to the rather harsh reality of the present inadequacies of Confederation, to the reality of the inadequacy of the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to express a very personal point of view about Canada and about Alberta in the most straightforward way I know, by talking about the feelings I experienced both during those excellent speeches and subsequently. At first it was a sort of tug of war. On the one hand, I truly love my country; on the other, I recognize that the status quo in Canada is just not enough and that the existing rights of the provinces have to be respected and not abrogated in the guise of national interest. But that tug of war soon ended when I realized that we all love our country, but we can do so and still remain firm, and must remain firm, in our resolve to effect changes that we honestly believe will result in a stronger country.

Mr. Speaker, I came to realize another feeling that those excellent speeches had stirred within me: my love not only for my country but for my province, for Alberta, of course because of its natural beauty, but more importantly because of the opportunity it has granted me and my family and because, at the bottom line, it is my homeland. Mr. Speaker, I do not share the view of those who argue that Alberta is nothing more than a set of arbitrary boundaries within which some Canadians live. I suppose I feel so strongly about that because I was born and raised here in Alberta, and because my wife and I

have made a very conscious choice to make Alberta our permanent home and a permanent home for our children.

I recently read some accounts of the settlement of the Ukrainian immigrants in western Canada, and in Alberta in particular. I'd like to share some of those thoughts with hon. members, because it might help to explain more fully why I feel so strongly about my province. I am sure the story of the Ukrainian immigrants is in many ways similar to that of many other ethnic communities who settled in Alberta. The Ukrainians came to this land because their homeland was dominated by foreigners, because they had little or no opportunity for a better life for themselves or their children, because for many of them their only real asset in life was an intense desire for freedom and opportunity to build a better life for their families.

So they gathered together their few belongings — often a few men from the village would go first as an advance party — and they made the long perilous journey to this country and this province. First, overland to the Atlantic seaboard and then on boats — often on crafts of doubtful seaworthiness and with outrageously bad facilities — they came to Canada. But they didn't simply stop at the eastern seaboard. They didn't stop until they reached the west. They came to the west. They came because they were encouraged by the government of the day, because they were considered hardy and tough and prepared to endure the wilderness and rigors of the long, cold, Alberta winters, and they came because the land reminded them so much of their homeland, the breadbasket of Europe.

Many who came to Alberta settled in the area east of Edmonton near Vegreville. While many other settlers had thought that the area was rather inviting because the land was hard to break, because of the heavy brush, they looked at it in another way. They were enthusiastic about the area. To them the brush meant abundant firewood, precious firewood, which was so scarce in the old country. They broke the land and underwent unbelievable hardships living, first of all, in mud huts or less. But they survived and prospered. They built sturdier shelters and worked the land. As the years went by they worked more land and began to prosper as farmers.

They raised their families here in Alberta. But they wanted their children to be more formally educated. They wanted them to go to school, to be able to choose their way of life, to have the opportunity to make their own decisions about their occupation. Eventually some were able to save to send a child to teachers' college, which then was called normal school. University was out of the question; it was far too expensive. For some time those new teachers, who excelled at the normal schools, would get teaching jobs only in the Ukrainian communities. But later they got jobs in Edmonton and throughout the province. That new generation of Ukrainian ancestry wanted so much for their children, now second-generation Albertans, to have the benefit of a university education so that they too could have the opportunity, the choice of whatever career they wished. And those children, much like the children of many other first-generation Albertans, achieved those goals.

While the story I've related to you is taken from a book, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know the accounts are true. I know because I am of Ukrainian ancestry. My mom and dad were both school teachers who attended normal school and taught near Vegreville. And I know because they wanted so much for their son to be able to get a university education so that he could choose his

future as a free man here in Alberta.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one may ask: what's so special about this story and about Alberta? It could be told of any ethnic group, and about any region in Canada or the United States. In part that is true. But to me as a second-generation Canadian whose grandparents came from the Ukraine to Alberta by choice, because this special part of Canada provided them with opportunity and a chance to live as free people, it's a very special story and a very special place.

I never realized just how strongly I felt about Alberta until I left to attend law school in Vancouver, British Columbia, one of the most beautiful cities in one of the most beautiful provinces in the world. But somewhat to my own surprise, after three happy years in B.C. I turned down a job offer that I was very flattered to have received from a law firm in Vancouver, and with my new wife in tow came home to Alberta. I came back in 1972 at a time when there were frankly more opportunities in Vancouver. I came because Alberta is my homeland. It's my homeland in Canada: where my grandparents came; where my parents were born, raised, and still live; where I was born and raised; and where my children are and will be born and raised.

So, Mr. Speaker, to me Alberta is a great deal more than a set of boundaries somewhere in western Canada. My love for this province doesn't lessen or compromise in any way my love for my country, and it doesn't make me any less a Canadian to feel as I do about Alberta. But if we really do love our country, we have an obligation to it that goes far beyond swearing allegiance to a flag. That

obligation is to face the harsh reality that Canada has some very serious problems today, not just economic ones — we're all well familiar with those — but deep-seated structural problems. We owe it to both our province and our country to fight unceasingly for a new Confederation, a Confederation that will last so that someday perhaps our children will stand in this great room and be able to say that their mothers and fathers had the foresight and courage to fight against great odds to build a strong Alberta and a strong Canada.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the hon. minister's motion to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would just indicate to hon. members that it's not proposed that the House sit tomorrow evening, and would move that we call it 5:30.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:22 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

