

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, April 15, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, three very important people from that great territory to the north, the Northwest Territories. They are here having discussions with some of our people, including myself, with particular regard to the Slave River studies. They are the Hon. George Braden, Minister of Economic Development and Tourism; Hon. Richard Nerysoo, Minister of Renewable Resources; and Hon. Arnold McCallum, Minister of Social Services and the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation. They're in the Speaker's gallery. I'd ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Edmonton Belmont, who apologizes for not being here, I would like to introduce two groups to you and to the members of the Assembly. We have a group of grade 10 students from M.E. LaZerte. We have 30 in the public gallery and some in the members gallery. They are accompanied by their group leader. Would they please rise and accept the warm welcome of the House.

Mr. Speaker, also on behalf of the Member for Edmonton Belmont, we have a group of grade 5 students from McLeod elementary school. They are accompanied by their group leader Mrs. McKeen. Would they please rise and accept the cordial welcome of the House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, on February 28, the community of Grande Cache was shaken by the deaths of four of its citizens in an accident at the McIntyre underground mine. The occupational health and safety division has been investigating the circumstances which resulted in this tragedy, and has now completed its report. Officials of the division are in the process of meeting with representatives of McIntyre Mines Limited and with the union representing the miners to discuss the actions required to ensure that the recommendations of the report are implemented. As of this morning, both parties, the United Steelworkers of America, Local 7621, and management have agreed to commence immediately review and implementation of the recommendations. I intend to be personally involved in meetings with the union and management, together with my officials.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file three copies of the report with the Legislature Library. Copies will also be available to interested parties through my office and the occupational health and safety division.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Nurses' Salary Dispute**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Labour, or perhaps to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's a result of the nurses in the province of Alberta voting some 94 per cent in favor of strike action. Yesterday in the House, the Minister of Labour said that there may be an appropriate time for him to become personally involved in the negotiations. I think I used the term "face-to-face negotiations". My question to the minister: in light of the vote the Alberta nurses have taken — 94 per cent of the nurses voting to go out on strike — and the anguish being caused to a great number of Albertans as far as the health care potential for members of their families and themselves, is the minister now prepared to become personally involved in the negotiations between the nurses of the province and the Alberta Hospital Association?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members regret when there is a situation which causes any upset to society, any possibility of misunderstanding, or extended collective bargaining which creates that sort of situation. This is one of those occasions. The vote which is being completed today — and some public comment has already been made on it — is a stage in the free collective bargaining procedure. For me to commit to my future course of actions at this time, when there has not been an announcement of any strike or work stoppage, would be a deliberate undermining of the collective bargaining process. As I indicated to the House yesterday, we have mediation services available, and we are maintaining contact with both parties. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday and as I will re-indicate now, I am prepared to assist when the time seems appropriate to do that. But to indicate when and if I'm going to make personal interventions at this time would, in my estimation, jeopardize the possibility of other developments which may occur.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Alberta Hospital Association that the Alberta government will back the Hospital Association in one last attempt to avert a strike, by making more money available to Alberta nurses? Does the minister have the support of the Treasury Board in making that commitment?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the record shows that the government, through the department, has usually and traditionally met the legitimate financial needs of the hospital boards as they've been submitted to us, and that in the past we've honored the commitments the hospital boards have negotiated through their association, the Alberta Hospital Association. Again, I think it would be unwise, in fact unwelcome, for me to indicate any particular ceiling of financial commitment when these important negotiations are still under way.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then to the minister. Mr. Minister, in light of that answer, does the Alberta Hospital Association have a free hand to negotiate what it would adjudge to be a responsible final offer to the Alberta nurses' association?

MR. RUSSELL: I'm a bit puzzled by that question, Mr. Speaker, because of course they do. I don't think there's been any sign whatsoever that we have attempted through the department or branches of government to place any restrictions on them. We've given guidelines, and I emphasize the word "guidelines", to the public sector management agencies with respect to what we hope will be their position with respect to bargaining. But of course every individual association must respond to their particular association.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, it might be helpful if I read a communication from the president of the Alberta Hospital Association which I received this morning, outlining very clearly what their last offer to the nurses is. If hon. members would like to hear that, I'd be pleased to read it.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the message is dated 10:45 this morning, and gives details of the Alberta Hospital Association offer of 32 per cent over two years to the United Nurses association. It goes on to say:

With regards to the breakdown in contract negotiations with the nurses, may I advise that the last offer by the Alberta Hospital Association to the United Nurses of Alberta negotiating team was that of wage parity currently in effect for Ontario nurses. More specifically the offer effective January 1st, 1980 constituted a 19.15 percent increase in minimum salary rates to 1450 per month and a 15.27 percent salary increase to 1676 per month at maximum salary rates to be followed in 1981 by a 10 percent general increase. In addition the association agreed to additional benefits over the next two years equivalent to 3 percent of salary costs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is wise to read that into the record for information purposes, and I'd like to file a copy for the Legislature Library.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or to Minister of Labour. Where would the most recent offer the Alberta Hospital Association has made place Alberta nurses in comparison with the recent settlement in British Columbia — above, below, or equal to?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it would seem to me that any hon. member who wished to make that comparison would be free to do so without expecting it to be a ministerial responsibility.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the minister. Is the minister in a position to assure the Assembly that the last offer made by the Alberta Hospital Association would enable Alberta nurses to be compensated on a basis equal to nurses in British Columbia? I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that one may say this is a matter of public information. But what we're talking about here is that within 48 hours there is the possibility of Alberta nurses walking out. In light of getting that kind of comparison out in the public arena, it seems to me that that would be

extremely helpful to know — not just for the nurses, members of the Assembly, or the Hospital Association, but for all Albertans — given the concern expressed by a large number of people who will have to have themselves or members of their families withdrawn from hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Assembly wishes to agree to that kind of questioning, of course I'm not going to stand in the way. But I point out again that this is the sort of comparison that any member of the public and any member of this Assembly can make. It's not within the function or the official duty of our ministers to make assessments of that kind as to what's going on in other jurisdictions.

MR. KNAAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it's more than that. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that actually a responsibility that belongs to the hospital boards and the nurses, and their negotiation independent of this government — and that offer was not made by the government but by the Hospital Association. In, fact, he's asking a question which relates to the Hospital Association, and this government has no responsibility at all with respect to that negotiation.

DR. BUCK: Who puts the money up, Knaak?

MR. KNAAK: If the member over there wants to speak, please rise on that point of order.

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. First of all, members in this House are well aware that last-dollar funding comes from the provincial government.

DR. BUCK: Everybody except Knaak.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order specifically, the question of comparisons with other provinces is certainly the kind of question that can be put. It's not obligatory that the minister answer it. But in fairness, I would point out that frequently when questions are posed in this House, when it is in the interest of the government side, where the comparisons with other provinces are favorable to Alberta, we get one minister after another standing up joyously giving us the good news. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, if they choose not to answer the question, that's up to them; but the question can be put.

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly. The hon. member has summed up the situation in his conclusion. It is up to the ministers and the government, and it's not for me to decide what information they voluntarily wish to make public.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'll pose one further question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is the Alberta government prepared to support a settlement in Alberta that would enable Alberta nurses to be compensated on a footing equal to nurses in British Columbia?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I just can't believe I'm hearing that kind of question from the Leader of the Opposition at this stage in important negotiations.

DR. BUCK: Well, you've heard it.

MR. RUSSELL: I've tried to make it very clear that the record shows that this government has delegated the responsibility for collective bargaining on the hospitals side to the Alberta Hospital Association. And I think the record has shown that the government has responded to the financial requirements which have accrued as a result of those negotiations. But for me to say publicly at this stage to what level we would support in comparison with other provinces would, I think, be totally irresponsible.

Alberta Corrections Review

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Solicitor General and ask what the basis was for the change in orientation of the report done by that group from Chicago — when there were no Canadian firms available, according to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. When was the focus of the report changed from, really, a master plan for the correctional services in the province to an overview or a review of the correctional operations in the province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that as notice. I know that the name was changed. I think that occurred as a result of discussions between the consultant and the departmental people in the Solicitor General's Department and perhaps in the Department of Housing and Public Works.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the Minister of Housing and Public Works who, according to *Hansard* on June 27, really was responsible for entering into the contract. Could the Minister of Housing and Public Works indicate to the Assembly when the change was made from a master plan to a review or overview of the penal system in the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague the Solicitor General has adequately responded to that question. He said he'd take it under advisement.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to either of the hon. gentlemen. Could either hon. gentleman indicate to the Assembly why neither one of them knew last June 27 that the change had been made? According to *Hansard*, they both refer to the — Mr. Harle, the hon. Solicitor General, refers to it as a master plan, and the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works used the same kind of terminology. Why didn't they know last June, when the report was virtually finished and the minister was waiting to get it?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't receive the report until the end of January or the beginning of February of this year.

MR. R. CLARK: To the hon. minister. Would the hon. minister not have been informed by his officials in the department that they changed the whole focus of the report?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I don't really accept the import of that question. Again, my colleague said that he'd take the matter under advisement and respond.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister, either of the hon. gentlemen. Could the Solicitor General indicate to the Assembly when it was first brought to the

minister's attention that there had been considerable re-writing of the report?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the consultant and the two departments developed a plan for carrying out the work that the consultants were asked to do. A considerable amount of work was done over the period from 1978 until the final report was prepared. I received it, as I say, roughly at the end of January or the beginning of February 1980. There was continuous dialogue over that period of time between the consultants and the officials in the Department of the Solicitor General.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Recognizing that the minister has just said the report was commissioned in '78 and received in January 1980, why was it that six months before the minister received the report — June 27, 1979 — neither minister knew it was going to be an overview rather than a master plan, as was indicated in *Hansard* on that occasion? And on that occasion, why didn't either minister know the departmental officials were going to be doing the laundering of the report? Because in this situation, in *Hansard* there is no indication of that laundering at all. It talks about a master plan by the firm of Moyer Associates of Chicago.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think the Leader of the Opposition has used a very unfortunate expression. Certainly the dialogue that occurred and the work that the consultant asked of departmental officials were done at the request of the consultant. Any information, any records, any material, ideas, alternatives, options were all supplied to the consultant. The consultant developed a review team which went over that material. We have received what I believe to be an excellent report, now entitled Alberta Corrections Review. I had no contact at all with the officials or the consultants until quite late in the fall last year, when I met the consultant very briefly. I've been waiting, as have many people, no doubt, for the Corrections Review. It's now been received and contains some 90 recommendations, which we'll be considering and acting upon over the next period of years.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, were there any changes made in the report after the minister met with the consultant?

MR. HARLE: As far as I know, there was drafting of the report done by officials in the Department of the Solicitor General and communication with the consultants, leading up to the final date of printing. I have no idea what those were. Those were done in co-operation with the consultant. Anything that was finally arrived at as the final form of the report bears the name of the consultant.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last supplementary question to the minister today. Mr. Minister, why was it needed to go out to Chicago to get consultants for \$250,000 if, to use the term the minister just used, officials of the department were drafting the report?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would reject that last comment.

MR. R. CLARK: You made it yourself.

MR. HARLE: The drafting was done at any request that was made by the consultants for information of whatever kind and was done over a period of time. The report bears the consultant's name. He had absolute authority to receive, reject, modify, or change whatever material was supplied. That was the obligation upon the consultant and, as I think any consultant is entitled to do, he relied upon information and work done by the department.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, is it the normal course of action in the Department of the Solicitor General or other departments of government that where consultants have been engaged to do certain work for the people of Alberta, changes can in fact be made in the data base and the time frame, consulting with senior officials of the department, without obtaining at least the consent and agreement of the responsible minister?

MR. R. CLARK: If the minister doesn't run the department, who runs it?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I was not involved at all in the material within the report.

MR. R. CLARK: Who's responsible?

MR. HARLE: The report was asked for by the Department of Housing and Public Works, which commissioned the consultants. The consultants quite naturally went to both departments involved for a variety of information. That information was supplied as requested. Alternatives and options were considered. The material was prepared. A considerable amount of effort went into the review process, which has resulted in an excellent report.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have a number of other members who have not yet asked their first questions. If there's time, we can come back to this topic. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Quebec Referendum Debate

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. I understand that the Liberal leader Claude Ryan will seek outside help from the other provinces of Canada in the upcoming referendum debate. Will the Premier be speaking in Quebec if asked to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's question is clearly hypothetical. The eventuality hasn't arisen. Perhaps some other way of putting the question would escape that difficulty.

MR. BORSTAD: Would it be the policy of the provincial government to attend and speak in that debate?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think I've answered that question previously in the House, merely by saying the discussion I held with the Liberal leader in Quebec,

Mr. Ryan, when I was there in early March was that we would be prepared to participate in the referendum debate within the province of Quebec if we were asked to do so.

Nurses' Strike Vote

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It flows from the recent strike vote by the United Nurses of Alberta. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly under whose authority two Calgary-based agents of the Department of Labour seized ballot boxes used in conjunction with the UNA strike vote in the town of Canmore and the city of Medicine Hat?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I could take those questions as notice. I can respond in part to my understanding of a situation in Canmore; that is, there apparently was a question about who was eligible to vote. I understand that that question has been resolved today, and that clearance has been given for the vote to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, in the event that there is any difference of opinion as between the employer and the employees concerning who is eligible to vote, there is responsibility in the Department of Labour to resolve those matters. That was the case in Canmore. I would have to take the matter of Medicine Hat as notice to determine what may have been the cause for that development, if in fact there was such a situation there.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to explain to the Assembly why the ballot box seized in Canmore was held overnight in the home of the Calgary agent who seized the box, rather than being locked up in a department office? And why was it seized before the vote count was taken, as was done in the case of the city of Medicine Hat?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated that for the moment I've exhausted my fund of information on these very perceptive and intriguing questions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. With respect to Canmore action, the minister indicated that certain complaints were lodged. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly where those complaints came from that prompted the action by officials of the department at a time when the issue was very clearly charged and one would think that everyone would be very cautious in approaching this matter?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the problem in Canmore did arise from an abundance of caution, that there was a disagreement, and that the matter was stalled at that point in the process until the issue in question could be resolved. That has been resolved today. So I have to underline that the very problem apparently originated from an abundance of caution.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position, then, to advise the Assembly that two boxes, I gather, in Medicine Hat, as well as the one in Canmore, will in fact be returned to the United Nurses? In the case of Medicine

Hat, I gather that the votes were in fact tabulated, but will the ballot boxes be returned to the UNA today?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think a very grave misconception is being developed here about the responsibility for the conduct of a strike vote. That is a responsibility on the Department of Labour. That is a supervised strike vote and, as required by The Alberta Labour Act, the ballots as well as the procedures are mandated by the Department of Labour, and the results have to be reported pursuant to requirements of the Department of Labour.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of any ownership on the part of the United Nurses of Alberta. So far as I know, it's strictly carrying out a procedure which is the responsibility of the Department of Labour.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The question is not just the physical ownership of the ballot boxes, but the ability of the United Nurses of Alberta to know, in fact, that those ballot boxes have been properly counted under the procedures set out by the Act.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I can only advise hon. members that no problem of concern has been expressed, as far as I'm aware, with respect to any improper proceedings, which seems to be the allegation I'm interpreting from some of those questions. As far as I know, everything is in order. Where problems did arise, my understanding is that they've been resolved. But I shall be checking into it.

Drivers' Licence Records

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. I'd just like to know if the minister is in a position to indicate, or has the answer to the question I asked last week as to what co-ordination there is among the western provinces in the dissemination of drivers' licence records.

MR. HARLE: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the system is that the jurisdiction where an offence occurs reports the conviction to the jurisdiction where the driver's licence originates. It's a mutually operated system whereby information regarding, for example, impaired charges under the code is passed on to the jurisdiction where the individual holds his driver's licence.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position now to indicate to the Legislature the situation that applied to Mr. Lindquist, when information that was forwarded to Saskatchewan from the Solicitor General's Department was incorrect and caused the incarceration of this young man?

MR. HARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It will take me a few moments to do so. On September 8, 1976, Mr. Lindquist was convicted in Alberta under Section 236 of the Criminal Code and suspended for six months from that date, up to and including March 7, 1977. He completed an impaired drivers' course on September 22, 1976, and his Alberta licence was reinstated on March 8, 1977. On July 9, 1978, a Manitoba conviction under Section 236 of the

Criminal Code of Canada was entered against his Alberta driver's licence. On July 16, 1978, a second Manitoba conviction under Section 236 of the Criminal Code of Canada was entered against this individual's licence.

On August 18, 1978, a notice of suspension was submitted to Mr. Lindquist's last given address, 5715 - 115 Street, Edmonton, effective July 16, 1978, to July 15, 1981. This notice was sent by certified mail. The period of three years was given as a result of the three Criminal Code convictions applied to Mr. Lindquist's record. On August 21, 1978, the certified mail was signed by a P. W. Lindquist. On February 15, 1980, Mr. Lindquist was picked up for speeding in the Grenfell district in Saskatchewan. At that time at check was made on CPIC, and it was noted that he was a suspended driver in Alberta. As a result, he was issued a summons for driving while under suspension and for speeding, and was to appear on March 5, 1980.

At that point, I am led to believe from the information given to officials in the department by the RCMP that Mr. Lindquist informed the police officer that he knew he was suspended in Alberta, but was unable to find out why. On March 5, 1980, Mr. Lindquist failed to appear on the summonses and, as a result, a warrant was issued for his arrest. He was arrested on March 22, 1980, and incarcerated pending a court hearing. On March 26, 1980, Mr. Lindquist appeared in court, at which time the RCMP dropped the charges for driving while under suspension, since they had received information indicating that the entry on the CPIC records was incorrect.

I might say that as soon as it came to the attention of officials in the motor vehicles branch, it was obvious that the two Manitoba convictions were in fact not even against Mr. Lindquist. Had this come to our attention at any time [before] the issue of the notice of suspension, it could easily have been corrected.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that the information that came from the minister's department was inaccurate, does the minister have a system in position at this time to make sure these things do not happen? Secondly, can the minister indicate if there have been other instances such as this, of incorrect records being sent out to other jurisdictions?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice. I am not aware of any. The system, of course, depends on humans to operate it. The reviewing officer quite obviously made a mistake, and I have sent a letter of apology to Mr. Lindquist.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate if there's any avenue open to the person in question as to compensation for the loss of time, the loss of a job, plus the anguish of staying in jail for five days when he really shouldn't have been there? Is there any compensation available to the person?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the normal practice when someone has been adversely affected by a decision made by an official in the department is to make a complaint to the Ombudsman. In my letter to Mr. Lindquist, I have suggested that if he is not satisfied with the apology, he should approach the Ombudsman.

Premier's Toronto Speech

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It would relate to the Premier's speech in Toronto tomorrow, I believe. Could the minister indicate whether the Premier will be announcing any new policies in that speech that haven't been announced in this Legislature? We know what happened in Vancouver, and we see another repeat performance coming. [interjections]

MR. R. CLARK: Johnston doesn't know.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think that requires some knowledge about what's going to happen tomorrow. I just don't have that at my fingertips.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Acting Premier. Has the Acting Premier been advised with regard to the contents of the Premier's speech tomorrow in Toronto? Will it violate one of the sacred principles of this Legislature, that new announcements should be made here? [interjections]

MR. HYNDMAN: The hon. member should endeavor to contain his anticipation until tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it's nice to be arrogant. But if the Premier is going to talk about something new, has he talked about it to the rest of you fellows? [interjections] Has he let you in on the good news?

Regional Water Services

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Environment. It's a follow-up to a private member's motion requesting the government for regional water services throughout the province. Could the minister advise whether any action or progress has taken effect since then?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, yes, we are moving in different parts of the province in terms of a regional concept for shared costs and use of a common facility for transportation of water.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary question to the minister. Have any commitments been made to any of the municipalities? If so, is it the intention of the minister to finance such regional water systems?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are a number of *ad hoc* regional systems within the province that deal with both water and sewer. I would suggest to the Member for Vegreville that probably the most significant one has to do with his particular constituency, and that we have just recently approved a regional water supply that will serve at least five communities, culminating at the town of Vegreville.

As to front-end financing, we have worked closely with the mayors of the five communities. They are in agreement with special front-end funding for a specific period of time. Following that time there will be a review based on the population growth in the area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question relating to the regional water line. Can the minister indicate what upgrading will be required on the line from Edmon-

ton to Fort Saskatchewan to increase the carrying capacity?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I could take that as notice from the Member for Clover Bar. At the present time there is a line that runs to Fort Saskatchewan. I think they are in the process of upgrading, but I'd just have to take that as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Motion for a Return No. 111 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

105. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:
- (1) what was the total value of royalties paid by Manalta Coal Ltd. as a result of operations at their Sheerness mine in 1979;
 - (2) what was the total value of royalties paid by Manalta Coal Ltd. as a result of operations at their Sheerness mine in 1978;
 - (3) what was the total value of royalties paid by Manalta Coal Ltd. as a result of operations at their Sheerness mine in 1977;
 - (4) what was the total value of royalties paid by Manalta Coal Ltd. as a result of operations at their Sheerness mine in 1976;
 - (5) what was the total value of royalties paid by Manalta Coal Ltd. as a result of operations at their Sheerness mine in 1975?

MR. NOTLEY: I think they say yes.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

102. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing all reports, recommendations, or written information received by the Minister of Environment from the Hazardous Chemicals Advisory Committee regarding proposed amendments to The Hazardous Chemicals Act.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a slight amendment to Motion 102: after the words "all reports" strike out the four words "recommendations, or written information", substitute those words with simply "and recommendations", and accept it on that basis.

[Motion as amended carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

204. Moved by Mr. D. Anderson:
Be it resolved that on behalf of the people of Alberta this Legislative Assembly publicly express to Canadian Citizens in Quebec our hope that they will remain within Confederation, and that we further declare our commit-

ment to working with our fellow governments to bring about a restructured Confederation in which the unique features of each province are properly recognized and represented.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to propose this motion to the Assembly today, it's my opinion that the unity debate, which has taken place for a couple of years and is now reaching its crescendo with the announcement today that the vote in the province of Quebec will take place on May 20, is of great importance not only to the people of this country as a whole but perhaps to an even greater extent to the people of this province at its time in history. I fully believe Alberta shares many of the frustrations felt by fellow citizens in the province of Quebec. The difficulties they've encountered as a result of distance from the rest of the country in terms of language and culture is indeed felt by us in a different way because of a distance in miles from the central part of our country and a lack of population base.

As part of this nation, Quebec has perhaps been frustrated since it joined. Indeed, some may ask why this country has been held together at all. The province of Quebec, or what is now Quebec, was forced into Confederation on the Plains of Abraham when France lost its foothold in this part of North America. Since that time issue after issue has come up which has shown that there is discontent and frustration in that province. The hanging of Louis Riel was seen by the people of Quebec as a move by English Canada not to deal with their problems but in fact to enhance the frustrations in that particular province. The conscription issue in World War II came close to tearing the country apart. Then the FLQ crisis during the last decade showed us that indeed there were people in the province of Quebec, though in the extreme minority, who felt so strongly about the problems they faced that they were willing to take violent action. The most recent indications of frustration in Quebec, of course, were manifested by the election of the Parti Quebecois government a couple of years ago.

Alberta too, perhaps in a more quiet and unassuming way in past years, though that may not be said for the last while, has felt frustration, beginning with its time as really a colony of eastern Canada. We did nothing but supply raw resources to the east. In fact we were responsible for nothing but looking after the needs of that part of the country, and were governed by that part of the country, through to the time we began to develop our agricultural base and our independent economic status, and still faced the frustration of having our economic sphere operated out of Bay Street in Toronto.

Political control has perhaps been even more frustrating, because we haven't had the population base the eastern provinces — or the central provinces, to be more accurate — have had. Therefore we have never been able to help control the destiny of the nation in the manner we would like to.

But, Mr. Speaker, despite these frustrations of Quebec and Alberta and, I'm sure, of other partners within Confederation, we have grown together. We have fought together in two wars. We have indeed gone through a depression and have striven to the point where we are a nation today — a basically strong and united nation, I believe, which has shown itself to be one of the great leaders in the world in many areas.

I'd like to quote from a column in *Maclean's* magazine dated May 9, 1977, where Mr. Harries said: Confederation cannot survive in its present form and renegotiation

is a necessity. Renegotiation of the economic basis of Confederation is necessary, not because the original arrangement failed, but rather because it achieved a remarkable degree of success.

It's my opinion that that voluntary coming together of the people of Alberta and the people of Quebec with those of all other provinces and the territories has let us develop to the point where we now have to make a choice with respect to the Confederation which, as a basically young country, we have built to maturity.

How does Quebec feel today about the Confederation which they worked so hard to hold together and build in the past? It's my personal belief, from a knowledge of people in that province and from discussions I've been privileged to have in the past, that they still feel basically the same. There is a warmth, there is that kinship that comes from the fighting and growing together over years. In fact last year the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods and I had an opportunity to meet with three members of the Quebec National Assembly who were members of the Parti Quebecois. Even with those individuals — individuals who had dedicated themselves to breaking apart the nation — I felt that warmth and sincerity.

How does Alberta feel about the people of Quebec and their position currently in Confederation? The Canada West Foundation, in a series of 14 seminars and workshops held in 1977 — one of which I had an opportunity to attend — came to the following conclusion. First, most western Canadians found some similarities between Quebec's ambitions for recognition and the west's ambitions for recognition; second, a majority of people at those meetings rejected the concept of sovereignty association; and third, the people at those meetings felt that a strong nation could not be built on different deals with each province, but on equality for all provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I think the feelings of the people of Alberta toward the people of Quebec were underlined to an even greater extent in the People to People petition, which brought around 115,000 Albertans together to extend that hand of friendship to our sisters and brothers in the province of Quebec and to ask them to consider remaining within Confederation and working with us there.

It's the problem of frustration that we now have to deal with. We have to enlarge upon options and explore the alternatives. The frustrations were outlined very clearly, in my opinion, by the hon. Premier of this Legislature in the 1978 first ministers' conference on the constitution. He said:

Historically, Albertans have not felt that their interests and concerns have been adequately accommodated within the present federal system. They sense that their accomplishments and aspirations, both individual and collective, have been frustrated by the historic concentration of economic decision-making in the so-called "golden triangle" centred in Toronto ... It is not only a matter of freight rates [the Premier said] but Alberta's aspirations have been obstructed by federal policies affecting agriculture, transportation, natural resources, development policies, international tariffs.

At that conference, the Premier mentioned as well that the unilateral imposition of controls by the federal government in terms of wage and price guidelines in '77 was the greatest example of infringement on rights of the provinces. I think if the hon. Premier were here today and had an opportunity to speak, he might well amend

that to read, the force majeure clause initiated a couple of weeks ago, and the other activity we've seen on the part of the federal government, primarily yesterday in the Speech from the Throne.

So with the frustrations apparent, with the problems there, with the people of Quebec now prepared to vote on exactly what they want to do about Confederation, we have to look at what alternatives we have as a nation and, in particular, what alternatives the people of the province of Quebec have in terms of this Confederation. The first, of course, is to accept the proposal of the current Premier of that province for something called "sovereignty association". I should make it clear initially that in my opinion if the Premier obtains that vote — and I hope he will not — that won't necessarily mean the people of Quebec have voted to leave Confederation.

In a survey of businessmen in the province of Quebec, just handed to me by a colleague in the House — and remember these are businessmen, people who have a knowledge and understanding of the operations of government by virtue of their occupation — this question was asked: in your opinion, does sovereignty association mean that Quebec will become a country unto its own, distinct from Canada, or that Quebec would remain within Canada without becoming a distinct country? Of the businessmen surveyed, 32.7 per cent said sovereignty association meant remaining within Canada without becoming a distinct country. Another 9.1 per cent didn't know. Clearly, over 40 per cent did not understand the concept the Premier of that province has put forth.

Indeed, if we take a look at that concept of sovereignty association, he clearly calls for a separate sovereign state. The association part, the hon. Premier of Quebec says, is bringing together the two countries so that we can have a free circulation of goods and services, a monetary union between the two countries, a free circulation of people back and forth, joint control of agencies like Air Canada and Canadian National, and so on. In other words, the Premier of Quebec has suggested that while they can be a separate state, they can receive all the benefits Quebec now derives from Confederation. Indeed, I don't think we in this Legislature or people in any part of Canada can accept that particular concept. I quote from a recent statement made by the western premiers: the western premiers reject both the status quo and Quebec independence followed by an economic association with Canada, the so-called sovereignty association option considering neither to be viable alternatives for solving the problems currently confronting the federal system.

So it is clear that sovereignty association is a call for a separate nation with the kinds of contacts with Canada which cannot be possible. Indeed, that particular vote taking place on May 20 may be seen as a ruse, an attempt in some way to fool what could well be at least 40 per cent of the people of Quebec. But it is one of the options which the people are going to have to choose on May 20.

The second option is presented by the leader of the federalist forces in that province, Mr. Claude Ryan. He has presented a paper in which he outlines the kind of Confederation he sees. That Confederation would include a maintenance of the federal system of government, the existence of provincial powers strong enough to take charge of tasks relating to the development of physical and human resources, natural resources, land use, local and provincial commerce, education, culture, and so on. And the Legislative Assembly should act with full parliamentary sovereignty limited only by those matters assigned to the jurisdiction of the federal government.

He makes a number of other suggestions with respect to bringing together the two cultures and allowing a mechanism federally which would deal with the cultural differences between the two provinces. But clearly the option put forth by Mr. Ryan is a positive one. It is one which calls upon that province to remain part of Confederation, yet talks about the restructuring of Confederation in such a way as to ensure that the people of that province will be able to control their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, there's a third option for Canada and this is Harmony in Diversity, a document we're well aware of in this House, presented several years before the Ryan paper but which, in my opinion, includes many similar points. If I may briefly outline the six points on which the Harmony in Diversity paper is based:

- responsible parliamentary government must be the basis of our system of government;
- the principles of constitutional monarchy must be maintained;
- all provinces have equal constitutional and legal status within Confederation;
- strong provinces make a strong, viable Canada, complementing the role of [the] federal government;

That's an important statement — a strong and viable Canada made by provinces "complementing the role of [the] federal government".

- within their respective spheres of jurisdiction, the two orders of government — federal and provincial — are equal, neither being subordinate to the other;
- each of the two orders of government must respect the responsibilities and jurisdictions of the other.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it's within that document that this government in previous days outlined the vehicle through which our nation can hold together, where our people can again feel part of a country and are able to maximize their advantages regardless of what part of this nation they remain in.

I believe quite firmly that at this time in history, the people of Quebec are like another brother in the same family. It's a new living arrangement which we must have. But I must say, before closing my introductory remarks on this motion, that I am deeply concerned with the role the federal government may well have set aside for itself, not only within this debate but within Canada. At this time in our nation when more than ever before we require a government which will bring together the people, which will ensure that each province has the ability, the resources, and indeed the legislative right to control its own destiny, the government has seen fit to enact a force majeure clause unilaterally and announce yesterday in the House of Commons part of a deal with Alberta for which there has been absolutely no negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's unfortunate those measures have taken place now. I think they have increased the frustration level in this province and indeed must make every province, including the province of Quebec, concerned about what role they will continue to play in Confederation. Regardless of that, I think it's our time in history to extend our hand to our sister province experiencing similar frustrations, and to ask them to stay within this family of provinces, to bring together the kind of nation that will allow us to realize our maximum potential. Let us hope that through the passage of this motion and future actions this province may take, Quebec and Alberta and the people in those two provinces, as

well as in the other eight provinces and two territories, may be able to say in the future without qualifications, without hesitation, and in one breath rather than in two: I love my province; I love my country.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part briefly in the debate on Motion 204, first of all I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Calgary Currie for an excellent introductory speech and for an ongoing interest in this very crucial issue. In prefacing my remarks, while acknowledging the initiative taken by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, I think in a sense it's unfortunate that a matter of this importance is not being dealt with as a government motion; and that in fact the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Premier himself isn't leading off the debate. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because frankly if one looks at what is happening in other jurisdictions . . . In our neighboring province of Saskatchewan the Premier recently made a major speech to the Saskatchewan Legislature on the question of Confederation. We've seen a broad-ranging, three-week debate in the province of Quebec — albeit the question is, going to be put to the voters of Quebec. In upcoming days in the House of Commons, it's my understanding that the primary focus of the Speech from the Throne debate is going to be on the issue of constitutional change and the Quebec referendum. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I say to members of the government that it is unfortunate it is not a motion introduced by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that we are debating today. I would hope that minister would take the opportunity during the course of this debate to outline very clearly the government's position on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with just two or three aspects of the forthcoming debate in the province of Quebec. I would have to argue that the ultimate decision as to whether the people of Quebec remain in Confederation must lie with the Canadian citizens who live in the province of Quebec. But having said that we cannot keep the country together by force and that it must be the citizens who decide by ballot whether that very important part of the country stays within our national fabric, I think it is important that we also say we are not neutral about the referendum, that we very much want the people of Quebec to decide in the upcoming weeks — and to decide by a decisive majority — that no, they are not going to support Mr. Levesque's proposal for sovereignty association.

Mr. Levesque is a very able and skillful person, an individual leader whose social conscience is undeniable. His contribution to the Quebecois is beyond challenge. But on this issue, I think the proposal for sovereignty association, while tactically shrewd in many ways, Mr. Speaker, is putting a false question to the people of the province of Quebec. If the PQ government were to state honestly and categorically to the Quebecois that they wish independence with everything that implies, then the question of the referendum would be more clear cut. But the PQ ministers and their advisors are shrewd enough to know that if they can get a fudged referendum past the voters of the province of Quebec, these things develop a momentum of their own. The tremendous traumatic experience that would, I think, affect not only the people of Quebec but all the people of Canada should the referendum pass, would develop a momentum which could very well lead the government of that province to achieve its long-term end, which is an independent, sovereign state.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud that the Premier of Saskatchewan took the initiative the other day to go to Quebec and make a speech. Some people — some in the traditional left in this country — criticized Premier Blakeney for journeying to the province of Quebec to, I think, call it as it is; to say very clearly that we want the people of that province to vote no, that we want to see them remain in Canada, and that as an indication of good will we're prepared to look at major constitutional restructuring that perhaps will challenge some of the traditional views many of us have held over the years.

But if the people of Quebec vote yes for sovereignty association, if it is a *oui* vote, then it is not reasonable to expect people in the rest of the country automatically to jump in enthusiastic response to a form of economic union, particularly people in western Canada who over the years have had to pay more for goods and services produced in Ontario and Quebec. Part of the bargain, if you like, has been a recognition that we are in it together, that we are part of a great nation. But if the people in Quebec decide that they wish to develop their own separate state, frankly it is a little bit much to expect that the sheltered markets for woollen products and clothing produced in Montreal and Quebec would find the same tariff protection in western Canada. Surely that's a bit much.

It seems to me it is only fair and reasonable that we present that view to the people of Quebec in as diplomatic a way as possible, not in a threatening sense. I think it would be a very serious error in tactics to say, either you do it our way or else. But there is a difference between threatening tactics, Mr. Speaker, and simply stating honestly that as part of Canada we are all willing to give and take — that's part of our view of this country — but that if any part of it decides to go on its own, whether it be the PQ government in Quebec or two members of the Saskatchewan Legislature who also want to break up this country, that simply cannot co-exist with the bargain that is Confederation.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question at this time really is: is our Legislature going to support categorically the first part of this proposal? I have no difficulty in saying yes, I think it is a reasonable position. It is unfortunate that it is not the Premier of the province who is saying that in the Legislative Assembly today. We've had debates in the past. We had a debate in 1976 on a constitutional amending formula. We had a debate in 1978 on the government's position paper which took some time to complete in this House. While I had some very serious concerns about many aspects of that position paper, nevertheless at least it was discussed in the Legislative Assembly. But before the people of Quebec vote in what has to be admitted is the most important action ever taken by a citizenry in any part of Canada in the history of the country, surely it is not unreasonable that we should be debating a government position paper.

I want to deal very briefly with the second part of the resolution. In 1978 I didn't agree with the government's position paper. I think there are important distinctions between the proposals of Mr. Claude Ryan and the position paper accepted by this Assembly in 1978, the most important of which is the recognition in the Ryan document that there should be an entrenchment of language rights and a Bill of rights, so that rights of Canadians would exist wherever they live in the country. Other areas in the Claude Ryan paper are somewhat analogous to the Alberta document. Although as I read Mr. Ryan's paper — he is barnstorming Quebec, perhaps not directly on behalf of, but at least it's the alternative to

the PQ proposal for sovereignty association — there is probably greater recognition of the need for effective central leadership.

I'm more comfortable with the Ryan proposal than I am with the document passed by this Legislature in 1978. But, Mr. Speaker, it would probably be premature for any of us to say at this juncture that if the federalist forces win in Quebec this spring — and we all hope they do — we will be able to prejudge what the restructuring of Confederation will be like. Quite frankly, that can't be predicted at all at this stage. First of all, we are going to have to have, as a continuing guide, a spirit of generosity and good will, and secondly, a commitment to be flexible and to recognize that the national interest is going to have to involve the modification of not only regional but national stands.

I well remember the 1978 constitutional conference. The hon. Member for Little Bow and I were honored to be able to sit in on that particular conference as observers. On the first day the general feeling of most provinces was that the federal government was prepared to take a very hard-nosed stand: no conciliation, no compromise. But on the second day, good heavens, it was a different Prime Minister Trudeau. He came in with accommodations in a number of key, important areas. I think that's the sort of thing we have to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Member for Calgary Currie raised some concern about the Speech from the Throne yesterday. Certainly there are going to be arguments over oil pricing, no question about that. But one positive feature in the federal Speech from the Throne yesterday was recognition by the federal government that should the "no" forces win, things aren't going to be left as they are. The Prime Minister and the federal Liberal government realize that there has to be some pretty fundamental constitutional change. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I just say to the members of this Assembly that while we can support the second aspect of the resolution, we must not be so firm in our resolve that we mandate the leadership of this province to take a rigid position over the next several years, when in fact tolerance and flexibility will be required.

But that is not the crucial issue now. The crucial issue in the next few weeks will be to make it clear that while the people of the province of Quebec have the right to self-determination, none of us in this country is neutral about that. No one is committed to using force of arms to keep anybody in Confederation. But all of us deeply want that vote to be no. To facilitate that, we are all perhaps prepared to take a look at some of our traditional positions in order to see a new and, hopefully, stronger Confederation, but a stronger Confederation that very much includes the continued role of the province of Quebec.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate in the debate on Motion 204. I wish to compliment the Member for Calgary Currie for bringing this important and timely topic to this Assembly for discussion and debate.

Before going into my prepared notes, I just want to comment on the remarks made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. One of his apparently strong comments was that this should have been a government motion rather than a motion by one of our outstanding members not in the cabinet. I see the member's leaving now; he doesn't want to listen to these remarks. May I

say it's well known that we work as a caucus and as a team, and that non-cabinet members introduce government bills. In this case, I can confidently state that the government supports this motion, as do I.

The other points — and it's a bit disconcerting to me, because sometimes I feel the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is just not living in the province of Alberta. He talks about Premier Blakeney's speech in the province of Quebec. He talks about preferring Claude Ryan's paper over the Alberta government's paper. But the biggest omission of all, Mr. Speaker, is a lack of recognition that there's now a real concern in Alberta as well, not just in the province of Quebec. Not one word was mentioned about that concern in Alberta.

Three years ago the province of Quebec elected a party that ran on a platform to take the province of Quebec out of Confederation. The vote on the referendum will occur on May 20. The referendum will ask whether or not to give the Parti Quebecois the mandate to commence negotiation of separation from Canada. Clearly the feeling by the citizens of Quebec of dissatisfaction with Canada as it is today is deep and strong.

Mr. Speaker, what gives me such great concern is that feelings similar to those in the province of Quebec are developing in Alberta, perhaps for different reasons. These feelings are stronger than mere alienation. More and more of my constituents are asking whether it is no longer possible for Albertans to receive fair and equal treatment from our federal government. What can be done to assure a viable future for our young children if the federal government is consciously eroding our strength? Can we no longer trust our federal government? It's asked over and over again. There is a feeling that our success is in spite of the federal government, rather than with its support. These feelings are deeply felt and, the people of Alberta feel, legitimate.

The reasons for this are many. I may mention that I'm now talking about feelings toward the federal government; I'm not necessarily talking about feelings vis-a-vis central Canada or other governments within Canada. The reasons are these.

Just recently we had a unilateral decision by the federal government to enforce the force majeure clause in the agreement with Syncrude. It's well known that not only will this affect the price received by Syncrude, but it will dramatically affect the royalty received by the citizens of the province of Alberta, a royalty really needed to pay for the infrastructure costs put in by the province of Alberta.

The pricing of oil: it's now become such an accepted proposition that we negotiate for the price of oil with the federal government that we lose sight of the fact that there's no other commodity in Canada where the price is negotiated with another government. It's a unique situation, where one province produces a product and that province must negotiate the price of that commodity which, by the constitution, it owns. That alone, not even to mention the level of the price, is disconcerting.

The export tax the federal government unilaterally placed on the oil exported from Canada was again an historical precedent. Never in peacetime has the federal government imposed an export tax on a commodity produced by one province and kept the revenues unilaterally.

Other longer or historical concerns are the freight rate and transportation concerns. It was a major item at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference when it appeared that the Trudeau Liberal government would take a concerted effort to resolve some of our long-felt

frustrations. Normally, as I've mentioned in this House before, a tariff barrier gives equal protection to all parts of the country. It does not do so, however, if you combine it with a discriminatory freight rates structure that makes it impossible to ship our goods competitively to the markets. It's twofold discrimination: one is that the rates per mile are higher in western Canada. They're discriminatory in the sense that the rates for finished goods moving from Alberta to Ontario are more expensive than for the same goods moving from Toronto to Alberta. The combination of the present freight rate and tariff structure makes it virtually impossible for industry to develop spontaneously in Alberta unless some support or extraordinary beneficial climate is created in Alberta, as this government has done with its favorable tax legislation.

The other frustration felt by Albertans and western Canadians is the lack of progress in the movement of grain and the port facilities. The United States, over a period, has increased its exports of grain fivefold, while we've merely doubled ours.

A frustration which manifests itself, rather than being apparently obvious, is the centralization that's begun in what we might call the membership of the Supreme Court of Canada. What's the significance of that, and how does it manifest itself? Well, if the federal government appoints very, very learned people to the bench who have known centralist views, that creates a negotiating and legislative advantage for the federal government that it would not otherwise have. The present court is such a court. It's viewed from Alberta's point of view as a centralist court. Doubtful legislation — where otherwise a province and the federal government would be, say, at a fifty-fifty probability of winning their case — has shifted in favor of the federal government. This has allowed them to negotiate much more vigorously and strongly, and in fact to enact legislation that prior to the existence of this court would probably have been unconstitutional.

Other frustrations include the lack of representation in the federal government or any real power or authority within the federal government, since in whatever government we have the caucus is dominated by the Ontario and Quebec membership. When there is a legitimate trade-off between western and central Canada concerns, which there is, this leads to more of them being in favor of the central government than the western Canadian provinces.

Whether or not all these concerns are well founded, they are deeply rooted, many with justification. As mentioned before, I hope and pray that Canada will remain a united and strong country. But I fear that more and more Albertans are giving up hope that Alberta will ever be treated fairly within Confederation. Whether we like to acknowledge it or not, some Albertans and some western Canadians are seriously discussing the question of separation. In fact, two members of the Saskatchewan Legislature have left the Conservative caucus to form a new party for the purpose of seeking western independence. I hope this is not necessary and that it won't happen.

If the present energy negotiations between the government of Alberta and the federal government break down and if the federal government imposes sanctions from Alberta's point of view, using present legislation and then referring this legislation to the existing Supreme Court for more or less confirmation of constitutionality, that will have the result of expropriating ownership rights. By ownership rights I'm talking about the normal rights attached to ownerships — whether or not you want to sell and at what price you want to sell. Albertans don't see it

just as a negotiation of a price. We're not talking merely about dollars. We're talking about a change of attitude. We're looking for fairness and treatment as an equal within Confederation. Albertans would interpret this as another confirmation of an unwillingness by this federal government to treat Albertans equally and fairly.

If these energy negotiations break down, the mood of very serious concern that I've talked about will deepen. It will be a sad state for Alberta, because not all Albertans will feel the same. Many of us, no matter what, will want to remain Canadians, and others with equally legitimate views will wish western Canada to separate. Not only will we have an intensified division within Canada, but within western Canada itself.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be overly dramatic, but I want to emphasize to the federal government and to my colleagues that the federal government is at risk of very seriously affecting the unity of this country if Alberta does not receive fair treatment in the energy negotiations.

What's the answer? Well, I don't have all the answers. I'm sure I don't have an answer for this complex problem. But I do have some suggestions. Certainly constitutional amendment will go part of the way. However, it is not up to the federal government alone to propose constitutional amendments. We need the concurrence of the province of Ontario as well. Constitutional amendment can only occur if we have unanimous approval of all the provinces. That may cause some difficulty, especially if we're talking about moving to the provinces some of the legislative authority which is now concentrated in the centre. Any such constitutional amendment should include the principle of the equality of all provinces: no amending formula where one province has lesser rights than the other; the need for greater provincial legislative authority with the ability of interdelegation with consent; reconfirmation of ownership rights by the provinces over natural resources, including the ownership right for a fair return; recognition of the need for Supreme Court of Canada appointments to be made with provincial input and a representation of a cross section of Canadian interest and understanding; and, fifthly, a federal government where representation is based on a system different from the present system, where all provinces would have their interest expressed in a real way, in a more equal manner.

Although constitutional change will go a long way, or part of the way, in resolving our problems, one can't hold out hope that constitutional change will occur easily, especially with the province of Ontario having a veto on any recommendations that may come forth from the federal government, the province of Quebec or, for that matter, the province of Alberta. What do we do in the interim? Very difficult negotiations lie ahead for Albertans and the federal government on the energy question. No doubt the Alberta government has to be flexible, but it also needs to be strong. And there's a reason for being strong. In this particular instance, I believe Alberta is right. That sounds a little bit pious. But I'm going to make the points why I think Alberta is right in showing responsible Canadian leadership in the energy package it offered to the federal government, which as I understand it was almost, or in most points, accepted by the former Conservative government.

Alberta agreed to increase oil prices in stages and to keep the domestic price of light crude at no more than 85 to 90 per cent of the average United States price at Chicago. This would have preserved the competitive edge of all industry in Canada, especially Ontario's industry. Alberta would carry the cost, in terms of both infrastruc-

ture and social costs, to accelerate the development of the oil sands to provide greater energy self-sufficiency for Canada. The Alberta government was prepared to give Ottawa a larger share of the income from future oil sands plants. In other words, the Alberta government was prepared to accept a royalty formula different from the present one for the greater benefit of all Canadians. The Alberta government was prepared to invest approximately \$3 billion from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund in equity and debt in the next two large energy projects.

Of course Alberta was prepared to pay for all the infrastructure associated with the development of those projects, which would have run into hundreds of millions of dollars coming out of these royalty revenues from conventional crude oil. Quebec City was to have the same gate price for natural gas as Toronto, which meant that Alberta producers would pay the transportation cost from Toronto to Quebec City. The gas was to be priced at a lower rate than the present conversion value for oil for incentive pricing, so that Canadians would in fact substitute gas for imported oil. This would have two results: it would allow cheaper energy for other Canadians and would reduce our balance of payment deficit on the oil account.

Alberta was prepared to participate in debt financing of other energy projects in Canada. Alberta agreed to lend \$2 billion over five years to a national energy bank. That is a good deal for all of Canada and a responsible energy package. The present Liberal federal government has indicated it's not prepared to accept this package. In fact we see signs that it's going to come forth with proposals which are fundamentally opposed to principles on which the Alberta government will not yield.

Why am I talking about being so strong in energy negotiations with the Liberal federal government? The reason is this: we're not necessarily negotiating with the people of Canada. We're not negotiating with the people of Ontario. We're negotiating with a Trudeau Liberal government. Its views of the national interest aren't necessarily right. What I'm suggesting to my colleagues in this House is that this package is a responsible energy package for Canada and demonstrates leadership by the Alberta government. It's my view that under our constitutional rights Alberta could have insisted on world prices. Alberta could have very legitimately reduced output for conservation needs, but we haven't done so. We responded to Canadian needs. At the current rate of output, all of Alberta's conventional light and medium crude oil will be gone in 13 years. All of it, at current rates of output.

Where has Alberta shown other areas of leadership? Where has it served the national interest as well as its own? In a willingness to develop the heavy oil sands. A person might ask how this shows national leadership. Well, Alberta doesn't need the oil; Canada does. Two heavy energy projects commencing at the same time will have tremendous impact on our budgetary requirements to put infrastructure in place, and can possibly overheat our economy and cause serious labor disruptions. In fact, it can cause a higher level of wage rates in Alberta than in the rest of Canada, with serious consequences to our young manufacturing industries. Nevertheless, the Alberta government was prepared to go ahead in the national interest.

Our loans to the other provinces: it's good for Alberta; it's good for the other provinces. It's a policy of this government to lend to all provinces at the most favorable

rate obtainable from that province at its most credit-worthy. Again, it's a policy in both Canada's and Alberta's interest.

The natural gas incentive pricing proposal that was part of the former energy package was, again, in both Alberta's and the national interest. It's a leadership that Alberta and western Canada have shown.

The medical research foundation is happening in Alberta, in Edmonton. But it's not merely for the benefit of Albertans and wasn't envisaged that way. It was an expenditure of over \$300 million to benefit all Canadians.

With respect to grain transportation, it is in the interest of both Alberta and Canada that this happen. Increased exports mean more prosperous farmers, which means greater prosperity for chemical plant producers, fertilizer producers, and certainly machinery equipment producers, most of whom are located in parts of Canada other than western Canada.

What Alberta has done is shown some degree, and I think a very significant degree, of combining provincial interest with national interest. Why haven't enough of our friends in the rest of Canada — we do have friends in the rest of Canada — recognized it? I think one of the problems is the present political situation and the hysterical eastern media, as Bill Thorsell calls it. It's really up to us as Albertans to do a better job communicating our policies to the rest of Canada. The stakes are too high to leave it to politicians in Ontario to communicate our message, or to leave it to the press in other parts of the country. I have a real concern with the Conservative government in Ontario. I understand it's a minority government and, being a politician, Bill Davis has to try to re-win an election. But to really develop, as has been done over the last three years, a conflict between Albertans and citizens of Ontario serves no one. It is irrational to argue that Canadians need prices significantly lower than all the countries in the world, when both Germany and Japan have demonstrated that world prices can make you as competitive and even more competitive than your trading partners.

Mr. Speaker, I see a real concern ahead for Canada and for Albertans, and I'm very sympathetic to the people in the province of Quebec. I say this is not the time for Albertans to forsake their previous commitment to show leadership in Canada. The present Liberal federal government, which I think can carry a significant part of the blame for the present tension in Canada, won't be there forever. The present Conservative government situation in Ontario will also change. I'm not saying, let's be Canadians, and Canadian unity forever under all circumstances, all conditions. But I say this is not the time to lose our cool. This is a time to summon our strength, to show some leadership and try to unite Canada.

Thank you.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate this afternoon, initially I want to commend the hon. member Mr. Anderson for putting Motion 204 on the Order Paper. I intend to address my remarks in basically four areas.

First of all, I want to make some comments with regard to what I think Alberta has to base its defence upon. I found the comments by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud interesting, and I had considerable agreement with a number of the points the hon. member made. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to make some comments with regard to the Quebec referendum as I see it. Thirdly, I want to point out, not only to the Legislative

Assembly but to people outside this Assembly, that basically, speaking to people of Quebec, over many years the provinces of Alberta and Quebec have perhaps had more in common than any other two provinces in Canada. That is, regardless of the political stripe of the government in this province or Quebec, we consistently have been the two prime defenders of provincial rights. That point very often goes unnoticed by people in the province of Quebec, and I think is very often lost on our own people.

The fourth point I want to make deals with a suggestion made just yesterday in the Speech from the Throne in Ottawa. It dealt with the appointment of a committee of Parliament to examine the electoral system to ensure that the highest degree of representation and responsibility is involved. I think it's important that we in Alberta take some steps to see that it isn't only a matter of federal input as far as that House of Commons committee is concerned. I want to allude to some comments I made following the last federal election that I think are worth repeating on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, just before I become involved in comments in those four areas, might I say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud that I welcomed very much his comments with regard to the attitude of the present government in the province of Ontario. This will not be a popular thing to say in this Assembly because of the close relationship between the Premier of this province and the Premier of Ontario over a period of many years. But frankly I have considerable difficulty determining who has made the people of Ontario madder at Alberta — the Premier of Ontario or the present Prime Minister of Canada. As far as I'm concerned, it's about six of one and half a dozen of another. That's the message I wish a number of members who sit on the other side of the House might make to representatives of the government of the province of Ontario.

DR. BUCK: He was trying to get re-elected.

MR. R. CLARK: My colleague says the Premier of Ontario was trying to get re-elected. But at the same time, I hear rumors that if the Premier of Ontario does get re-elected with a majority, before very long he will have aspirations to lead the federal Tory party of this country. If that is the case, frankly I would see very little difference in attitude between the Premier of Ontario today and if he were the leader of the national Conservative party down the road, because his roots and the base of his support would be in the province of Ontario. And while I have this opportunity, I say to members of the Conservative government in this Assembly, be very leery of the Premier of Ontario becoming leader of the federal Conservative party at some time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal now with the four points I want to discuss this afternoon. I don't always agree with the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, but I thought he made an excellent presentation of one of the ways in which Alberta's position can be defended. That's the situation of our constitutional defence. But I say to all members and especially the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who's here this afternoon, that I don't believe we should put our greatest reliance on constitutional defence. I believe that as a province our greatest reliance as a province should be in developing good will with the other provinces in Canada. Because should any federal government be so much out of touch with reality that they take steps to deal with Alberta's

resources — I use that as an example, although others could be used — the matter would eventually go to the Supreme Court of Canada and lie there for a considerable period of time. Regardless of its view, be it Liberal or Conservative, any government controlled in central Canada would do that only if they felt they could have the support of the bulk of the provinces in Canada. So the point I want to make to hon. members is that, yes, our defence of our rights as a province rests with the constitution, but even more importantly with the good will and support we have with other provinces in Canada, in convincing other provinces that what could be done to Alberta, Saskatchewan, or British Columbia, could be taken against those provinces in the future.

I say to the members of this government that the examples of medical research in Alberta that are going to benefit all Canadians are fair ball. It's a good initiative. But it seems to me that that kind of initiative and the idea of lending money to other provinces in Canada is not the way in which we really develop long-standing good will with the other provinces. I use the comparison of the United States and the money they lent to various countries following World War II, under the very best of intentions, just like we're lending money to other provinces in Canada. Sometimes I think it's important that we ask ourselves, what kinds of long-term allies were really developed?

I think an approach which would have more long-term strength in helping to protect Alberta's position within Confederation would be that if we as a province were to take some leadership in developing a national economic plan for Canada. When my colleague the Member for Little Bow spoke in the Assembly two years ago, I believe, he used the example of big Albertans and little Albertans, big westerners and little westerners, and talked about the need for some sort of new national economic strategy for Canada. I suppose if one were to go back to the plan Sir John A. Macdonald developed, since that time we as a nation really haven't developed the next generation of an economic plan for Canada. It seems to me that with our financial resources, we as a province might give leadership in the development of a national economic plan for Canada for the 1980s and '90s. We're in the fortunate position of being able to say to provinces, let's move in this direction collectively, albeit with the federal government. With the provinces giving the kind of leadership that's possible there — because very candidly, members of the Assembly, in Canada we have the situation of provincial governments that are stronger than the national government. There's an opportunity for the provinces not working in isolation from the federal government but giving leadership there.

We in Alberta have the opportunity to use the Heritage Savings Trust Fund resources available for investment outside the province not on a loan basis but for desirable projects which will stand this country in good stead for the next 10, 20, 30, 40 years. I think that kind of leadership by Alberta, and hopefully by western Canada, would build strong relationships between Alberta and western Canada and the other provinces in Canada, so that if any federal government in the future were to be so stupid as to raid our resources or something in one of the other western provinces, there is that reservoir of good will between Alberta and the other western provinces and the rest of Canada and no federal government, regardless of its political stripe, could get away with it. Our defence would not be in the Supreme Court of Canada, but in the reservoir of good will we have with other provinces in

Canada. To me that's the kind of leadership we in Alberta and western Canada should be taking.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I want to make deals with this question of the Quebec referendum. I think it should be clearly, clearly stated to Premier Levesque and his government that what they talk about in sovereignty association is beyond question, totally unacceptable as an alternative to this Legislative Assembly and to Albertans. When that referendum is held — I believe one of the hon. members spoke on this while I was out, and I apologize — if the vote is yes, then in fact the rules of the game for changes in Canada's constitution in the future will be unalterably changed. No longer would we be able to sit down as 10 provinces and the federal government and be involved in negotiating to change the constitution, change the BNA Act and patriate that Act.

It seems to me that discussions on the future of Canadian federation have to be based on a number of principles. I think it's important that four be outlined this afternoon. First, the control of natural resources and property rights must be vested with the provinces. Secondly, the language rights of all minorities should be protected in areas where they form a significant percentage of the population. Thirdly, the constitution of Canada should be patriated, but not before an amending formula is established. And fourthly, an amending formula which requires the consent of every province to an amendment directly affecting that province must be worked out. I think those are four of the basic principles that should be involved in any attempt toward renewed federation in Canada. Some three or four years ago this Legislature passed a motion dealing with patriation and the working out of an amending formula before. But I point out to members again today, as I did on that occasion, that to talk about patriation is one thing, but we cannot support patriation until an amending formula is worked out or we're really flirting in an area of very, very dangerous negotiations.

Let me conclude my remarks in this second area about the Quebec situation and a new constitution for Canada by saying this: I, as well as any member in this Assembly, know that it isn't going to be worked out quickly. Members will recall — I guess the first nationally televised debate on this question took place back in 1967, Canada's centennial year — when John Robarts had the conference in Toronto. Really the position put forward — and I say this with the greatest of respect — by the government of Quebec at that time, which was the Union Nationale government under Daniel Johnson, was very similar to the position put forward by Claude Ryan and the federal forces under Mr. Ryan today.

But let me conclude my remarks here by saying: let there be no misunderstanding that if the people in Quebec vote yes on sovereignty association as put forward by the PQ in the referendum coming up, that will put an end to any semblance of ongoing negotiations for changing the BNA Act or bringing it back to Canada, because in my judgment sovereignty association as set out by the government of Quebec is totally unacceptable under any circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the third point I want to deal with is this question of the similarities between the province of Alberta and the province of Quebec. I welcome the question that was asked by the Member for Grande Prairie this afternoon, and the confirmation of what the Premier said earlier in the House that, in essence, if the Premier were asked, he would take part in the discussions down there. The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

will recall that some two or three years ago I was extremely critical of the province for not becoming much more actively involved in the question in Quebec at that particular time. But it's very often lost on the people of Quebec, and the people in Alberta too, that from the standpoint of provincial rights for decades Alberta and the province of Quebec have stood shoulder to shoulder on that issue. It seems to me that that is one of the points the government of Alberta must make in the course of being involved in that referendum; that on the question of provincial rights, people in Quebec have no stronger ally anywhere in Canada than the province of Alberta. That point should not be lost.

The fourth and last comment I want to make, Mr. Speaker, deals with this question of the federal government setting up a parliamentary committee to examine the electoral system. Whether we want to admit it or not in this Assembly, we're in a situation today basically where we have no national political parties. That causes additional strains on the country. It's not my purpose this afternoon to talk in terms of whether we should be looking at some sort of proportional representation or some other proposals. The point I want to make is this: with the announcement by the government of Canada to set up a committee in the Parliament of Canada, I think it would be very appropriate for the Alberta government, along with the governments of Saskatchewan and British Columbia where there are no federal representatives on the government side of the House, to make representation that in setting up that parliamentary committee some means be established where there is representation from the province on that House of Commons committee. Initially I'm sure the federal government will say, no, that isn't possible, or there will be MPs who represent western Canada on the committee. But it seems to me important that there be some provincial government representation on that committee from the three western provinces, which just happen to be the three producing provinces as far as energy is concerned.

A day or two after the federal election I urged the creation by the federal and provincial governments of an electoral reform commission, which would look very extensively at the question of representation in the House of Commons. Whether it's the committee set up by the federal government or it's a federal/provincial electoral reform commission, I think there has to be federal government, House of Commons, and provincial government input in that kind of review. From the standpoint of attempting to show western Canadians that there's real interest and concern for their points of view, the federal government should move to have provincial involvement in that committee, other than simply appointing MPs who represent western Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to congratulate the Member for Calgary Currie in bringing forth the motion. I think he has displayed both initiative and boldness, and I look forward to the conclusion of the debate on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I have only two quick points to make. One, I've heard the word "frustrated" quite often this afternoon in regard to Quebec, and the statement that they would like to be in control of their own destiny, in effect to be masters in their own house. Well I can say to Quebec: so do we in Alberta wish to be masters in our own house.

Secondly, in regard to the restructuring of Confedera-

tion, I believe there's a need for change in Confederation. It's like anything else: as times change, the requirements and desires of people change as well. I think we in Alberta support the restructuring of the country, but that restructuring has to provide an equal opportunity for Albertans and the province of Alberta relative to the other provinces in Canada. A restructuring that results in a perpetuation of the status quo, where favoritism is shown towards the eastern provinces, is unacceptable to Albertans.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, now that we've come through the first hour and a portion of the next hour, I think perhaps it's time that we re-read the motion:

... that on behalf of the people of Alberta this Legislative Assembly publicly express to Canadian citizens in Quebec our hope that they will remain within Confederation and that we further declare our commitment to working with our fellow governments to bring about a restructured Confederation in which the unique features of each province [and, I assume, territories] are properly recognized and represented.

I wonder if I might revert to one of my other professions for a moment, and think of the cultural heritage of another people. I would quote from the sixth chapter of the Book of Genesis. As these people looked back in terms of their own heritage, this was one of the comments made: In those days the giants were on earth; they were the heroes of old, men of reknown.

That comment really is one that relates to most nations in this world when we think of previous generations. We think of the giants in our land who went before us, those who founded this nation, those important people who had the courage to forge a nation. Those of us within this Legislative Assembly, and I'm sure those beyond its borders in terms of this province and certainly within this nation, realize that we owe a great debt of gratitude to our forebears within this country. Oftentimes, as we think of an issue such as sovereignty for the province of Quebec, many of us wish for the good old days when there were giants in the land, great political figures who would be able to forge a new unity.

It's there when we really need to pause and think, because the real giants were really ordinary people. They were people just as each one of us here. It's the ordinary, everyday citizen who is forging any kind of new interpretation of what Confederation or the whole destiny of this nation is. So there's a real sense in which we should have this ongoing call for Canadians, all of us to be leaders, all of us to have a sense of vision. So there's a real sense in which we should have this ongoing call for Canadians, all of us, to be leaders, to have a sense of vision. There is a real sense in which we as fellow Canadians, together with the people in Quebec but also in all parts of this nation, share the heroes of our nation.

There's a real sense in which we need to think back to the white discovery of this nation, when people sailing westward just happened to bump into some land. Oftentimes they came for economic expansionist reasons. I think that if we examine even the history of the province of Quebec in terms of its settlement early in the 1600s, one reason Samuel de Champlain came was to seek wealth on behalf of yet another country. This whole matter of the voyages of discovery, to make colonies, if you will, of other parts of the world, and in a sense later on the opening up of this whole vast interesting country of Canada, had economic reasons. They weren't the sole

reasons. Oftentimes the reason was simple curiosity, but more often than not any kind of government or organization has the bottom line as to how many dollars you are going to commit and produce in terms of any kind of exploration venture.

For a moment I would like us to take a look through my life in terms of the visits I have had to the province of Quebec, the realization of the cultural richness within that province. When I first travelled to the province of Quebec in 1960, I found as an historian that my heart really did quicken within me as I stood on the ramparts of the fortress of Quebec, the Citadel. One of the most moving moments of my life in terms of being a Canadian was to listen to the Van Doos regiment on the parade square really belt out *Vive le Canadien*.

There was a real sense there, as one could look over the ramparts upon the broad sweep of the St. Lawrence, and the surrounding countryside, that indeed this is an important part of this fabric, this nation, this Confederation of Canada. Certainly I could think of Quebec's having a part to play in the roots of my own family, because it is where my own mother arrived from England, a child of one. Then again in 1926, my father emigrated from England to make this country his country.

There is no doubt, if you wander around the streets of the province of Quebec, whether in the urban or rural areas, that there really is not only a sense of history but a sense of romanticism, a sense that awakens the poetry within each of you if you happen to go there.

Very definitely, when we think of the province of Quebec, we need to think in terms of individuals. That is something we forget when we're dealing with other nations, provinces, and even other cities and towns with any other kind of jurisdiction. But while there are those broader entities, nevertheless we must deal in terms of the specific relationship with individuals. As you walk on the colorful streets of Quebec City below the fortress, through the magnificent grandeur of the Gaspé, or if you are, for example, on Mount Royal hill in Montreal, the whole mosaic of Quebec is not one that can be categorized in terms of one kind of image. It's a whole kaleidoscope of color, a whole montage, if you will, of interesting people together, of those who may well trace their origins in Canada to French, English, or Jewish backgrounds. There's a whole great diversity encompassed within the word we use to delineate that province of Quebec. Very definitely, should it come to pass, all of us within this Legislature, within this province, would decry that Quebec would be withdrawn from this Confederation. Canada itself would truly be impoverished by that withdrawal.

In the motion before the Assembly, we talk about the unique features of each province and territory. Other colleagues who have spoken here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, have made adequate mention of that particular point. But there is no doubt that no matter where we go within the broad panorama of this country, there are indeed unique features, not just from a geographical point of view but in terms of individual personalities, the individual perspective, if you will, as to how we can forge this nation into a stronger nation in the world's family of nations. No matter where you go in Alberta and Saskatchewan, there's no doubt that there seems to be a higher degree of independence than one can discover in other parts of the country, especially in central Canada. There is also the whole matter of that self reliance, a willingness to open oneself, one's mind, to new possibilities in terms of the whole spectrum of life, but also to

open oneself to the whole possibility of new approaches to a Confederation, one where there is that diversity, but there is that whole aspect of stronger provinces, stronger communities together, making in sum total an even stronger nation of Canada.

When one speaks of separation — I know, for example, in my travels in the Yukon, there also is a part of the country that feels it is cut off, not only from eastern Canada but from almost everywhere else in this nation. There again, those attributes of independence and self reliance, and an openness and willingness to engage in other kinds of channels, even in terms of government. As we examine western Canada, there is a very real sense that, as was mentioned earlier this afternoon, we find certain components which rely on a sense of disfranchisement from eastern Canada, a feeling of having been cut off from the real power and responsibility in this nation. Yet at the same time, there is also that thirst for a greater involvement in the making of a stronger Canada.

Students of history have read about the 1869 Riel rebellion at Red River. The whole aspect there was the seeking of greater aspects of self-government, consultation in terms of determining one's own destiny. Again in the Northwest Rebellion of 1885, where Louis Riel comes out as the predominant figure, it's a whole matter of decisions being made way off somewhere else, decisions made to affect land ownership, forms of government, language rights, and education. We in western Canada have to appreciate that those incidents where Mr. Riel was prominent nevertheless were very much part of the growing pains not only of western Canada but of this whole fabric of a larger nation.

As a child in Regina, I would often go to the RCMP barracks and try to visualize the hanging of Louis Riel. That obviously meant something to me, but it was being distorted. It had been distorted in terms of the educational process I had participated in in Regina. The distortion was that here was a rebel; here was someone wild eyed, who deserved to be hung. But later when I started to do research into that, I discovered that Louis Riel was someone who was speaking in much broader terms, one who really was dealing with the issues of a stronger Confederation and the right of all people in all parts of that nation to be legitimate participants in decision-making processes.

So it is that as you visit the grave of Louis Riel in Saint Boniface in greater Winnipeg, here again one should be brought back to the realization that in that predominately French-speaking community on the banks of the Red River was a symbol of growth within this nation. In any community and in any family, there will always be growing pains. Any individual, each one of us, will suffer growing pains. Hopefully we won't decide to cut off one of our limbs so we can then have a restructured Confederation, but far rather that we work to a wholeness of that system to make that stronger Confederation possible.

Within the province of Quebec today, we know that some recent position papers have been developed. It is interesting to note that within the so-called Ryan beige paper, fundamental rights of first inhabitants of this country must be recognized. I hope our brothers and sisters in the province of Quebec will also realize some fundamental rights on behalf of our native Indian Canadians.

In the same paper is also the matter of the recognition of the richness of cultural heritages of different regions. I'm sure that each one of us here can agree and applaud that kind of cultural diversity which is part of the rich,

varied, wonderful make-up of this country of Canada. There is no doubt that the government of Alberta is willing to work toward forging an even stronger Confederation, and that willingness, that undertaking to work with our fellow governments, has been made evident on more than one occasion.

Mr. Speaker, there are other areas in which we as a province, as individuals, can become involved in terms of forging together this greater sum of what this country can be. One of the interesting things that happens from time to time within the province is the matter of student exchanges between various parts of the province, between various parts of the country, and the very important role that can play by our children being housed in the homes of people in Quebec, for example — the great potential for growth and understanding that is there. The whole matter of interprovincial travel each one of us takes part in: perhaps we could very seriously give up thoughts of trips to Hawaii and, instead, turn the direction of our trip and visit the province of Quebec.

The whole matter of the twinning relationship between the city of Calgary and Quebec City is one that should not only be noted but built upon. I think there are many people within this province who are very much interested in the construction of the Q & M pipeline as a means of supplying gas to eastern Canada, including the province of Quebec, as a means of helping them in terms of energy self-sufficiency and security of supply.

Mr. Speaker, I would make these last two comments. In recent weeks, together with a number of members of the Legislature I'm sure, I have received correspondence from other people in western Canada urging us to state our position with regard to separation from the rest of Canada. Of course, I can only answer for myself. To any of those letters I received, I can only reply as politely as possible and utterly reject their proposition. I firmly believe that we work together for the further construction, the enlargement of this concept of a Canada by having stronger provinces, stronger territories, but all having that kind of true, firm, partnership decision-making so that together we can grow into a larger nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say this: Canada is really in need of leaders, Canadians, of greater vision, so that in interpreting the mosaic of this great and varied nation, with all its diverse richness of cultural identities and concerns, in terms of this whole nation including the province of Quebec, we will be seen together by future generations and be referred to as giants in their day, men and women of renown, men and women of vision.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate on Motion 204. First of all, I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Calgary Currie for presenting this motion.

To address this motion in its proper perspective, I believe we must look at two very basic questions: question one, what is Canada? Question two, what does it mean to be a Canadian? As a political organization Canada is, or should be, a family of provinces working co-operatively to form a strong country. To function fully in that family, each province must have equal constitutional status. I believe this is clearly expressed in our government's position paper, *Harmony in Diversity: A New Federalism for Canada*. I refer to recommendations 24 and 25:

The Alberta government recommends:

24. that an amending formula must reflect the principle that all provinces have equal constitu-

- tional [rights]; and
25. that an amending formula reflect the principle that existing rights, proprietary interests and jurisdiction of a province cannot be diminished without the consent of that province.

Mr. Speaker, any strong family is made up of strong members who share a mutual respect for one another. You do not find strong, long-lasting families where the strength is retained in the head of that family. This leads me to recommendation No. 6 in the same booklet, *Harmony in Diversity*, where our government's position is very clear on provincial ownership and control over natural resources:

6. that the existing sections in the British North America Act protecting provincial ownership and control of natural resources be strengthened.

Our Liberal government in Ottawa shows little respect for provincial resource ownership. Their recent invoking of the force majeure clause in the Syncrude agreement demonstrates this very vividly.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a very diverse country. Each province has its strengths and weaknesses. If we build on our strengths, we have the ability to become a strong nation in which our citizens can hold their heads high and take a sense of pride in being Canadians. However, if we emphasize our weaknesses, we will become involved in continual bickering, divisiveness, and will destroy ourselves as a nation.

Canada has the ability to become self-sufficient in energy and to eventually control her own economic destiny. Alberta is in a position to play a leadership role in this development, and certainly has indicated a willingness to do so. However, our federal government is reluctant to allow this to happen.

How does what I am saying relate to Motion 204? I believe Quebec's aspirations in Confederation are similar to Alberta's. They wish an opportunity to build on their strengths and have more control over their destiny as a province. I firmly believe that if our federal government would direct its efforts to strengthening rather than weakening the provinces of this nation of ours, our fellow Canadians in Quebec would be able to achieve their aspirations within Confederation.

Socially, Canada was built on the mosaic philosophy. Immigrants to Canada came from all over the world and had the opportunity to become Canadians and, at the same time, retain their culture and a pride in their heritage. Mr. Speaker, to me this mosaic fibre makes Canadians distinctly different from the citizens of our neighboring country the United States of America. Without a continued emphasis on our heritage, we can lose this unique characteristic. The position of this government recognizes this feature of our social fibre. Recommendation No. 14 in *Harmony in Diversity* states with respect to culture:

The Alberta government recommends:

14. that culture be included in the Constitution as a concurrent power, with provincial paramountcy.

The expression of our unique culture through the arts, literature, and the preservation of our diverse heritage is a vital part of our society's fabric. The provision by this government of a separate department of Culture, which offers numerous diverse programs, certainly demonstrates Alberta's commitment to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated previously in this House that the Bonnyville constituency which I have the honor

to represent can be viewed as a micro-organism of Canada. Our population is made up of a large number of Canada's first citizens, the Indians. We have strong settlements of citizens of French background, settled primarily in and around Bonnyville, St. Vincent, and Therien. You will find citizens in these communities from almost every other ethnic origin. Canadians of Indian, French, and Ukrainian backgrounds are particularly active in retaining their culture — and in the case of the French, also in retaining their language. Alberta Culture has offered a great deal of assistance to these citizens in fulfilling their aspirations.

Alberta Education has also played an important role. Many schools in the constituency offer courses in French, Ukrainian, and Cree. French immersion courses are becoming increasingly popular. Students in the Bonnyville area have the opportunity of attending a bilingual school where subjects other than French are taught, using French as a language of instruction. Students in the Therien-St. Vincent area have access to a similar opportunity by attending the Mallaig school in the St. Paul constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the varied needs of this diverse population do not always lead to smooth easy solutions. But they certainly contribute to exciting, vibrant, strong communities. The micro-organism is working well. If we build on our strengths, there is no reason that the total organism, Canada, cannot work well. On behalf of my constituents, I would encourage our Canadian citizens in Quebec to remain within Confederation and work with us, their fellow Canadians, to build a stronger and better Canada.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I too appreciate the opportunity to participate today in the debate on Motion 204. As other members have observed, it is a motion with two parts. The first is an expression of this Assembly's hope that the citizens of Quebec will remain in Confederation. The second is a declaration of our commitment to work with other provincial governments in achieving a restructured Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that both parts of the motion are significant. I would like to comment briefly on both. You may recall, sir, that earlier in this spring sitting in my reply to the throne speech, I spoke of a tension in Canada, a tension that derives primarily from our energy price negotiations with the federal jurisdiction. This motion, of course, addresses itself to another equally serious tension in Canada. That arises from the deep-seated feelings of inequality in Quebec and, by implication, elsewhere in Canada.

A number of years ago, Mr. Speaker, while I was serving with the Royal Canadian Navy, it was my good fortune to live with a French-speaking family in Levis, Quebec, for a period of about six months while my ship was undergoing an extensive refit in the shipyard there. The home I resided in was about a mile from the shipyard, and twice daily I would walk the main street of Levis, Quebec, dressed in the uniform of a Canadian naval officer. Several times a week during that walk to or from the shipyard, groups of young French-speaking children would point and chatter to each other and in French say the equivalent of "there goes the Englishman".

Until that experience, the words "two solitudes" were nothing more to me than a book title. But since that experience, I've come to realize that the words "two solitudes" describe a profound cultural chasm between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians. Since

that time, and until this present moment, as a concerned Canadian I have tried to make a modest personal contribution toward the resolution of that most serious national problem. With that goal in mind, Mr. Speaker, I'm most pleased today to confirm that the hope expressed in Motion 204 is indeed my hope.

The referendum vote taken on May 20 will decide whether or not Quebecers will agree to give their government a mandate to negotiate what is termed "sovereignty association", an independent Quebec associated with the rest of Canada through a common market and a common currency. At this point in time, with 35 days remaining in that referendum campaign, the outcome is very difficult to predict. Many observers in fact have predicted that results will be very, very close. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any one single event or development will persuade those presently planning to vote yes to change their intention. Any such change in intention will come from a mix or a combination of factors. However, I am fully persuaded that the news of the passage of this motion today could prove to be one of the more influential developments in the referendum campaign period.

A recent news analysis quite perceptively observed that fear is a key element in the referendum campaign. Some of those who advocate a no vote have resorted to a scare campaign, pointing out that a yes vote would mean economic decline and the loss of some federal benefits. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate for me to comment on the validity of that tactic in this Assembly, but I have often felt that hope is a far more enduring motivation than fear. I trust that this motion today will give Quebecers renewed hope and assurance that they are not one solitude, but in fact are equal partners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted a slight digression. I was intrigued with the comments made in the House today by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. It was of interest to me to compare the tone of his comments today with that of the remarks he made in this House during the debate on the government's position paper on a renewed constitution, I believe in the fall sitting in 1978. At that time he made this comment: "we are, in my view, taking far too extreme a stand in favor of provincial rights." And on another occasion in that same debate: "the bottom line of the proposals we are debating today would be a decentralized Confederation that would, in my judgment, seriously balkanize this country."

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have detected a position shift with the comments made today by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in which he advocated that our position be one in which flexibility and tolerance will be required. Now I must confess to a certain uncertainty as to the cause of that shift. I'm not sure it could be explained because he's perhaps been positively impressed by various philosophical positions advanced by members of the government. Or is it perhaps simply the exercising of a chameleon-like quality, in which there has been a change in oratorical hue from red to reddish-blue, for whatever *per se* political advantage. I'm not at all certain, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I regret there is precious little time today for me to elaborate on my support for this government's position paper on constitutional reform, Harmony in Diversity. This has been done very well by my colleagues today. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you and the hon. members present that there are two interesting precedents, or examples, that will impact locally and internationally if the referendum fails, if Quebec remains in Confederation and a restructured Confederation can

be achieved, in which the unique features of each province and territory are recognized.

On the local level, Mr. Speaker, in every community there are racial, class, and cultural differences which I don't believe can ever be remedied or resolved by legislation. Only by individual effort and commitment can discrimination ever truly be eliminated in Canada, and certainly in Alberta. I submit today, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of individual commitment needed is more likely to develop in a national setting in which differences on a national scale have been addressed and accommodated. Obviously I feel that the reverse is true: that these various differences, these discriminations at the local level, are less likely to be resolved in light of the failure of attempts to restructure our constitution and Confederation.

On the international level, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest that other nations' respect for Canada can significantly influence international negotiations, trade, travel, and so on. It appears to me, sir, that if we can achieve a restructured Confederation in which these unique features of each province and territory are indeed recognized, international admiration for this country quite probably will result and all Canadians will benefit, directly or indirectly, from such admiration.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that through this motion today, through the decision of Quebecers to remain in Confederation, and through a restructured Confederation and constitution, at some time in the future an English-speaking Canadian naval officer will walk down the streets of Levis, Quebec, and little children will point and say, here comes the naval officer, implying that he is neither English-speaking nor French-speaking but simply Canadian. At that time, sir, a new Canadian novel might appear with the title "No Solitudes".

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's an important debate today. Confederation really is at the crossroads. I'd like to offer my congratulations, too, to the hon. Member for Calgary Currie for bringing this important topic to our attention. It's particularly auspicious today, because the referendum date was set in the Quebec National Assembly today by the Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Levesque. It's a real source of concern for many Canadians, Albertans included, because we're concerned about the future of this country. Is the country we have come to know and love going to continue as it has, perhaps in a renewed and changed format, or is it going to be torn asunder? I think Joe Clark spoke as Prime Minister about a community of communities. His dream of Canada was that regional differences, cultural differences, would be respected and accommodated in a much more decentralized country. The alternative he presented was a country that was highly centralized. It could not accommodate those differences and literally would be blown apart because of the pressures and tensions that would develop from that.

I think nationalism is a dangerous and potent force. In a sense it's akin to religion. It inspires blind belief in the service of something much bigger than an individual. It's interesting to note that nationalism as a force in the world grew when religion declined as a motivating force in mankind. In effect it has become the new state religion in many countries and seems to be a similar force in Quebec today. Nationalism seeks out differences rather than similarities and promotes hostility. We have only to look at World War I, World War II, and Iran today to see the serious negative effects of a people who seek out

differences rather than similarities.

In that sense, Mr. Speaker, Canada is an important political experiment, not simply for this country but for the world. Because in Canada we are a curious amalgam, a combination of historical accidents. We are a country where a French colony was grafted onto a territory that chose not to go with the American experiment to the south. We welcomed peoples to a western territory — a territory that, an hon. member correctly pointed out, came into Confederation unwillingly. In a sense Louis Riel was a politician equally as conventional as many of the western politicians today, demanding more access to the decision-making power over the control of our destiny. Canada's an important political experiment, Mr. Speaker, because we represent an experiment in the course of human history whereby people from different backgrounds have come together and tried to accommodate their differences. I think it's very similar to the family of nations in the world today, where we have many differences that need to be accommodated and we need to seek out similarities rather than differences.

Monsieur le Président, je voulais dire aussi que le Canada est une expérience de la tolérance. C'est un respect pour les différences culturelles et c'est assez important pour les francophones Albertains aussi. C'est que les francophones Albertains ont un investissement dans l'avenir du Canada et d'Alberta. C'est important de dire que les francophones Albertains ont les droits à l'éducation, à la culture. C'est un respect pour nous comme Harmonie en Diversité. C'est le titre du document créé par le gouvernement Albertain. Et je pense que les francophones Albertains doivent donner aussi leur appui au gouvernement Albertain à la recherche de la tolérance. Le nationalisme est une force négative. C'est possible dans l'avenir [inaudible] Québec dans la Confédération de prédire que peut-être dans l'avenir d'Alberta, les droits peuvent être accorder aux groupes en minorités, comme les francophones en Alberta. Et je veux dire simplement que c'est important que les francophones Albertains disent aux confrères et aux voisins que pour leurs propres intérêts, c'est nécessaire que le Québec reste comme membre de la famille canadienne.

MR. SPEAKER: *Un ordre, s'il vous plaît. J'espère que l'honorable député donnera son texte français au rédacteur du journal des Débats.*

MR. COOK: *Monsieur le Président, je serai très heureux de donner une traduction au journal.*

For the benefit of my friends in the Chamber, I simply said that nationalism is a dangerous force here in Alberta as well. It's important that Quebec remain in Canada, because it confers on francophone Albertans certain rights and privileges, and respect and tolerance, and they would seriously run the risk of losing those rights and that respect if Quebec were to leave Confederation. I'd simply like to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps I could also explain to the Assembly my interjection, which was to the effect that I would hope the hon. member would have a copy of his French text for the editor of *Hansard*.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I replied by saying I'd be happy to provide translation. My remarks are off-the-cuff, not with a text. I'll work with the editor to translate them. They're simply symbolic words, and I'd be happy to try to put them on the record in English.

I don't think Albertans or Quebecers look at Canada as simply a state where the status quo is acceptable. I think we all agree, Albertans and Quebecers, that Canada requires a re-examination and redefinition of the Confederation partnership. Albertans look to Quebec to remain in Confederation, but to act as a catalyst. We hope that with that catalyst, that vote on May 20, when we hope they'll vote to remain in Canada, the federal Liberal government will galvanize itself, resolve itself into seriously re-examining the regional pressures and tensions that have been so eloquently referred to by many members of the House on both sides. So Alberta is serious about renewing Confederation, not on the basis of the status quo but looking to documents like *Harmony in Diversity* and the Ryan beige paper. We look for not merely words from the federal government, as in the throne speech, but for some concrete actions, a demonstration of good will and the recognition that this country is a community of communities and simply cannot reflect the central view of what our culture or purpose is. If Canada is to have any purpose at all, Mr. Speaker, it is to reflect that harmony in diversity that is so badly needed in a world that is chaotic and dangerous, with dangerous weapons and dangerous passions. Nationalism is something to be contained, not something that should be exaggerated.

In closing, I congratulate the hon. member for bringing this resolution to the Chamber at a most auspicious time, giving Albertans and their representatives a chance to go on the record as being fully in support of the maintenance of Confederation, but a renewed Confederation. It has to be negotiated on those terms, not simply for Quebec but for all Canadians who feel a sense of dissatisfaction and some frustration. I would ask this House to support this resolution unanimously, and to carry that message strongly to our fellow citizens in Quebec as they consider a very serious question that's important to them and to us.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to participate for a few brief moments on this important referendum introduced by my colleague from Calgary Currie ...

DR. BUCK: Resolution.

MR. JOHNSTON: Resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. Clover Bar.

To underline the importance of the timing of this debate, not just because the referendum date has been struck today but surely because much of the concern of all of Canada will be focused on the western Premier's conference coming up next week in Lethbridge — I am confident to suggest to you that a very strong, unequivocal expression of concern will be forthcoming from that very important conference. At the same time, we do have in the context of today's speech a note of some hope for constitutional change expressed by the federal government in its own throne speech delivered yesterday.

I also want to outline very briefly the timing we're dealing with here. I think it's important to put in a time context the three important reports which have been referred to by the various speakers. It's important to note that Alberta, I believe, was the very first with its *Harmony in Diversity*. It was then followed by the two other reports: *Quebec-Canada: A New Deal*, and Mr. Ryan's paper, *A New Canadian Federation*. It's important to note that for one very important reason: Alber-

tans have always expressed the need and the challenge to find new satisfactions for their problems within Confederation, within the constitutional change. So I think it's important that we have taken that leadership historically and will continue to pursue that as one of our major objectives.

I also want to express briefly to the Assembly general support for most of the comments by the Leader of the Opposition, and I will also take those to heart when we're dealing with this unity and constitutional question next week in Lethbridge.

Let me just briefly look at the question which is being put forward by our colleagues in Quebec. I think we have had some comments on the skill with which this has been put forward. They introduce the question in a very simple fashion, suggesting that Quebec in its public proposal wants to negotiate a new agreement with the rest of Canada based on an equality. This seems to be the theme that runs through their speech: that it's one to one, an equality within Canada. They want to be able to have their own economic independence — a common concern shared by most provinces — to levy their own taxes and pursue their own economic objectives but, they go on to say, to establish their relations abroad. The important thing, however, is that no change in the political status will result from these negotiations, but in fact there will be another referendum question called and the people will have one more chance to express their views as to whether sovereignty is the true option. That's really the question they're asking: whether the government can negotiate a new agreement between Canada and Quebec. Many of our speakers today have already stated that that's a very simple question and one which likely will receive support in Quebec at this point.

What isn't reported, of course, are the concerns expressed on numerous occasions by our colleagues, not just by the Premier of this province and the western Premiers but by many leaders in Canada all across the nine other provinces, suggesting that in fact sovereignty with association is not a viable alternative for the people of Quebec. The question remains: are we communicating this to them? I guess we'll know very soon that in fact the real question facing the people of Quebec is one of sovereignty. That is really, full stop, as many have already expressed.

What does it mean, however, if we vote no to the referendum question? I think that's the message we have to get across, the point being that a no vote is not a rejection for change within our Confederation. As I indicated before, Alberta cannot pursue a posture of status quo within Confederation. Time and time again we have suggested that we are willing and able to meet the constitutional challenges facing all of Canada, to deal with the issues facing us as we move into the next 114 years of our history. That's the kind of position Alberta is taking, and that's why the people of Quebec must recognize that the no vote is not a vote for status quo but in fact a vote for a constitutional change, a process which I think the rest of the provinces have accepted.

As the Member for Calgary Currie outlined, we have put forward fundamental principles in our Harmony in Diversity, moving through the various established traditions which you and I have learned to accept and respect and work with, right through to the fact that we find there has to be an opportunity for give and take in this question. That's not to say that all the views reflected in Mr. Ryan's paper can be accepted by any of us. It's not necessarily to be supposed. But I do believe there's a

broad framework which presents to some an alternative to the problems we're facing in Canada; that is, that separation is the only choice we have. I think we have an opportunity right now to really pursue real, recognizable changes in this constitutional question.

To that point, Mr. Speaker, I'd only go on to add that regardless of the results of the referendum in Quebec, Alberta will remain committed to the process of pursuing constitutional change within Confederation and share fully the burdens and responsibilities of the provinces to try to find some other form, some other new system, which will handle the difficulties which all provinces are facing within Confederation. We will continue to suggest as well that Quebec will not stand alone. I think that's an important view the Leader of the Opposition made, that in many cases the concerns, frustrations, and heritage, I suppose, of Quebec are very similar to those of Alberta. And historically speaking, we can point to some of the issues other speakers have moved toward.

We sympathize with their desire to find a greater challenge and to have a greater say in control over their own affairs — not much different from us here in Alberta. And we will continue to pursue, with all our vigor and our interests, increased decision-making in provincial affairs within this Confederation. We think that by building on this diversity we can have a harmony within Canada.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, just for the record, that we will continue to pursue this objective: We hope the people of Quebec will recognize the importance of their question and will vote no on referendum day, because in my view the no vote is in fact a vote for constitutional change and is not a vote for status quo.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Calgary Currie conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. D. ANDERSON: I think we've had an important, exciting, and indeed in-depth conversation with respect to the whole topic of Canadian unity today. I don't plan to reiterate many of the comments made so eloquently by my fellow members this afternoon, but I would like to re-emphasize five points that I think were made today with respect to this important resolution. The first is the hope that the federal government will rethink its position with respect to Confederation and will consider the need for each individual partner within Confederation to be an important element unto itself, able to take maximum advantage of its own resources and its people. The second is that the key to keeping Quebec in Confederation is a restructured Confederation, and that that is necessary for all of us who will be partners to participate in coming years. Third is that we as a province now stand ready to assist in this referendum debate in ways which the federalist forces in that province may define as best and to the best advantage of the cause of national unity. Fourth is that we continue with our leadership as a province in putting forth the concepts and ideas that will help to make this Confederation a working entity, and that we begin this at the western premiers' conference which will take place next week in Lethbridge.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to note that I've accepted an invitation from you to go to Quebec City this weekend with several other members, including the one who spoke so eloquently in both official languages this afternoon. I'm looking forward to the possibility of bring-

ing, with you and the other members, our expression of a hope that the people of Quebec will choose to remain within Confederation, and our commitment to working toward a restructured Confederation which will recognize the unique differences in each province.

[Motion carried unanimously]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I require that the clock be stopped only long enough to discuss this evening's business. The Committee of Supply is the order of business for tonight. The order of the estimates has already been made known to hon. members of the opposition. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to deal with it on that basis when you adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that when hon. members reconvene this evening at 8 o'clock they'll be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:31 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply resumed at 8 p.m.]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the Committee of Supply please come to order.

Department of Education

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll continue with the estimates for the Department of Education. First, I think there were some points to clarify on Vote 1. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition wants to make a comment, or do you want to refer it directly to the hon. minister?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I believe the reason we held this section was the minister was going to get some information with regard to consultant fees and so on.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, last night the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked about 430 on the computer printout for the department. I believe he expressed an interest in knowing what had happened in all four votes. With respect to 430 in Vote 1, the increase of approximately \$215,000 is due to the cost of developing and marking the English achievement examination. That was \$125,000 in consultant and contract fees for development and marking, and the increased cost of monitoring the August and March grade 12 appeal examinations. The cost of marking the appeal examinations increased by \$25,400. That accounts for approximately 16 per cent of the 24 per cent increase the hon. leader alluded to, and the balance is the 8 per cent which covers the inflation on the base cost or the base component of last year.

With respect to Vote 3, the increase of approximately \$237,000 is due to costs associated with the translation of the learning resources project and increases in the costs of

printing and binding, school broadcasting, and substitute teaching. In Early Childhood Services there's an increase of \$20,000 for binding and printing costs that had previously been charged to materials and supplies, which is Code 600. There is an increase in curriculum of \$38,000 to cover increasing costs of printing and substitute teaching. There is an increased cost of \$30,500 in audio-visual services to cover the increasing costs of printing and school broadcasts, and there's an increase of \$83,000 in language services to cover translation of the learning resources material in French and English, and \$58,000 to cover extended-run printing and inflation.

In Vote 4, the increase of approximately \$29,000 is primarily due to increases in medical and dental aid for students attending the Alberta School for the Deaf, costs which are covered by the Department of Education.

The hon. member asked some questions last night related to the sensory multihandicapped program planning project. While I know that this isn't in Vote 1, Mr. Chairman, I take the liberty now of providing an additional copy of this to the hon. leader. He asked a number of questions last night, all of which are answered in the report. I'm afraid I misconstrued the nature of the questions because I assumed he had had an opportunity to read the report, but I'll provide to him a copy of the report as well as a copy of the news release dated January 23, 1980, at which time the report was released to the public.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Thanks for the answers.

Mr. Minister, going back to Vote No. 1, if I recall the explanation accurately, it was for the development and marking of English examinations, and then it was approximately \$25,000 for the two appeal periods. Mr. Minister, are we running into a situation where there are many more appeals? It seems to me that a \$25,000 increase in that particular area would obviously be that there are more appeals. In other words, more grade 12 high school students are choosing to go the appeal mechanism than has been the case in the past.

MR. KING: There are more students writing appeals, but the effect of that is compounded because we also pay release time for teachers to monitor and mark the examinations. So it isn't simply a straight line projection on marking, but on release time for teachers when they are marking.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister — and if the answer can't be provided now, perhaps you could provide the information to me by memo — why would that release time be in Code 430 as opposed to salary to non-permanent positions or, in fact, wages? Why would it be funnelled out of this area here? Marking examinations or supervision would be a very short-term kind of thing. Why wouldn't that be paid out of wages or non-permanent positions as opposed to Professional, Technical, and Labour Services?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, because the teachers to whom we are providing release time, who develop and mark the examinations, are not at any time employees of the Department of Education, either on a salary or a wage basis. They continue to be the employees of their local jurisdiction. We buy their services by contract for a short period of time. It is a professional contract service.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then to the minister. Mr. Minister, so in Code 430 we find the payment for all teachers who mark examinations, prepare grade 12 examinations, and the people who do the work on the various — I want to say power tests — the various tests given through the 1 to 12 system: all that would come from Code 430? Is that what we're now being told, Mr. Minister?

MR. KING: No, that isn't correct. The work on the development of the English achievement exam was done here, and the appeal exams are done here, as well as some others which I could not identify for the hon. leader right now. Some test development is also done in Vote 3. The amount of that would be very small. If the hon. leader would like detail, I could provide it to him by memo; I could not this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could conclude Vote 1. We have to vote the total.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support
Services

\$6,917,170

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition want to comment on some of the other votes?

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, I have three or four rather general questions I'd like to pose before we finish the estimates. The first one deals with a request from the Alberta School Trustees' Association. One of their resolutions passed at the 73rd annual convention in Calgary dealt with the Alberta School Trustees' Association urging the government to make the Sindlinger report on school utilization a public document. Mr. Minister, if I recall when the work was started, early in the minister's tenure of office there was a commitment given that this report would be made public. Mr. Minister, I would ask at this particular time that that commitment be followed through, so that not only do the school trustees have the benefit of that information but that the people in both Calgary and Edmonton who are going through this question of school utilization in the two urban areas would have the benefit of the report. I ask the question in light of what I understand to be a commitment made by the minister some time ago that the report would be made public.

MR. KING: Was that the only question the hon. leader had?

It would be difficult, Mr. Chairman, to make public the report of the Sindlinger task force, given the way in which that report was presented to me; in addition to which, I think I would be best advised to simply say that in light of the way in which that report was presented to me, it would be difficult to accede to that request.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, in light of that information, if the report was given verbally to the minister, I feel confident that the minister, some of his staff, or the gentleman who wrote the report would be quite capable of putting the essence of the report together. I can't see any other reason, why at the very least the recommendations couldn't be made public in keeping with the commitment that was made much earlier. If it isn't a matter that it was made verbally, will the minister explain to the

committee why, because of the nature in which the report was given, it isn't possible to make it public?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I could make available, and would undertake to make available, a summary of the recommendations of the Sindlinger report. I would make that undertaking to the House.

MR. R. CLARK: I wouldn't want to be accused of quibbling, but I take it from the undertaking the minister has just given the committee that that summary of the recommendations would include all the recommendations.

MR. KING: Yes, that would be the case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then I'd like to move on to just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has a question, I believe.

MR. R. CLARK: I'm sorry.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I have another question which I hope you'll bear in mind after the member's. Regarding the report which was submitted to the minister, the minister has been somewhat cryptic about the manner in which it was received. I wonder if he would elaborate on that a little bit and clear it up for us please. Exactly what was the manner in which the report was received?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a situation and with a commitment which was made with respect to the first task force struck by the government caucus. It might be appropriate to say, or rather to emphasize, at this point that what we are talking about is a document that pertains to the internal operations of the caucus. It was not prepared by government staff, nor at government expense, nor was it prepared for the government, in the legal sense. Because it was the first to be set up by the government caucus, and because of the commitment which the hon. leader has mentioned, which commitment is outstanding, and because I would have to acknowledge that, I am prepared to make the substance of that particular report public.

But by saying that, I am suggesting to hon. members that it cannot in any sense be construed as a precedent for the future action of any Members of the Legislative Assembly. In that respect I want to say that I undertake to provide it as a member of the caucus, rather than in my capacity as Minister of Education. The report was made to me in more than one part, on more than one occasion and, I would suggest, had both written and oral components. If I'm incorrect in my judgment of what constituted the recommendations of the report, then certainly the hon. member who is the chairman of the task force could correct me. But my undertaking now is on the basis of the judgment that it was made in more than one part and in both oral and written form. In making the statement this evening, I want the circumstances surrounding the initial mandate to that task force and the unique nature to be clearly understood by all members of the Assembly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, thank you, Mr. Minister, but that was quite a merry goose chase. I appreciate

the commitment that we're going to get the essence of the recommendations, but I question very much whether people in the educational community understand why, once the commitment is made, we go through all the hoops that have just been explained. As I say, thanks for the report.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise one other issue with the minister which was referred to last evening. It was the press release of January 23 dealing with the Sensory Multihandicapped Program Planning Project. Mr. Minister, if I understood the comments made last night, there is a commitment in the Speech from the Throne that this program will be initiated. An announcement was made by the minister on January 23 that we'd move in this direction, yet there's no place in the estimates where money is appropriated for this particular program.

Last evening, Mr. Minister, the comment was made by yourself, sir, that the Legislature had the commitment of the government in the throne speech. That, along with this announcement, really was the commitment of the government. I find it very difficult to understand, even though negotiations are going on between the school boards and the Department of Education, why a decision was made not to put any money at all in the estimates. I pose the question to the Minister of Education, or perhaps it should more properly be posed to the Provincial Treasurer, as to why, given the announcement the government made in January and the commitment in the throne speech, there is, if I understand the minister accurately, not one cent in the budget for this particular program.

MR. KING: I thought I explained that last night, Mr. Chairman, but I'd certainly be prepared to try again. On January 23, we released a report. We did not at that time make any commitment toward the future of the program. The commitment has been made subsequently and is contained in the throne speech of March 20 of this year. What I said to the hon. member last night was that this was an action developed by the government subsequent to the completion of the estimates in the budget for this year, and that was the only reason funds were not in the budget for this year.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then to the Minister of Education or to the Provincial Treasurer — perhaps more appropriately referred to the Provincial Treasurer: Mr. Provincial Treasurer, are there any other programs in the throne speech which have not got money provided in the budget for them?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'd have to check on that, Mr. Chairman, and report during my estimates.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the Provincial Treasurer: isn't it the practice of the government that when programs are announced in the throne speech, the budget which follows some two weeks later attempts to provide the money for those programs, albeit in this particular case the amount of money may be up to question, as the minister properly indicated last evening. But Mr. Minister, how does the Treasury Board go the route of a special warrant, because in fact there's been no money allocated to start financing this program?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, it's certainly true that the budget which follows the throne speech in most cases provides for the funding of

the programs announced in the throne speech. But in some cases there are programs which have not yet started, or which are unpredictable in respect of the rate at which they would proceed during the year. I have not done a detailed comparison and matching of the budget and throne speech, but if there are commitments in either, they'll be carried forward. I think the best way to approach them is with respect to each particular ministry and to have questions posed as to the rate of progress and the funding with respect to each program in each ministry. I'd be happy to elaborate on that during my estimates.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, one further question. It seems to me that what we're doing here is establishing a rather dangerous practice. We're being asked to approve the estimates before the committee right now. We have a new program announced. We don't have one cent in the estimates for that particular program, and we're being asked to approve the estimates for special education with an announcement of a new program in the Speech from the Throne. Yet, by the Minister of Education's own admission, not one cent is in the budget for that program.

Now I can recognize how they may even have put \$100,000 or \$500,000 in the estimates and come back after the negotiations are finished with the school boards later in the year and say there's a need for a special warrant to add to that. But in its simplest form, the principle we're establishing here is to say yes, this program's going to go ahead, but we're not asking the Legislature for one cent for the program. It's going to be all funded, not by initial approval of the Legislature, but by special warrant.

MR. KING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat the comments made by my hon. colleague. I am sure that the general practice of this government, well established since 1981 . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: 1971.

MR. KING: '71. Now I'm future-oriented. . . . is that programs are funded out of the budget and the estimates of the fiscal year. There are, however, exceptions. I believe that a strong argument can be made that the needs of this particular group are exceptional. I would like to know if the hon. leader is suggesting that as the result of circumstances which delivered this report to the government in January of this year, we should put off implementing the program until September 1981? That is frequently the practice, that the government must defer good projects because of the time at which they appear in our budgetary cycle. But I think while that is practice, one of the signs of good government is that you can recognize the need for an exception when it appears. And I can only repeat that this was presented to the government after the last day for inclusion in the budget. Notwithstanding that fact, I think the government has adopted a reasonable course of action under the circumstances. If the hon. leader is suggesting that in order to do justice to our budgetary procedure we should defer the implementation of this program for one year, then I would be pleased to hear him say so.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, the minister has fallen into the trap that is very obvious. Here we have a minister who made the announcement of the releasing of the document on January 23. Somehow, between then

and when the budget was finalized — which would likely not have to be more than two weeks before, or about the time the House started — the minister, from that time until the budget was finalized, couldn't get his cabinet colleagues to put some money in the budget for the program. Mr. Minister, that is really what you're telling us here this evening. That's quite an admission, Mr. Minister — the announcement made in January, the report coming down, and then the minister couldn't get his cabinet colleagues to put one cent in the budget for an excellent program. So we're going this route. No question, Mr. Minister — and if the minister wants to play Sherlock Holmes, fair ball — no question about the program not going ahead.

I must say, Mr. Minister, that I take the government at face value, that when it includes a new program in the Speech from the Throne, it follows that money would be provided in the budget, if not in all at least in part, so you can add to it by special warrants. And, Mr. Minister, I happen to have been around long enough to know that changes can be made in the budget as late as when the Legislature starts sitting, March 20.

So, Mr. Minister, if it's a matter of the department forgetting about the program for some reason, I'd simply say that's most unfortunate. The point I want to impress is that this is a very dangerous practice to follow. And best I ask, are there any other programs, any other announcements the minister has made over the past year, included in the announcements in the throne speech, that are not funded for in the budget? [interjection]

I take it, Mr. Chairman, from the minister not getting up, that the other announcements in the throne speech for this department are covered by budgetary appropriations. Is that an accurate assessment, Mr. Minister? There are no other blunders?

Agreed to:

Department Total \$736,006,770

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister like to move that the vote be reported?

MR. KING: Indeed, Mr. Chairman. I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Transportation

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister like to make some opening comments?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of brief comments. Of necessity they'll be similar to what I said on Friday, when I roughly outlined the make-up of the department and what it covers generally. The headings I used on Friday were: urban transportation, street assistance programs for towns and villages, airports, resource roads, assistance to municipalities, counties, I.D.s, and special areas, and then of course the total road system.

The approach to the road system divides roughly into two parts. Keeping in mind that we — that is, the people of Alberta — have an investment in the road system something in the order of \$20 billion-plus, we have to think about protecting and restructuring the existing system at the same time that we're concerned with expanding the new parts as they are required.

As to the distribution of funds in the department, there is no great mystery about it. I've made it very clear to members that work they are interested in in their specific constituencies can be and has been generally discussed with the members, that the decisions reached are based on representation not only from the members but from the municipal bodies and then, of course, working in conjunction with the department itself. Those are the three ways we approach the allocation of funds. With that, Mr. Chairman, I hand the meeting back to the committee.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to lead off the debate on the Department of Transportation estimates. First of all, I have not been too impressed with the program this government has provided for the people of Alberta as far as roads go. I would like to say to the minister that we have a large investment, in the billions of dollars, for the road program we have in place in this province.

I think we have to look to the former government more than to the present government for that road system. [interjections] Well, the Tory hacks can make all the noises they want to, but that's the way it is, Mr. Chairman.

I think the minister had better do some lobbying with his colleagues to get more funding in the budget than we have at present. Because if we're going to rehabilitate our road program, the billions of dollars the people of this province have invested already, the minister's going to have to come up with more than he's got now. He's not going to be able to keep up with the rehabilitation of the roads we have in place at this time.

I'd like to know, when the minister is answering some of the questions, if the approximately \$300 million for rehabilitation is going to extend for a five-year, seven-year, or 10-year period, and whether that's going to be sufficient funding to rehabilitate our road system. I'd like to say to the minister of highways that every time I drive on Highway 2 from Edmonton to Calgary now, I take my vehicle into the tire shop to find out if I need a wheel alignment. The reason I think I need a wheel alignment, Mr. Chairman, is that the road is getting worn down that much. The next thing, we'll be having problems with rain on that road; you'll be hydroplaning, because there'll be that much water sitting on it. The minister knows that. Some of the middle, front, and backbenchers don't seem to know that, because they spend all their time flying back and forth, but some of us poor people have to use the automobile. But, Mr. Chairman, it is that serious.

Some of the other roads have to receive a lift, and have to get it immediately. The minister knows that. All I'm trying to do to the Tory backbenchers is to wake them up to the fact that the minister needs some support. That's what he needs. He doesn't need anybody laughing, because there's a problem. He needs some support in caucus. So that is an area of concern. I'd like to know from the minister if he has a master plan, a five-year plan, a seven-year plan, a 10-year plan, and what the funding will be for that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to say to the committee that we as a party feel that a billion dollars should be spent from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund over the next five years to provide people in the rural areas with a secondary road system they deserve. We have been waiting for 10 years now for this government to complete the secondary road program, and it hasn't been done. I would like to see a billion dollars, and I'm sure the people of this province would like to see a billion

dollars of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committed to the secondary road program. Let's get the thing on the road.

Mr. Chairman, I have another area of concern. To the minister: I would like to know the department's commitment to light rapid transit in the two major centres of Edmonton and Calgary. If we're going to have a light rapid transit system in these two major [cities], we'd better get the show on the road. If we're going to move large numbers of people, all you have to do is go to some of the large centres in Europe to see what they do and how they move people. We have to realize that motor car usage is going to change in the next decade. We're going to be using the automobile if we want to go, say, from Edmonton to Medicine Hat; then we will jump in the old tin lizzie. But if we want to go from Fort Saskatchewan to Edmonton, or Leduc to Edmonton, or Stony Plain to Edmonton, then maybe we're going to have to use something other than the motor car. So I can see in the future that we will be changing the role of the automobile. I don't think it will ever become extinct, but I think its role will change.

If we're going to have light rapid transit in the major centres, let's do it right. I'd like to bring to the minister's attention the fact that if I'm parking my car at the northern terminal of the LRT in Edmonton at 8 o'clock on a crisp January morning when the temperature is 40 degrees below Fahrenheit, when I come back eight hours later to pick up that automobile, it's not going to get me home, because automobiles don't start too well at 40 below zero. [interjection] Centigrade or Fahrenheit. My boxing friend from across the way, the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, is trying to be funny, but I guess even he knows that 40 degrees Fahrenheit and 40 degrees Centigrade are the same. In case he doesn't, he knows now.

The point I'm trying to make is if we're going to utilize light rapid transit systems, we have to put these infrastructures into place. We have to start thinking of more than just a rail line. I'm glad to see the city of Edmonton has discovered that maybe they should put some kind of roof over that station at north Edmonton. I'm not much of an engineer, but I do know that it rains and it snows every once in a while in this country, so you do need some shelter. I'm glad to see the city of Edmonton has discovered that. But we have to put these other structures into place so we will encourage people to use light rapid transit.

Also, Mr. Minister, if you want to show some initiative and some imagination, let's provide some initiative, imagination, and leadership and look at providing LRT connections between Stony Plain, Fort Saskatchewan, Leduc, and St. Albert and Edmonton. Let's have a look at some of these things, because I'm sure that when Pacific Western Airlines looked at the airbus service, they weren't sure if it was going to be a money-maker. But they provided some leadership and some initiative and put it into place, and it worked out well. So there are some initiatives the minister and the government could show. I'm not blaming the minister, but I'm saying that this government had better give us more than just caretaker government.

Mr. Chairman, another area is: what has the Department of Transportation done, or what studies do they have in place that relate to the existing rail lines between Edmonton and Calgary and using rapid transit on those? The Osaka special or the Flying Scot. Are we looking at alternatives? Because maybe some day jet fuel will be-

come so expensive we must use the rail lines, we must use electric motors to travel back and forth between Edmonton and Calgary. So it's not good enough to say, well, we're doing this and this now. Are we doing some forward thinking? That's what forward-thinking governments do, Mr. Chairman.

The last point or two I'd like to make to the minister is, what kind of forward thinking are we doing when we look at further development of the oil sands? Are we going to ask the people to drive up Highway 63 to Fort McMurray? I have many friends who travel that road every weekend, and they say it's like playing Russian roulette. Are we going to have that same thing happen on Highway 28? What kind of forward planning do we have in place? What kind of critical path program do we have as to when that road will be finished?

So, Mr. Chairman, I am lobbying for more money for the road program in this province, I am lobbying for more money for light rapid transit in the two major centres, and what I'm lobbying for more than anything is some forward thinking from this department.

Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could in a general way relate the construction of provincial terminals to the policy the government has in regard to third level scheduled airlines or third level scheduled service, especially in view of the fact that several of the terminals which have been constructed by the province at this time do not yet have regularly scheduled service.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I just have two or three questions I would like to pose to the minister. The first question: I would like the minister to outline the policy the department has in relation to letting out contracts. In many cases — and I've seen it happen many times — a contract will be let out to a contractor and then they'll sublet the gravel hauling, for example, at rates much lower than government rates are set at. I have a particular situation, and I had one when Dr. Horner was the Minister of Transportation. He did what he could. He said that at that point it was the policy of the government to try to have the contractors — when they bid on contracts, they bid them at a certain dollar — he was going to try to put pressure on or talk to the contractors to see that they paid government rates when they sublet the contracting.

I am sure the minister has been made aware of the problem we have in my constituency right now where they're twinning Highway No. 1 through Brooks. Leduc contractors got the contract and then sublet gravel hauling. When they got the contract, they knew it was government rates. I'm sure that's the way it was tendered; that's the way they bid the contract. But they turned around and sublet the contracting, hauling the gravel for at least 30 per cent — I don't know for sure what the figure was — below government rates.

My second question, Mr. Chairman: I was wondering if the minister has any time frame or priority set for the twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway. He gets many complaints on that highway. I know the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower from Medicine Hat also gets many complaints and concerns on the twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway. And not only the twinning, Mr. Chairman, it's upgrading the two lanes we have. Between Tilley and Medicine Hat, the existing two lanes we have on Highway No. 1 are certainly breaking

up. I have heard many say, how come, with all the money we have in the heritage trust fund, we can't improve the Trans-Canada Highway. In the last few years very little work has been done on Highway No. 1. There have been some improvements on the two lanes. I do appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the several miles of highway they're twinning through Brooks; it's much appreciated. But many people come to me, and I know they come to the hon. member from Medicine Hat as well, to see what the time line for twinning the Trans-Canada Highway is going to be.

Mr. Chairman, my third question is: I know the town of Bassano has been in touch with the minister with regard to getting some funds for putting in an airstrip. They have some funds from the government to purchase the land, and I would like the minister to indicate if he is prepared to put any money in the budget this year so they can go ahead with their strip.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments. I thought I should stand up and maybe straighten out a thing or two when I heard the hon. Member for Clover Bar criticizing — how nice it was when they were in their government. [interjection]

I would like to bring to the attention of hon. members that I was a member of the county of Lamont. In 1966 the Minister of Highways with the Social Credit government at that time called on all municipalities in the province to form regional road studies. About three, four, or five counties and municipal districts got together. I chaired the county of Lamont. Minburn, Vermilion River, and Beaver were part of . . . At that time, the Minister of Highways with the Social Credit government asked his government for approval of \$300 million for the next 20 years for secondary road systems. The hon. member says that he'd like to see \$5 billion put on in the next five years — at that time the transportation minister in the Social Credit government asked for \$300 million for the following 20 years. There would still have been six years left had Social Credit kept on. It was only \$300 million, and they did not get approval. That program was quashed. [interjections]

I can agree with the hon. member, just like anybody else. We need more roads, and will be needing more roads. With the abandonment of railroads, the bigger trucks are going to be damaging them. But I think the hon. member should feel very fortunate that our government does not work like the previous administration. Just recently the hon. Member for Clover Bar was mentioning Highway 15. True enough, just because there was a four-year term when the Vegreville constituency did not have a Social Credit member, Highway 15 was built and paved right up to the Vegreville constituency, and the other was left like a track. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Oh, John.

MR. BATIUK: Highway 16 between Mundare and Vegreville was the only place . . .

MR. R. CLARK: Either he's poorly informed, or he's more confused than usual.

MR. BATIUK: Highway 16 between Mundare and Vegreville was the only place between Lloydminster and Jasper that did not have shoulders, just because there was no Social Credit member for one time.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I say, I know we need roads. I

need some in my constituency — and everybody else. But I wish some hon. members would not try to throw dirt when, you know they say . . .

DR. BUCK: Tell us about highways.

Mr. BATIUK: As I say, I just thought it was my obligation to straighten out some of the things.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some comments to the minister through you, Mr. Chairman. The subject has been brought up by the Member for Bow Valley of Highway No. 1 through the Hat in both directions, from the Hat and Redcliff. My specific concern would be with the completion of the second bridge in Medicine Hat, and the starting and completion of the first stage up the hill from the bridge through the town of Redcliff, with interchanges both at the main intersection and the intersection on the north side of town. I wonder if the minister could give a time line on that.

Another point, Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the minister could comment on the secondary road program and how often a county or MD would have a major construction project on a secondary road. I ask that question in view of the resolution that was passed, I believe, at the last MD and counties meetings — or it might have been the one last fall, not this spring — with reference to major construction programs in the counties every second year instead of every third year or another number of years. I represent an area that has a great many miles of road. In one county I believe the estimation was that without a major program every second year, it would take 25 or 35 years to get the secondary roads upgraded.

The other point, Mr. Chairman: could the minister comment on the situation with the bridges in the irrigation districts and the local municipalities involved in upgrading these bridges over the irrigation canals?

Thank you.

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just thought I would express some of my concerns to the minister on transportation in our area. [interjection] Yes, the Chestermere Lake area. That's my constituent talking here, you see.

I have some concerns, Mr. Chairman, and one of them is the No. 1 Highway that goes through Strathmore and on east; it's overcrowded. I understand some work is slated on it for this year, but I've also heard some rumors that it might not be done due to the fact that they're having a little difficulty getting the land. I'd like to hear the minister comment on that.

I would also like the minister to comment on the future of the 900 series roads. I know one of the recommendations made to the minister was that maybe the 900 series roads as such be discontinued, and I would like to see that done. I would like to see either the 900 series road in the regular secondary program, or else taken into the primary system where there would be some budget. With the rural resource roads, I'm wondering if this program is going to be equally divided among the counties and municipal districts across the province, or will the minister or the department be saying where this is going to be spent and in which area?

Just another short comment on the abandonment of railways. It was my understanding that when this government took out a rail line, it was going to make sure that the farmers in that area who had much farther to haul their grain than the usual 10 or 12 miles would have

a suitable secondary road, and it would be the highest priority. I would like to know what has happened to this program, as we have lost two of our points.

One more short comment. I notice we have a new program, which I compliment the minister for — \$22 million for rehabilitation of paving. I also saw that \$10.5 million was cut in new highway construction, which concerned me a little bit. But considering they both used to be in the same program, I suppose it's not quite as bad as it seems.

With those few remarks, I would just say thank you.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments to the minister regarding his budget generally, then a few specifics about the Red Deer area. I would first of all like to commend the hon. minister for his diligence in striving to meet the demands of all the MLAs throughout the province, in trying to accede to their demands for upgrading our highways, building our resource roads, and so on up to the level they have. Certainly a 24.5 per cent increase in one year is very significant when one considers this represents \$110.5 million. I think the minister should certainly be commended for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the minister comment to a little greater degree regarding the construction of primary highways and the construction of bridges. Those two headings are contained in Vote 2, when we get to that point. As I read these figures, there's been a drop-off of some \$9.6 million.

Further, I'm a little confused by the descriptions of interchanges. There doesn't seem to be wording of that nature in the summaries of the various votes, and I take it, on checking with the hon. Member for Barrhead, that apparently interchanges are considered in two votes, under the construction of primary highways and the construction of bridges. So in the terminology of the department, I would take it that an interchange is a bridge with an interlocking roadway going around it.

Mr. Chairman, getting into this particular subject, I would like the minister, if he would, to dwell for a while on the safety factors of interchanges and the probable need for them in the very near future on very busy highways such as No. 2 and others in the province where highways by-pass our urban areas of a significant size. I'm particularly concerned with the safety factors in the Red Deer area on Highway No. 2 south of the Red Deer River crossing. Some years ago a system of roads was developed so that as you came from the south from Calgary and approached Red Deer, it was possible to veer off to the right and go directly into town. Conversely, when leaving the city and going south, you were able to go over a simple bridge system, turn off, and go south. It was a relatively simple interchange at that point. In those days, Mr. Chairman, I guess no one really envisioned that the city of Red Deer would grow so rapidly. If I may, I would like to draw the picture of the city expanding very, very rapidly to the south of the river. In fact, the bulk of the residential growth for some years moved in that direction.

About four years ago, in the need for expansion, much of the commercial retail enterprise went to the north side of the city, and traffic was conveyed over two bridges. Now we have a situation where most of the people live in the south, and a lot of the retail trade is to the north. But lately, there's been a real move to provide shopping and other commercial enterprises on the south side of the city. This now means that many people will come from the

west — Rocky Mountain House, areas such as Rimbey and Lacombe, and so on — come down the highway system, and find they cannot turn into Red Deer when approaching from the north off Highway No. 2, because there's nothing built into that interchange system. It's now necessary to proceed about a half a mile south, and either make a U-turn on the highway, or turn off onto service roads and turn around in private businesses — gas stations, motel lots, and things of this nature — then proceed back onto the highway in order to approach the city. This is becoming a very dangerous situation, when one considers that right now there is an \$80 million shopping centre going into the extreme south of the city. Coupled with that are the plans to build a relocation of the exhibition grounds.

Of course, these exhibition grounds are going to entail a lot of truck traffic into them. And there will be a great deal of truck traffic to service the stores and so on. A lot of this truck traffic will proceed from a northerly direction. As well, at the moment these trucks, if they do not want to progress the whole length of the city, crossing over congested bridges in the centre of the city, must perform some very dangerous gyrations in order to approach the city from the south.

Another safety factor that should be considered, Mr. Chairman — and I would hope the minister could address himself to it — is the requirement for another interchange for safety purposes on the extreme west side of the city. There has been a considerable expansion in our college system, which is located in the southwest portion of the city, plus a considerable expansion in the last three or four years of residential subdivisions in that area. Many people now find that when proceeding from the north down to the city, they either have to travel through the city and again cross the river bridges, or move into deceleration lanes and wait for oncoming traffic on a dual highway before making a left-hand turn to approach the city from a secondary road system. Of course, when those persons are leaving to go in a northerly direction, again to avoid congestion through the centre of the city, they must move out to that highway system, move into an acceleration lane, and hopefully be able to pick up speed in a short time before cutting into that fast-moving traffic.

So I would sincerely hope that we get into the area of highway safety in the comments the minister makes, and specifically I wonder if he could give us some expression of when we could expect these two safety features to be incorporated in this highway structure to the south and to the west of the city of Red Deer.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to compliment the minister on the new highways budget with the 25 per cent increase that is shown. There are some concerns in the Macleod constituency, especially continuing the two-lane highway on from Nanton right through to Cardston, and then from Macleod through to the Monarch turn, because that area is not to be taken lightly. When asked about twinning, two things came up. Number one, they said we could make Highway 23 a one-way going north and Highway 2 a one-way going south and we'd have a four-lane highway, except there is 20 miles between the two highways and it wouldn't work very well for a four-lane.

The traffic count was another formula that has been used to judge whether four-laning should take place. It seems that once the traffic count in the Claresholm area hit a certain figure where it could be twinned, they raised

the traffic count so it didn't qualify. Now it's come up to where the traffic count is there for twinning, and I would like your assurance you're not going to raise the traffic count again.

The other thing is that we appreciate the highway construction going west from Nobleford toward Granum, done this last year. Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to be aware that the balance of that road needs to be done because it's not up to the load limit. It's breaking up and we're getting concerns in that area. I would hate to see it put off for two or three years until we had no road left at the one end.

Also, over the last 35 years it seems there has been a bridge promised from Picture Butte to Lethbridge. Every politician but this one promised it would be done. I said maybe we'll get it if I don't promise it. I think it's one that could alleviate some of the traffic problem going into Lethbridge, because truck traffic could use that bridge to get into the industrial park and wouldn't have to go right through the city to get there. I'd like the minister to take note of that, Mr. Chairman, and respond to it if he's able.

When I look at the highway budget, I think everyone is aware that a 25 per cent increase in budget doesn't necessarily mean that every constituency is going to get 25 per cent more road work done this year. I'm not asking for that either; I just hope that over the next three or four years we will receive our fair share of that 25 per cent increase.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make one or two comments with regard to the transportation budget. One, I think the 25 per cent increase is significant; secondly, I certainly support the suggestion by my colleague of a five-year plan and \$1 billion to take care of the highway needs.

Specifically, though, I'd like to relate two things from my own constituency. I would be remiss if I didn't put them into the words of this Legislature. Number one: Highway 23 from the Champion area over to Highway 3 certainly needs widening and shoulders. I think the minister has had a number of representations on that; as well, the Member for Macleod is supportive of the same idea. The second thing is the approach road on the north side of the Carseland bridge. The minister well knows at this time — we've had discussions and I appreciate his concern — about the number of accidents we've had in the last couple of years; we've had two deaths of truckdrivers. I certainly hope we're able to come up with dollars in the budget to construct the approach road on the south side of the Carseland bridge.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to put those two items on the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions or comments, perhaps the minister would respond.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to go through these in the order in which they were presented. To the Member for Clover Bar, mostly I think I would like to say I appreciate his offer of support and that we should move faster. No one will quarrel with that. Really, I think that is what he was saying, that we should move faster.

However, the one thing that I would say in that regard is that there is a second criterion other than funding; that is, we have to relate the funding to the capability of the industry to absorb and return fair value. We do have to be careful that we just don't try to solve the whole problem with funding alone. For that reason, we have

been working very closely not only with the construction industry but with the suppliers of material — cement, asphalt, this sort of thing.

I think it would probably be useful to repeat what I said Friday: we actually had the experience, last year of offering two paving contracts and not receiving a bid. That was related to the lack of asphalt. A third contract that was soil cement was bid, but couldn't be proceeded with because there was no cement. This year we have turned our attention to the suppliers. We've had discussions with them, and we've had reassurance that they can meet commitments in both areas. We've also had discussions with the construction industry, and have made the point that we're going to be monitoring the bids as they come in. We wouldn't like to see any great variations in the bidding which would just absorb the funding and not return value.

The other comment was on rapid transit, certainly a good comment, and I think this will have to be considered. How fast we can move on that I don't know. If you were to look at the rail line between Calgary and Edmonton, the main corridor, and if you were to combine by rapid transit, we would have to be looking at something probably in the order of a 100-mile-an-hour sort of thing, which would mean very heavy expenditure for a grade separation. So it isn't something we can do in a hurry, but a good comment.

As far as the difficulty with parking at the end of rapid transit, we're working with the cities. As I've said earlier, we are into the funding process in the urban transportation side. My colleague from Calgary Foothills keeps reminding me not only about the corridor through Calgary but the northwest by-pass, and on and on it goes.

We had a comment on the oil sands resource roads. The specifics of the major resource developments such as Cold Lake and Alsands are not shown in the budget. If those are to be proceeded with, depending on how the negotiations on energy go, they will be funded outside the budget, as is indicated.

I understand the pressure on 28 leading into 63. There's no question that we have to turn our attention to that. I know that with the development of Alsands, 63 would get a very heavy demand. I know that the shoulders are deficient. We are going to be encouraging the use of rail to relieve that to the degree that we can.

There's a great deal of reference all through this to increased work on primaries. I'll try to zero in on that at one time, rather than hitting it as it appeared in the various comments that were made.

On the issue of air terminals, brought up by the Member for Calgary Buffalo: I'm not sure if you were referring to the Grande Prairie and Lethbridge airport terminals. We are building smaller ones, of course. We have terminals between Edson and Jasper. I'd better take that as notice, get clarification from the member, and provide him with the answer later.

The Member for Bow Valley was talking about the policy on contracts. I'm not aware that trucks are being hired and then paid at less than contract rates, although I wouldn't dispute the fact that this could happen. As you would know, the contracts are let in total. How each individual contractor operates with his subs would be mainly his concern, except that I would think the rates for hauling should relate to government rates. I'd be glad to look into that for you.

The Member for Bow Valley also came in first with a comment on the twinning of No. 1. I believe that was referred to by the Member for Cypress and others. As

you look at the estimates, this year you will notice there is a substantial increase in funding for the secondary system, and something less in the way of a percentage increase for the primary system. The reason for that, perhaps apart from the fact that we couldn't sell the package and make it any bigger, was that we — referring back to what I said about the investment that we have in our whole road system now and the fact that the development all over the province is spreading tremendously.

I can remember a time when our primary highways were essentially No. 1, No. 2, and No. 16, and that's where you moved. When I look at the road system on a map today and look at the development around the province, it seems to be going in all directions from the centre. The demand on the road system that's out there, which was designed for something much less than what we're using today, is increasing. Therefore we are having to turn our attention to protecting what we have at the same time that we try to expand the system. The roughly 8,500 miles of secondary road we have is only 15 per cent paved. We're stepping up that program very fast this year.

The business, then, of trying to do much in the way of major twinning not only on No. 1 but on No. 16, which is really a second Trans-Canada — keeping in mind the load that No. 16 carries, particularly near this city west of Edmonton, is now heavier than west of Calgary, we have as much pressure to go with twinning there as we do on No. 1 from the Saskatchewan border towards Calgary. The only way we've been able to cope with this, given the limitation of the industry plus the limitation of funding, has been to react to those places we have the most problems with. The city of Medicine Hat is one area. The Member for Cypress made reference to the second bridge we're going in there with now. It's approaching completion. We're also moving westward from Medicine Hat to Redcliff. We have to twin; we have to go into grade separation, this kind of thing. The Member for Bow Valley also mentioned the development at Brooks. It isn't only twinning that's going on there. We also have an overpass, and that's a very expensive way to go.

The Strathmore area referred to by the Member for Drumheller — I'm trying to tie this together in the order of the road itself, not in the sequence of questions — is creating some problem. We are having some difficulty with the acquisition of right of way, but we're proceeding.

I would invite you to accept the fact that we can only spread ourselves so thin. Since we have zeroed in on the secondary system this year and will have made a tremendous start in this direction, I can assure you that next year we will turn our attention to expanding the primary system, and thereby should be able to give you some better answers on the twinning aspect as well as improvement of other parts of the primary system.

The Member for Bow Valley commented on the Bassano airport. We have now gone through the application for airports for approximately the next four years. I'm not able to comment specifically on Bassano, because we've been working with the airport committee to get our priorities on this. Those applications that have been made have been examined and discussed with the airport committee. I will get you some information on the status of the Bassano area.

The irrigation bridges referred to by the Member for Cypress: we do have a budgetary item of \$1 million strictly for irrigation bridges. That will be an ongoing program. I don't recall the question exactly as it referred to secondary road programs, the counties and MDs, except

that we are moving very rapidly in that area and have been meeting with not only the MLAs from these areas, but also with the counties, municipalities and IDs. If I could give you anything further on the secondary program, I would invite you to discuss it with me when we are finished.

The Member for Drumheller mentioned Strathmore. I have commented on that. He mentioned the 900 series. We don't plan to designate any more 900s. The rural resource roads referred to last year: \$20 million was designated for assistance to counties and municipalities on resource roads, keeping in mind that they don't recover any funds just because these resource developments occur in their municipalities. We've been reacting to areas where there are specific problems: the one I've referred to a number of times as an example is 621 out in the Drayton Valley area, where we did go in, and there are other areas I can't identify for you at the moment.

The railway abandonment program. I think the request there was: are we doing something to provide roads where rail lines have been taken out? When we make the consideration for what we do in secondaries, we certainly recognize the problem brought on by the losing of a railway.

The Member for Red Deer had a very major concern, and I'm certainly not going to go into answering that point by point. We are in the planning stage now, particularly on the south side of Red Deer. That's a very major area, and we're well into planning how to solve this. As a matter of fact, I believe the member was in and we tried to decipher what could happen on the south end there. I would invite the Member for Red Deer to come in again and specifically discuss the northern entrance that is giving a problem. There's no question about the planning going on around Red Deer because of the major development we have there.

The Member for Macleod also commented on twinning from Calgary south, and No. 3. The answer there, of course, is the same: we are not on a major twinning program this year, other than to respond in areas such as Spruce Grove, Stony Plain — I've already mentioned Brooks, Medicine Hat, and Strathmore. We're doing some major improvement on No. 16 east of Vegreville. The Member for Macleod made the comment that since there's a 25 per cent increase shown in the budget, there would be a fair division between constituencies. I can assure him that that is exactly what we're aiming for, given the fact there are some differences within constituencies and problems we have to cope with.

The Member for Little Bow made some comment on primary. The answer on the primary aspect has to remain the same. Again, I invite you to check with me if there is a specific I can answer for you. We're aware of the Carseland bridge. We've had our people in there looking at that. We've started initiating some safety factors on the short term, realizing full well that something much more major than that has to occur.

That roughly covers the questions and comments as I received them, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one or two more points to the hon. minister that have to do with the rehabilitation program for major highways. I'd like to know from the minister, if this rehabilitation program we have now is an ongoing commitment, is the minister looking at a five-year or a seven-year program, or is there just a one-shot deal now? Secondly, I'm sure the minister is aware how the construction business operates. They just

can't tool up for one year. The representation I made to the minister is that if we're going to make a commitment of say, \$1 billion out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, then we have to say to the industry, look, we are committing for five years or seven years and these are the dollars we'll be committing. Therefore, the people in the industry could tool up, because they're not going to tool up if it's going to be just a one- or two-shot thing. That's why we're trying to indicate, number one, do we have a master plan for rehabilitation; number two, are we going to make five- or seven-year commitments, so the industry can know how to react?

The third question I'd like to ask the minister is if he can indicate to the committee just what the role of the chief deputy minister is. I see the budget is up 28 per cent. I know a lot of the other people in the department who are career, professional civil servants, who are engineers — and I guess most of the time you need engineers to build highways and so on — and I'd just like to know what the role of the chief deputy minister is. Also, I see we've got an increase of 21 per cent in the chief deputy minister's office, and then we've got . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Do they work as hard as nurses?

DR. BUCK: My hon. colleague says, do they work as hard as nurses? Nobody works as hard as nurses.

But I'd just like to have a breakdown of what's going on in that department, what the responsibilities are, and what we expect to get for our money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister wish to have comments from other members now?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, if there are any more.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, a couple of clarifications: on my question on secondary roads, I wasn't specifically aiming at a road, I was aiming at the overall program. I believe there was a resolution passed by the MDs and counties that they would like a major construction program every two years. I just wondered if the minister had any comment on that with reference to the new secondary roads program. Secondly, I'm not sure if I missed, in the answer the minister gave, the year or the years when they expect the construction on Highway No. 1 to go on from the bridge, up the hill in the Hat, and then through Redcliff.

Another question, Mr. Chairman, to the minister: I wonder if he has a date on which I hold the stake and he swings the mallet at the Saskatchewan border on Highway 501. For those who are wondering what that's all about, last year in Saskatchewan, the minister challenged the minister in Saskatchewan to drive in a stake with the Alberta sign at the Alberta/Saskatchewan border on the extension of 501. I'm not sure what bet was made, but our minister suggested to the Saskatchewan minister that if I could hold the stake steady, he could drive the post on his side faster than it could be done on the Saskatchewan side.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a challenge?

AN HON. MEMBER: Find a gopher hole first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, in commenting on the concept of the long-term funding, we keep hearing terms like block-funding. I'm not sure I know exactly what that is. I know what continuity means, though, and the Member for Clover Bar is quite right: it's difficult for a construction industry to gear up if there is some doubt about what is going to be done. Conversely, though, the reassurance . . . In discussions with the construction industry I have said that if they go back over the numbers for the last 10 or 12 years, whatever you like for a term, as a first indicator, there is a pretty good indication that there has been a steady growth in the amount of funding allocated, not necessarily on an even basis, but a steady increase.

Secondly, because it's so obvious that the development in the province in the foreseeable future — the foreseeable future has got to be anything from six to 10 years — that this growth is going to continue, I believe and as a matter of fact have said to the industry when they really would like to have said, well, what's in the budget for this year — obviously I couldn't tell them. But I did invite them to use their imaginations. With the development now ongoing, and with the development that's indicated, and keeping in mind that 85 per cent of all the produce we move in the province now goes over our road system, they would have to know they can afford to gear up and be prepared to respond to the kind of budgeting that has been ongoing, and is increasing progressively. I'm sure they're aware of that.

As far as the question on the increase of budget for the deputy minister is concerned — the chief deputy minister, I think the question was — we are involved with an organization called the International Cargo Handling Association. This conference will be jointly hosted with Economic Development. The total estimated cost for both departments is \$135,000 in '80-81 budget. Ninety countries are going to be involved, and we're hosting them in Edmonton. So the increase really centres around that. It isn't because he's doing more work or giving better value, because he can't give better value. It's been right 100 per cent. So the international conference we're hosting here in Edmonton is the reason for the increase.

Going back to the Member for Cypress, I don't know that I can answer you on a project every two years. Because of the increase in the amount of work we're doing, I don't know that we'd be allocating something every two years to every county or municipality. It isn't quite that cut and dried. Mr. Chairman, the member asked about a time line, or at least work on No. 1 west of Medicine Hat. We are, as the member would know, approaching completion on the twinning of the bridge, and are going on with the programming for widening and improving from Medicine Hat west to Redcliff. That has to involve a grade separation. The date on 501 that was referred to — the minister from Saskatchewan has found himself in a little bit of difficulty with his time line, so the day you hold the post for me to drive to see if we can win a bet, may have to wait one year, depending on what they can do on Saskatchewan side.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if he could tell us the status of the northwest by-pass in Calgary, if work is contemplated being done on it this year, or when.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks, I complimented the minister on the 25 per cent increase in the expenditure of the department. As I sat

here looking at the budget speech and the estimates, I began to question whether that was really true, that 25 per cent more money would actually be spent in 1980-81 than has been spent in 1979-80, or in other words, the summer of 1979. When I look at that, I look at the department's expenditure and the forecasted expenditure of \$488 million. There's a 15 per cent increase, which brings the budget of the department to \$562 million. But if that was really in a true sense 25 per cent new money, we should have the budget of the Department of Transportation somewhere around \$600 million.

DR. BUCK: That's called Tory budgeting.

MR. R. SPEAKER: If we look at last year's estimates at \$451 million, up to \$562 million; that does bring the 25 per cent increase, and I can understand that. But my understanding from the budget debate was that we were going to have a 24.5 per cent increase in Transportation expenditures. Well, in reality we're not going to have that. I guess I have two questions: one, could the minister explain that, so that it's clearly understood? Secondly, will we be facing a special warrant in this coming year, so that we do truly have a 25 per cent increase in expenditure?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, on the question from the Member for Calgary North Hill, the northwest by-pass, we've been down there twice in the last not too many months to have a look at the by-pass route which, as the member would know, also includes a very major bridge development. We've had discussions about this with a number of members from Calgary. We've had meetings with the mayor. We flew the route to acquaint ourselves. The indicators are that because of the land acquisition problems and the major engineering that has to occur, the earliest we will actually get into construction will be late 1982. It's a very major project.

The question from the Member for Little Bow — actually he's quite right. Using one figure, it's about 15 per cent; using another figure it's 24.4, or whatever. We won't split the difference. What happened to us, Mr. Chairman, is that because the construction season was probably as good last fall as you'll ever get moving late into the fall ...

DR. BUCK: You ran out of oil, Henry.

MR. KROEGER: ... and because I was a little bit green, we got up a head of steam, and before we could get it stopped we had an overrun of about \$35 million. Treasury, of course, was fully aware of this when we went in to make our arguments for this year, and they reminded us of what had happened.

However, the figures are better than they appear on the surface. While we are showing a factor of about \$140 million, we also have another \$20 million for a pavement rehab on primary, shown in 2.9, which will actually bring us up to about \$160 million, which will help a little. Those are the numbers that we have. To the Member for Little Bow: no, I don't believe I'd be welcome going back with a special warrant this year.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. I'm pleased to hear his comments about twinning the Trans-Canada Highway from Medicine Hat as far as Redcliff. I look forward to his being able to use his persuasive powers to get the rest of that road twinned as

soon as possible, as well as Highway 16 west of Edmonton.

Mr. Chairman, two quick comments with regard to rest areas. I know it really applies to Vote 2. I'd like to commend the Department of Transportation for the rest area available on the east side of Highway 2, and hope that somewhere in the plans of the upcoming year a provision is made for a rest area on the west side for those legislators who are all worn out driving back from Edmonton to Calgary and other points in southern Alberta. Then again with regard to rest areas, along the Trans-Canada Highway, especially between Calgary and Medicine Hat, there is obviously a need for additional pull-off spaces. That may be one means of trying to alleviate some of the flow of traffic there on that stretch of the highway.

My final comment is a personal one directed to the minister. In my plea for having the rest areas on the Trans-Canada Highway, one of the reasons for having them is so that both he and I can better appreciate the bounty of the prairie, which is not baldheaded.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, it wasn't my persuasive ability that had very much to do with the increase we're indicating here. As a matter of fact, I invited MLAs to help make the case and they did it very well. This kind of thing should be spread through the system. When a good case can be made and you have the support of all MLAs to make that case, the government is prepared to listen, and that is reflected in the budget we have.

As far as rest areas are concerned, we're aware that these should be expanded. One specific one we have mentioned to us quite often is the stretch from Jasper to Edmonton. It's a very great length, and because we've experienced difficulty there the suggestion has been made a number of times that perhaps we could break that drive with a good rest area that would interrupt the monotony of driving too far at one time. We are having discussions with my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Parks, and will probably be developing some new programs in this area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the more I sit in this Legislature, the more I am baffled by this government's book-keeping. When the government first came in, we found out that actuals weren't actual and forecasts weren't really forecasts. I would really like to know why we're wasting our time even going through the estimates, Mr. Chairman. I say that in all sincerity. Why are we wasting our time going through the estimates. Are we committed to 24.5 per cent increase in the Transportation budget or are we not? If the minister feels that we should be and if the treasurer wants to write out a small cheque for \$110 million, this side of the House is certainly going to support the minister.

But let's come clean with the people of Alberta and let them know what we're really proposing to do. Otherwise, let's close the books, go have a beer, and shut this operation down. [interjections] This is an exercise in futility, because we're really passing nothing concrete. We're not really indicating this is what the minister's going to spend.

Let's find out. Is the budget going to be increased 24.5 per cent or only 15 per cent? What a way to run a government, Mr. Chairman. You know, C.D. Howe used to say: what's a million? Well this government says: what's a hundred million? If we're really interested in increasing the budget to \$610 million, let's do it. If the

minister requires a motion, I would be glad to make that motion so we live with the estimates. What's with this kind of a bookkeeping system? I would like to know from the minister or the Acting Government House Leader: are we going to spend \$610 million or are we going to spend \$562 million?

Mr. Chairman, I'm just saying this is not the way a government should be run. If we are going to vote on the estimates for this department and all other departments, let's vote with some relevance. If the minister wants another \$110 million, let's get him \$110 million and quit playing games.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to outline to the minister a problem we have in northeast Calgary. When light rail transit was first proposed for the city, I tried to persuade city officials that the logical place for the first leg was northeast, because that is where the principal expansion of population has occurred. Indeed, in the spring of 1975 when I was knocking on doors, there were 5,000 people in the Properties; today there are almost 50,000. The area is rather unique. It's geographically isolated from the rest of the city by the Nose Creek valley, the railroad tracks, and the Deerfoot. There are only three entrances to the city, so you can well imagine, with this tremendous population expansion, that these entrances are plugged up every morning.

So I would propose to you, Mr. Minister, that this is the logical place for the next leg of the LRT. I would like to pose to the minister: can additional funds be made available for that purpose?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, just a few words on some of the comments just made. The minister said he got carried away with construction last fall and spent a considerable amount of money. The Member for Clover Bar made some reference to it. I don't know if I got any of those miles of road, but I'm sure a lot of people out there in the country and in the city are awfully happy. How were we to know at this time last spring that the fall was going to be open? How were we to know that we would be able to construct and get that many more roads done? At least they're done.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Cypress. I would simply say in response to those comments that when this budget speech was made up, which would have been around March 20, if the Provincial Treasurer didn't know what the figures were from special warrants last year, this government's in worse shape than I suspect it is.

Now this budget speech, under the topic of Roads, Highways, and Transportation, page 21, third paragraph from the bottom, says: "a 24.5 per cent increase". If you take that increase over what was spent last year, that is simply misleading. There's no other term for it. No matter about the minister or the Provincial Treasurer not knowing what's going on. What's happened here is that the government has tried to be cute. What they're talking about is really a 24.5 per cent increase over the estimates last year. But they've misled the people. There's not a 24.5 per cent increase in the estimates, the money being spent. It's a totally misleading statement. And the Minister of Transportation is the poor devil who's got to defend it across the province after individuals like the Member for Cypress trot out and say there's going to be a 25 per cent increase. Clearly, this Legislature has to make a choice now: is it going to approve the estimate in this book, or

are we going to live with the budget which came down April 2?

Mr. Chairman, I'd say to you, sir, that we're not yet through our second department in the estimates this year. We found out in the first department, the Department of Education, that we have a commitment in the Speech from the Throne which, due to sloppy administration in the Department of Education, there's no money in the estimates for. Now in this case, on page 21 of the budget it says there's going to be a 24.5 per cent increase over last year. Clearly, the figures aren't provided.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this committee and the government have to decide whether they're going to live with the estimates or with the budget speech. My colleague from Clover Bar has clearly suggested that what we'd best give very serious consideration to is living with the budget speech, because that's what Albertans heard on the night of April 2, that there was going to be a 25 per cent spending increase in that area. If we're to live with that commitment, we'd better be adding close to \$120 million, to get that up close to \$605 million or \$610 million. Then there will be the 24.5 per cent increase that's in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I don't for one moment hold the Minister of Transportation totally responsible for this situation. I think he's trying to do a decent job. But he's caught in an impossible position here. People across the province are being told there's going to be a 24.5 per cent increase, and in essence there isn't; it's a 15 per cent increase. We'd better do as the budget says, and add another \$120 million so the minister is seen as a man of integrity when he goes out across the province to live with the budget speech.

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask the minister a question for clarification on an answer he gave on the 900 series roads. I hate to keep picking at this 900 series, but it's kind of a bugbear of mine. The minister said no more 900 series roads would be designated in the province. I imagine that's because of a problem of jurisdiction and maintenance he's had with this type of road over the years.

What is going to be done with the ones we have now that are designated as 900 series, and may be half built? I know you might say that they're going to be built in the future, but we've been waiting a long time for a lot of these 900 series roads, and they never seem to have any budget allotted to them.

For clarification of another question on something I didn't ask but maybe should have on local rural highways. They have a 47.5 per cent increase, which I certainly applaud the government for, for taking them into the secondary road system. It's very badly needed. But you did make one little remark in answering one of the other members, that next year the emphasis would be on the primary system, not on this secondary system. In that case, I'm hoping this will not be dropped in one year.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary McCall commented on the rapid development in northeast Calgary. I'm sure the member is aware that we provide the funding and that the planning and allocation of areas for development are the concern of the city. Secondly, we're into the second year of a six-year program on this type of funding; that is, major funding within the cities. This comes up for review every second year, and there are indications already and requests for increases over what's already been indicated and allo-

cated. So if there were a specific concern such as was described by the Member for Calgary McCall, that should be, and rightfully can be, brought to the attention of the city. And the answer is, yes, we will be looking at possible increased funding.

I don't know that I can make any useful comment on the percentages as we have indicated them. The percentage of 24.4, or whatever that exact percentage would be, does relate estimate to estimate. As has been pointed out, the actual is 15.2, I believe. Those figures are there; it's a matter of how we want to read them.

The Member for Drumheller brought in the comment that had to do with the increase in the rural local. While I did say that next year we would be turning our attention to increasing funding for the primary system, it would not be at the expense of the program and the 47 per cent we have shown there. That has been agreed to, and that there has to be a longer term approach to the rehabilitation and construction of the secondaries. We would expect that we can make the argument to maintain or increase that program, and the work we'll be doing, the direction we'll be going on the primary system, will not be at the expense of the secondary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. Member for Calgary McCall have a further question?

MR. LITTLE: Yes I did, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity, and thanks to the minister for that answer. I'm well aware that the allocation is by the city. You remember that you were very shortly in office before I was knocking on your door with the same type of request. It was the extra funds I was looking for.

The next point I want to bring to the minister's attention was that although we may look forward in the future to improved rail transportation, inter-city and throughout the province, the fact of life is that at the present time rail transportation is not satisfactory. Air transportation is just outside the financial means of many of our citizens. More and more of them are using buses. My understanding is that the service is reasonably good, but I would like to point out to the minister that the bus depots themselves are absolutely deplorable. They're dirty, untidy, and are frequented by undesirables. I'd like to request that the minister use his office to approach either the bus companies or the proper authorities to see if these bus depots can't be made somewhat more attractive for the thousands of Alberta citizens who use them constantly.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, that's a good comment. In line with that, we did do away with the seat tax the bus companies had — and that converted into something in the order of between \$300,000 and \$400,000 — with the understanding that they would use those funds to upgrade the bus depots. I'm not able to say that they've started to respond, but certainly would be glad to follow up on that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not happy. I will not vote one dollar on the Department of Transportation estimates until we have the Provincial Treasurer stand in his place and explain to the committee and to the people of this province exactly what the figures mean and what he's trying to say. Mr. Chairman, we are really being asked to vote on something that for all intents and purposes is just a figure taken out of the air. The Government House Leader can send his runner on his way right now to get the Provincial Treasurer to answer

to this committee as to what's going on in the provincial budget as it applies to this department.

I have great empathy for the minister, really, having to try to defend the Provincial Treasurer's statement in his own report. Mr. Chairman, when the government backbenchers have the audacity not even to know what's going on here, when the record says that it was the effective submissions of government MLAs that reflected the 1981 Transportation budget — well, where are they now? What are they going to do with the \$120 million that's short in the budget? Mr. Chairman, it is a sloppy way to run a government. As the hon. leader, Mr. Clark, has stated, this is just the second department and already we're hitting two for two, a thousand per cent, in misleading the taxpayers of this province. Mr. Chairman, they might just as well keep the clock running because we're going to be here all night until we hear from the Provincial Treasurer what's going on in his department and how they are running Treasury. What are the figures, and what do they mean?

Mr. Chairman, this is a sloppy way to run a government, and we want to hear from these effective, persistent submissions of the government MLAs as to their input in this budget. If that's effective submissions by government MLAs, I'd sure hate to see them when they're ineffective.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quit grandstanding.

DR. BUCK: \$120 million — grandstanding my eye. Anderson, you won't even be around the next time, so we won't have to worry about you. [interjections]

Mr. Chairman, that's just the tip of the iceberg of the arrogance of this government. They think everything's such a big laughing matter. Well, \$120 million is not a laughing matter. If some of these government backbenchers would get out of the airplane and start driving on some of the roads in this province, they would support their hon. colleague the Minister of Transportation and get the \$120 million in the budget so we wouldn't have to drive on the roads we're driving on. If this government's proud of its road record, I'm not proud of their road record, Mr. Chairman. We need the money in the budget, and we want the Treasurer to tell us what's going on. I won't vote one cent, Mr. Chairman, until the Provincial Treasurer comes and tells us what's happening.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I move to respond to the hon. Member for Clover Bar by maybe refreshing his memory on a little history.

DR. BUCK: Don't go too far back or you won't remember.

MRS. CRIPPS: I shall remind you, never fear. We did have a transportation committee which looked at the road budget, the problems, and the reasons for those problems over the past few years. I might go back to the road program prior to 1972, which was totally stagnant. The Member for Vegreville mentioned the secondary road program. The basis of that program was to meet transportation needs of the area more effectively and efficiently by collecting traffic from local roads connecting centres of populations, by providing some consistency in the standards of construction and providing continuity across local jurisdictions, by providing a uniform level of service throughout the province, and by providing a construction program of updating existing roads as part of a long-range plan. That was the program prior to 1972. But

the funding, 1968 to '69, was \$3,500,000; '69-70, \$3,500,000; '70-71, \$3,500,000. Where, I ask you, is the increase in funding from 1968 to 1971? Not one penny increase in the secondary road program. The secondary road program for 1979-'80 is \$45 million.

DR. BUCK: Tell us you invented oil. [interjections]

MRS. CRIPPS: Are you done? Okay. In 1972 . . . Don't get excited. In 1972 a five-year secondary highway program was projected. The main objective of that program was to supplement the primary program and to improve major local roads. In 1973, though, Syncrude came along with a fair change in direction and reorientation of the program. Another effect on this road program was the Mackenzie Valley pipeline and the pavement to Grande Cache. These were expensive roads to build and substantially changed the direction of the road program. In 1975-76, Syncrude and other mining developments demanded similar equipment. So prices escalated due to the lack of capacity and lead time. After 1976, continuing inflation caused problems, especially in land assembly, which increased the cost sharply. The major projects continued to forge ahead, but we admit that the primary and secondary roads did suffer.

Vehicle registration in Alberta has almost doubled since 1970 — 772,000 vehicles in 1970; 1,375,000 in 1978. Alberta has the highest ratio of vehicle growth of any province in Canada. There are more trucks in Alberta than in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and British Columbia combined. In 1978, there were 404 million ton capacity miles, compared to 97 in 1972.

The secondary road program at that time was 8,428 miles. Now 50 per cent of that has been graded to a standard that can be paved. You've heard the minister say they intend to increase the paving program on that secondary road system. The improvement in these secondary roads will result in lower maintenance costs, as the average cost of maintaining a gravel road is \$3,100 compared to \$2,400 for a two-lane paved road. Gravel reserves are rapidly depleting, and the increased hauling costs will be reflected in increased costs of maintaining gravel roads. Municipalities are worried about this gravel depletion. Soon there isn't going to be any.

The road program hasn't kept up to the economic activity and growth in Alberta. But let's take a look at the economic growth. Between 1971 and 1978, 282,000 jobs were created in Alberta.

DR. BUCK: On a point of order. What has the representation got to do with highways? We're talking about highways and transportation, not economic growth, Mr. Chairman. [interjection] It is so. Speak to the point of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The reference I think the hon. Member for Drayton Valley is making is related to what she is trying to state about highway programs. I think we'll have to let her carry on to explain what she's getting at.

MRS. CRIPPS: Over the last five years — if you'll bear with me — a total of 226,000 new jobs have been created in Alberta, an average of 45,000 jobs a year. Those jobs depend directly on the availability of access. That means this government has had to build new roads, to provide infrastructure for the creation of those jobs in Alberta. We're looking forward to special consideration for some

of the infrastructure for these major new developments as they come on stream, because we recognize that it's impossible to do it out of the ordinary road budget we have in Alberta today. I think the rehabilitation program is an excellent one, and a step in the right direction.

Being from the Drayton Valley constituency, I'd like to make special mention of the resource road program, which is really a benefit to my constituency, having 621 and Highway 22 which are definitely resource roads. I really don't think the Member for Clover Bar has driven a rough road until he's driven the roads west of Drayton Valley.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Clover Bar has raised a sincere concern in my mind about some of the figures in these estimates. He's also impugned the integrity of the backbench MLAs, so I feel it's only right that I respond to his points.

The first point is in regard to the third last paragraph on page 21 of the Budget Address. The line in question goes: ". . . the 1980-81 budget of Alberta Transportation will increase by \$110.5 million over 1979, a 24.5 per cent increase to \$562.4 million." That number is being compared to a figure on page 327 of the Estimates of Expenditure 1980-81. In that table an increase is shown, a percentage change of 15.2 per cent from the 1979-80 forecast; that is, from \$488 million, the comparable 1979-80 forecast, to \$562 million, the amount to be voted in 1980-81.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it's correct both to say that there's a 24.5 per cent increase and that there's a 15.2 per cent increase. What has been done in each document is to compare comparable items, so that there is consistency. The 24.5 per cent increase compares a budget to a budget, whereas the amount to be voted in 1981 compares the comparable forecast to the 1981 budget. The conclusion is that both numbers are correct. They're both consistent in the use that has been made of them.

By covering this point I hope I've demonstrated that the backbench government MLAs are indeed familiar with the estimates and can in fact support them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I didn't have my hand up. I'm afraid I must have been waving it around in the air.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I want to bring out the same points as the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I think it's self-explanatory. If some members cannot understand it, I hope somebody will be able to draw a picture and make them understand. The difference I was looking at was between the estimates of this year and the previous year's, not the total expenditures. So actually when there was a special warrant for \$35 million, I think that was in the interests of the roads of this province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to say two things: one, I think we all have to look into the future and be concerned about the infrastructure of this province, the highways, the economic development. I think the Member for Drayton Valley is right in talking about why we need more money in the budget for Transportation. We support that totally. We think there should be a 25 per cent increase. I believe in the fall or last spring, I remember saying in one of the statements I made in this

Assembly that we should increase the budget of the minister by at least 25 per cent. I was happy when I heard in the budget speech that it was going to be increased 25 per cent; very pleased with that particular statement.

But what displeases me at this point in time is the fact that we were led and given the impression that the budget was really increased by 24.5 per cent in actual dollars. In the newspapers, the media, the figure of 25 per cent went out to the people across this province. That's what they heard. The people believed that. I believed that, which can be seen from *Hansard*. The statement I made this evening in my opening remarks was that it was 25 per cent. But on close examination that really is not what is happening. The Transportation budget is short nearly \$50 million if we are going to bring the budget to an actual increase of 24.5 per cent over the actual expenditure of the summer of 1979. It is short nearly \$50 million. The transportation infrastructure the hon. member talked about will be short that number of dollars.

To me, Mr. Chairman, the people have been misled. I can say that I was certainly misled by the figure. If you read the statement the hon. Member for Buffalo referred to a few moments ago, it says "the 1980-81 budget of Alberta Transportation will increase by \$110.5 million over 1979," — over 1979; that's all it said — "a 24.5 per cent increase to \$562.4 million." It does not say "over estimates". It gives the impression that it is over the actual expenditure of 1979.

Mr. Chairman, that is how I and other members of the Legislature interpreted it. If we look in *Hansard* at some of the earlier statements this evening, I think some hon. members of the government party said it was increased 25 per cent. The people of Alberta believe it was increased nearly 25 per cent. Mr. Chairman, I think the Provincial Treasurer must answer for that kind of statement, and answer for it in this Legislative Assembly. If we look at this summary statement, the 1980 budget highlights statement, it says "increases road and highway building and rehabilitation by almost 25% to \$562 million."

Well if that doesn't say that there are going to be 25 per cent more new dollars over what was actually spent in 1979, I don't know what else it says. I think it's incumbent upon this government to take that particular item and either correct it, admit it's only 15 per cent — that's the least they can do — or say they're going to add to this budget not only the \$110 million they said they were going to put in, but nearly \$50 million on top of the \$110 million, to bring it to an actual 25 per cent increase.

With the revenue of this province, with the need for infrastructure and highway building, and with the sincerity of the minister trying to do a job, I think it's unfortunate that we get into this kind of hassle at this point in time. Mr. Chairman, that's totally unfortunate, and it's the wrong thing we should be debating. We should be debating at this time which highways should be built, where they should be built, and the priorities in the province. But what are we talking about? A mishandling and a misleading statement by the Provincial Treasurer. I just can't accept that.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I think it's incumbent upon you, Mr. Chairman, to bring in the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order.

MR. GOGO: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, even though the committee is in committee of the estimates, I understand we still obey the rules of the House. I'd just like to bring to the attention of the Chair Section 357 of *Beauchesne*. No member of this House may "impugn the accuracy of information conveyed to the House by a Minister."

I would like your ruling on the point of order, because I believe that what the members are doing at this point is impugning the motives of the minister and bringing forward misinformation to the Assembly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order. Mr. Chairman, before you rule, let's bring the Provincial Treasurer in and ask him to explain this document. As my colleague has said, it clearly talks of 25 per cent. Then we can go to this document and have the Provincial Treasurer come in. Then we'll make the decision as to exactly what the situation is. Let's have the Provincial Treasurer give us an explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as the point of order and the discussion are concerned, we're getting highly into a matter of opinion and interpretation. When you get into the matter of opinion, it's only usual and normal that there will be various points of view. To try to resolve them by debate in this manner I don't think is going to be very successful. However, I have no objection to the hon. Member for Little Bow carrying on with his comments if he wishes to do so.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think my concern is that the record be put straight. I believe your comments are very well taken in that some opinions are being expressed. At the present time the budget statement is not clear, because the hon. Provincial Treasurer — and maybe it was an oversight in writing it — said, over 1979. He didn't say what the base number was in 1979.

I must say, though, that in my interpretation and that of the public, the base number referred to was the actual expenditure of 1979. And here we're arguing in this House that it wasn't the actual expenditure; it was an estimated one. The people out in Alberta and the municipalities that were looking at this money didn't think it was an estimated one; they thought it was compared to the 1979 actual plus a 25 per cent increase, so there's 25 per cent more money available to them to build roads and transportation systems.

Mr. Chairman, that must be clarified in this House. If the government has really increased it only 15 per cent over actual, the people of Alberta should know that. And we as members of the Legislature should know that.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, just a word if I might on some of the points that have recently been made. The hon. members of the opposition are aware that it's well known that comparisons of the type described by them and by hon. members of the government are appropriate and proper in any discussion of estimates. It would be an extraordinary thing if it were not relevant to any discussion of estimates to compare the proposed expenditures with those proposed the year before, which are the estimates, and those that had actually been forecast to have been made for the entirety of the year before, which are not always the same as the estimates and, in this case, were made significantly different as a result of special warrants.

I don't propose to add anything beyond what's been said, Mr. Chairman. This is so apparent to anyone who has looked at the matter at all, or at the documents hon. members have been discussing, that there is no real need to elaborate upon it. However, the remarks of the hon. Member for Clover Bar do call to mind one of the remarks of Sir Winston Churchill. I wondered if he would feel honored or feel whatever way he wants to in hearing that repeated. It was a remark of Churchill's about Atlee. He said: we must always remember this about Clement; there's a lot less there than meets the eye. I offer that to the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions and reports as follows:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, sums not exceeding the following for the Department of Education: \$6,917,170 for departmental support services; \$712,652,000 for financial assistance to schools; \$8,324,700 for regular education services; \$8,112,900 for special education services.

The Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon the proposal is to proceed with second reading of Bills. However, we would hold Bills Nos. 9, 13, 17, and 37. We would start with Bill 25 and follow it with Bill 24, then go from Bill 26 in order as shown to the extent it's possible to deal with those during the time available tomorrow. In the event that second readings are completed, we would propose to do committee study of Bills and, on Thursday evening, Committee of Supply.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Government House Leader before the question is put: the Bills to be held tomorrow are 9 and 13 — which we asked for, and I appreciate their being held — 27, and what is the other Bill?

MR. CRAWFORD: I'm sorry; not 27, but 17 and 37.

[At 10:26 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]