

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, October 22, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw to the attention of members of the Assembly the presence of a distinguished group of parliamentarians in the Speaker's gallery. They are members of the Houses of Parliament of the Republic of South Africa. I would ask you at the conclusion of the introductions to join me in welcoming Senator the Hon. H.G. O'Connell; Mr. R.A.F. Swart, MP; Mr. G.D. du Plessis, MP; and Mr. J.R. Albertyn, MP. They are accompanied by Mr. Dennis Casale of the South African embassy in Ottawa and Dr. George Adorjany of the Department of Economic Development — International Trade. May I ask our distinguished visitors to stand and receive the welcome of all my colleagues.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 59****The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust
Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1981-82**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 59, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1981-82. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to set aside, in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for 1981-82, 30 per cent of the revenues from Alberta's depleting non-renewable natural resources, for the benefit of this generation and future generations of Albertans and Canadians.

[Leave granted; Bill 59 read a first time]

Bill 64**The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 64, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that the so-called \$100 deductible applies to Section 13, which involves the unknown owners and operators of vehicles.

MR. SPEAKER: On the motion by the hon. Solicitor General for first reading of Bill No. 61, The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Amendment Act, 1980, do you all agree?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I was introducing Bill No. 64.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. On the motion by the hon. Solicitor General for first reading of Bill No. 64, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1980, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Leave granted; Bill 64 read a first time]

Bill 72**The Department of Transportation
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 72, The Department of Transportation Amendment Act, 1980. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this has to do with the revolving fund for purchase of land for the construction of highways and roads, increasing it from \$60 million to \$110 million.

[Leave granted; Bill 72 read a first time]

Bill 66**The Students Loan Guarantee
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of the Bill is to expand the scope of institutions which can lend money to students under the student finance program.

[Leave granted; Bill 66 read a first time]

Bill 61**The Reciprocal Enforcement
of Maintenance Orders Amendment Act, 1980**

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill relates to the transmittal of evidence given in legal proceedings and the related court proceedings.

MR. SPEAKER: When I called out the wrong Bill a moment ago, I wasn't suggesting that there is any strong resemblance between the Member for St. Albert and the hon. Solicitor General.

[Leave granted; Bill 61 read a first time]

Bill 70**The Agricultural Statutes
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, The Agricultural Statutes Amendment Act, 1980.

It includes the repeal of The Frozen Food Act and amendments to The Meat Inspection Act and The Livestock Brand Inspection Act and The Meat Inspection

Act are necessary due to aspects of the repeal of The Frozen Food Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 70 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 61, 66, and 70 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table today three documents: firstly, the annual report pursuant to The Co-operative Marketing Associations and Rural Utilities Guarantee Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980; as well, three copies of the annual report of Alberta Resources Railway for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1979; and lastly, copies of the financial statement pursuant to Section 16 of The Municipal Capital Expenditure Loans Act for the year ended December 31, 1979.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's a very real pleasure today for me to introduce to you and all members of the Assembly, 30 grade 6 students from the Talmud Torah school, which is one of the northern anchors of the fair constituency of Edmonton Glenora. They are accompanied by their teacher Kathy Wright, and four interested parents, Mrs. Meloff, Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Shtabsky, and Mrs. Sorokin.

They are in the centre of the members gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask at this time that they rise and receive the warm welcome of members of the Assembly.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, His Worship Mayor Johnnie Doonanco, from the village of Glendon, located in the Bonnyville constituency. I would ask that Mayor Doonanco rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a former Member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Spirit River-Fairview, Mr. Adolph Fimrite, sitting in your gallery. Members will recall that Mr. Fimrite was the minister responsible for northern affairs. He has left Alberta and moved to British Columbia. If he's going to move out of Alberta, I can't think of a better place to move to. I'd ask Mr. Fimrite to rise and be recognized by members of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Federal Constitutional Proposal

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. It's really a follow-up to the questions I posed to the Premier on Monday, dealing with what appears now to be ongoing negotiations with regard to some portions of the package in the resolution

before the House of Commons. Has the Premier been in consultation with the Premier of Saskatchewan during reported negotiations that have been going on between the Premier of that province and the Prime Minister which, according to reports from Ottawa today, have ended up in some changes — I'll use that term — in the package which is proposed to go to the committee?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker. I have not been in contact with the Premier of Saskatchewan, other than in conversations I had with him a week ago Tuesday, which naturally were between the two of us, when we met in Toronto.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Has the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs been involved in discussions with the government of Saskatchewan during the course of these negotiations on resource ownership and resource control?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, again I believe these are matters between governments. I'd welcome any questions the hon. leader may have with regard to any proposals made by the federal government on the constitutional situation.

As I stated at length here on Wednesday, we've made it abundantly clear that the basic concept of unilateral action by the federal government is repugnant to the province, and that the amending formula is as well. Until those matters are resolved, we are not of the view that our approach in this province is one of looking on trading or brokering one item for another. We endorse the position of the official opposition in the House of Commons today that the best answer for this situation is patriation of the constitution, with an amending formula known as the Vancouver consensus.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister flows from the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the invitation of the Premier. Would the Premier advise what the consequences of the reported concessions that the Prime Minister has apparently used to buy NDP support are to Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to. A copy of the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Broadbent dated October 21 has come into our possession, in which the Prime Minister proposed to Mr. Broadbent certain changes with regard to resources. They are three in number, Mr. Speaker. Essentially they're the very items that were raised on September 8 in the first ministers' conference by the Prime Minister, which we stated were insignificant insofar as Alberta is concerned.

The first item is a general declaration that confirms the jurisdiction of the provinces with regard to the management of resources. That in itself causes us concern, as not necessarily being a step forward but a step back, because it sort of implies that the position of ownership rights of resources is less than has been established in terms of the general awareness and general understanding in Canada and, more, seems to equate the approach the Prime Minister appears to be making to the province of Nova Scotia relative to offshore natural gas.

The second item in the Prime Minister's letter is to provide the provinces with concurrent jurisdiction of non-renewable resources and interprovincial trade, with federal paramountcy. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legis-

lative Assembly, that means really nothing if the federal government either intends or has in fact moved into that area of jurisdiction. With the federal government's Petroleum Administration Act, they have moved into the field of oil and natural gas, which is a basic resource of this province. From that point of view, therefore, having occupied the field, that's a meaningless provision for Alberta.

Thirdly, there is a provision to give the provinces the right to levy indirect taxation on non-renewable resources. That is helpful and convenient to the province of Saskatchewan, as we understand it, and not significant here in Alberta, because the vast majority of our production is Crown production.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Has the government had an opportunity to assess the tax revenue that might be open to the government of Alberta as a consequence of the proposal with respect to indirect taxation, bearing in mind that some 20 per cent of oil production and 21 per cent of gas production is from freehold, on which we are not presently able to levy a royalty similar to the royalties in our Crown reserves?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for — I was going to say Oshawa [laughter] — Spirit River-Fairview would check the record of discussions — he was in the Legislature — when we dealt with the oil reserve taxation approach, and where we do have provision under mineral taxation, we have measures to levy taxation of freehold interests that are adequate. One can debate, as the hon. member may wish to. Although we are dealing in many cases there, as the hon. member knows, with small participants of a freehold nature in our province, we are able to obtain adequate revenues from the freehold interests in the approach we're now using.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier — I hesitate to get into the debate. The information I've been able to obtain from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources is that in fact we're looking at a very substantial loss, \$130 million compared to almost \$800 million. My question, very directly to the hon. Premier, is: what assessment has been made of the revenue potential of this proposal subsequent to the Prime Minister's statement at the constitutional conference of September last?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to leave the specifics to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources when he returns from the interesting province of Saskatchewan, where he is today on another matter. We have the vehicles that permit us adequately to acquire from the freehold interest holders in this province revenue for the province that we think is fair and equitable.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the Premier saying to this Legislative Assembly that a revenue rate from freehold — which is 96 per cent owned by two companies — that is one-sixth the rate we obtain from Crown leases is in fact adequate?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is really arguing the extent to which we are in fact obtaining a levy from the freehold interests. That is of course a matter of debate. On another matter, we can of course alter, through the provisions of our legislation, additional

revenue from the freehold interests if we consider that is an appropriate approach to take. It does not require an alteration in the constitution in order for us to do so.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. Premier would indicate to the House whether he has information to indicate how these so-called concessions, or a facade of concessions, can in fact be amendable?

MR. LOUGHEED: If I understand the question, Mr. Speaker, it would be my understanding that the proposals made by the Prime Minister, that I have just referred to, relative to resources — which, as I've said, are insignificant to this province and do not go to the root issue of resources contained in Harmony in Diversity — if they found their way into an ultimate constitution, would be subject to amendment in the way in which the other amending provisions are in place in that proposal. In short, they could go into the constitution and be taken away from the provinces in the west, pursuant to the Victoria Charter amending formula.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary and a clarification, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier then saying to the House that in fact those changes could occur and we could be vetoed? There could be a veto against any changes.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, they could be deleted but, again, I think the important point is the earlier question: are they significant to the province of Alberta? As I said on September 6 in Ottawa, they do not go to the heart of the resource questions that are raised in our submissions.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier then indicate to the House: is there anything in the so-called facade of concessions the Prime Minister has indicated that we as a province do not already have?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we do not have the provision to levy indirect taxation in non-renewable resources. That's a provision I've been answering previous questions on. It's certainly a convenience for provinces such as ours, and more extensively for the province of Saskatchewan, but there are other ways to solve the revenue problem.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, following on the heels of the questions from the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, could the hon. Premier indicate if the position of the Alberta government is that any proposed changes to the constitution are irrelevant as long as the Victoria formula remains the one way in which powers may be amended in that constitution?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that is definitely the Alberta position. It is fundamental on two aspects: we favor patriation; we believe it should be done on the basis of existing convention, not unilaterally, with an amending formula, pursuant to what has been developed by 10 provinces, called the Vancouver consensus. That's the fundamental position. We don't believe in trading or brokering with regard to other aspects unless those matters, which are fundamental to this province, are met.

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Premier, has this government been able to assess whether the accepted amendment of the federal government of the constitutional position would prevent the federal government from attempting unilaterally to set the price of oil or gas moving interprovincially? Would the amendment of the federal government prevent the federal government from imposing an export tax on resources owned by the province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first question, I would have to say that these proposals by the Prime Minister do not deal with the question of the pricing in interprovincial trade, when one stands the federal Petroleum Administration Act beside the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Act. Insofar as the second question is concerned, that of an export tax, that is a legal matter that should be responded to if and when that situation arises in the course of the next week.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary flows from the resource ownership question. The first part would flow from the question of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I wonder if the Premier might assure this House that this government would not use any alleged concessions on indirect taxation to attach to the resources flowing to the Indian bands of Alberta that enjoy freehold rights. The second part of the question is: if these concessions were affected ...

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly we could start with the first part of the question. The second part, as it was begun, would of course be hypothetical.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it certainly would be our view to assess the situation with regard to the native people and not in any way put them in a position less advantageous than they're in today.

MR. PAHL: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the other supplementary is: would the Premier care to comment on the effect of these concessions upon the declaratory powers of the federal government?

MR. NOTLEY: Asking for an opinion. Really! [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I was a little uncomfortable about the question by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, which appeared to be asking about a legal opinion. I think questions concerning the government's position would be in order, but questions for legal opinions — and they seem to come more often from the learned members of the legal profession in the Assembly — of course do not fit within the question period.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, not being a member of the legal profession, I'll not try to rephrase the question.

Environment Council Recommendations

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Environment. It flows from the concerns expressed to the Minister of Environment by members of the Environment Council of Alberta concerning the effectiveness of the council and, frankly, the willingness of the government to take seriously the recommendations of the council. My question to the

minister: what assurance has the minister given to the Environment Council of Alberta that in fact they will have an opportunity to play a significant role in the future?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the authority of the Environment Council of Alberta is pretty clearly laid out in the legislation. That legislation has been in place for several years now. I don't contemplate any changes in the legislation.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Perhaps I didn't phrase the question precisely enough for him. I would remind the minister that this year people from the Environment Council met with the minister and laid before him their concerns about the government frankly not listening to their recommendations at all. My question to the minister: what assurance has the minister given the Environment Council of Alberta that their advice is going to be listened to and followed, as opposed to being totally ignored?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the latter part of the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not a fair comment. [interjections] The fact of the matter is that the Environment Council of Alberta is an advisory group. And I might say they do an excellent job. They have responsibilities in the area of public hearings on issues of common concern in policy laid down by the province. They deal with certain terms of reference when they go through their exercise on hearings.

I think the member is speaking specifically of the most recent hearings. Some 74 recommendations were made to our government, and some 46 of the recommendations were totally accepted. There are 15 to 20 of those, in addition to the 46, that are under consideration at the present time. A decision on them has been deferred. The batting average is pretty good, I think.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Unfortunately, Mr. Minister, the council doesn't share your assessment of the batting average. My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, as I see you rising to your feet, is simply this: for the third time, what assurance has the minister given the people from the Environment Council of Alberta that the government is going to listen seriously to their major recommendations? I have asked the question twice. I assume there has been no guarantee.

MR. COOKSON: The legislation is very clear. I guess I have to repeat myself again, Mr. Speaker: the Environment Council of Alberta acts in an advisory capacity. That's where the situation is, and unless the hon. Leader of the Opposition has some suggested amendments to legislation which would in fact change, and may take away from, the role of the Environment Council of Alberta, that's where it will remain.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question with respect to statements attributed to the chief officer of the ECA, Mr. Crerar. Have there been any discussions between the minister and the chief executive officer of the Environment Council of Alberta with respect to that gentleman's tenure, and hopefully his continued tenure, as chief executive officer?

MR. COOKSON: Not specifically with reference to comments one reads in the media, Mr. Speaker. I simply gloss over those kinds of statements. The chief executive officer and I have had recent discussions about communication between Environment Council and Environment. We have agreed to try to improve the communication, specifically with regard to resolutions they propose on occasion, and to shorten the time span between the time our government rules on their advisory commitments and the time they are made public. Other than that, there's not much more I can say in regard to comments from the media.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government had an opportunity to review its position with respect to the recommendation some months ago concerning hearings into the operations of the oil and gas industry on the forest industry, and whether or not the government would reconsider that particular recommendation by the ECA?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, on the forestry report and the recommendations put forth by the Environment Council, we went through those recommendations very thoroughly. The recommendations overlap, in terms of not only Environment but the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

We have had ongoing discussions with the Environment Council and its advisory committee, and with the chairman of the panel that dealt with the forestry report. I am happy to say that a number of the recommendations that were deferred, subsequent to public disclosure of the province's position, have been acted on. Perhaps the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources might like to comment on the positive moves we've made in terms of a direction to seismic activities. We continue to move toward recommendations that were made in the forestry report. To sum up, we still have ongoing discussions on upgrading on the basis of the forestry report.

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

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

MR. NOTLEY: The minister indicates that the government still has ongoing discussions. However, with respect to the specific recommendation that there be public hearings by the ECA to look into the matter in considerably more detail — the recommendation came as a result of the forestry hearings, but specific hearings on this matter — is the government prepared to reassess its previous position on that matter?

MR. COOKSON: That issue has been raised several times. I think I have made it clear that we would defer any decision on any further types of hearings for several years, until we work through the proposals made earlier and make subsequent changes. If sometime in the future we again feel there is an area that should be explored by way of public hearings, I have assured and said publicly that we would follow through on that.

Public Service Negotiations

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. Is it the intention of the government to

make another offer to the employees of Division 1, in view of the fact that some 2,300 employees in Division 1 would now qualify for social assistance supplements because their salaries are so low?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the Public Service Employee Relations Board reviewed the employer's request for arbitration. Once the memorandum of agreement that had been negotiated at the bargaining table with the bargaining team from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees had been rejected, an application was presented. As an employer, we will follow the direction of the board. The board has reserved its judgment until October 30 and, in the meantime, has requested that we meet again.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the board has requested that both parties meet again, is the government considering at this time another offer? More specifically, is the government considering an offer which would increase the amounts to those at the lower end of the scale, in view of the fact that you have a very large number of employees who, frankly, are working below the poverty line. Has the government considered separating their offer, and a substantially higher offer to those people at the lower end of the scale, most of whom are women?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would indicate again to the member that it is not an offer that was turned down by the members of that division; it was a memorandum of agreement reached in good faith at the bargaining table. That memorandum was rejected, not an offer. In addition, this government, through my office, made very clear that it would offer to the employees of that division a retroactive adjustment of 9 per cent, payable to all members of that division, without prejudice to the hearing that was being requested. To the best of my knowledge, that offer has been rejected by the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, notwithstanding the concerns.

The details the member is asking for will be dealt with in due course, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated that we will follow the directions of the board, and we will be meeting.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether he has in his possession any information with respect to the turnover rate in Division 1? Is the minister able to confirm that the rate is in the neighborhood of 30 per cent?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, as all members of this Assembly are aware, I have provided each member with a statistical review of the turnover in each division. In the case of Division 1, there is a turnover in new entry jobs. That is not uncommon, and it is common to private employers as well as other public employers. However, much of that turnover may well be voluntary, due to retraining programs and other advancement opportunities within the government of Alberta. We have a series of programs that provide that opportunity. There's no question that there will be a high turnover in a beginning area position in any type of employment.

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

Assembly of the extent of the use of private placement agencies, particularly with respect to the temporary jobs in Division 1 as a result of people leaving, and whether it is correct that the cost to the taxpayer . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member knows the answer, this is not the place to give it.

MR. NOTLEY: Then maybe I could ask the minister if he is able to advise whether in fact the cost to taxpayers of private placement agencies for those temporary jobs is some 20 per cent higher than would be the case for the jobs being taken from the public service sector itself?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty understanding the direction the member wishes to take. Within each department we have the opportunity within the budget for that department to obtain temporary services of employees from private placement agencies; for example, for absences, maternity, and recruitment areas when someone has obtained a new position. Each department has a budget and, to the best of my knowledge, is maintaining that budget.

MR. NOTLEY: My question to the hon. minister — and perhaps I didn't make the question clear enough — is simply this: is the minister able to advise the Assembly that using private placement agencies in fact costs considerably more — I believe the figure is some 20 per cent more — than would be the case for that job being supplied by the normal Division 1 employees? The question I raise, Mr. Speaker: is the minister in a position to advise whether there is any unusual need to employ placement agencies as a consequence of the contract negotiations?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, again it would be a matter of conjecture. There is an offer to the union to increase the salaries across the board; that has been rejected, I understand. In the meantime, temporary placement services can be used if a job needs to be done.

When one considers the salaries and benefits to a provincial employee, one must also consider the fringe benefits and other parts of the package. So it's very difficult to say that one person employed by a placement service and provided to the government of Alberta . . . That person would receive less remuneration from the company, but the total costs are about the same. You have to consider the benefit package a permanent employee receives from the government of Alberta: vacation, pension, and all the other programs the government offers.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I recognized the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, and then I should recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. If there's time, perhaps we could come back to this topic.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary to the minister relates specifically to the status of salary negotiations at the land titles offices in the province of Alberta. Given the fact that there are some serious percentages of resignations, not with the newest but with the most experienced staff members — the land titles writers and persons who ensure the integrity of our

land titles system in this province — can the minister advise whether consideration has been given to significant increases to such experienced personnel to ensure that they are not leaving for other jobs in the private sector, thus jeopardizing the integrity of the land titles system in this province?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, for the member and the Assembly, that particular detail is a number of classifications within the overall division. There are about 37 classifications in this division, affecting about 10,200 employees. In addition to the general negotiated settlement involving an increase for the general classes, the memorandum of agreement resolved some individual classification adjustments, called special adjustments. As a part of the rejection by the division, they have therefore fallen by the wayside. I would assume that our next meeting and the further consideration by the Public Service Employee Relations Board may rapidly lead to a conclusion. It would be my wish that we resolve this, because the employees have been on their 1979 pay scales since March 31.

In addition, each employee and his or her personnel officer and/or his or her supervisor may submit a classification request for adjustments. We would review those in the normal process. If those individuals have that concern, I think they should approach their personnel officer and make that submission and, through the Attorney General, it would eventually reach my department.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: As a follow-up to the minister's response, is the minister aware of the fact that these very employees have been seeking without success for over five years to obtain reclassification?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the second part of the process these employees have perhaps been following involves an appeal process. The appeal process results in a decision that is binding upon both parties — the employees and the employer. From the information the member has, I presume that the evidence or the reasons provided by the employees have not been sufficient to provide for an appeal in their favor. There is a process for that.

In addition, of course, we do look at market conditions. In our negotiations we have our objectives, and we do look at the market conditions. I'm not aware of any significant increase in the turnover in this particular area.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's supplementary and concerns the question of salary levels in Division 1. There's concern about the level of salaries, and I think there's general concern about that level of salaries throughout the economy. Has the minister undertaken any studies to determine whether the salary levels in the various subdivisions of Division 1 are comparable to the private sector?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, in our Personnel Administration Office we have a division that in fact carries out such surveys, among not only the public sector employees in Alberta but the private sector employees. The negotiated settlement that was rejected would have provided the employees of that division, on average, with increases that would have brought Alberta into the leading position, subject to only one other government in Canada, and on par with the private sector in Alberta.

Grain Handling — Prince Rupert

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. Early in September the minister announced the financial arrangements for upgrading the Prince Rupert grain terminal. Could the minister indicate what time line we're looking at for the completion of upgrading the Prince Rupert terminal? What is the status of the upgrading at the present time?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I can't provide the member with a construction completion estimate. Some consideration is still being given to the new buffalo-sloped elevator developed by Alberta Beton. But I'm happy to report that the construction is under way and that the initiatives by Alberta have indeed started the Prince Rupert terminal and given our growers an alternate that we hope will give them good access to salt water and the Pacific Rim markets in an ongoing way.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In regard to the infrastructure — I'm thinking of the rail lines and the port facilities — has the federal government agreed to put in some financing to upgrade the rail lines and also the facilities at the port?

MR. PLANCHE: CN is doing some ongoing work in the mountain passes. There's still some difficulty with supplying adequate trackage to Prince Rupert because of unstable soil conditions in some areas. The navigational aids and the federal government's responsibility for the shipping part of the port facility are all in place. The access road construction is under way, and there is some clearing going on on Ridley Island right now.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister had indicated that the province will be involved in a debenture and also in loaning the consortium \$100 million. Will the province be taking any equity in the Prince Rupert facility?

MR. PLANCHE: No it won't, Mr. Speaker.

Edmonton Annexation Application

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the minister could advise the Assembly when the Local Authorities Board will be releasing the Edmonton annexation report.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot advise an exact date, but I do expect a report from the Local Authorities Board panel prior to the end of the calendar year.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister assure the Assembly that the 10 to one vote of the St. Albert electorate, opposing Edmonton's annexation application, will be seriously taken into consideration in any final boundary decision?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in considering the Edmonton annexation application, I believe the government has a mandate to consider all relevant matters. Certainly the report of the Local Authorities Board will be the major document considered, but as well I can assure the member that the views of the residents of the county of

Strathcona, the city of St. Albert, the city of Edmonton, and any other areas being considered for annexation, will be taken fully into consideration before our final decision is made.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question, if I might, to either the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. I'd like to ask either hon. gentleman if he could indicate to the Assembly if there have been discussions between the city of Edmonton and Alberta Government Telephones regarding the possibility of the Alberta government buying Edmonton Telephones, as part of an overall annexation package that might be made more palatable to the city of Edmonton.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there have been no discussions in that regard.

Urban Transportation

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation, please. There's been a fair amount of interest and discussion in Calgary recently with regard to the funding of LRT, particularly with regard to the specific instance of an underground route in the Hillhurst-Sunnyside area. It seems that proponents for and against it are thinking they may be on the government's side, but I'd like to ask if the minister could indicate specifically if it's the government's policy to fund such projects or if such decisions would be left to the city.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I think we've taken a very clear position with regard to urban transportation, not specifically with LRT but including LRT: while we do fund, we do not intend to be involved in route selection or whether we're talking about aboveground or underground LRT systems.

Federal Constitutional Proposal (continued)

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Premier, as a follow-up to the question on energy. Regarding the so-called concessions, which I think we've established are really, in the main, not concessions at all, I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House whether he has received any assurance from the federal government that the so-called concessions include the cancelling or revocation of the declaratory powers of the federal government.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there's nothing in the document I read today from the Prime Minister to Mr. Broadbent that refers to the declaratory power. Although we raised at the constitutional conference the need to reflect in any new constitution the reality of Canadian federalism and withdraw the declaratory powers of the federal government, because of what it might mean in terms of disunity in Canada, that was rejected by the Prime Minister during the first ministers' conference in September. There's no reference to that matter in his so-called proposals of yesterday.

DR. PAPROSKI: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier and you would allow it. I wonder if the Premier would indicate what consequence that declaratory power has to the citizens of Alberta. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I realize that we're dealing with an extremely important topic, and that the government's position with regard to that topic is of the utmost concern in the question period. But I think we do have an established practice which does not favor asking questions of outright opinion. With great respect, it would seem to me that that's what this question is.

Public Service Negotiations
(continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could pose a supplementary question to the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration, flowing from the questions I asked before. This is with respect to the issue of arbitration, to which the contract for Division 1 will go at some point. Is the minister in a position to confirm that the lawyer who will be making representation on behalf of the government to the Public Service Employee Relations Board will cost us \$2,500 a day? Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly why that kind of very high remuneration, considering the low wages of the people involved, is . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: That's two and one-half times the value of the former Attorney General.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right.

DR. BUCK: Even Foster's not worth that much.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to discuss the obligations and remuneration within a contract, but I would say that the government of Alberta sought and obtained the best legal advice it could. I'm confident that the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees similarly took their actions. I have no idea what their costs are, nor am I concerned with their costs; I'm concerned with the results. The results will be discussed and deliberated at a meeting, presumably by October 30.

I should also indicate that contrary to the statements made by the member, the arbitration board has not been formed. The Public Service Employee Relations Board is dealing with this issue. An arbitration board has not yet been established.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm, without acknowledging what the solicitor is being paid, if this government has a policy of paying any more for legal help than any other client would pay their solicitor?

DR. BUCK: Connie, don't let him ask that.

MR. STEVENS: No, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

15. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the operations of the government since the adjournment of the spring sitting.

[Adjourned debate October 20: Mr. R. Clark]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate on this particular occasion. I would say at the outset that I enter this debate with rather mixed emotions. On the one hand, it's the last opportunity I will have to take part in this debate in the capacity of Leader of the Official Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank you for the courtesies you've extended to me during the period of time it's been my responsibility to be Leader of the Official Opposition. I'd be less than honest if I didn't say thanks to the former and the present Government House Leader for the co-operation I have received from them. I wouldn't want any hon. member reading *Hansard* to feel that we've agreed on the issues at stake on every occasion. Obviously, that isn't the case, as a matter of record. But I do appreciate the courtesies that have been extended to me. Having said that, I would hope that my successor, be it my colleague on my left, on my right, or on my double right, would receive the same kind of consideration I've received.

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I find my remarks today difficult because, as I've said, on one hand it's the last opportunity I'll have to speak from this particular point of view and, secondly, because I'm going to spend a considerable portion of the 40 minutes that I plan to speak dealing with an issue that I'm sure is of great concern not only to members of this Assembly, regardless of where they sit, but to Albertans and certainly to Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, before I become involved in my comments with regard to the constitution, to be followed by comments on resource control and the federal budget, concluding with a few brief but certainly important comments about social problems and economic development, I want to set the record very, very clear that once the Social Credit Party has its leadership convention at the end of November, it is my intention to step down as Leader of the Official Opposition, regardless of what happens at that convention. I would further say, Mr. Speaker, that it's my intention to continue to sit in this Assembly as the Member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Olds-Didsbury.

I want to make very clear, Mr. Speaker, the four basic reasons I am stepping down as the leader of the party. Allow me to preface my remarks by saying it's my intention to continue to be actively involved in the Social Credit Party, because I feel it's essentially important in this province, regardless of whatever happens in the future as far as constitutional discussions, that there be a party, which is the alternative to the present administration, that's strongly committed to the individual initiative system and approach. I will continue to be actively involved in the party.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to have it made very clear that my reason for stepping down is certainly no difference of opinion with the existing candidates seeking the leadership. But I think that from time to time political leaders should take very frank assessment of those things that are important. I have a young family, a son who is 13 and a daughter who is 11. In my judgment, if I were to carry on for another eight years my son and daughter, when they were 19 and 21, would be in the situation of being able to say, Dad, it was good to see you on the weekends when you weren't playing golf.

I think that a province, a country, and communities start from strong families. I've been extremely fortunate to have a wife and family who have supported me. In no

way have they put pressure on me to take the step I'm taking, but I want to pay tribute and credit to my wife and family. [applause]

Mr. Speaker, now to move on to the question at hand, the constitutional question itself. Since members in this Assembly last met — and the Premier certainly sketched the details in when he spoke in this debate last Monday. Members will recall that near the conclusion of the session last spring there was the Quebec referendum and then a special debate in this Assembly on the referendum and the effects of the favorable results — at least from my point of view — on that referendum debate. On that occasion I expressed the hope that Alberta and other provinces would take advantage of what happened in that referendum to move toward making some concrete changes, in co-operation with the federal government, to live with the commitment that was given by people all across this country to the people in the province of Quebec. Now in June, since the House adjourned, there was the first ministers' conference. During July and following, there were the meetings of the ministers responsible for doing the negotiations, and then the first ministers' conference took place.

I want to make two points very clear, Mr. Speaker. When one looks at the approach the Prime Minister and the federal government took on setting a very short period of time for coming to resolution on the issues at hand, and when one looks at the number of items that were included on that list, in my judgment it was not practical, reasonable, or sensible to expect that regardless of how good the feelings were between the Prime Minister and the premiers we would be able to come to grips with, I think, some 12 issues. Frankly, too many issues were up for grabs at the time, and the time frame was unrealistically short.

I have many people say to me — as other members in this Assembly do, I am sure — that the constitution is not the greatest issue facing this province or this country. Indeed that's the case. I would suggest to members that questions like inflation, a national energy policy, the national deficit, balance of payments in our international trade, and unemployment are issues of far more importance to people walking up and down Jasper Avenue in Edmonton right now than the constitution.

However, Mr. Speaker, for whatever reasons the federal government chose, there are two that are commonly bandied around as the reasons the constitutional question is before us now. One — and I don't mean to be disrespectful to the Prime Minister — is to simply say that it seems to me that since the last federal election the Prime Minister has basically become, with the greatest of respect, a one-issue politician, a one-issue Prime Minister. In my judgment that issue is the question of patriation of Canada's constitution, and receiving some of the credit, perhaps even much of the credit, for that taking place.

I think that's regrettable. I think it's unfortunate. But let me point out to members on both sides of the House and to people across this province that as I read the signs, the present Prime Minister is not going to be the Prime Minister forever. In fact, far shorter than that. It's my judgment — and of course everyone has particular views on that — that he may not be the Prime Minister for an extended period of time.

AN HON. MEMBER: It seems longer than it is.

MR. R. CLARK: It may seem longer than it is. It may well seem that long. But that's one of the reasons this

constitutional question is before us. I don't agree with that approach, but whether we like it or not it's a fact of Canada in 1980.

The second reason, and I think a reason why the matter before us is of a great deal more significance, is the fact that earlier this year the referendum took place in the province of Quebec. Whether we want to be reminded of this or not, Canadians from every province in Canada were involved in attempting to convince the people in Quebec that they should vote no. The Premier of British Columbia, the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Premier of Ontario, the Premier of New Brunswick, Joe Clark, the former Prime Minister and an MP from Alberta, the Leader of the Opposition nationally, were involved in the campaign in Quebec.

Also remember that 115,000 Albertans signed that petition that went from Alberta to Quebec to help convince the people in the province of Quebec that they should vote no and vote in favor of Canada. I've done some checking with the people who were involved in helping organize that petition — people members on both sides of the House know very well; very well-respected Albertans, very well-respected Canadians — and they tell me that in the course of acquiring 115,000 signatures there weren't more than 100 people who said, no, I won't sign that petition; no, I'm not in favor of trying to encourage the people of Quebec to stay in Canada. Now certainly it's implicit with that kind of involvement of Albertans in saying to the people of Quebec that once the people in that province voted no, there was then some responsibility on all of us to try to work out some accommodations.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Assembly I raised the question: what kinds of discussions have gone on between the Premier of this province, or this government, and the Prime Minister, or the government of Canada, during the last two weeks? I asked specifically "during the last two weeks", because in the course of the last two weeks — and once again, whatever one may think of the Prime Minister or the federal government, they are there and we have to work with them if this country is to hang together. We may not like it. We may not approve of their approach; obviously we don't in many areas. But we simply can't ignore them and say they're not there.

It was for that reason that I asked the question: what kind of representation, negotiations, have been going on between Alberta and the federal government during the last two weeks since the resolution was put before the House, and especially during the last week, because it was during the course of the last week that the Prime Minister — once again, whatever you may think of him; he's no more a political friend of mine than he is of members on the government side of the House. But whatever we may think of the Prime Minister, twice in the course of the last week he clearly indicated there was a possibility for some compromise, one, on the question of natural resource control and, secondly, on the question of the amending formula.

Mr. Speaker, when the Alberta government is dealing with its municipalities, it can afford to take this holier-than-thou approach: if you're not prepared to deal with a thing totally the way we want to, we're not going to deal with you. You can do that when you're playing slow pitch with Alberta's municipalities. But when you're playing at the level we are now — hardball — we can't simply say we're going to fold our arms, sit back, and not be involved in the negotiations going on because we don't approve of unilateral action. I don't approve of unilateral action either. But, I'll tell you, as an Albertan I'm not

very proud that the Saskatchewan and federal socialists have been negotiating a deal, good or bad, on behalf of resource control, and we're the province that's got 85 per cent of oil and gas natural resources, and we bloody well haven't been involved in those negotiations for the last two weeks. I think that will not stand well in the long term of this province.

We complain, with great legitimacy, Mr. Speaker, that we don't like the amending formula. I don't like it either. I don't like the referendum proposition. But, once again, we in Alberta can't sit back, fold our hands, and say we're not going to be involved in the discussions. This thing is not before the courts at this time; it won't be before the courts for some time. I would point out to hon. members once again that when the thing goes before the courts, that is absolutely the last resort we have. If the courts rule in our favor, okay. If the courts rule not in favor of the provinces — the province of Alberta, or other provinces that may still be hanging in there at that time — then we have to make that awful choice: do we call a referendum, or 'separendum', or whatever? I don't want this province to get into that kind of situation, Mr. Speaker. That's why, whether we like it or not, we've got to recognize now that the debate is in the political arena, and if we're going to be part of that debate we've got to be in the arena.

I plead with members on the government side. I've been a member of the government in the past. I know how easy it is to get yourself talked into a corner and then not know how to get out. As a minister I've done that. I've been a member of a government that did that on occasions — not when the stakes were nearly as high as they are now. I simply ask the members on the government side: consider very, very seriously your decision, which I think is totally wrong, to refuse to be involved in the political discussions now going on. I can make no more earnest appeal to the Premier, the members of his cabinet, and the government members, that if we sit back and refuse to take part in the discussions going on, there's every indication the federal government will be able to move the legislation through, hopefully with appropriate amendments. It won't be the kind of resolution that I can endorse totally. But I think we have to give and take some, even though that's going to be difficult.

For if we do not, we set the wheels in motion, not in a meaningful manner. I think there's not one member in this Assembly who is a separatist or who wants to see Alberta or western Canada go its own way. But if one reads the history of countries that have been through this kind of problem in the past, gradually, without anyone having a great game plan that separation or confrontation take place, the wheels start to move. The balls start to roll, and once they start to roll you can't stop them.

I fear very much, Mr. Speaker, that that's what's happening in the course of negotiations between Alberta and the federal government at this time.

I want to refer to three areas the Premier talked about in the course of his remarks last Monday. The Premier spoke of Confederation as a product of the provinces. Mr. Speaker, Confederation is more than a convenient compact of provinces. It was not and is not convened for the convenience of one or more of the provinces. When the four founding provinces came together over 113 years ago, they formed a nation and gave that nation powers. They did not give the federal government power simply as a matter of convenience. Rather they gave the federal government the power and authority it took to forge a nation.

Now, over a century later, that nation is more than the sum of its constituent provinces. I draw the comparison for Members of the Assembly, much like a family is more than just the sum of the individuals who comprise it. Nations last for centuries and serve the needs of the society well unless destroyed by forces from without or dissension from within.

Over the next year Canada faces that kind of choice. The choice is whether we will let the problems between the rich and poor provinces, the problems of regional differences, the problems of east and west versus central Canada, and the problems of the duality of our French and English backgrounds tear us apart. Or whether, Mr. Speaker, an accommodation can be found that will meet the needs of the nation as a whole and still be fair to the provinces. The challenge is to reach an accommodation that will meet the needs of the nation as a whole and still be fair to all provinces.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta can and must be instrumental in that choice. In the course of the last two weeks Alberta strategy is not to be involved in negotiations right up until the eleventh hour with the federal government. I would hope the government of Alberta will go before the joint House and Senate committee and make its views known as strongly as it possibly can. It isn't good enough for us to sit here in Alberta and say, but the federal government knows our views. If this nation is to hang together in the future, there has to be some give and take on both sides. Over the past seven or eight years no province has made a greater contribution to keeping Canada together than has Alberta. I commend the government and Albertans for doing that. But this is not the time to say we're going to sit back, fold our arms, and say, you know our position and unless you're prepared to come to that position, we're not going to be involved in negotiations or discussion right up until the very last moment, almost, when that resolution gets approval from the House of Commons.

So when the Premier spoke on Monday of the constitution and talked of Canada and the federal government being there for the convenience of the provinces ... I recall when the Premier sat on this side of the House and used to talk in very glowing terms about a strong central government in this country and how the province of Alberta was being neglectful of its responsibilities by not being in Ottawa and negotiating. My how the circle has turned.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier spoke also about the lack of checks and balances when the federal government has a majority. I respectfully submit that such a case is found not only in the federal government but anywhere power goes virtually unchallenged. The checks and balances present in the parliamentary system are not like those found in the three branches of the American government. Rather the parliamentary system is dependent upon the strength of its leaders. This strength is not measured in an ability to fight or take and hold positions, rather the strength of parliamentary leaders is found in their ability to reach accommodation, to put the good of the whole before the interest of the province or of their area of responsibility. In the current constitutional debate, none of the major role players has been willing to assume flexible positions. As I indicated earlier in my remarks, it's only been in the last few days that the Prime Minister began to show some flexibility. I waited and I listened very carefully to the Premier's speech Monday to the Assembly, which wasn't just a speech to the Assembly, but a speech to Alberta, a speech to Canada. I see no

indication at all by this government, even at this late hour, to seize the initiative and to move into those areas where there is some flexibility and develop other areas of flexibility. What happened Monday, rather than Alberta taking some bold new initiatives to try to break the logjam, was that we came in with the referendum legislation. However we phrase it, the word "referendum" is now colored by the experience of the province of Quebec. What we did Monday was simply up the ante in a poker game where we don't hold all the aces.

Mr. Speaker, one other area I'd like to talk about, following the Premier's remarks, is the question of patriation. Obviously the two levels of government have shown that they cannot agree on a formula which brings about patriation of the constitution. In 1976, my colleagues and I in the Social Credit Party put forward that no patriation occur until an amending formula which would be acceptable to the province could be agreed upon. This is still our position, Mr. Speaker. The formula put forward in the House of Commons resolution gives unequal powers to the provinces or gives the decision over to the majority of the voters. There must be some accommodation on this issue so that provinces can be guaranteed to protect their provincial rights.

The Premier made reference to the Vancouver agreement. In a light-hearted and certainly a very factual, offhand comment, he said that he — I hope I'm being accurate here — felt that if it was called the Vancouver agreement rather than the Alberta agreement, it had a better chance of being approved.

MR. LOUGHEED: By the federal government.

MR. R. CLARK: By the federal government. If that is the case, and I take the Premier at his word, we've reached a pretty sad situation in this country. There obviously has to be accommodation on this question of the amending formula.

But, as I said earlier, the current leadership of the government in Ottawa is not going to last forever. Perhaps the next leader will be far more agreeable, far more conducive to an approach that would be in the best interest of all of us as Canadians.

I make the point again to members that we're going to get no place if we simply rely on a court case, simply rely on cutting our production back somewhat in the future, forcing the federal government into retaliating, and our taking the next move and their taking the next move.

Mr. Speaker and members, that's what I mean about how the ball starts to roll. I urge the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Premier and his cabinet, members of the government in the House, even at this hour to get into the political arena, get involved in the political negotiations that are going on at this time, because rightly or wrongly, writing a constitution in Canada in 1980 is a political process. During the past, the past two weeks specifically, we're simply not being part of the process.

I want to make this point too, Mr. Speaker. I support the basic position of the province of Alberta. I think most Albertans do. I've made that clear in this Assembly on several occasions. Where I think we're really going wrong today is in the strategy we're using. We're not prepared to be involved in the negotiations on this thing, right up until the very last moment. I simply cannot understand that kind of approach.

I suppose if there's one person who is seen as a father of confederation for the province of Alberta, it would be

W.H. Haultain. Leading up to 1905 and this province becoming a province in Canada, he talked about the need for us in this province to be big Albertans, not narrow and little Albertans. I think there have been several times during the time this government has been in office that they have been very big Albertans. But I say to the members of the government at this time: you're moving dangerously close to what Haultain warned Albertans to stay away from, and that's to become narrow and little Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is moving along very quickly. I want to make one last comment in this area in light of the referendum legislation that was introduced on Monday. I preface my remarks by saying that I know this will not be well received by members on the government side of the House. That doesn't really bother me a great deal. Regardless of that I've sat in this Assembly for 20 years this November. I don't believe there's a person on either side of the House who wants to see this country fall apart. I think it's incumbent upon either the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to give a commitment to Alberta and to Canadians that there is absolutely no intention of using Bill 60 in the form of a referendum that would lead to the separation of this country. I think that assurance has to be given to Albertans before the federal budget comes down. I'm convinced that when the federal budget comes down, that will add more fuel to the fire as far as separation is concerned. I think we have to do far more than go to the courts. We've got to enter into the political arena to get that amending formula changed, and I believe there's still time. I urge the government to give that assurance to Albertans and Canadians before the federal budget comes down.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to the question of the federal budget itself, and energy development. There's been a great deal of talk about an export tax on natural gas. Members get their information from a variety of sources. The best information I have is that, yes, the export tax will be going ahead. It'll capture part of the net-back which producers currently receive from exports to the United States. It's unlikely the border price of natural gas will be increased — well, it can't be increased because the present price is higher than many purchasers in the U.S. are prepared to pay.

In my judgement there will be two main effects in the private sector, in addition to a decrease in government revenue. Many of the small Canadian companies dependent upon the net-back to provide them with a source of cash flow will find themselves in very grave difficulty. The imposition of an export tax will capture a significant part of that cash flow and will put these companies in a position of borrowing more than they currently need to. In addition, an export tax will take in conjunction, with the three years it takes gas finds to get on stream, it'll make the value of their locked-in resources very low, and make capital-raising very, very difficult.

In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, it may be said that the large multinationals will do their best exploration not in the gas fields across this province but on 8th Avenue and 9th Avenue in Calgary. To me, this would appear totally contradictory to the federal government's intention of Canadianization of the oil and gas industry. I totally cannot understand what the federal government is thinking in this area. It's worth noting that many of the small companies are diversifying by putting a larger portion of their investment dollars south of the Canadian border. The presence of a natural gas export tax would only

aggravate this situation and certainly reduce exploration activity within the province.

Mr. Speaker, if the federal government is so unwise as to come forward with this export tax in the new budget, and with the rhetoric that's going on at this time, the gas export tax will be seen in the same light as the CPR, freight rates, conscription, and Louis Riel. The gas export tax will be a fifth grievance of very, very sizable proportion that western Canadians, particularly people in British Columbia and Alberta, will see as a very, very gigantic injustice to this part of the province. And the downright fact that the federal government is talking about setting up a western development fund — as I understand it, some \$4 billion, which will be very close to the amount they're going to take out of Alberta and British Columbia from the gas export tax; they're going to take it out of Alberta and British Columbia, and Saskatchewan to a smaller degree, put it into a western development fund, and then regenerate that, circulate that back into the four western provinces at the discretion of the federal government — is totally beyond my ability to understand. Frankly, how they expect westerners will accept that kind of thing — I totally can't follow them at all in that area.

The fund will take a billion dollars from the west and give it back under federal control and likely with federal strings attached. Mr. Speaker, this amounts to no gain for the west. Rather it's a loss of autonomy and amounts to central Canada determining the manner in which western Canada develops. One must question whether the result will be the same, or whether the priorities will be the same as those chosen by westerners.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of development of the tar sands, I believe the government has to reassess its position of saying that tar sands plants cannot go ahead until a whole energy package is in place. That strategy, I believe, had considerable merit when the Conservative government was in Ottawa, because they seemed to understand the need for an energy policy for Canada and to understand self-sufficiency. Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, by not allowing those two plants to go ahead, and not waiting for a total energy package to be agreed upon, we're really hurting ourselves in this province more — from the standpoint of employment opportunities, of development of technology, and of the viability of those two projects — than we are holding for ransom the rest of the country.

So I say clearly to the government that I think the government of this province should reassess its position, because I think we no longer hold all the chips. By holding those two plants back, I think we're hurting the long-term development of this province and certainly of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to make a few comments about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In the next few years the Heritage Savings Trust Fund will become much larger than it presently is. If it is not seen to be working for the interest of all Canadians, it will increasingly become a source of division within the nation. The fund must be made true to its objectives. It must return a rate of return to the people and help shelter the people of this province from the depletion of natural resources and the accompanying fall in government revenue. In addition, the fund must work to develop the economy of the nation as a whole as well as Alberta. These two points must be made more clearly and must be made more often to people outside the province.

If wisely used, the billions of dollars which will be in the fund represent a potential for great economic strength

for this province and this nation. It can be a source of economic, social, and political unity. If unwisely used, it becomes a target and a source of division between the energy-rich and energy-poor provinces within Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, when the fund was set up, it had two prime purposes: one, to gain a rate of return for Albertans for the future; secondly, to help Alberta move towards diversification. During the course of this fall session, my colleagues and I will be putting forward proposals which will call for us to clearly separate those two functions, and then to take a number of new initiatives in the area of economic diversification in the province. Frankly, in my judgment, we've lost much of our enthusiasm for development in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, the last area I want to comment on deals with the question of social problems and economic development. Everyone realizes that there's a high degree of relationship between resource development and social problems. This stress has been attributed to large-scale changes in individual life styles and community structure that accompany rapid industrial development and rapid economic boom. Problems associated with this development include increased rates of crime, particularly violent crime; delinquency; child abuse; family breakdown; mental illness; and one could go on.

Experience in rapid-growth communities in both Canada and the United States has shown that early preparation and early intervention can lessen the impact of resource development on the incidence of the associated problems. Consequently, it's imperative that social programs of the government become increasingly oriented to the prevention of social ills rather than the more traditional curative approach.

I say to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health that I was at least pleased that the minister, in the course of reviewing preventive social services programs, did not scuttle the concept. In fact, I take the minister's announcement to mean that the concept of preventive social services has been reinforced. The acid test for the sincerity of that reinforcement of preventive social services will be determined when the budget comes down this year and the kind of support that is available in the preventative area. I think it's essential in this province that we come to grips with the problems of economic development in a manner that has not been attempted in any other place on this continent.

During the past few months I had the opportunity to become quite familiar with some of the approaches being used in Colorado, that part of the United States where they're going through a similar economic boom. I think Alberta would be wise to look at some of the initiatives being tried by the U.S. federal government in that particular part of the United States, because their problems are very much the same as ours in trying to cope with very, very serious social problems.

Strangely enough they have come to the same conclusion that I hope we have in Alberta. That is, even though there is not a great political pay-off for the politicians, there is a great pay-off for the people involved if we really take some initiatives in the preventive side of things. They are now grappling with this problem of how you come to grips with preventive programs and, at the same time, show the public you are accountable to that there is indeed a positive result. Mr. Speaker, I see this as an area that we in this province not only have to come to grips with, but we have the finances to do it in a manner that could give leadership to all North America.

As far as this session is concerned, my colleague Dr. Buck will be introducing legislation dealing with individual privacy in an increasingly technological and computerized society. We will be introducing amendments to The Child Welfare Act. As I have already indicated, we will be introducing a number of amendments and suggestions dealing with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and a more comprehensive investment strategy there. We will also be having some things to say with regard to prevention of violent crime in our Alberta society. And we will be proposing legislation dealing with labor strife in this province as it applies to essential services.

If there are two things which are interwoven — and they are not constitutional patriation and resource taxation — they are the problems of social upheaval and rapid development and industrialization of an economy. This major problem must not be lost sight of in the immediate issues of the day, since it will be with Alberta for many years to come, regardless of what happens on this question of the constitution of this nation.

I conclude by saying very simply and very straightforwardly, Mr. Speaker, that the comments I have made today are my comments. I do not propose to speak on behalf of my colleagues in the official opposition. I expect them to speak on their own behalf on this question of the constitution. I would hope that many members on the government's side would use the same kind of approach. This is not a time when we have to adhere to party lines or rigid party loyalty. It is a time for putting Canada and this province far ahead of our own particular political parties and our political point of view.

Thank you very much.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn caught the Speaker's eye first, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too welcome the opportunity to participate in this most important debate. Before proceeding with the substance of my remarks, for the record I would like to say at this time to all members of this Assembly that I regard the hon. member who is the official Leader of the Opposition as a friend, a legislative colleague, and a man of great integrity who has made an outstanding contribution to our province. [applause]

In the course of his remarks last Monday, the Premier of this province spoke with some considerable feeling about the activities of the government since the Assembly adjourned in the spring of this year. I think it's important to note that he spoke first of the people programs: day care, health care facilities, preventive social services. I think it's very important — and I share the view of the hon. member who spoke previously — that despite the historic energy and constitutional struggle that we are clearly engaged in at this time, we must not lose sight of the pressures that the strong economic activity in this province have brought to bear and impose on Albertans individually and collectively. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the rapid in-migration occurring in the province of Alberta on a daily basis is straining our social facilities to their limits, is clogging our roads and our highways with an unexpected number of vehicles, and from time to time is wearing thin the congeniality that has been a trademark, a hallmark of Albertans for so many years. But that battle to maintain the spirit of Alberta that we are so

proud of can be won, and it will be won if we maintain a sensitivity and an awareness of the feelings and needs of Albertans in these very turbulent times.

But while we maintain and develop our programs for people, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to overestimate the magnitude of the historical drama that is this very moment being played out on the stage called Canada. That drama consists of two acts, but both acts are being staged simultaneously. Perhaps that is historically appropriate because, in the opinion of this member, the acts are in fact inextricably interwoven. They are, of course, the energy debate and the constitutional crisis.

Other hon. members are well aware of the fact that the energy debate between the producing provinces and Ottawa has raged on for altogether too long. Since the return of Mr. Trudeau to office earlier this year, Ottawa has consistently rejected an energy package put forward by Alberta which would give Canada a chance at energy self-sufficiency, a rare opportunity in the western world; a package that would increase oil prices to only 75 per cent of true fair market value, and only then after a period of some four years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this package has been rejected by Ottawa; rejected in favor of federal proposals for unilateral price-setting by Ottawa, and an anticipated export tax on natural gas that will have the undeniable effect of transferring even more of the resource revenues of this province and its people into the deficit-riddled federal coffers. The tragedy of all this is that amidst the apparent determination of Ottawa to put Alberta in its place, as it were, the unique opportunity that a country has for self-sufficiency is being thrown aside. It's being thrown away.

I don't intend to speak at length on the energy issue, not because it lacks in importance. Of course it is an absolutely crucial issue to this province and its future, and there can be absolutely no mistaking Ottawa's intention to make a resource revenue grab in its October 28 budget. Rather, Mr. Speaker, because I believe there is essential unanimity in this House, in this Assembly, on the position that Alberta, the government of this province, has taken in protecting the rights of the province and, most importantly, of the citizens in this province. I say that notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. member opposite with respect to the strategy on tar sands development. It would appear now that the hon. member would have this province do a flip-flop on that strategy as well.

Mr. Speaker, instead I will direct the balance of my remarks to the issue of the constitution, which has an obvious interface with the energy issue. Herein lies the rub. Those same nice people from Ottawa who are about to rob Albertans in broad daylight of our best, and perhaps our only, opportunity in Confederation to attain true equal economic stature with central Canada, are also bringing us, unsolicited, on the same stage and at the same time, a new constitution. It appears that some hon. members of this Assembly, while recognizing on the one hand the insidious nature of the attack on the energy front by way of unilateral move by Messrs. Trudeau and company, somehow see the unilateral federal move on the constitution as a positive step requiring only some modification, some alteration, a little more talk before it becomes totally acceptable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while recognizing that the Prime Minister has chameleon-like qualities that would put Rich Little to shame, I must ask hon. members how it can be that the same man who is about to plunder the coffers of the energy-producing provinces with one hand,

can be viewed at the same time as something akin to Moses descending the Mount, with the new constitution in his other hand. One doesn't require a great deal of formal education to see through the sham. All it requires is some good old-fashioned common sense.

It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I must reply to the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Let me assure him that the remarks I am about to make come from my heart, and have been arrived at after a very serious consideration of my conscience and my country. I appreciate the very diligent attempt the hon. member made to walk the tightrope on this issue, but I must say that he has fallen into the net of Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

I believe the hon. member was quite correct when he said that there is one issue here that is preoccupying the mind of the Prime Minister at this time. But it's not patriation. It's ensuring absolute control of the regions of this country by Ottawa. That's his goal, Mr. Speaker.

It seems to have been forgotten by the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, when speaking of the referendum that was held in Quebec earlier this year and the imagined need to act in the way the Prime Minister has acted on the constitutional question, that neither the present government of the province of Quebec nor, more importantly, the Liberal party of Quebec and its leader Claude Ryan, support the proposals of Mr. Trudeau. I think it's important to set the record straight on that very important matter.

I'm saddened to say, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the diligent efforts to the contrary of the hon. member on the opposite side, he did sound like an apologist for Mr. Trudeau. As a Member of the Alberta Legislative Assembly I feel saddened by that. I appreciate his positive attitude, if you will, his looking for the silver lining in the cloud. But I must say to that member, it's about to rain and we'd better get out our umbrellas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that his analogy of municipalities and the provincial prerogatives in that regard is inaccurate and, more importantly, troublesome to me, because clearly the authority of the municipalities in all provinces of Canada derives from the powers of the province vested through the British North America Act and related statutes. I can't believe that the hon. member was seriously suggesting that the jurisdiction of the provinces in this country derives from the federal government. I would ask the hon. member, who I see has taken a leave of absence for the moment from the House, that when he reads *Hansard*, which I trust he will, and considers my remarks, to consider the full implications of what he is suggesting, if in fact it is his view that the powers of the provinces in Confederation derive from powers of the federal government. I reject that view completely.

I'm troubled by the hon. member's apparent face on the issue of and the strength with which Alberta must cope with the constitutional crisis that has been imposed upon us by the federal government. In that regard, I'd like to refer specifically to *Alberta Hansard* of November 1, 1976, to remarks of the hon. member at that time when he spoke of a telex communication from our Premier to the Prime Minister, where our Premier said the following:

The Government of Alberta feels strongly that any unilateral move by Parliament, on the federal government's initiative, to remove the Constitution from Westminster would be a clear violation of the historical precedent of Canadian constitutional development and the conventions and customs which have grown up over the past decades concerning provincial participation in this very important matter.

The hon. member went on to say, on behalf of his party and presumably on his own behalf:

Mr. Speaker, we strongly support that position.

Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, the hon. member doesn't seem to strongly support it any more. In fact, what he seems to be saying is, gosh, they've gone ahead and done it, and I guess we're just going to have to acquiesce and accept it. To me, what's happening at this time is that we are really being put to the test of our words. It troubles me greatly, as a member of this Assembly, that the hon. member has beat such a hasty retreat in that regard.

I also appreciated the attempt of the hon. member to reassure us that Mr. Trudeau won't be in office in Ottawa forever. But of course the fatal error in that line of reasoning is that it fails to recognize that once this new constitution is adopted, if it is — and I hope with all my heart that it is not — it won't matter who the new Prime Minister will be thereafter. The deed is done. The instruments of absolute power of the federal government will lie at hand to be used when whoever the Prime Minister is feels inclined to use them. That in fact is the reality of the consequences of the constitutional proposals proposed by the Prime Minister.

In completing my response to the remarks of the hon. member, the Leader of the Official Opposition, I must say that the only conclusion one can draw from his remarks — and they're drawn with great sadness — is that the strategy of the member opposite appears to be: capitulate; give in. I'm saddened and disappointed by that conclusion and, with respect, I do not accept that advice.

But in fairness to those who have taken to being fence-sitters on this issue of the constitution, I think it has to be acknowledged that the sight of those Canada geese flying across our TV screens every night, night after night, makes one feel almost guilty about reviewing the Trudeau constitutional package with any sort of critical eye. It feels downright un-Canadian. I must say — and I think it's clear to most members of this Assembly — that it is a communication strategy specifically designed to intimidate our intellect and inflame our emotional feelings about Canada.

But the fence-sitters will still probably say, what's so wrong with Mr. Trudeau's proposal? He's going to make us whole, isn't he? He's going to bring our constitution home. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it's not a proposal at all. It's a parliamentary Bill in the form of a resolution that is at this very moment being rammed as quickly as possible through a Parliament under the control of a Liberal majority, with absolutely no western representation, and a government dominated by the person of Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

So to those who back away from strong and direct action to rebuff Mr. Trudeau and these proposals, who talk fancifully of the value of a more conciliatory approach, of more meetings, of more compromises, I simply must say that while there may — and I pray that there will — be opportunities somewhere down the road when dialogue will be an effective strategy, that time is not now. Mr. Trudeau has already sent his emissaries to Great Britain to pave the way for passage of the resolution as it stands, with no amendment. He has rejected holding up the Bill for a Supreme Court reference. He says, why bother. He knows he's right. He has set a severe deadline and, admittedly, by the member opposite, an unrealistic deadline for Parliament to pass that new constitutional Bill.

So to those who dream of across-the-table negotiations

in the immediate future, who see themselves as brokers or as the voices of reason and moderation who will save our country, I must simply say, with the greatest respect: wake up. Our country is about to be changed before our very eyes, changed into a Canada that will be a pale facsimile of the Canada that we know today and that we all love. It is true that we'll each be accountable to future generations to explain what we did to keep our country intact, as it was before this great constitutional crisis of 1980-81. I for one don't wish, and frankly don't intend, to tell my grandchildren that I fiddled and saluted the flag while Mr. Trudeau was lighting the match that reduced Canada to a burned-out skeleton of its former self.

I remind those who would applaud Mr. Trudeau — and apparently there are those who would — for acting unilaterally to patriate the constitution, that if the provinces in Canada were so foolish and naive to accept without the most strenuous challenge any form of unilateral patriation of our constitution by Ottawa, by that very act, by their acquiescence, they would have given away without so much as a whimper or a fight the very essence of Confederation. Surely if our constitution is anything at all, it is an agreement between the provinces and the federal government, a compact in which the provinces have clearly defined rights and responsibilities, and cannot be steamrollered by an all-powerful central government.

So quite apart from the fact that Mr. Trudeau and the Trudeau package involve far more than simple patriation, the unilateral act in itself represents a flagrant violation and contemptuous disregard for the federal nature of our country. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, if it succeeds it will destroy the delicate balance that binds our country together.

That is why it is so completely wrong to applaud Mr. Trudeau for his unilateral move, unless of course one doesn't happen to believe in federalism, with its checks and balances, with its ensuring that the federal government isn't all-powerful. In the judgment of this member, Mr. Speaker, unilateral action in itself leads us towards a unitary state, where the central government calls all the shots and the provinces do its bidding. I reject that view of Confederation. That is not the Canada we live in, and that is not the Canada I want for tomorrow.

Despite Mr. Chretien's view, which I completely reject, I would suggest to the hon. members of this Assembly that the late Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, a westerner who loved his country as no other man did, must have tears in his eyes as he watches this constitutional tragedy unfold. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad time for Canada.

Still, the fence-sitters might say that Trudeau had no choice. We know how those provincial premiers just love to get together periodically and bicker about the constitution. Gosh they'd bicker till the cows come home — so Mr. Trudeau tells us. Those fence-sitters would say that the premiers just aren't made of the same good conciliatory stuff that Mr. Trudeau is. Of course the sad truth is that there was considerable progress at the meetings held during the course of the summer on many items crucial to the patriation of the constitution.

The sad fact is that it was the federal government which refused to concur. Perhaps the saddest truth of all, Mr. Speaker, is that had Mr. Trudeau asked for consent of all provinces to a simple patriation of our constitution on the clear understanding there would be no unilateral federal moves to amend it without the provinces' consent, I believe that consent might well have been received. I believe this government recognizes the desirability of

bringing our constitution home, of having it here in Canada.

But the fact is, Mr. Trudeau never put that proposal on the table. In a very specific and deliberate way he did not place that question before the provinces. If some hon. members wonder why not, I suggest as recommended reading a close look at the leaked federal strategy paper. An agreement with the provinces wasn't a goal at all, unless of course it involved total capitulation by the provinces. That document, Mr. Speaker, would make Machiavelli blush, but it doesn't seem to trouble Mr. Trudeau. The fact is he's still following it to the letter.

To those who argue that all the package needs is some sort of confirmation that the provinces do in fact own and control their natural resources, a statement that is presently conspicuous by its absence and still has not been dealt with adequately by the Prime Minister, as the Premier indicated earlier this afternoon, to them I recommend for close reading the proposed federal amending formula. The Victoria formula would give both Quebec and Ontario a perpetual veto over constitutional changes, regardless of changes in population, while leaving the other provinces of Canada in a clear, second-class status, and creates the real possibility that a group of provinces can gang up one on the other. That's not my concept of federalism either, Mr. Speaker.

Even more frightening than the Victoria formula — and I don't believe this aspect of the proposal has received adequate attention — is the alternative which the federal government has seen fit to reserve unto itself in the constitutional package; that is, of course, the concept of the national referendum. At first blush one might think, gosh, what could be more democratic than a referendum, with a majority view prevailing, which is of course the democratic way. But clearly when one recognizes the population imbalance in Canada, when one realizes the fact that the federal government would set the rules, we realize that inevitably a decision favoring central Canada would result, particularly on issues like resource control. On that basis the proposal for an amending formula has to be seen in the same light as the entire package. The Premier referred to it, I thought rather kindly, as simply unfair. To his words I would add the following: not only unfair, but unjust and unacceptable.

So, Mr. Speaker, where do we as Albertans who all love our country go from here? Do we, as the fence-sitters would suggest, essentially capitulate, by acceding to a supposed senior government in Ottawa, by going hat-in-hand to Ottawa to plead for a slightly better deal and throw ourselves at the feet of the mandarins? To that I say, absolutely not. While I consider my entitlement to sit in this Assembly a privilege of the very highest order, I could not sit idly by if the prevalent view of this Assembly were to accede to Ottawa and to scramble for whatever we could salvage of Canada as we know it, all in the name of apparently saving our country.

Surely we must fight. We must fight with the determination that comes from knowing that our cause is just, with every ounce of energy that we can muster to stop this plan which will surely rip our country apart if it succeeds. Only if it is stopped will we perhaps have the opportunity to sit again at the negotiating table and, in the way that Canadians have always resolved their differences, come to an agreement and keep our country truly strong and free.

Mr. Speaker, we're not fighting for Alberta in this constitutional debate; we're fighting for Canada, a federal state which we love and wish to preserve.

In closing I would simply say that I hope with all my heart that all hon. members, regardless of their political stripe or their personal motivation, are up to the battle that does lie ahead. This is not a time for the faint-hearted. Our country hangs in the balance.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate this afternoon, I want to deal briefly with a few observations on some of the events that have occurred over the summer, then with the question of diversification, which I believe is an important issue. I want to conclude my remarks by dwelling for a few moments on the constitutional question, which has been alluded to by the other speakers in the debate so far.

Before doing that, however, I want to associate myself as a member with the remarks made by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn concerning the excellent work of the Leader of the Opposition over the last number of years. Regardless of where we sit in the House, we as members have respected the sincerity and honesty that the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury has brought to the deliberations of this Assembly, and wish him and his family, in whatever role he wishes to play in the future, all the best.

I'd like to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that several days before the Assembly began, we learned with a certain amount of sadness of the death of Richard Gavin Reid, the last UFA Premier of the province of Alberta. It would perhaps be appropriate, even though Mr. Reid was never a member of the New Democratic or CCF Party, for me as leader of that party to make a very brief observation.

Mr. Reid led the UFA, which in 1933 voted formally by convention to join the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. During Mr. Reid's active life in public affairs in this province, he made an outstanding contribution to Alberta politics as a member of the cabinet, as a Member of the Legislative Assembly and, for a period of 13 months, as Premier of the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I move from there to deal with the government's record in a number of areas over the summer. I am pleased to see that the hon. minister in charge of the public service is in his seat, because one of the areas where, frankly, there has been some real trouble is in public-sector bargaining. I look over the wages of Division 1 Clerks and see that on the basis of the Canadian Council on Social Development definition of a single parent with one child requiring \$1,000 a month to stay above the poverty line, some 70 per cent of the employees in Division 1 are paid below this level. Two-thirds are women; one-third, men. But of the people who are below the poverty level, according to the Canadian Council on Social Development, 94 per cent are women.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, even using the standards of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health of who would qualify for social assistance supplements, it's my information, using the province's means test, that some 23 employees of Division 1 would qualify for social assistance supplements.

Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying, and I don't mind saying this candidly in the House, is that as we review our bargaining, it is very important, because we've taken away the right to strike from public employees of this province, that we go the extra mile. We've got members of this government who are always talking about Ottawa going the extra mile. Yes, in many respects they should. But when it comes to bargaining with people whose right

to strike we have removed by legislative action, we must go the extra mile. When one looks at the present level of salaries, the turnover rate in our public sector, I would say that we indeed have some distance to go before we can argue that we have gone that extra mile.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation is not in his seat. While we hear rumors that we're going to go ahead with Labour Act revisions where there's been very little public input, nevertheless despite the fact that there was extensive public input in the Select Committee on Workers' Compensation, a number of major recommendations for important changes which would overhaul compensation legislation in this province and, in my judgment, make Alberta a leader among the provinces of Canada, I'm disturbed that this matter is going to be held over. There's no secret that we have a good deal of pressure. As members we've got it from various business groups. But the fact is that the special select committee spent almost a year deliberating the report. We had the assurance in the spring from the minister that we'd proceed this fall, yet we're going to be delaying any action. I find that particularly regrettable.

I raise it, Mr. Speaker, in the context of some of the labor problems this government has faced in the first six or seven months of this year: the nurses' strike, the strike of the public service employees. There's a widespread feeling, and properly so, among working people that the government is not listening and is not really playing a fair role.

In question period today we had some questions about the role of the Environment Council of Alberta. Despite what the minister has said, the track record speaks for itself: this government has been ignoring the major recommendations of the Environment Council of Alberta. You can go over the list and take recommendations which range from being quite insignificant to the fundamental ones, but in virtually every major recommendation, we've seen that the government has at best equivocated, delayed, and then, when we get to the bottom line, to use a favorite Conservative phrase, has said no.

Mr. Speaker, there is also the question of health expenditures, social services. During the question period and by resolution I'll be dealing with issues relating to those matters as the fall session proceeds.

I'd like to deal with the question of diversification of the Alberta economy. When one looks back at the passage of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund legislation in 1976, there was really very little doubt that the major public argument for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was the need to diversify the economy. Yes, to set aside money for a rainy day, as a savings account; that's true. But the major objective was to diversify the economy. All one has to do is look back to the speech the hon. Premier made to the Calgary Chamber of Commerce on September 6, 1974. I'd like to quote from that speech, Mr. Speaker, because I think some of the observations are useful to recall.

Since entering public life over nine years ago, my theme has been that this province's economy is too vulnerable, it is too dependent upon the sale of depleting resources, particularly oil and natural gas for its continued prosperity. We have perhaps another decade left to diversify our economy, to become less dependent . . . we must be in a position to be less affected by external factors. If we fail to do so in my view we will leave the next generation in Alberta a sad legacy indeed — a lack of economic muscle to

sustain our quality of life over the longer term.

It was this kind of thinking that, probably more than anything else, convinced people in 1975, when the promise was made by the Conservative Party in that election to establish a Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that this kind of thing was needed — to diversify the economy — because what happens after the oil and gas are gone? Yet when we look over the record, we find that six years after the Premier made that speech, four years after the heritage savings trust legislation was introduced in the House, Alberta in many respects is more dependent on non-renewable resources: more dependent for its revenue, no question about that; more dependent for its jobs; more dependent when you look at the goods-producing industry, the value added — almost every industry. Because I want to deal with other matters, I won't go over the industries one by one, but when you examine them all, in 1980 we are more dependent on oil and gas than we were when these observations were made six years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I realize, and all members do, that it's a difficult proposition to diversify the economy of a province like Alberta, that we are a long distance from markets and that there are problems to overcome. There's no question about that. Yet when one looks at what we are doing with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the Alberta investment division — I'm not talking about the capital works division or the Canada investment division, but the Alberta investment division. When you look at the way in which we've invested money in that division — and I intend to say a good deal more about this when we get into the debate in the Legislature on the Bill that was produced today. When you look at the investments: infrastructure — including Alberta Housing, Home Mortgage, Government Telephones, Municipal Financing Corporation — makes up 75.8 per cent of the total. Money that we're in fact recycling to the oil industry — the Alberta Energy Company, the Syncrude equity, the Gulf Canada convertible debenture, and the Canada-Cities Service convertible debenture — a total of 15.9 per cent.

The only aspect of this Alberta investment division that you could credibly call diversification, or at least with diversification potential, is the Alberta Opportunity Company and the Agricultural Development Corporation, with 3 per cent and 6 per cent respectively of the total, or a total of 9 per cent of the Alberta investment division.

I say quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that that isn't good enough. I say to the members of the House that if we're going to keep faith with the observations the Premier made in Calgary in 1974, which were totally accurate — we've got a decade left to diversify, said the Premier — we're going to have to do better; we're going to have to do much better than a portfolio of investments in the Alberta investment division that, quite frankly, are going to leave us as dependent in the future as we have been in the past on a non-renewable resource sector.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the remaining 20 minutes of my time to deal with the question of the constitution, because I think that really is one of the major issues to face Canadians and Albertans at the moment. I suppose we can examine two fundamental options as we look at the proposals before the House of Commons. One is to say we're going to take legal action; we're going to test it in the courts. We're not going to agree; we're not going to negotiate. We're going to take the view that we're going to fight it in the ditches, fight it in the trenches, fight it no matter what. The hon. member from Calgary put that

position as clearly as one could put it.

The other option, Mr. Speaker — and I suggest to members of the House that it is not capitulation at all — is looking at continued representation and negotiation.

Members of this House may not agree with the Premier of Saskatchewan, but I would rather doubt that many would accuse the Premier of Saskatchewan of being anything other than an eloquent spokesman for the west. Very few people over the years — and I've been at the constitutional conferences as an observer — have spoken more clearly or forcefully for the interests of western Canada at these conferences. I would just remind hon. members, before we paint ourselves into the corner on strategy, that we might well take a look at the observations made by the hon. Premier of Saskatchewan, who has objected, as I think most members of this House have, including myself — including myself — to the unilateral nature of the Prime Minister's move.

The fact of the matter is that however one may be opposed to the unilateral move, is there a route other than blind opposition? Is there a route other than saying no, a thousand times no; we're going to fight it. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Premier of Saskatchewan has suggested there is another route. In his observations in early October, after the announcement was made, he outlined areas of the package before the House of Commons where the government of Saskatchewan has rather serious concerns. I do not share all those concerns; some of them I do. But he is making representation to the national political parties and to the government of Canada.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that's what we have to be doing in this province if we're concerned about elements of the package Mr. Trudeau has presented to the House of Commons. The alternatives are clear. Opposition — we may be able to have all kinds of beautiful statements made in the Legislature, to the applause of all the Tory members — or the other route, to attempt to make changes where changes can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the basic question is, is it possible to make changes? Today we had the Premier suggesting that the flexibility shown by Prime Minister Trudeau was irrelevant to Alberta, totally insignificant to Alberta. We had members of the Legislature talking about so-called compromises. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at what in fact is in the commitment by the Prime Minister. It doesn't go as far as I would like it to. But I think members of this Assembly should be saying — if we want to see it go further, let's say where it should go further. But let's not suggest we're retreating.

What is the Prime Minister saying: confirm the jurisdiction of the province with respect to exploration, development, conservation, and management of non-renewable natural resources and forestry resources, including the making of laws in relation to the primary production of such resources. So you've got production, management, development, conservation, and exploration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What about ownership?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I'm coming to that. That's exactly right, the whole question of ownership as well. That is fundamental and part of it.

The other part that has to be expanded upon, in addition to ownership and control, is indirect taxation. Now the Premier says today that's insignificant. Well, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the freehold in Alberta,

21 per cent of the oil and 20 per cent of the natural gas in this province is produced from freehold. If you look at the amount of revenue we're obtaining from freehold, it's \$130 million. But if we were to apply our normal conventional royalty rate, it's almost \$800 million, or an additional \$670 million. Mr. Speaker, that is a significant difference.

Members are saying, oh well, that wouldn't be fair to tax them. The fact of the matter is that that's a decision the government should be able to make as a result of its public policy. The debate could take place in the Legislature. But what we found in Saskatchewan, where most of the oil was freehold — the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs would understand this, because of the court case in the province of Saskatchewan — most of the revenue which should ultimately go to the people of that province couldn't because of the fact that it was freehold. So when legislation was brought in, it was challenged in the court.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the advantages of the right of indirect taxation is that it would allow the government — members may jeer if they wish, that's fine; it's up to them — to make the decision. They may very well not want to tax their friends in CPR and Hudson's Bay. I would be rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, if this government would. But the fact of the matter is that at least that decision could be made where it should be made, in the Legislative Assembly. To dismiss the right of indirect taxation as being insignificant is absolute nonsense.

MR. JOHNSTON: We don't have the right to indirect taxation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that if we don't have that right and we were to ask the two companies involved to ante up the amount that we could get from the normal royalty levels, we would be in the Supreme Court so fast. Not even all the legal staff this government could pay at whatever the outrageous rates they pay them per day would be able to save our case.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the proposal for indirect taxation is a reasonable proposition which this government may not agree with in total; it may want to go further. But don't dismiss it out of hand. Really, don't dismiss it out of hand.

MR. COOK: On a point of order. Can I just ask the hon. member to clarify one item? Can he explain the difference between taxes and royalties, one being the ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have difficulty in conceiving the hon. member's intervention to be a point of order. But if he would like to ask the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview for leave to put a question, now or at the end of his speech, that would be in order.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to answer the question of the hon. member at the end of my speech, when I am trespassing on either his time or other members' time. If he wishes to ask a number of questions, in the process of attempting to educate him I don't mind taking the rest of the afternoon, although I might have to take longer than the afternoon.

DR. BUCK: It'll take longer.

MR. NOTLEY: That's true, probably the rest of the fall session, Mr. Speaker. But I would say to the hon. member that we'll deal with it on his time.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make again and stress, is that the proposition advanced today is of value. Let's not be cavalier. Let's not get ourselves all hyped up here and say, oh, it's no good; we don't like the Prime Minister; we don't like the leader of the federal New Democratic Party. Fine. Look at the position being advanced. If you want to make changes, there are opportunities to change it. We're going to have an all-party committee. The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs should hot-foot it down to Ottawa when that committee holds its meetings, and he can make representation in the areas where he thinks changes should be made.

DR. BUCK: We're lucky he came back from Japan.

MR. NOTLEY: If he gets back from Japan long enough to do some of his work in this country. No, Mr. Speaker, to dismiss it is completely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the question of the Charter of Rights, because in my judgment that issue is very important. As I look over the proposal before the House of Commons at the moment, I would say I have some concerns, not because the Charter of Rights will interfere with provincial jurisdiction; it also interferes with federal jurisdiction. It sets out controls over the rights of governments — federal, provincial, or municipal for that matter — to interfere with individual rights. It seems to me that as long as we've talked about Bills of Rights, from the time that Mr. Diefenbaker offered his Bill of Rights to Parliament more than 20 years ago, the argument has been expressed. I have agreed with that argument, that we should entrench a Bill of Rights in the constitution so that it applies everywhere, that the basic rights of being a Canadian should be the same in Newfoundland as they are in Alberta; should be the same in British Columbia as they are in Ontario.

Along with that, Mr. Speaker, and I say this bluntly in the House, it seems to me that we have to recognize language rights as a fundamental part of that package. I will say that in Spirit River-Fairview, as I will say it in St. Paul or in Falher.

The argument against a Charter of Rights is that somehow legislative assemblies or the Parliament of Canada looks after the rights of individuals better. I suppose one could draw from the British tradition at least some precedent for that point of view. But I would say that though I respect the arguments presented, I don't agree with them. I think it is important to entrench basic rights.

I look at the great republic, the United States, and I see that the whole question of segregation was not dealt with. It wasn't dealt with by the President or by the Congress. What really started it was Brown versus the Topeka, Kansas, Board of Education. It went to the Supreme Court. On the basis of the Bill of Rights, the United States began to move on the question of segregation. Politicians then followed. But if we'd waited for politicians to lead, we would've waited a long time indeed, Mr. Speaker.

Now as members know. I have a great respect for the Premier of Saskatchewan, but I frankly disagree with him on this issue. I think that a Bill of Rights, a Charter of

Rights — call it what you will — is absolutely necessary. Where I have some concern about the resolution put to the federal House, and where as a member of the Alberta Assembly I would like to see representation made, is the very wording where those rights exist except "reasonable limits as are generally accepted in . . . a parliamentary system". Now, Mr. Speaker, that is dangerous. The "reasonable limits" has meaning because there's international jurisprudence on reasonable limits. But the phrase, "as are generally accepted", is a very dangerous proposition. If we're concerned about a Bill of Rights that is the kind of thing we should be making representation to the federal government about. But there's no point in having a Charter of Rights, if you then have an escape hatch that you can drive a truck through. As one member of this Assembly, I think that's a concern I would offer this afternoon.

Then there's a question of the equalization formula. Well I can't imagine that any of us in this Assembly would be against some kind of equalization formula. As a matter of fact, from time to time this government has offered support for that principle. But again there is a problem in the package before the House of Commons, that we have to make representation on. In the formula we should be talking about payments, equalization payments to the provinces. The way it's worded now, we have "measures as are appropriate". So instead of getting the concept of equalization payments to the less fortunate provinces — which is a principle I think all of us can support — Mr. Trudeau is proposing is an equalization formula where the federal government itself can do an end run around the provincial governments. That's wrong.

But the assertion I would make again, Mr. Speaker, is that that's the kind of issue that we should be making representation on to all the national political parties, not just the Conservative party, and to the all-party committee. The Premier of Saskatchewan has made that point in his submission. Let's make it "equalization payments", not equalization in a vague formula that Mr. Trudeau can interpret at will.

Now the question of the amending formula. In 1976 I voted against this government's proposal on an amending formula, because I don't believe it is possible in a federal state to develop an amending formula where you have, if you like, special status for 10 provinces and a patchwork system of amendments. I said that in 1976; I have no reason to change my mind today.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time I do have some concerns about the amending formula that is set out in the resolution before the House of Commons. Some of the concerns have been alluded to by the member from Forest Lawn. If the Victoria Charter isn't agreed to or if there isn't unanimous agreement over the next two years, and the provinces are not able to meet this new test of 80 per cent of the provinces with 80 per cent of the population coming forward with an alternative proposal, then we are stuck with a referendum. A referendum in principle is a very good thing, but the crucial question is: who makes the rules? Who asks the question? Of course the thing that must concern all of us, regardless of where we sit in the House, is that under the formula now before the House of Commons, it will be the Prime Minister's party, the majority government, that sets the question.

That disturbs me, that's one of the reasons, as we look at the issue, that we've got to find some interim mechanism. I say "interim", because I think in the long run we will best deal with this matter by a reformed second

Chamber. I support the principle of the House of the Provinces, with equal representation from every province so that issues that have federal/provincial implication — whether spending limits, treaties that have provincial implications, cost-shared programs, or matters dealing with changing the constitution that affect provincial powers — in terms of framing the question that would be put to the voters, it would be this body that would do it. But I'm not so naive to think that over the next short while, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be able to get agreement to establish some kind of second Chamber.

So we're going to have to find an interim solution, and what is that interim solution? I would suggest that we've got to look at some kind of impartial commission between the period when the constitution comes into effect and the time that we can re-define the role of the second Chamber. I'm convinced that in the final analysis, it is a re-constituted second Chamber, representing all the provinces on an equal basis, that will give us the opportunity to deal with the question of how a referendum can break any logjam between the provinces on one hand and the federal government on the other.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister: let's go down, let's begin making representation on this sort of approach. Members here don't like to hear it, it doesn't fit in with the record, but the fact that the Prime Minister was prepared to move, perhaps not as far as members here would like, on the issue of provincial ownership and control of resources . . . Nevertheless the fact that we see an amendment, or at least the willingness to entertain an amendment, must lead us to the conclusion that it is worth going that extra mile to get agreement and to find areas where we can improve the resolution before the House of Commons, and improve it before it is passed.

I say as sincerely as I can to the members of the House: what is the alternative? The alternative to this route is some kind of constitutional armageddon where we arm ourselves, almost getting into a constitutional arms race, where, as the Premier of Saskatchewan very eloquently put it, we compound bitterness with bitterness and division with division. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we can do better than that. I say this as sincerely as I can. The west is strong. We don't need capitulation, but we do need accommodation. We don't need confrontation so much as co-operation. Above all, we need a new spirit of generosity rather than mean-mindedness. That doesn't mean we agree with everything Mr. Trudeau has done. We disagree with many elements in a fundamental way. But this is Canada, and if we're going to keep this country together, we must not paint ourselves into a corner. Let's make it possible to reach reasonable compromise and accommodation.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, even though I know it is not very popular to argue that in this House. Nevertheless it is ultimately the kind of position this government itself is going to have to reach, because you're not going to win all the points you think you're going to win. And the price of being defeated on those points one by one could be fatal for this province and for Canada.

Before we close all the doors to accommodation, before we get carried away with the rhetoric, I simply ask you to think carefully about another alternative that is now being followed by four of the provinces, including just recently the Conservative government of the province of Nova Scotia. We don't need to take a hawkish, hard-line position all the time. We're strong enough, Mr. Speaker, to be conciliatory.

MR. COOK: Could I ask a question of the hon. member?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has been exceeded slightly. It would appear that the hon. member didn't wish to allow time for your questions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if other hon. members would permit me to answer questions for the next 15 or 20 minutes or so, I'd be glad to accommodate the hon. member.

DR. BUCK: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no authority to amend the rules.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to, and still will, reflect the views of most of the constituents in the Three Hills constituency. But after listening to the remarks of both the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I can't help but make some comments.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview talked about the lack of diversification in this province among other things. I've now been in this Legislature for a year and a half. I know the hon. member has been here much longer, and I certainly realize why the hon. member still sits by himself. I would say that the hon. member, in my view, has absolutely no appreciation, not only for the people of this province and their desires, but for the way this province has evolved and operated successfully.

Just as an example, in 1979, 70,000 new jobs were created in Alberta, and 11,000 of those jobs were in the financial service sector. Now I say that's diversification. In my own constituency, which is basically agricultural, with the moves of the province in supporting a regional resources project bringing diversification of the light industrial sector to the smaller towns and villages, it has made a significant difference. We certainly don't find that sort of situation in our sister province of Saskatchewan with the socialist views that that government has held. I maintain that our success has been because we do adhere to the free enterprise system and we encourage it where ever possible.

The Premier certainly spoke well in terms of the kind of balance we have in this country. I can only say that either the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview wasn't listening or possibly he doesn't hear that well. Possibly that's been his problem for a number of years, and that's why he still is alone. We do have to be mindful of the fact that the federal government does have representation by population and that, to balance that, the provinces are supposed to be equal. Under the type of situation and suggestions we hear from our socialist people in this province and elsewhere, that just wouldn't exist. It would change the character of Canada to the degree that at least in this province none of us would recognize it as the Canada that we know.

Listening to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, first of all I have to concur with the comments made in terms of his participation in the public field of this province over the years. I can say in a very personal way, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has — I don't know who's been following who around, but he resides in the constituency next to me. I think he may have been born in a hospital and I was born right in the village of Acme, but we were born very close together. We even rode the same horse to school on occasion. Later on, as his family moved to the Carstairs area, I eventually found my way

there too. I suppose it's fortunate that the hon. Leader of the Opposition found himself living west of the No. 2 highway and I found myself living east, because there was a boundary in between. It's been a fairly significant one, because on one side is Olds-Didsbury and on the other side is the constituency of Three Hills.

But I'm very pleased to be a member of this Legislative Assembly and to serve at the same time as the hon. Leader of the Opposition, because certainly in many areas we have agreed. Of course there are some times that we don't agree, and I have to comment on a couple of his remarks, too.

Certainly, I was absolutely amazed at his mentioning Mr. Broadbent, the leader of the NDP, and his so-called spokespersonship on behalf of the western provinces and representation in terms of somehow looking after our resources, when historically I think we can look back on the stand of the NDP — I'm thinking of some comments by Mr. Barrett for instance — and know full well that they concur basically with a federal jurisdiction on the resource issue and a sort of meting out in bits and pieces to the provinces of some type of jurisdiction in that area. But certainly, they basically subscribe to the philosophy of pretty well full control in a federal sense.

The other remark, which was interesting in how it was received, was about Mr. Trudeau's time in office and how long it might be. I think one of our colleagues commented about it just seeming like a long time. It reminds me of somebody saying to me before I quit smoking: Connie, you're going to live much longer. I said that I felt it would just seem much longer. Probably that's about the situation we have with Mr. Trudeau.

For those of us who are privileged to be representing the people of Alberta in this Assembly and in particular to be government members, I for one am not going to apologize for being a Canadian living in Alberta with an Albertan's views of what Canada is all about. If you had talked to me possibly in late August, my remarks would have been slightly different than they are today. That's as a result of going to Ottawa, being privileged to sit in on the first ministers' constitutional conference, and having contact with people from all across this country whose main concern is this country. It was very obvious that we brought a very significant difference of views.

I subscribe that all those views are legitimate and, while it may be a little fractious at times in terms of a country, that they can be compatible. It's a little like the family dinner table. When there were seven people sitting at ours, all with very strong opinions, I don't think anybody would have suggested that those seven people should all be the same and fit into the same mould. I don't think they would have suggested either that the family should break up because we didn't agree.

In my view, as a result of viewing the proceedings and participating to some degree behind the scenes and in conference with colleagues across the country, we have a Prime Minister at this time who holds a particular view of this country. It's not shared by all of us; indeed, it could be questioned as to just how many do share his view. It was interesting to watch him in operation, because before I went there I was quite confident that anyone faced with a group of people representing the provinces of this country who had reached some consensus on a great many items — and I have in front of me 12 items from that conference that had been under discussion. I felt confident that somebody who had reached the point in time when he actually had been Prime Minister of a country for that many years, would have developed a

feel for the flavor of this country. I was absolutely wrong. I feel very sad in having to say that, because I tried very hard. I listened very hard for any sign of giving on the part of the federal government. After the so-called, the now infamous, document appeared on the scene, it was obvious why that wasn't happening.

It's interesting to listen to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview talk about flexibility. I saw that flexibility on the part of all the premiers. On the part of the Prime Minister, I saw an attitude that became indicative of exactly the way he feels about a good many of us.

We spoke of the fishermen in Newfoundland, and I then spoke to some of those people, and others besides Newfoundlanders, about my feeling that the farmers in Alberta, a great many of whom are in my constituency, are no different. The programs that the Premier of Newfoundland was talking about, the important things to the people of that province in terms of the family fishery, and the reasons things had to be a certain way as espoused by the people from Newfoundland, really were no different from our talking about protecting our family farm, a very basic unit in this province, one I think we're all very proud of. After those discussions somebody made a comment to the Prime Minister about Alberta being very sympathetic and indeed understanding to the fishermen of Newfoundland. He very quickly quipped: unless there was something in it for them. You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours, as if we weren't capable of somehow caring about other people across this country.

That was absolutely incredible in my view, and I suppose speaks to the problem we have before us today in the way the federal government is operating, in a very parochial fashion. I suppose if those of you who understand Transactional Analysis would dissect people's actions into three categories: the parent, the child, or the adult. I would say Mr. Trudeau operates in his parent all the time. He is like the father who has had a family — they've gone away, grown up a lot, and once in a while ask each other for a little bit of help — and for some reason or other, has decided sometime on in the game to call them all home and tell them what they are about to do, how they are going to run their businesses, and how their lives are going to be. That also is fairly incredible. But, again, that style of operation, I guess, leads us to the place we are now.

The amending formula, in my view — and I don't intend to get very technical in talking about the details. When people are discussing what's before us now, the people of this province in particular, if we go into pages and pages of documents, we'll lose them. I think they want to describe what this province and this country mean to them. When I am out in the Three Hills constituency — and we had a cabinet tour there just recently. It brought home in spades what was on people's minds. They're very concerned about this country. I take exception to comments that were made by people from central Canada when I was in Ottawa who would preface a lot of their comments to me by saying: but, Connie, I'm a Canadian. And I said, what does that make me?

When my parents came here in 1923 from Germany, they came after having read advertising in Europe, as many people did who came to western Canada in particular, that talked about what this country had to offer. They came having a particular view and built this country, in particular this province. I think we can all understand that view because, being busy putting clothes on children and food in mouths, I suppose we haven't given

the time to culture, the pursuit of the arts, and things like that, that are more prevalent in central Canada to the people who have been there a long time. We have been busy building. I was told that, on average, we may be 20 years behind in our culture here in Alberta. I am not sure whether 20 years from now I want to be where Ontario is. I think that's entirely up to the people of this province to decide.

When we look at our pioneers, we listen to them. The generation that's my age and the young people who are the age of my children who are now having their children — and somehow I've been thinking that I should be just a little bit lifted in my station in life because I became a grandmother this summer, but I really haven't noticed that much difference; life hasn't been any easier.

But listening to those people talk about Canada is very understandable, because they've been building, building, building. They weren't thinking about building just in terms of Alberta; they had a vision of Canada, seen through the eyes of this province.

There's very good reason the view of Canada by somebody from central Canada, the federal government in particular, would be different. I would hope that all of us would understand how they came to that view. They've looked at us in a certain way, and I suppose we haven't been adamant enough in reflecting what we feel about Canada. If we have reflected, they haven't received the message. It's a little like some of our colleagues in this House haven't received the message. I would say that because of that difference we indeed should be making every effort to let Canadians who live in other parts of Canada know. I think we've been doing that, and I would want to reinforce that we do that even more, to let them know our position.

To have somebody like the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview say that we're not willing to negotiate — I suppose that everybody gets down to a point in time when they take a position. The hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn did that well in explaining his position and how he felt about the fence-sitters.

For over two years, some of us who are new on the political scene have been discussing the paper that was evolved in this Legislature, spoken to in this Legislature, called *Harmony in Diversity*, and we have come to a consensus on that basic tenet in our philosophy and presentation to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would say it is indeed time not to apologize for having taken a stand, but to say that in this length of time it is darn well time we understood what the people of this province wanted, and reflected that to the federal government. We have probably gone as far as we can go in being flexible in the major areas, because we have a responsibility to reflect the views of the people of this province.

I'm really proud of the participation of Albertans in this country. The kind of energy package presented to the federal government and Prime Minister this summer reflected that kind of participation and willingness to give. As other members have said, it was rejected totally out of hand. I find that completely unacceptable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will just reiterate that I for one have agreed with my colleagues. We have come to a consensus. We have presented to the people of this province the platform and policy, which they accepted in an overwhelming way. I believe it's our mandate to reflect that. I urge all hon. members here, whenever the opportunity arises — as it has just recently with our honourable guests from Ontario visiting us — to reflect the feelings of

the people of this province at every opportunity available to us.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Government House Leader, there will be no sitting of the Assembly tomorrow evening. On Friday the government will again call Motion No. 15 on the Order Paper.

I move we call it 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:29 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]