

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

[Leave granted; Bill 76 read a first time]

Title: **Monday, October 27, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 76, The Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1980, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

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

[Motion carried]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 75****The Liquor Control Act, 1980**

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 75, The Liquor Control Act, 1980.

The purposes of this Bill are: to combine the present Liquor Control Act and The Liquor Licensing Act into one piece of legislation; to bring the legislation into the 1980s, as the existing legislation was last amended substantially in 1958; to discourage as much as possible the abuse of alcohol consumption, while at the same time recognizing the social use of liquor in licensed premises by creating some new licence categories and, in the case of sports stadia, to require municipal approval by by-law; and to establish an appeal body known as the Liquor Licensing Review Council to review licensing decisions and to modernize the sections dealing with the legal possession of liquor.

[Leave granted; Bill 75 read a first time]

Bill 71**The Natural Gas Rebates
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 71, The Natural Gas Rebates 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, the purpose of this Bill is to extend the provisions of natural gas price protection to Albertans through to March 31, 1985, as well as to establish a statutory fund from which payments of rebates will be made. A second important principle in the Bill is to make it possible to provide rebates for propane and heating oil to those Alberta citizens who do not have access to natural gas.

[Leave granted; Bill 71 read a first time]

Bill 76**The Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 76, The Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill is to assist remote urban groups in rural areas of our province to obtain natural gas service through construction and operation of high-pressure gas pipelines.

Bill 233**An Act to Amend
The Child Welfare Act (No. 2)**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 233, An Act to Amend The Child Welfare Act (No. 2).

This Bill will ensure that all child abuse cases that come to the attention of the director of child welfare, one of his agents, or employees of the Department of Social Services and Community Health, are recorded on the central child abuse registry. Secondly, the amendments will enact a clause making failure to report child abuse a summary conviction offence.

[Leave granted; Bill 233 read a first time]

Bill 223**The Small Business Development
Corporation Act**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 223, The Small Business Development Corporation Act.

The purpose of this Bill, which is based on similar legislation successfully in place in other provinces in Canada, is to provide an investment vehicle — namely, the registered development corporation — through which our government can provide financial incentives to Albertans to invest in qualifying small businesses owned and controlled by Canadians and doing business principally in Alberta. This measure should encourage and enhance the continuing diversification of our economy.

[Leave granted; Bill 223 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, first, copies of the reply to Motion for a Return No. 119 of 1980, and secondly, pursuant to sections 14 and 59 of The Legislative Assembly Act, reports for the year ended March 31, 1980, showing payments in respect of members of the Assembly.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of The Petroleum Marketing Act and The Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Act, I wish to table the annual report of the Petroleum Marketing Commission for the year 1979, together with included financial statements.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to The Students Finance Act, I beg leave to table the three copies of the annual report of the Alberta Students Finance Board for 1979.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today — rather a team effort — to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 12 grade 10 students from the Calgary Seventh Day Adventist School, located just west of Calgary in the active riding of Banff-Cochrane. They've had an educational talk with my colleague from Calgary North West. I understand they are sponsored by the Coralwood Academy, located in Edmonton Kingsway. They are accompanied by their sponsors Judy Kimbal and Mrs. Farag. Would you all please rise, and would the House welcome them to the Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Office of the Premier

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, on October 20, during the course of my remarks on the motion before the House, I reviewed the full history of the efforts by the Alberta government to negotiate an energy package for Canada with the federal government. We are of the view, and have been throughout, that every effort should be made by our government to negotiate such an energy package. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, last Monday I delivered a letter to the Prime Minister which, because of its significance, I would like to read into the record. It's a letter dated October 17, and states as follows:

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

As you are aware, we appear to be approaching a serious confrontation over national energy policies. When we concluded our discussions on July 25th, we both were of the view that we would be prepared to meet again if there was any indication that further discussions would be constructive.

It is our view that the Alberta proposal of July 25, 1980 made a number of significant modifications from Alberta's previous position, with the objective that a compromise was in the best interests of the nation. However, your response was substantially the same as your Minister of Energy, Mr. Lalonde, had earlier communicated to the Alberta Minister of Energy, Mr. Leitch. In particular, you advised that you were still considering a natural gas "export tax" despite the strong views of Alberta and British Columbia that such a tax was at least contrary to the spirit and probably the terms of the Canadian Constitution which provides that the provinces own the natural resources. You further advised that you would only agree to a schedule of conventional oil prices for the next four years which in effect would result in Alberta being forced to sell off its rapidly depleting light and medium crude oil reserves at approximately 50% of their value.

Since that time, the Premiers met in Winnipeg in August and all agreed, except Ontario, that a federal tax on the export of provincially owned resources would be viewed as a direct attack upon provincial proprietary rights over resources.

They also [all] agreed, except Ontario, that the price of depleting reserves of Canadian oil should rise in stages to more adequately reflect the value of the resource.

On October 2nd your Minister of Energy, Mr. Lalonde, met in Edmonton with Mr. Leitch and was

not prepared to alter the position of the Government of Canada on oil pricing for conventional light and medium crude or rule out a natural gas "export tax". While Mr. Lalonde did propose a new pricing approach for oil sands and non-conventional production, he no doubt appreciated that our earlier position of not separating that issue from a total energy package would be continued.

When I left you on July 25th, you did say that you would consider further my views with respect to the extent of federal funding required for energy programs, and also that the traditional "profits" taxation approach could provide the federal government with adequate revenues without resorting to tax measures, such as a natural gas "export tax", that are highly objectionable to the producing provinces.

It unfortunately seems that we are on the verge of throwing away the very important opportunity for Canada to become oil self-sufficient by the end of the decade. We both know such oil self-sufficiency can only be realized with full and complete cooperation between the federal government and the provinces which are major energy producers.

If you feel anything constructive would result from our meeting again, I would be prepared to fly within hours notice to Ottawa at any time to meet with you.

I received a telephone reply from the Prime Minister on Thursday afternoon, October 23, and he stated in effect as follows: that there was no room for negotiation; that they'd locked up the budget. He implied it was very inconvenient to alter it; that in any event there was no room for negotiation.

Department of Agriculture

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to announce to hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly that today, October 27, through this week to the 31st, has been designated Agriculture Week in Alberta.

The purpose of Agriculture Week is to increase the awareness of agriculture's importance, potentials, and constraints. At a time when other issues are demanding Alberta's attention, it is tremendously important to keep our citizens aware of agriculture, our renewable resource.

We are taking agriculture's message to the schools, libraries, museums, special events, businesses, and shopping centres. We are preparing displays, demonstrations, public forums, school courses, contests, television shows, radio and newspaper ads, a speakers' bureau, tours, and other educational programs.

All segments of the agricultural industry have been approached for both ideas and contributions to support Agriculture Week projects.

We hope that an awareness and support of agriculture will start here in the Legislative Assembly and act as a catalyst to the rest of Alberta. Your participation in Agriculture Week can begin now by encouraging the businesses and people of your constituencies to support Agriculture Week and by directing both your suggestions and your contributions to the Department of Agriculture.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Hospital Services**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my first question is addressed to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It stems from the minister's announcement last spring of the construction of new hospitals. After that announcement, is the minister in a position to indicate if he has an idea how many hospitals are presently under construction under this new program, and how many are at the planning stage?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice and report back with exact numbers. The total number of projects is 91. Not all of them include totally new buildings. A number are under construction, and a number are in various stages of planning. For that amount of detail, I would have to take notice and report back.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate if his department has addressed itself to the concept of freeing some of the people who are in active treatment beds and putting them in chronic hospitals or auxiliary hospitals? What is the government's philosophy as to moving these people out of active beds into chronic beds?

MR. RUSSELL: For a number of years, Mr. Speaker, a policy has been in effect that extended care patients should be maintained in the extended care beds that do have lower daily costs. We try to maintain a proper ratio of those kinds of beds in each hospital region. I don't know what more I can say, other than it appears that the hon. member and I are in agreement on that policy.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on that issue. Can the minister indicate if he has an idea how many beds presently being used for chronic people will be freed, reverting to active treatment beds?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't know if I could get those numbers with any great accuracy, Mr. Speaker. I say that because a lot depends on the assessment given by the patient's doctor. That assessment isn't always the same in different hospital districts, but I do know that in a number of jurisdictions doctors are claiming that extended care patients are taking up active care beds.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Can the minister indicate what consultations have been going on between the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care as to supplying nursing staff for these proposed hospitals?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of discussions, but of course discussions between ministers are not normally the subject of the question period. I can point out, however, that we are examining very carefully the government response to the task force on nursing which has been put before this Assembly. In addition, we are proposing to review their future roles with the various training facilities in the province, so we might make sure that we have reached the maximum

capability insofar as Alberta's training capacities are concerned.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care indicate: after the nurses' strike was terminated, has this caused us to be in a more deficit position as far as our nursing staff situation in the province is concerned?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the member raised the question, because it's an important one.

At their annual meeting, just concluded last month in Winnipeg, the ministers of hospitals and health discussed the matter. The best advice we have is that currently there's a fairly serious shortage of nurses across Canada and in most jurisdictions in the United States as well. We're told that this is a cyclical thing that for some reason occurs from time to time. This cycle does seem more serious, and the provinces exchanged information and ideas as to how we might improve that situation.

I think most hon. members are aware that at their meeting a year ago the western premiers asked the four western provinces to undertake a joint health manpower study. This year at our Canadian ministers' meeting, that was expanded so that all provinces will be participating in it. Because it is not just nurses; it's all health care personnel. It's not just in Alberta; it appears to be countrywide.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In implementing the new hospital construction program, I understand that a standard plan is being used in the rural areas. Could the minister indicate whether, within that plan and as a result of it, a number of the maternity facilities and active beds are being reduced in the rural areas of Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think I understand what the hon. member is getting at. It's not a standard plan. It's a plan that has standard component parts that can be put together in a variety of ways to meet the requirements or local site conditions for a variety of communities throughout Alberta.

We're doing this because we think it's much quicker and in the long term will be more economical than asking all those communities to start from scratch and each custom design their own hospital. We're doing this by treating the boards involved as a group client. We meet with them and then get on with revising the drawings. I think you can imagine that in such a situation each community is not able in all cases to get all the things it would like to see in those plans. Notwithstanding that, I believe they are still very excellent basic community hospitals.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a last supplementary to the minister. Can the minister indicate if he's in a position to indicate to the Legislature if the minister or the government has reconsidered its decision not to build a children's hospital in Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that proposal has been referred to the Edmonton area's hospital planning council. I think I explained earlier that that body plus its sister body in Calgary have been allocated substantial funds to undertake metropolitan bed-need studies in order to give

us a more accurate assessment of the numbers and kinds of beds we'll be needing in the two metropolitan areas in the long term.

The construction of the proposed new children's health care centre would have a direct effect on some of those beds, particularly as they're now located in existing hospitals. So I've told the proponents of the proposal that we're referring their suggestion to that study, and that the idea of a children's hospital should be an element considered in the study.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question for clarification to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to give the Assembly any details as to when the study will be complete?

MR. RUSSELL: No I can't, Mr. Speaker. I would think it would last several months, because of its broad terms of reference. As far as I know, neither study has started yet. The task forces that are supposed to be developing terms of reference and interviewing consultants are just in their start-up period. I don't think either body has yet hired its consultant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the interest in the general question of a children's health care centre in the city, has the government given any general request for a time frame? The minister said several months. Are we looking at four months, six months, a year? Are people in northern Alberta going to be able to have some definitive position from the government as a consequence of these studies by this time next year?

MR. RUSSELL: I would hope so, Mr. Speaker. But I think the important thing to recognize is that children are not suffering from a lack of adequate hospital facilities in northern Alberta as a result of our taking our time to make a final decision with respect to that proposal. Therein of course lies one of the essential parts of the problem; that is, there is actually a surplus of pediatric beds in the Edmonton metropolitan region now. The question as to whether or not they should be closed down and replaced with a new facility somewhere else is an important one that is a matter of concern to a number of hospital boards. That's why referring it to the general metropolitan study is so important.

Hazardous Chemicals

MR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my second question is addressed to the hon. Minister of Environment. It has to do with the pesticide 2,4,5-T, which is a known carcinogenic. Can the minister indicate if the provincial government is considering banning 2,4,5-T?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, as I've said before in the Legislature, we rely a lot on the judgment of the federal government that does all the licensing of products, both that come into Canada and that are manufactured here. To the best of my knowledge, the recommendation so far by the federal government is that they have not detected sufficient evidence in their studies to indicate that there should be any wholesale ban of 2,4,5-T.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if the minister or his department has corresponded with the counterpart in the United States, indicating that the United States has banned 2,4,5-T?

ed States, indicating that the United States has banned 2,4,5-T?

MR. COOKSON: Yes, we are aware of that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate if there was very extensive use of this pesticide in Alberta last year?

MR. COOKSON: Very little, Mr. Speaker. We have suggested to users of this particular chemical, which contains a specific substance known as dioxin, that we feel there should be less and less use of it. The result is that most chemical companies have removed a fair portion of the particular chemical from the market. It is used only in a very limited way at this time, specifically for brush spraying.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what monitoring the minister's department does as to the amounts used? What kind of mechanism is in place, Mr. Minister, to indicate if it's being used by the general population or just by commercial operators? I'd like to know if the minister can indicate what monitoring there is.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, under The Agricultural Chemicals Act, we have at the present time laid down a pretty specific plan of licensing and handling by those who manufacture and distribute the product and who have it for retail or wholesale. So under the licensing procedure and under that particular piece of legislation, a particular agricultural chemical will fit into a certain category. Once they're in that category, unless we see fit we adjust it to another category. In this respect, through this procedure and through working in co-operation with Agriculture, we pretty well know how the chemicals are being handled.

Feed Grain Sales

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just recently the advisory committees to the Wheat Board and the Canadian Livestock Feed Board recommended that the complete control of the domestic feed grain market be returned to the Canadian Wheat Board. This has serious implications for the farmers of Alberta. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would relate to the House whether or not a response to that is being contemplated.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we were made aware of the interest being shown by a joint meeting in Ottawa in the change of the coarse grain feed Act and the asking of the federal government to place back under the purview of the Canadian Wheat Board the sales of domestic feed grain. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it was a request to revert to a system that existed sometime in the past. It was found rather difficult. At that time it wasn't workable.

We were rather concerned when we read the telex and its implication to Albertans, Alberta being the prime producer of barley and of course one of the chief areas of feed grain. That was discussed in the telex itself. We produce about 50 per cent of the total feed grain in Canada. We immediately notified our concern to the federal people, to Mr. Argue and Mr. Whelan, and suggested that before any move was made we have an opportunity to present the case of the western feed grain

and the comments of the province of Alberta, and felt at that time that any move away from what existed would certainly be a detriment to producers in this province, both in the loss of some of the freedoms of the disposition of coarse grain and in pricing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. When the feed grain issue was first discussed and taken from the purview of the Wheat Board in 1974, the then minister indicated that there would be a producers' plebiscite within a year. What is the position of the government of Alberta with respect to the question of a plebiscite, a referendum among the producers, as was first promised when the feed grain policy came in on an interim basis in 1974?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the indications we have over this last year, both by direct contact and in correspondence, is that the producers of various commodities of grain in this province — some beyond the feed grain aspect — would request a relaxation of the sale of the basic product. Of course the two that come to mind quite recently are soft white wheat and oats. We have stated in the past that if the producers wished to have all the grain withdrawn, or the options of which they as producers wished to show to the Wheat Board their intentions, we would have no objections to the producers passing their comments individually or collectively through the organizations they own, to make that representation to the Canadian Wheat Board.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question is not whether farmers individually may wish to contact the Wheat Board, but whether or not the government of Alberta has any official position with respect to the very clear commitment given in 1974, when the interim policy was announced, that there would be a formal opportunity for producers to register a verdict on the feed grain question, just as they did on the rapeseed question in 1973.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, that indication as to their wishes has been made to us, and we have forwarded their wishes through the organizations to which they belong at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. My question is not the wishes of individuals or even of farm groups, but whether or not the government of Alberta favors a plebiscite among the producers on this matter.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the province and indeed the Department of Agriculture have always felt that through their indications the producers of this province collectively, and certainly the majority, would give us the opportunity to present to the federal government the option of marketing their products.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can I take it from the minister's response that the producers, by majority — that in fact the government does favor holding a plebiscite as was promised back in 1974 by the then minister in charge, Mr. Lang?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, by receiving their requests and passing on the information on behalf of their

associations, we have felt that we have met and passed on their wishes.

Medical Fees

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It concerns the Hall commission report. Is the government in a position to advise the Assembly whether any decision will be made during the fall session, any legislation introduced, concerning the question of extra billing?

MR. RUSSELL: As hon. members know, Mr. Speaker, it had been our intention to introduce such legislation. It's still being considered for introduction this session, plus an alternative to it. Whether or not one of those will come forward, I'm not able to say today. Unfortunately, since I last reported to the House on the matter the situation has been somewhat complicated by the stance of the federal government and their response to the Hall commission, which indicates the distinct possibility of federal legislation being introduced early next year which would ban extra billing or opting out.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Since the federal minister is quoted in the House as indicating that no action would be taken pending provincial agreement on the question of some method of binding arbitration, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly today what the position of the government of Alberta is with respect to binding arbitration as recommended by the Hall commission?

MR. RUSSELL: We've indicated to the Alberta Medical Association that we would agree to final, binding arbitration for fee schedules. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, we're the only province in Canada that has responded favorably to that recommendation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister indicated that federal action may delay provincial action. However, from the quotes attributed to Mme. Begin . . . Is the government of Alberta prepared to move on the question of second billing, in view of the fact that the other provinces have not agreed to binding arbitration, and the minister has indicated that no federal legislation would take place until they do?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is confusing the two issues. Binding arbitration is simply setting the provincial fee schedules in each province with each respective medical association. The action Mme. Begin has indicated she'd be prepared to take after conferring with the provinces next February would be to legislate federally against opting out or extra billing. That's what makes it a little complex, particularly for Alberta, being the only province in Canada at the moment that doesn't have some sort of opting out legislation on its books.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In studying the options, what assessment is being given by the government to the Quebec system, where opting out also means that the patients of doctors who opt out forego the ability to bill the plan?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't consider the so-called Quebec plan, for two reasons. I think it's punitive for the patients who see the doctors, and in discussing it with the Quebec minister, I'm advised that there are only in the neighborhood of 24 or 25 doctors, all of whom are clinical psychologists and have an extremely wealthy clientele. That's the so-called Quebec method of opting out.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What is the government's position with respect to the recommendation in the Hall report that premiums should be eliminated over a period of five years because they tend to reduce the accessibility of people to medicare? Has the government a formal position on that? What contingency plans has the government developed in the event that the federal government legislates in the area?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think we've made our position very clear, as have several other provinces. We believe that a direct levy which helps support the costs of medical care is a good thing. By identifying it through health care premiums, it's not only a good financial program but certainly helps to identify the plan to the people using it. So we oppose, as did all the provinces — excuse me, I shouldn't say all, because Saskatchewan didn't. We opposed, as did most of the provinces, the concept that there should be no identifiable charge for health care or hospital services in Canada. The federal minister made her position very clear: she believes that there should be no hospital user fees, no premiums, and no extra billing, and that the income tax system should support the costs of the program.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What studies have been undertaken by the government of Alberta on the impact of medicare premiums on the working poor, those people with taxable incomes just above the \$5,000 level, especially in view of the observations contained in the Hall commission report? Is the government giving any consideration at this time to increasing the threshold at which premiums are paid?

MR. RUSSELL: To answer the latter part of the question first, Mr. Speaker, those thresholds or income limits are under continuing review for both the groups excluded from paying premiums altogether and those that are partially subsidized. As far as ongoing studies, they take that part of the review that I mentioned. The contingency plan, if all other avenues are closed, would be to resort to the methods used by other provinces; that is, to increase income taxes or institute a sales tax.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Regarding the premium issue, Mr. Minister, could you please advise the House if you have had many representations from Albertans regarding our premiums, and if they object to them?

MR. RUSSELL: I've had a handful of briefs from organized groups relating to that matter, Mr. Speaker. It was interesting that when the provinces met with Mr. Justice Hall and questioned him directly on that point, he was able to say in response to a question posed by myself that he couldn't find or hear of anyone in Alberta who

had been denied good medical care because we had either premiums or extra billing.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise what percentage of doctors are now extra billing, and whether this percentage has decreased over the last year.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the percentage has not decreased; it's remaining pretty constant at just above or below 37 per cent.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether the percentage of extra fees billed, as opposed to the number of doctors billing, has gone down or remained constant?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there is some interesting statistical breakdown with respect to the matter the hon. member is getting at. As I recall, the dollar volume is going up, and it's going up within a smaller or decreasing number of practising physicians. From the analysis we have, it would appear that a very small number of doctors are extra billing quite substantially, and that the majority of doctors who are extra billing are doing it in relatively small amounts.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister considered the possibility of what the legal profession calls taxing legislation, where abuses in billing or extra billing can be controlled, say, by the College of Physicians and Surgeons?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Grain Transportation

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister or any representative of his department met with federal officials regarding the slow movement of grain in western Canada?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I haven't met with anyone tied directly to the federal government, other than to have passed on the concern of our producers in regard to the problems in the movement of grain, mainly in the southern part of the province.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. Could the minister outline to the Legislature at what stage the manufacturing of grain cars is at this point, and when they'll be ready for use?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, we've had considerable difficulty with labor relations and work stoppages in the plants that received our contracts. Hopefully we'll begin to take delivery on December 15.

International Assistance

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Culture is prompted by a constituent's written and telephoned communication regarding our financial international assistance program. Could the minister please indicate why the government has cut back on funding to learner centres in the province?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government has never cut back on funding to learner centres. Learner centres are funded through the Alberta Council of International Cooperation, and also from CIDA.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government cut back on the matching grants to agencies which assist internationally?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not. Last year we paid just under \$7 million to the international assistance program. To date, we have accepted projects in the amount of approximately \$8 million. So we certainly have not changed our policy in the funding of international aid programs.*

Energy Pricing Negotiations

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is with regard to the letter tabled today and the response of the Prime Minister. First of all, with regard to the letter: I certainly think it indicates a noble effort on behalf of the government to negotiate. Secondly, with regard to the response of the Prime Minister: it seems to be rather a hard-nosed response. The response of the Prime Minister was that the budget was locked up. Could the Premier indicate at this time whether the Prime Minister had any options other than giving that specific answer at the late date, after October 17?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to answer, because we had an agreement that I would respond in the House today with regard to tabling the letter and also respond on the basis of what I reviewed with him at the conclusion of the telephone conversation. But it was clear to me that — although obviously they were negotiating, or felt they were, on October 2 when Mr. Lalonde, the federal minister, was here meeting with the Alberta Minister of Energy and Natural Resources — they had reached a stage with regard to budget preparation that, the Prime Minister implied to me, it would be very inconvenient to alter. But he went on to say, at both the conclusion and the commencement of our discussion, that he didn't see any room for negotiation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier elaborate? Following the meeting with Mr. Lalonde on October 2, was there any feeling by the Premier or the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources that, potentially, there was room for negotiation? Or were negotiations after October 2 at a standstill, and was there no further movement by the federal government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to respond to the question dealing with the October 2 meeting. But it was my feeling, in writing the letter tabled in the House today, that I should make one final effort to see if there was a possibility of reaching a compromise and avoiding a confrontation. That's why, as I said in the letter, there were two items that I thought he was prepared to consider further: the extent of federal funding required for energy programs — and no doubt in a few days that will be a matter of considerable debate — and the traditional profits taxation approach; in short, that there were ways in which revenues of a significant nature could be ac-

quired from the petroleum industry with the traditional profits taxation approach. I was bringing the nature of that discussion we held on July 25 back to the Prime Minister's mind.

But with regard to the portion of your question that deals with the view as to whether or not there was anything further by way of negotiation from the federal minister, perhaps I'd refer that to our Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I think it fair to say that throughout the discussions I've had with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, there has been no movement in the area of either the export tax on natural gas or the pricing of conventional light and medium crude. There was some movement, including movement on the October 2 meeting in Edmonton, on the pricing for synthetic crude from the oil sands and for certain enhanced recovery oil. But apart from that, there was no real movement by the federal government throughout the discussions. Certainly, following the meeting of October 2, there appeared to be no areas in which there was likely to be any further movement or any opportunity for negotiation.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. With respect to the profits taxation approach, has there been any discussion about what changes would be necessary in federal corporation tax law in order to yield sufficient revenues to the federal government? Is there some possibility of an interim approach, if it is going to take a period of time to make the necessary changes in the federal corporation tax structure?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's our judgment that legislative changes are not required. There was some concern about a year ago — and the hon. member may recall — with the question of the Canada/U.S. tax treaty arrangements in terms of taxation of foreign-controlled companies. But since that time, considerable progress has been made. What they call "leakage", I believe, in terms of the profits or cash flows that are there, has potentially now been closed off, as a result of the understanding that has been reached between Canada and the United States on the tax treaty.

So the position is that it doesn't really take legislative changes; it may take regulatory changes. That would be a matter solely and appropriately within the federal jurisdiction, to determine the degrees to which there should be incentives or depletion allowances or write-offs of that nature, whether they should or should not be adjusted. But within the profits taxation approach, we believe that there is adequate potential for federal revenues to cover the funding that we feel is necessary to do those things required to be done by the federal government from an energy point of view.

MR. PAHL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if there's anything else in the Thursday telephone conversation between the Premier and the Prime Minister that he may wish to share with this House, in view of the statement of the Finance Minister in the House of Commons on Thursday, that same day, that the federal budget details were not yet finalized.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I observed that question, I believe by Mr. Knowles, to the federal Minister of

*See page 1240, left column, paragraph 4

Finance, and that answer by the federal Minister of Finance. I don't know that I can usefully comment on that, because it was given within the context of parliamentary question period.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture would like to deal further with an answer previously given.

International Assistance
(continued)

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to correct an answer I made to the hon. Member for Calgary North West. In my enthusiasm, I increased last year's grant by \$1 million. The program received approximately \$6 million last year and, to date, the government has approved projects to just under \$7 million.*

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 24: Mr. Horsman]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the state of the province address, in which the Premier has outlined in considerable detail the progress made by our government since the Legislature rose after the spring sitting, I want to compliment the Premier on the very comprehensive nature of that review and to underline how important it is that the people of Alberta understand how effectively this government has been dealing with many social issues, despite the fact that we have been preoccupied with matters of great concern with regard to energy and the constitution. I hope the people of Alberta will indeed have the opportunity to review what has been expressed by the Premier in this Assembly, because the message was indeed very important.

Secondly, may I add my voice to those who extend to the retiring Leader of the Opposition best wishes in his new role. As he indicated, he has been in this Assembly for 20 years, and has served the people of his constituency and his party effectively over that period of time. I want to say how very touched I was with respect to his comments about the importance of the family in our society. I want to share the same sentiment with members of the Assembly today. It is a difficult thing for those of us in public life to leave our families each week and come to the capital city of Edmonton. Personally, I share the views expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. I wish him and his family well in the years ahead.

There were a number of matters mentioned by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, with respect to my Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: student finance; the introduction of — and we will be debating this later in the Assembly, so I won't dwell on it further — the heritage scholarship program; the 1980s advanced education endowment fund, which is unique in Canada; and furthermore, the skilled manpower training that we are able to provide in this province for our young people and people wishing to enter the world of work.

I want to take issue now, if I may, with some remarks that have been made in this province in recent days by my counterpart on the federal level, the federal minister of manpower. Certain reports have come to my attention, and I think it's important that we dispel some of the notions being put abroad in the province with respect to the effectiveness of our training capabilities in this province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, without any question and with no apology to Mr. Axworthy or any other member of the federal government, I have no hesitation in standing in this Assembly and saying that Alberta has the finest apprenticeship program and skilled manpower training program to be found anywhere in Canada.

DR. BUCK: Started by the Social Credit government.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interjection from the hon. Member for Clover Bar. Every great oak has a beginning somewhere — with a nut. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I want to be serious on this particular point, however, because I think it is inappropriate indeed for the federal government, in the cloak of trying to sell a constitutional package which we find offensive, to come into this province and make threats about withdrawal of funds from the federal coffers to a province that is doing more than its share to train young people in skills. I suggest that's part of the smoke screen being put about by the federal government and its various cabinet ministers, and I reject it.

I understand the hon. minister is in Edmonton today. [He] asked for a meeting with me, but found other more important things and cancelled the meeting after it had been arranged. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to express to the members of this Assembly, as I will express to him — and have done so, as a matter of fact, in a letter — my very real concern that it is not appropriate to the many people involved in our manpower training programs and our apprenticeship programs to make the statements that have been made.

I reject the criticism of the programs in this province. In a province with slightly over 8 per cent of the population we have trained and are training, not only in our technical institutions in southern and northern Alberta but through an expanded program in our colleges system, over 25 per cent of the total apprentices in Canada today, in 40 trades. Earlier this year, we as a government announced an expansion of that programming, in terms of capital expansion, of over \$100 million. Mr. Speaker, we recognize our responsibility, and in my mind — and, I trust, in the minds of any members of this Assembly — there is no notion that we require an imposed program from the central government in the field of education and training. That is our responsibility, and we are meeting it and meeting it well.

Now I want to touch upon the constitution. I find it ironic indeed that in this year, 1980, in which we as a province have been celebrating 75 years of belonging to Canada, we should find ourselves under serious attack. That is exactly what it is, Mr. Speaker. Make no mistake about it. I find it disturbing, and I share the view expressed by other members of the Assembly in this debate, that they are saddened. That's the most commonly used word in this entire debate. Members of this Assembly are saddened by what is taking place in Canada today with respect to the constitution of this country.

We have placed a comprehensive proposal before the people of Alberta and the members of this Assembly. As

*See page 1239, left column, paragraph 3

the Premier has pointed out, we are the only provincial Legislature to have done so. We have put forward *Harmony in Diversity*, a discussion paper which outlines in detail the position of this province as approved by a vote in this Assembly, and emphasized time after time in speeches by our Premier, other ministers, and many members of the Assembly. Having done that, we have taken that position to a number of constitutional conferences and discussions.

We have indicated quite clearly that we are prepared to negotiate and, if deemed necessary, to make appropriate changes after those negotiations, but that we would bring them back to the members of this Assembly and to the people of Alberta and discuss them again. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it is in marked contrast to the position taken by the government of Canada, the Trudeau government of today. What is their constitutional position, and how do they achieve it? They issue, unwillingly perhaps, a document which I think should live in infamy in Canada, 64 pages of the most cynical approach to partnership in government that I have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by what I read in that 64-page document. I will not repeat the remarks on some of those comments so effectively made on Friday by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, particularly with regard to the legal strategy, except to say that I as a Canadian who very much loves this country, I am appalled at any government that would come forward with the cynicism espoused in that document. The concluding comment on page 60, "The probability of an agreement is not high", is particularly offensive. Of course it's not high. It was doomed to fail. From the cynical nature of this document, it's obvious that the Trudeau government wanted that conference to fail, so they conclude by saying "The probability of an agreement is not high". I quote again:

Unilateral action is therefore a distinct possibility. In the event unilateral action becomes necessary, Ministers should understand that the fight in Parliament and the country will be very, very rough. For as Machiavelli [our Prime Minister's great hero] said: "It should be borne in mind that there is nothing more difficult to arrange, more doubtful of success, and more dangerous to carry through than initiating change in a state's constitution."

Those are the concluding words of the operative part of this document.

I hope it is very, very rough. As Canadians, as Albertans, as members of this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, it's up to us to make sure it is very, very rough, insofar as the cynical approach taken by the government of Canada is concerned. It's up to us to communicate to the people of this province and the people in other parts of Canada that we reject this approach. We cannot acquiesce in this cynical, unilateral patriation of the constitution.

What is being said by spokesmen on behalf of the Trudeau government appalls me; trying to paint this package in glowing colors and in simple terms, when in fact it proposes to change fundamentally the nature of Canada. So we have the Trudeau constitution. I ask these questions as all Canadians must: can a constitution sown with seeds of bitterness and division produce good fruit? Will this constitution bring about the weeds of separatism instead? I'm afraid the answer in western Canada is "yes".

I am appalled, Mr. Speaker. I am not a separatist. My country is Canada. My family came to the shores of New Brunswick over 200 years ago. My very roots are in all

Canada, yet today I see the seeds of destruction being sown by the Trudeau government with this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must examine the various participants in this constitutional discussion. As I said, our Premier came before this Assembly and put forward a document for debate and discussion. Since then he has proven he was prepared to travel from one end of Canada to the other in order to tell people what our position is. He has shown he is prepared to go throughout Alberta and discuss our position. And I need hardly remind members of this Assembly that at the time of the last election campaign he placed this document before the people of Alberta as a fundamental part of the platform of our political party, on which we were elected. Let no one forget that today.

I was extremely impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the participation of not all but most of the other premiers in the constitutional conference we saw on television. Obviously they are concerned Canadians. As Angus MacLean, the Premier of Prince Edward Island, said, and I paraphrase, the fact he does not agree with Prime Minister Trudeau makes him no less a Canadian. I was impressed that those premiers — not all, but most — were not just trying to represent the interests of their own provinces, but had a wider vision of Canada.

Then we take a look at the Prime Minister. Without repeating my earlier comments about this 64-page document of cynicism, division, and bitterness, I can only ask: are the people of Canada prepared to buy this package from the Prime Minister? I suggest we must look at his record and his credibility. He brought you the War Measures Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. HORSMAN: He brought you wage and price controls within weeks of absolutely denying his government would introduce those measures. Now he has brought us a constitution. And as part of bringing that constitution to us as Canadians, Mr. Speaker, he said one thing — I listened carefully and will repeat what the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest had to say — he wanted every member of the House of Commons to participate. When I heard that, I thought to myself: can I really believe it? There are 284 members in the House of Commons. If they all speak for half an hour or 40 minutes apiece, it's going to take 140-odd hours at least to have everybody participate in the debate. I wonder if I can really believe him. Does he really want that? Well the answer was not long in coming, was it? He didn't want participation by every member. We know that when he imposed closure last week.

MR. KING: But first he had to get something from the NDP.

MR. HORSMAN: The hon. Minister of Education says, "But first he had to get something from the NDP".

AN HON. MEMBER: A sell-out.

MR. HORSMAN: Well he got it, and I want to come to that.

Mr. Speaker, he introduced closure after 10 days of debate, 10 days of debate on the most fundamental issue facing the people of Canada. Now he's packed it off to a committee which will meet in Ottawa, and not travel across Canada to meet the people and hear the views. Oh

no, you must go to Ottawa if you want to make your views known to that select committee. And I use the term "select".

AN HON. MEMBER: Well selected.

MR. HORSMAN: Well selected. How many average Canadians can afford to get on a plane or train and go to Ottawa and let them know their views? Are they even going to listen to the views of average Canadians, or are they going to listen only to the views of "informed" Canadians? Mr. Speaker, it is a sham. What will happen when the motion comes back out of committee? We've heard them say, oh well, we wouldn't impose closure then. But we've heard other people say, oh yes, closure will be imposed then too if necessary, to get what he wants. Based on his past record and his current effort in deceit and deception, the credibility of the Prime Minister in my mind is nil. Call for every member to participate and then bring down the guillotine!

Now I want to talk about that other participant. I can stand in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and say without any question that I have never been prouder of my federal leader than I am of Joe Clark today. And I applaud too the federal members of Parliament who are prepared to stand for their principles.

And now, the NDP. Wasn't a magnificent performance put on, Mr. Speaker, by the leader of the NDP coming before the Canadian people and saying, look what I've got you, management and control of your resources. The fact that we own them now escaped his mind. But maybe he doesn't understand. Since he doesn't represent a party that believes in private enterprise, maybe he doesn't understand what it means to own something. But in my mind there's a lot of difference between having management and control of something, and ownership of it. Mr. Speaker, the NDP sold out. Any westerner, any Canadian, must look upon his performance with disgust.

What do we find offensive in this package? It is unilateral. Maybe a lot of people who aren't lawyers or politicians don't use the term "unilateral" in their day-by-day conversation over breakfast or over the kitchen table, but it means one-sided. It means one side has all the rules in its favor. Now you show me a marriage that exists today under those circumstances.

DR. BUCK: It's sort of like being an opposition member in the Alberta Legislature.

MR. HORSMAN: No, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Clover Bar has never been constrained in making his remarks. The rules of parliamentary democracy provide ample opportunity for him to place those views before this Assembly. We haven't invoked closure, and I don't think it is the intention of this party to do so. If we did, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Clover Bar would be the most vociferous of all members of the Assembly in opposing such action. So I look forward to his participation in the debate, when he too will condemn the Trudeau government for the imposition of closure. I'm sure it will be coming. You cannot have a partnership of provinces, people, husband and wife, lawyers, chartered accountants, or anything, when it's all one-sided. It's no partnership, Mr. Speaker. When that's the case, it's tyranny.

We also find the amending formula offensive. The referendum could wipe away in one fell swoop all the guarantees of resource ownership, or whatever may be written in. Is there a western Canadian who doesn't

remember the night of February 18 this year and what happened? Before the polls had even closed in Manitoba, the decision as to the next government had been made for Canadians. That may be right in parliamentary democracy, but is it right in a referendum which could take away the rights of individual provinces?

I'm amused, Mr. Speaker, why the two years were thrown in — as a sop to somebody, to some suckers who were prepared to bite. Why didn't he make it four years, until after the next federal general election? If he had done so, he might have demonstrated some courage. But he did not.

Mr. Speaker, how did we become part of Canada? How did new provinces develop and enter Confederation. I tell you, it wasn't easy. Today we're celebrating 1905 as if it was an easy thing that we got in. It took years and years, of struggle by the Northwest Territories Assembly even to get the federal government to talk about it. There's a new book out called *The Formation of Alberta*. It's a documentary record of how we got to be a province. It leads off with the words: "The Province of Alberta was born in an atmosphere of great political turbulence". Granted, we can't remember that today because none of us here was alive and participating. It was "born in an atmosphere of great political turbulence". The people in the Northwest Territories were fighting to become provinces. Don't forget that. The Laurier government didn't want to give us provincial status any more than the Trudeau government of today wants to give provincial status to the Yukon and the remainder of the Northwest Territories. It's ironic, isn't it, that the chief victor in 1905, Sir Frederick Haultain, was by-passed by the Liberal government when the appointments came.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian. I love this country. But I am saddened, indeed almost sickened, by the spectacle I see today. I believe we can and should be full partners. I look forward to the day not far from now that the Yukon and the Northwest Territories will join us as additional partners in making Canada work and become an even greater nation than it is today.

Mr. Speaker, my time has elapsed, so I cannot tell you about the additional struggle of the following 25 years to gain control of our natural resources. Make no mistake about it: it was a struggle; it didn't come easily. And keeping Canada alive today as a nation we know, will not come easily and without a struggle. Mr. Speaker and members of this Assembly, I want you to share with me in that struggle. Let us make it a rough, rough fight for the Trudeau government.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to get into this debate. It is very important. It's certainly important for me as a rural member, constantly reminded by the rural community of the struggle they went through 50 years ago and beyond to gain resource control. Now we have a Prime Minister who is neither loved nor voted for in the west, bringing in a Bill that would change the fundamental aspects of Canada.

The referendum part of the resolution scares me the most. It's being sought by a man who enjoys trampling anyone in his path. He never lets anyone off the hook easily. He makes sure they're well beaten and whipped before they are gone. Nobody has ever enjoyed a put-down by our Prime Minister.

Our big problem in Canada today is not the constitution or the patriation of the constitution, although it would be nice to have the constitution in Canada, much as it is or with an amending formula acceptable to all

parts of Canada. Our problems are economic, pure and simple. There's no constitutional crisis in Canada until we have a Prime Minister who's the most egotistical person we could ever imagine. In my view, he's clearly doing this at this particular time and in this particular way because there are several things going on at once. If you want to get rid of a crisis, you create another crisis. We have an economic crisis. We have so many crises. But he's doing what he's doing because of the election in the United States, which will cloud most of the issue in central Canada. They're much closer to the United States political scene than we are here. He's trying to override the fact that people won't notice so much the \$14 billion deficit they're looking for in 1980, and the energy situation.

I thought it was interesting on CTV news last night, when the reporter said that now is the time when Alberta was either going to have to put up or shut up. I thought it was pretty coarse. But when you look at it, I suppose he's right. In my travels to anniversary celebrations over the weekend and in the last few days, the message coming to me loud and clear was: let's put up; let's go all the way if we have to; let's separate. One very astute young man said, if we're not almost satisfied, we'll separate. I said, well, it's fine for us to say this in the country because we have a strong feeling towards things out here and we know it was the farmers' government that fought and received the mineral resources, but we have a large number of people in the cities, particularly Edmonton, Calgary, and Fort McMurray, who are from other parts of Canada and don't understand this. Well, he said, we'll go the whole way; we'll eliminate Edmonton and Calgary if that's the problem.

The feelings are out there. When the Prime Minister says there's no way western Canada could separate, I don't think he's really looking at the facts. He certainly hasn't talked to anybody from rural Alberta. At a 75th Anniversary celebration yesterday, I had at least five people suggest to me that we should separate. It's a very emotional issue in the country.

I don't know whether we should separate. If we did separate, how would we separate? Would we separate with the prairies, the Northwest Territories, and the Yukon; would we try to draw in Alaska; or would we try to separate by ourselves? Of course, there's no way you can answer those questions. Therefore, there's no way we can talk about it until we find out what's in the federal budget tomorrow night, and a few other little things that are happening.

I don't think I'd stand here and say I'd be afraid to separate, because I feel in my heart that the people in my constituency would be willing to say, yes, let's go. But there's so much involved. Maybe what hurts the rural people and makes them so angry, particularly at this time, is how satisfied, happy, contented, and hopeful they were in the short term that Joe Clark formed the government. People in the country were happy. Even the socialists were happy for a change. [interjection] That was only for a few months. I was really surprised how everyone seemed to gather strength from the fact that in Vegreville riding we had a Member of Parliament, Don Mazankowski. It was like a chinook blowing in, or when you were small and it was Christmas time: there was hope and bounty on the horizon. With Trudeau and the federal government, there isn't that. If I can speak for rural Alberta, he can't convince rural Albertans I've talked to that he's even got his entire cabinet behind him, let alone his MPs.

When we look at the make-up of Canada right now, we

have 74 Liberal MPs from Quebec and 73 from the rest of Canada. That means Quebec has control over Canada right now. The leader of the provincial government in Quebec right now doesn't want to have anything to do with this new constitutional proposal. A news report this morning said that even Claude Ryan, the Liberal leader in the province of Quebec, didn't want to have anything to do with the constitutional proposal. Well I sure don't want to have anything to do with it. If we have a federal referendum today or down the road, the federal government, through the vast numbers in central Canada, could virtually wipe out everything we have here. Everything. They could do just about anything they wanted.

Certainly what grates on us constantly in the country is metric conversion. I don't think there's anyone in the country, not a single person in the country, who hasn't been affected by metric conversion. It's a bitter pill. It's hard to take, especially if you're out trying to fix a combine in the middle of the night and you're looking for a three-eighths bolt that comes out some other thing. You can't get the right burrs to fit, and you end up either welding it, or — we can't even use haywire any more; the machinery is getting too strong. My advice in dealing with people in the country has always been, let's stay calm; let's wait until we see exactly what's happening; let's see if they do anything bad to us in the budget; let's see what they really mean in some of these things. But as much as I'm convinced that we should stay calm, I find it more and more difficult to stay calm.

I wouldn't feel so bad if Ontario had offered us anything. But in my view they haven't offered us a single thing as far as the energy question is concerned and the availability of energy. This past winter we had a supply shortage of heavy diesel fuel here in Alberta. Wouldn't it be really strange if our drilling rigs, our explorers, our truckers, and all those people who work with heavy equipment in the oil industry had to shut down their rigs because we were short of diesel fuel? It could happen. It was very, very close. But two years ago Ontario, in its wisdom, for some strange reason sold its equity in Syncrude. Made a nice healthy profit. They could trot into the Legislature and say, hey, we made \$27 million — or what ever it was — in an investment.

They're constantly asking us to give in. They're asking the Premier and the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources for more and more. The energy package presented to Trudeau in July 1980 was really an outstanding commitment. You'd wonder if they even knew this thing existed. They keep asking us to negotiate, but we learned today the amount of negotiating the Prime Minister wants.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I want to say, after talking with rural people — particularly this fall and past summer, when we had an opportunity to meet thousands of people in the homecomings — that we can't let our pioneers down. We just simply can't. If we give in now, if we cave in, if we become soft or chicken, we're going to lose so much of what our pioneers gave us.

My mother came to this province about 73 or 74 years ago. She came by covered wagon. She lived in a sod house that her family was able to build for the first winter. They had a prairie fire in the spring, which burned out everything they had. They lived on rabbits and whatever else they could find. But they stayed. They survived. There were thousands who didn't survive, but the hardy stayed and the hardy survived.

We've had it pretty darned soft the last 25, or really the last 40 years — really, really soft. Are we going to let

somebody kick us around when our ancestors and our friends worked so hard and created what we have? It's so nice to drive out in the country and get some fresh air and not have traffic to buck and all the other things that happen around the city here, and enjoy Alberta, and then to remember that when our folks came here, or indeed for some of us, when we came here, this was all prairie wool and badger brush, no fence lines, no roads, certainly no telephones, and no radios. It was just wild land. Let's not let them take it away from us. Let's protect that. If it means going all the way, however far that distance may be, let's protect what they have left us.

The federal government is talking to us now about PetroCan and our energy supplies. They have all these great ads in the paper and on radio and TV. You turn on the TV and you've got these geese going by, or mountains out there. They're going to run an oil company, they're going to explore, they're going to develop: they're going to do a whole lot of things. They've had a hundred years to learn how to run a post office, and they can't run a post office. How are they going to run something as complicated as an oil company? They're going to get a few people who are hanging onto where the milk comes from. They're going to hang on and advise and rob until PetroCan is a post office. I can just imagine the clout that can happen with that.

Mr. Speaker, I have to be very annoyed with Ontario, particularly when there was an article in one of the papers the other day about a meeting the Alberta MLAs had with the Ontario MPPs. Although we probably deserved the criticism, because we are a resolute bunch and pretty hardy, I don't think we're necessarily rude when we stand up and suggest to Ottawa, or to anyone else, what we expect out of Confederation. It isn't that much. We're not asking for lots of things. What are we asking for? If you look at the payover from the federal services to Alberta, it's really very little. We don't have a seaport for them to spend any money on. We've got a couple of airports.

I well remember trying to extract some money from the federal government when we wanted to build an airport in my home town. It was years trying to get some money. Fortunately, the Alberta government has come along and brought in an airport program that got things rolling, and we got some rural airports. We can't expect anything like that from the federal government, even though they say they have a program. Incidentally, their entire budget for Canada for the rural airport program was about the same amount that we have spent on one airport in Alberta in some of tougher spots to build in, and that was to do all of Canada.

So when Ontario goes along and says, oh yes, we'll support the government on this, they're onto something, and it's on onto where the milk comes from. As long as they could bail out Chrysler and protect some jobs in Ontario, or wherever it was ... Now, it looks like Massey is going out to get on that same stream. This means jobs to them. We just met this morning with some people in the cattle industry. The things they said about the drought program were very interesting. They didn't want us to get involved in something that came banging in and was changed week by week.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and to all the members of the Legislature that no one is more Canadian than I am. But I represent a constituency that is very, very angry right now. If this federal budget is as tough as it sounds, and if this constitutional issue continues at the same rate, I don't know what my constituents are going to be asking for. But I'll tell you, I'm not going to want to stand here

and be satisfied, if we have a Prime Minister who is going to take away our basic rights through a constitution that's unilateral in every sense of the word, with an unfair amending formula that makes Alberta a province less than an equal to Ontario or Quebec. Ontario and Quebec, or maybe Ottawa, feel — perhaps because we're becoming strong, important, and recognized around the world — that maybe we're hurting their ego too much. Maybe they're trying to get at us that way. I don't know. They act like spoiled brats to me, when I see them on TV. I'm not prepared, or certainly not anxious, to have spoiled brats tell me how our country should be run and governed, and how we should take what we get from Canada. To me, Canada could be, should be, and I hope will be, one of the very strongest countries in the world and one of the very, very best countries to live in.

Thank you.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to participate in the debate on Motion 15. Each day has some significant meaning for all of us, and I suppose today will primarily be remembered as the day prior to the federal budget being presented.

Two of the critical issues before us are patriation of the constitution and our energy negotiations or, I suppose I should really say, lack of them. The resolution as presented in the House of Commons appears innocuous enough to many Albertans, but the final blow of closure of debate was indeed a drastic action, a clear indication of the unilateral action of the federal government and an insult to the democratic process of Parliament. There were actually no more than 24 hours of debate on this important issue. Out of 284 members, 22 Liberals, 19 Progressive Conservatives, and 5 members of the New Democratic Party spoke. Why the rush? The Bank Act has been debated in the House of Commons for four years.

Patriation is not the issue of concern to Albertans, but how it is done is a concern to all Canadians. On October 20, 1976, our Premier introduced a motion supporting the objective of patriation and reaffirming the fundamental principle of Confederation, that all provinces have equal rights within Confederation. Further to that debate in our Legislature, on October 25, 1978, Alberta introduced and tabled a document outlining the province's position on our constitution.

The issues are extremely complex, but already in each of our constituencies we are beginning to hear some new household words: patriation, the amending formula, entrenchment of language rights, entrenchment of other rights. Each of these items will affect us all by changing the Canada that you and I have grown up in and accepted as a proud place in which to live. I submit that if the Prime Minister proceeds with his game plan, Canada will be drastically changed and not the country we knew it to be. It is proposed that the entrenchment of rights will be delayed for three years. This sounds like a magnanimous gesture. But when one studies this item alone and looks at the implications, it means it will take at least that long for all levels of government to rewrite our laws for companies and individuals to understand how this one concept will affect their industry or their endeavors. It is an absolutely monumental undertaking to consider one aspect of the entrenchment of rights, such as age or sex. Our recommendation in *Harmony in Diversity* is that the protection of fundamental human rights continue to be a responsibility of Parliament and the provincial legislatures, rather than a Bill entrenched in

the constitution. In Alberta we believe that the rights of our citizens are protected by The Alberta Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act.

Over the years in this Assembly many, fine speeches have been made on the constitution and what it means. The Premier has so clearly reiterated the views of Albertans, our involvements, and the terrific amount of hard work that has gone into this issue over the years, with the culmination in the last few weeks. I am very proud to be a member of a government that has taken such a positive stand, and I wish to commend the Premier and the respective ministers and their departments, men and women who have diligently worked so hard on this issue.

The energy issue is part of, yet also separate, and we are truly on the eve of policies that no doubt can take Canada down a path of total ruination, a path that cannot be supported by Albertans. In a social gathering on Saturday night, one man put it so well: why do you think Albertans sent 73 Conservatives to Edmonton and 21 Conservatives to Ottawa? That is our answer; that is our support of the people of Alberta.

Canadians are the heaviest per capita consumers of oil. Even with all our alternate sources of energy such as coal, hydro, and solar energy — and they are important — we will continue to need vast quantities of oil. Forecasts indicate that by 1990 we will have a 60 per cent drop in the supply of oil from our traditional oil fields. It is also known that Canada has vast known resources of oil, plus the money, manpower, and technology to make Canada a self-sufficient nation. Shortsightedness and a pursuit of power have interfered with the logical development of a national energy policy.

Tied to the issue of energy self-sufficiency is energy conservation. What incentives have we had? Can anybody remember the day of a one-car family? It is difficult to grasp the high cost of producing our reserves in the tar sands, the Arctic, or the Atlantic. The federal government seems determined not to promote and encourage development, but to squelch every segment of private enterprise. Look at the number of Albertans, particularly in the drilling industry, who are leaving to go to the United States. Look at the amount of Canadian dollars that has left Canada to be invested in the United States.

The latest interference and suppression by our federal government is to dictate to the refineries that they must use Mexican oil. Some of this is of an inferior quality that our refineries are not even equipped to handle. Clearly it appears we are heading for total nationalization of one of our major industries. Why should this particular industry and why should Albertans have to balance the federal budget, which has resulted from mismanagement over the years?

Throughout his remarks, the Leader of the Opposition in our Legislature talked about: why haven't we been negotiating recently? I believe the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest referred to this matter on Friday. However, the die had been cast. I mentioned earlier, and the Premier has outlined, all the steps that have been taken. The Member for Olds-Didsbury talks about compromise, negotiate a deal like Saskatchewan, give and take, accommodation. That final curtain has descended. We are determined to protect our national resources. How can one possibly negotiate with a government led by a Prime Minister who fuddle-duddles one minute, then autocratically makes decisions to muzzle our democratic process.

The Leader of the Opposition in our Legislature also spoke about the relationship of economic resource development and our social problems. There is a tie, and how

fortunate we are in this province. In the Legislature on Friday the Minister of Social Services and Community Health outlined very clearly many of our new programs and the amount of money that has been put into our preventive social services day care programs. I think this was extremely welcome news to all Albertans.

I was fortunate to attend an international conference in Hong Kong in July. The theme of that conference was economic resource development and social problems. In small discussions, people from other lands were truly envious of the position of Alberta and what was being done in all our social programs. Interestingly enough, what evolved was not a solution of more money, but looking at how the money was being utilized and a re-evaluation of how communities, be it a country, a town, or a smaller unit, could assess their own needs, plan for them, and try to meet these needs, instead of government doing it all.

While in Hong Kong, I had the opportunity to tour two refugee camps. We are so far removed from that situation, and it is probably something most of us tend not to want to think about. It is horrendous to try to appreciate what those people go through and the help they need. Hong Kong has truly been an example to the world in coping with large numbers and trying to overcome the problems and hurdles in a compassionate way.

One of the interesting aspects on touring the refugee camp: because Hong Kong has a labor shortage, the men in the refugee camp are allowed to go into Hong Kong and work. This is very advantageous, not only for giving the men something to do throughout the days, but also it gives them the opportunity to accumulate a bit of money to start to supply some of the basic needs for their families. I must admit that I did find it very interesting that one of the first possessions most families seem to accumulate would be a very large transistor radio. However, they worked hard for this money.

If anybody can recall some pictures of World War II and the Japanese concentration camps, I guess that's pretty well what a refugee camp looks like from the outside: the barbed wire fences, the tin barracks supplied by the United Nations. However, this particular camp, which was very interesting because of the shortage of land in Hong Kong, did have a lot of space. There was ample room for children to play, and excellent buildings for school facilities for the children. It was interesting to note that one of the schools I toured had been supplied to this particular refugee camp by the Canadian Save the Children Fund. Most of the emphasis in the schools was, of course, on teaching the children English.

When one walked into the barracks, probably the most difficult thing to see was the apathetic looks, primarily of women and older people sitting there waiting, waiting, waiting. Many of these people have been waiting for two years and longer with very little hope of finding a new home in a new country. Interestingly enough, Canada has probably the most stringent medical requirements for refugees coming into our country. This is extremely difficult, yet it is a commendable policy. But it certainly raises many questions in your mind when you see a family of 25 people — that would be the father, his four sons, and their wives and children — left in a refugee camp because there's possible suspicion that one member of that family might have tuberculosis. The reason the process is held up so long, of course, is that diagnosing tuberculosis is not easy. Quite often there is disagreement between the local doctors in Hong Kong and the Canadian doctors. So it appears that a whole family sits in a refugee camp

because of some type of bureaucracy, or disagreement between people in the medical profession.

One of the reassuring parts of the trip was that as people are chosen to leave for a particular country, they are moved to another camp. This camp for refugees was a converted girls' school, run by the prison department of Hong Kong. It was a more cheerful place to walk through and talk to the people, because they had hope and were looking forward, at that particular time, to leaving in four days on an international flight to Toronto. What was interesting was the mettle of these people, if you ever saw pictures of the boats as they arrived in Hong Kong, or looked at the docks of Hong Kong as 35,000 people arrived, with threadbare clothing and nothing to their name. To see them all huddled around with their luggage, quite often brand new, with some items they have accumulated since they've been in Hong Kong, shows, I think, the type of people most countries will be getting. Obviously they will be a great asset to these countries.

I couldn't help but be surprised that on this particular Tuesday all the luggage was in the centre of the square in the refugee camp. I asked one gentleman, when are you leaving? He said, on Friday. I think the fact that all their bags were packed and ready to go indicated they were very, very pleased.

One of the problems refugees encounter — and I think most of us should become aware of it, because it's at the end of their trip when we probably have to help — is that they have lived with such a desperate hope for so long, having fled a country that has meant a lot to them, spending any length of time on any type of vessel, probably floating around outside in a harbor such as Hong Kong, and finally realizing their dream will come true. It was explained to us that once the hope is over, that is a very, very difficult time of adjustment. It may not be the weather of the country where they're going, their living accommodation, their food, or trying to speak the language: it is this final end to their hope. They've been living on this hope and nothing else for so long. I think it behooves all Canadians to consider this and help these people over probably a longer time than we would think is necessary.

As Canadians, we should be very, very proud of our participation in the refugee program. It was one of the top two countries in the world. It was a very, very good program. I would like to commend our Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, because he has continually kept us informed of the number of refugees that have arrived in Alberta, their adjustments, and where they have lived. One of the outstanding refugee programs was by Alberta Gas [Trunk] Line Company, which is now Nova. I was very proud as an Albertan to sit in a large audience and hear this acclaimed as the outstanding refugee program all over the world. Literally everything that they did, in regard to the number of refugees they took, where they helped them resettle, and other parts of their program, were acclaimed by our Canadian government as a true model of what could be done.

I would very briefly like to mention the 75th celebrations, which have been a very rewarding experience for me. In great contrast to many members in the Assembly who have obviously been very busy and have spent many long hours and probably travelled many, many miles to distribute many medallions to their senior citizens, I suspect that what happened in Calgary-North West was very significant in regard to numbers. I'm not sure if I had the least number, but I must have been very close to it. I had a total of five medallions to distribute. I'm sure

that my enjoyment was probably as great as yours, because we had a very special afternoon. Our Varsity Acres community association kindly donated the use of their hall. It gave us a chance to really talk to these senior citizens and hear their stories, which were very interesting.

An extremely stressful event for Calgarians, that happened over the summer and fall, was the teachers' strike. I suppose one of the few positive aspects for me was the opportunity to speak with so many of my constituents over the telephone and at meetings, both formal and informal. While one does not often receive publicity in the media as much as one would like, I must admit that the entourage of 30 cars weaving their way around the streets very close to my home and eventually ending up along the front of my house, has probably brought me the greatest publicity I've had since I've been elected as a member.

I guess the second positive thing that happened from the teachers' strike in Calgary was the organization of parents who got together and tried to look at positive solutions for trying to bring about the end of the strike as quickly as possible. I'm very proud to say that most of the initiators of those groups in Calgary were from my constituency.

In a crisis like this, or in the time of crisis when the nurses were on strike, so often people say to you: where were you; what were you doing for us? As you recall, on one or two occasions the Member for Clover Bar has delighted in needling me on this particular issue. Well, frankly, I didn't have time during the nurses' strike or the teachers' strike to cavort around the steps of the Legislature like some members did. I found that the process was to monitor the situation as it progressed and changed from day to day. We use that word, and we as legislators have some interpretation of what we're talking about. But I think it's extremely difficult for our constituents to understand that monitoring in a crisis situation like that means constant meetings with members of your constituency, with your colleagues in the Legislature, keeping in touch with ministers of the government who are directly affected, and writing letters clarifying the issues. For people to understand, I think it has to be stated that during a strike there is a formal collective bargaining process, and we must honor that process even if we don't like the results.

It's pretty difficult for anybody to measure the hours in the day and in the nights, seven days a week, that we participated, speaking to parents, teachers, and colleagues. I for one am very proud of my efforts, and feel I did participate and act on behalf of my constituents. I would like at this time to pay tribute to the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. Minister of Education because of the many, many long hours they too put in, working to resolve this situation.

I would like to commend the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Having introduced a motion in the House on this particular area in my very first term in the Legislature, I was very pleased to see that he has announced a \$10 million, eight-year program to provide funds for research, training, and education in worker health and safety. This, of course, comes from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, with the objective of developing ways of preventing accidents and ill health resulting from employment, and will promote and improve working conditions for all Albertans. I know this will be appreciated by many, many people in Alberta. I was particularly pleased to note this,

since I had introduced the resolution.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to take the time to reflect on two examples of what I think it means to be a Canadian and what this country obviously needed and still needs today. One was the heroic efforts of Mr. Ken Taylor when the hostages were brought out of Iran. Mr. Taylor was in Alberta this summer on many occasions, and it was thrilling to see the response of people to him. Indeed, it was a privilege to meet him.

I would like my fellow legislators to pause with me and reflect, although I would much rather challenge you to dig into your pocketbooks. However, at this time I would like to pause and think about the outstanding efforts of one young man to all of us. It was indeed worthy that he receive the Order of Canada. I'm speaking of the efforts of Terry Fox. [applause] In a time of many concerns to all of us, I don't think anybody has quite touched the hearts of so many Canadians. His determination and courage, not only to live but to share with all Canadians what can be done when people contribute to a worthwhile fund and research, can be positive to overcome the detrimental effects of cancer.

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner said in his speech on the constitution on October 27, 1978, that there were three important ingredients in a nation: land, resources — not only natural resources but people resources — and leadership. I think it's important that we've taken just a minute to pause and think about those two outstanding examples I mentioned. Those were spontaneous types of leadership. But at this critical time in Canada's history, and in fact in Alberta's history, we are indeed so very fortunate to have the outstanding leadership of the Premier of this province.

Thank you very much.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak today on Motion 15, moved by the hon. Premier last Monday.

Before proceeding with my remarks, I want to add my best wishes to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, who has served this Legislature for a number of years in many ways, in the last few years as Leader of the Opposition. I believe he has made a contribution to this Legislature and to his constituency, and I wish him well. I would also like to say how much I appreciated listening in the last several days to the members who have spoken on the very important issue of our constitution in this very serious time in our history.

I would like today to address my remarks to three main areas: Canada, Alberta, and northern Alberta. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I say that countries around the world look at us in amazement. We have so much — people, energy: everything that most countries do not have — and they can't understand why we fight amongst ourselves. But let me say that all this is caused because of one man who is on a power-hungry ego trip, who wants to destroy Canada as we know it today, and to set up a federal state where total control is in Ottawa, leaving the provinces as colonies to be milked for the benefit of central Canada. The Prime Minister is also determined that Quebec and Ontario have the only veto power in Canada over any changes in the constitution, while Alberta and the others have no veto unless they join forces. So actually you're making second- and third-class provinces in this country. The Vancouver consensus, which Alberta and all provinces supported, and which allowed for opting out, was not accepted by Ottawa. The Prime Minister said he could not accept it because it would

make a patchwork or checkerboard across Canada.

I say, what is wrong with a checkerboard? We presently have that. There are many examples today. Quebec opted out of the Canada Pension. Opting out made it possible for medicare and hospital care insurance in Canada. Old age pension differs between the provinces. The list goes on.

Not only do we now have to fight Trudeau and Davis; we now have the leader of the NDP kowtowing to Mr. Trudeau saying he has wrung out a constitutional package in [return] for his party's support. What a package. Mr. Broadbent also has the gall to say he won a deal for western Canada that no one else could wrest from that stubborn Mr. Trudeau. Mr. Broadbent, whose major support comes from the west, has sunk to the bottom of the barrel as far as I'm concerned. He's sold out his soul for a handful of promises from a man who is the biggest con artist in the country. Remember, this is the party that is supposed to represent labor in this country. It seems funny that now we have them allying themselves with labor's worst enemy, Trudeau and company — strange bedpartners, indeed.

Then we have the Member for Spirit River-Fairview saying we should be brokering or negotiating, going on bended knee to Ottawa for a few crumbs. How can we negotiate with a person who doesn't even know what the word is? That statement was confirmed today by the hon. Premier when he made the announcement during question period.

I say we have to stand up and be counted and fight for what we believe as Albertans. For too long, I feel, we have been hewers of wood and haulers of water. For too long, we've had one freight rate going east and one freight rate going west, paying differential charges on products west of Ontario. I will give you an example in my own business. We are charged a 40-cent differential on oxygen between Ontario and Edmonton. Why would there be a differential between Toronto and Edmonton? Oxygen is pumped out of the air by a plant in Edmonton. It seems funny, unless it's the mountain air we're pumping into those tanks that makes the difference.

Some of us in this Assembly fought in the '39-45 war to end Hitler and his tyranny. Now, in 1980, we see tyranny again, where the Prime Minister of Canada is literally running roughshod over the provinces and ramming the constitution down the throats of the provinces, who most violently oppose. He limits debate, forces closure, and is making a mockery of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to fight fire with fire, and stand up and be counted.

I would like to talk now for a few minutes about our province. I was saddened to hear of Dr. Horner's resignation as grain co-ordinator. His resignation is going to be a great loss to the western farmer. In the short time he was in Winnipeg, he was able to remove some of the bottlenecks and increase the grain movements by some 20 per cent. It is easy to see, though, why he would have to resign, just through utter frustration trying to deal with a federal government such as the Trudeau group.

The Prince Rupert grain terminals would not have gone ahead either, if it had not been for this province. I was glad to hear the Minister of Economic Development confirm the other day that the project is moving along in spite of the federal government, and that we could possibly see grain moving through that port by next fall. Another Alberta initiative was the 1,000 hopper cars to speed up the movement in our grain market. Our involvement in Neptune terminals in Vancouver — the list

of Alberta assisting in matters which are strictly federal goes on. Our federal government is so engrossed in bringing back a constitution, and not worried about things that make this country tick.

I was truly proud to be an Albertan and take part in the 75th celebrations this year. I thought the homecoming celebrations were tremendous, because they gave us an opportunity to join with people we had not seen for many years, who were back in our province to help us celebrate the 75th.

I would now like to move to some of the programs established by this government. The hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health has outlined a number of people programs that were put into place this year: more aid to the handicapped, improvements to our day care system, and more dental trailers for work in northern Alberta to service areas where there are no dental offices. Improvements to dental care was one of the recommendations coming out of the health needs seminar held in St. Paul last February. I was pleased to see that the Minister was able to respond so quickly in that area. The increased aid to senior citizens announced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs was greatly appreciated by them.

As far as I'm concerned, transportation in the province is of prime importance in an economy such as ours, especially in northern Alberta. Roads to service new farmland, new industry, the oil fields, the gas fields, rehabilitation of our main highway system, more assistance and aid to municipalities to supply necessary rural road systems, further assistance to our urban centres — I was pleased that the Minister announced extra funding in this area this year, but I would like to see the government establish a long-range block-funding program. Of all the briefs we receive through the Northern Alberta Development Council as we hold our public meetings across northern Alberta, 25 per cent deal with transportation. So I stress the importance of transportation to northern Alberta.

I was pleased with the recent announcement by the hon. Premier and the Minister of Recreation and Parks on the establishment of a new parks program for the five smaller cities in the province. This is very important to smaller centres. I urge that the program be extended to other centres as soon as possible. I recommend some form of assistance to smaller municipalities — towns and villages — so they too can develop campgrounds, picnic areas, and parks in their areas. This is one of the recommendations to the Legislature that came from the heritage trust fund committee last year. I would hope this will be implemented in the near future.

I would like to move along with some comments on northern Alberta and my constituency, Mr. Speaker. The branch of the Northern Alberta Development Council recently catalogued the major projects that were on the drawing board and could go ahead in northern Alberta if the conditions were right, such as the energy pricing agreement, satisfactory federal taxing, and stability at the national level. Mr. Speaker, that package of projects adds up to some \$45 billion. Most of these are in a holding pattern until some of these items I've mentioned are settled.

It is hard for the people to understand that our federal government is so obstinate and short-sighted, and has tunnel vision, with only patriating the constitution as their main goal while letting the country drift like a ship without a rudder. If these projects were to get the green light, all Canada would reap from the spin-off benefits.

We could work toward energy self-sufficiency; we could reduce our balance of payments; we could reduce inflation and increase employment, which is affecting eastern Canada right now.

Mr. Speaker, this uncertainty is having its effects in my constituency as well. The business community is not sure what is happening or whether they should invest. The oil companies are slowing down because of their markets and pricing. If the federal government budget tomorrow night has some of the negative things in it that we expect, things will dry up even more, and we could see lay offs and unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing. Six months ago we had a very serious housing shortage in Grande Prairie. You were not able to find an apartment, and you had to reserve a hotel weeks in advance. Today at least 120 new homes are for sale, waiting for somebody to buy them. Granted, the prices are probably a little out of line, and some people couldn't afford them, but they are there. Many new hotels and motels have been built. Although we have the highest rent rates in the province, which we are not proud of, the business community has responded and is building housing accommodation, which will soon have an effect on those rental rates because I believe we are going to have excess accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, Grande Prairie held a very successful Alberta Winter Games this year, with over 2,000 athletes from across the province participating. I wish to thank the Minister of Recreation and Parks for his assistance and presence at those games.

After a very mixed up spring, summer, and fall, the farmers in northern Alberta were able to get their crops off — a fair crop at that, but their yields suffered some because of the wet fall.

Municipal elections were recently held throughout the province, in which a number of incumbents lost their seats on council. Voter turnout was poor, as it was in our constituency. In our city about 20 per cent of eligible voters turned out. I want to congratulate those elected to three-year terms, and look forward to working with them in my constituency in the period ahead.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a conversation I had the other day with an oil worker in Grande Prairie. I asked him what activity there would be in the Grande Prairie region this winter. His answer was: well, a good freeze up of the ground and a thawing in Ottawa were all that was needed. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Canadian and I'm proud to be an Albertan. I hope and pray that Canada, as we know it today and fought for, will not be destroyed by the power brokers in Ottawa. It really disturbs me when Ottawa uses my tax dollars to carry a national TV ad campaign saying I should be proud to be a Canadian. As far as I'm concerned, this underhanded brainwashing is a national disgrace.

Every time I see Canada geese flying across my screen, I almost want to get my gun out. We have a great Canada. I don't need somebody from Ottawa to tell me how great Canada is. Mr. Speaker, I know we have a great country, and I'm proud of it. The only thing I don't want is to see it destroyed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in Motion 15, the state of the province address, moved by the Premier, and to some extent add to the comments very well and aptly expressed by my colleagues and the members opposite. First of all,

let me add to the views expressed by many to recognize the important contribution made to Alberta, and I suppose to Canada, by the Member for Olds-Didsbury, Mr. Clark. I think it's safe to say that in his role as a representative for that area, as an MLA, he held forth the priorities of his constituency. In terms of economic and growth objectives, I think [he] succeeded in achieving the representative set of packages which all of us as MLAs attempt to achieve for our constituencies. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all of us will agree that he also represented the province as a member of Executive Council. I think that must be part of the kudos or recognition we present to him today. Of course recently he has held forth as Leader of the Opposition and, as well, he has distinguished himself not only in this Assembly but in his role across Alberta. So I add to the comments. I think all of us were saddened to some extent by the recognition that this era is coming to an end. I suppose all of us at some point will have to recognize that various eras will come to an end, and someday we'll all have to face that as well.

Having said that, I look forward to the new excitement I think all of us anticipate from the Social Credit Party. Very soon we'll be seeing a new form of politics entering the Alberta arena; that is, the primary system. I don't quite understand how it's going to operate; I don't quite know who's going to be running for the leadership. But I think all this will be revealed to us very soon. I know that our acting leaders across the way will hold forth and reveal very soon that they're going to move into the leadership competition.

DR. BUCK: We've scrapped the primary system, Dick.

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh, you scrapped the primary system. Well, isn't that good. I wonder if they scrapped the leadership program, Mr. Speaker. That would be the next question. However, we look forward to this new bit of excitement. Frankly, I think it's time we saw some new excitement from the Social Credit Party across the way, and it's time all of us had a chance to understand their platform on many issues. Quite frankly, I think it's starting to move in different directions.

DR. BUCK: It took you 63 years, Dick, so just go easy now.

MR. JOHNSTON: Not only will we have a federal election, Mr. Speaker; we'll also have a leadership election very soon.

I think the other important item expressed, which was endemic of the debate so far, was the extremely sensitive tone of the points being put before this Assembly — extremely serious, extremely well thought out and, in many cases, very candid. A candid expression which outlines and strikes at the serious problems facing Alberta: problems of Confederation, problems which are being set upon us by external forces, many of which are out of our control, essentially focusing on the two areas of the constitution and energy. I think it's safe to say that those are the two important principles, the two important externalities, which all of us as Albertans are facing. I think that has been the context of the debate to date, this afternoon as well, and I know all of us share the serious nature of the problems facing us.

Allow me to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to touch briefly on the constitutional process, on the work of the continuing committee of ministers on the constitu-

tion which I was fortunate to be involved in over the summer. As you well know, the first ministers met on June 9. They suggested that the summer was a good time for constitutional debate. I'm not sure whether a hot climate and a hot debate was expected, or whether they simply wanted to ensure there was a government presence over the summer. None the less the representatives from all the governments participating in the continuing committee did go to work over the summer. We started off with meetings in Montreal, followed by meetings in Toronto, Vancouver, and Ottawa. Of course in between we had a meeting in Winnipeg, which was the premiers' meeting, and then we ended up with another meeting back in Ottawa just before the first ministers' conference, September 8 to 13, which was also held in Ottawa.

I might note, Mr. Speaker, that several members of the Assembly were able to attend with us. First of all, as you all know the Attorney General Mr. Crawford attended the September 8 to 12 meeting, along with the Member for Calgary Bow. At other meetings across Canada, the members for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, Calgary Currie, Edmonton Glengarry, and Athabasca joined us in debating the constitution. Also at the first ministers' conference were two members of the Assembly: the Member for Little Bow joined with us and was able to participate as a member of our delegation; the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was also in attendance. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we had representatives from both the urban and rural municipalities, and from the native associations of Alberta.

I thought I would very briefly go through the 12 items we focused on over the summer, simply to show, I think, that the process is one of discussion and an opportunity to understand the role of the various provinces. If we have an opportunity to discuss clearly the priorities which all of us wish to see in a constitution, and if we have a chance to see the other provinces' views on why certain changes are difficult for them, we'll get an understanding of why, first of all, the constitutional process is a very difficult process which, everyone knows, strikes at the heart of all legislation of both the federal and provincial governments, but which also must be proceeded with very carefully because, in fact, the changes are irreversible and we'll have to live with them as fundamental law for some time.

In terms of Alberta's point of view, I think we focused primarily on the question of resources. Of course the resource question was a priority to us. There has been considerable debate on the question of resources over a period of time. We've had debate in this House; we've had debate in other constitutional conferences. We had the most recent debate in February 1979, which was the last first ministers' conference on the constitution. That was a precedent with which we went to our work over the summer. However, when we got into the debates, the two representatives of the federal government — the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State, also the Minister of the Environment — quickly withdrew the resource sections. They simply said, what we agreed to in February '79 is no longer applicable, and pulled from the table the discussions that had been so serious and so time-consuming up to February 1979. They didn't offer much in return until very late in the game when, as some of you know, they brought in such things as adjustments in the area of trade and commerce, with federal paramountcy, to allow the provinces to legislate in that area, and some adjustments in the area of indirect taxation, but very little in provincial jurisdiction, the area which really affects the

province: a clarification to provide certainty to the ownership question, which no one doubts but that we'd like to see reinforced; secondly, to provide the removal of those declaratory and residual powers which are vested in the central government, which no other federation currently has, I might note.

The federal government refused to consider the declaratory power, even refused to give us any time to debate the reason Alberta and other provinces wished to see the declaratory power removed from the table. They unilaterally pulled that from the table, and in fact it was very difficult for us even to get the debate going on resources. They wanted to focus on other things. They wanted to focus on what they describe as powers or programs for the people.

Let me look at the amending formula, Mr. Speaker, another item which goes hand in glove with constitutional reform. Nobody disagrees that patriation is an important principle for Canadians, and no one disagrees that we should not have our constitution home in Canada. But at the same time there must be the understanding that an amending formula must be attached to it, which receives the consensus of all the provinces and all the governments participating. That has been the understanding in our country, Mr. Speaker, and that's why the constitutional conferences in '64, '68, and '61 failed: simply because one province said, I don't think I can go along with that particular amending formula, and as a result it was pulled off the table and we stay with the status quo.

In terms of the amending formula, you'll recall the debate in this Assembly in the fall of 1976, when the province put forward its proposal. The Alberta proposal recognizes at least one important principle; that is, all provinces within Confederation are equal, and no changes can be made to our resources, to our proprietary interest, to our assets, without our agreement. That's the one side of it, the important principle which all of you know is fundamental to our amending formula. At the same time, there have been many criticisms about the amending formula, such as, it's too rigid or too flexible. So we tried to find some place in between which first of all would encourage consensus and, secondly, work towards recognition of the diversity of our country, the recognition that there is a Quebec factor — not a dualism, but in fact some other diversity which has to be recognized in our constitution. That became the Alberta formula.

My colleague the Alberta Treasurer initiated discussion on the Alberta formula and had some success with it up to February 1979, the last constitutional conference, when I took over. I might add, there was some interest in it. Finally, through the summer we did find a consensus. The Alberta formula or Vancouver consensus was agreed to by 10 provinces, specifically including Ontario and Quebec. I don't deny they had some questions. I don't deny that some concerns were expressed by them: how do we deal with the general amending formula; does it apply to the Supreme Court; can you have institutions modified by the general amending formula, with an opting out formula? Many questions had to be considered. But it took some time, and we worked hard on the task of the Alberta amending formula. It became the Vancouver consensus, and I think it had an awful lot to offer Canadians in terms of an amending formula.

Well, 10 provinces agreed: the federal government said, well, it's too fuzzy; we can't agree with this; I'll have to think about it; and maybe as a final line. These were some of the comments which were given to us. At no time

did they offer anything significant to the debate. At no time was an alternative provided to us. In fact they hummed and hawed their way through that entire debate and said, well let's wait and see, or gee, I don't like the veto connotation in the Alberta formula. Nothing can be further from the truth, and nothing could have delayed the process longer than the federal position on the amending formula.

Offshore resources is another prime example where the 10 provinces said, gee, I don't think there should be second-class provinces in this country. I think that in 1867 the four provinces got together and all agreed to have resources transferred. I indicated that in Alberta we were celebrating the 50th anniversary of the resource transfer Act. We also made a very strong case. In fact Alberta took the lead in that debate, that there should be a similar proprietary interest in offshore resources. That is fundamental to our position with respect to resources, specifically with respect to offshore resources.

Mr. Speaker, 10 provinces agreed to that as well; some reluctance in a couple of areas, but generally a wide consensus on the transfer of offshore resources to the provinces. Well the federal government said, no, we want an administrative arrangement; we think we can give you 100 per cent today, and maybe when you become a have province, we'll go you 43 per cent, and maybe some other formula. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they wanted more options and alternatives in the constitution which would totally take away the rights of all provinces in terms of resource ownership than I could believe. I was astounded by the lack of reaction to the simple position that all provinces are equal; the provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, should have the same rights we do. Why don't we see that achieved? Ten provinces saying yes; the federal government saying no.

Well in my view, that's not the way constitutional change can be affected, and it's obviously not the way any other federal government wanted to proceed. They simply said, no way.

Other areas — family law, equalization, communication, fisheries — were generally accepted by the provinces. Strong elements of consensus prevailed, strong feelings that we could work out an arrangement on each of these items. Sure, in the case of family law, Manitoba had a different view. Clearly in the area of equalization, British Columbia wanted the wording changed. In the case of fisheries, there was some disagreement between New Brunswick and Newfoundland. None the less, Mr. Speaker, overall, in these issues, these clear division-of-power issues, a good understanding, a good consensus was achieved. But the federal government says, no, we don't want to deal with it. Ten provinces, agreement; one against.

There were a couple areas of course where the federal government did have a priority. Powers over the economy — they wanted to strike at the legislation which the province now has. They argued strongly that they did not have enough powers to centralize the economic tools of this country, yet they have all the economic powers they need: the power of banking, the power of trade and commerce, the power of direct taxation, indirect taxation. The list goes on and on, but they wanted more.

Mr. Speaker, clearly stated, the federal position on powers over the economy was a clear inroad, a clear intrusion on our jurisdiction, and we could not accept the format under which it was presented. We did provide an alternative. We didn't just say no. We provided an alter-

native which, in terms of concept, was simply that we agreed with the economic union between the provinces; we agreed with the general concept that was spelled out now in the constitution. We put it in much the same form as equalization is now being discussed. However, that wasn't acceptable either.

Charter of rights. Again, Mr. Speaker, although the provinces were generally in disagreement, could not see entrenchment of the charter of rights, of course some provinces agreed in part; others saw broad agreement on the fundamental points. But broadly speaking, the provinces did not agree with the entrenchment of a charter of rights.

The interesting development I guess, Mr. Speaker, is in the Senate reform area. Now all of us have talked about Senate reform. Throughout the summer I think there was about the largest collection of experts on the Senate that I've ever seen. People have written papers since 1958. Everyone has a position on Senate reform. It's the most normative set of circumstances anyone could suggest. Well every government brought their experts with them, and I tell you it was a very interesting debate. It took a lot of time. I don't know what came out of it, except that we didn't agree to change the Senate.

We agreed to set up some new body, called the House of the Provinces, which I think generally had some merit. It would deal with some of these differences. It would represent all provinces equally. It would operate in a manner which I thought had some merit. But again, towards the end of the discussion, the Minister of Justice kept saying, well I don't think we can achieve anything there; why don't we lay that over? Why don't we defer that in some manner? In other words, why do we deal with it at all?

I think the leadership of B.C. was very strong there. We saw that they had taken a position on Senate reform and, I think, managed to convince a fair number of participating provinces and governments. We could see some merit in this House of the Provinces. I think everybody agrees there should be Senate reform. I think that at some point, maybe 50 years from now when we're back, sitting in the Speaker's gallery, we might be hearing the same speeches on Senate reform.

MR. NOTLEY: Faster than that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Faster? Okay, Grant, I hope so.

But I think this is an area which would be difficult to change. It's an institution, and we already have the court case, which clearly states that the federal government can't change the Senate unilaterally. So they were working in this bit of difficulty.

On the Supreme Court, we saw the provinces generally agree on entrenching the Supreme Court in the constitution; a general agreement on some of the changes which could be recommended. Again you don't see any recognition of the Supreme Court changes in the current resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, that was the brief overview on the items before us. You notice I didn't talk about the preamble, simply because they're words and everybody has their position on words. At some point there may need to be a preamble to the constitution; that was discussed for some length of time. But when it came down to division of powers questions, those items which provided certainty to the operation of governments, which spelled out the way in which governments could legislate, the section of the British North America Act which deals with these partic-

ular powers — which go to the province, which go to the federal government — the federal government was not excited about discussion. They wanted to talk about these very broad issues, which they didn't seem to put forward in terms of alternatives. But they would not at all debate specifically the division of powers questions.

At the same time, as many speakers have noted, several things happened which I don't think were in the spirit of good faith. First of all, the advertising campaign. If I was sitting across from many of my colleagues here and knew I was going to introduce an advertising campaign, and we had been working together on the constitution over the summer, I think I'd give some warning. I'd say, you know, Monday we're going to have an advertising campaign which is going to sell the general need to change the constitution. But that wasn't the case. They didn't give us any forewarning at all, yet we were sitting there as friends and colleagues. No warning that this advertising campaign was forthcoming.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, is the question of these leaked documents, which set out sinister strategies which in fact are coming true, strategies designed to show that certain provincial governments have weak positions, that if you work on this particular aspect of that province's position, you can weaken it and therefore draw it away from the western block or the Atlantic block: very sinister and, I guess, Machiavellian ploys built into those memos. They didn't add much to the constitutional debate over the summer.

So all in all, I think there was general agreement among the provinces on many of the issues. A general policy was emerging, a threat of consensus. I'd say a majority on most issues was evident. But where it was evident and the federal government disagreed, nothing moved forward, nothing agreed to.

All of you had a chance to see the September 8 to 12 conference attended by all premiers and, of course, the Prime Minister. We saw, I think, that that conference collapsed. It didn't achieve much. I think you saw two different views of Canada, two different views of our federation. One view, that only the federal government can speak for Canada and the provinces can't, is the central point of view; secondly, that the Canadian federation is overly decentralized today. I think two important elements came out of that viewpoint: nothing in terms of consensus, nothing in terms of agreement on the work which had gone on over the summer.

We find ourselves today with a resolution before Parliament, a resolution on the Canadian constitution, 1980. What does it do? Frankly, it is the most serious intrusion I've seen in some time into provincial jurisdiction. It ignores the general conventions we have agreed to. It strikes at the legislative capacity of this Assembly. I think all of us must be taken aback by that inroad, by that challenge.

The Prime Minister in the first ministers' conference in his very last comment said about the amending process and about patriation that patriation is a very neutral act; it doesn't do anything. He only said half the story, gave half the position. Patriation with an amending formula is a very neutral act, but patriation with an amending formula imposed unilaterally is something else again. That's what we have before us today: patriation with an amending formula which has clearly been rejected. Since 1971, the provinces have not talked about the Victoria Charter. They've clearly rejected it as an amending option. He certainly did not effect a neutral act when he brought this resolution forward. In fact, he brought

forward one of the most hostile Acts I've ever seen, and which I think will be remembered for some time.

It does a lot of things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it takes away the notion of provincial equality. There's no such thing; it's been undermined; it's been taken away by this unilateral move. Secondly, it suggests that the responsibilities and the separation between governments are essentially being clouded. The division of powers, which at one time was keenly regarded as important between governments, is being camouflaged. We see inroads into our jurisdiction in the area of education. We see unilateral actions taking place which could affect our own resource questions.

No question about it, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious attempt by the federal government to change the existing constitution, to change the existing federation as we know it. The principle of an amending formula, a principle which can go back in terms of understanding between governments, an understanding between the federal Parliament [and] Westminster, has been changed dramatically by this unilateral move. It's always been the case that if amendment affects the powers of the provinces, there has to be consensus among the 11 governments on that particular point. Well that just isn't the case. Nothing could be further from the truth in terms of this proposal. I can assure you that if this proposal moves forward and is not challenged seriously in the courts, is not overturned, we will have an irreversible situation. We'll have a federation which none of us has experienced over the past 113 years, and the legal status of the provinces will be seriously eroded by the federal move.

Let me again look at the resolution before us, because I think it's important that we understand what has been included or reflected in this proposed constitutional resolution. I've indicated already the effort and work which has gone into developing an amending formula. If you look at the history of Canada you'll find, going back to 1935 and 1936, that the initial debate took place on various forms of amending processes. In 1960-61, the Fulton/Favreau formula was suggested. In 1968-71 we saw the Victoria Charter. Even in early 1979 we had the debate on various proposals for amendment. We had this summer's proposal on the amending process as well.

However, in the resolution offered to us we find the old Victoria formula introduced again, a Victoria formula which we have never seen before. If you look at the history of the Victoria amending formula, you'll find there was some protection for provinces such as Prince Edward Island. We all know that this particular formula, the Victoria formula, ignores the equality of provinces. It talks about the regions; it does not respect the individual rights of the provinces. Clearly there could be changes to the constitution which could take away the right of a province simply by the way the formula is set up here. In 1968-71 — we already talked about the Member for Olds-Didsbury; he was at Victoria in 1971, and he'll remember well that that formula gave recognition to the amendments with respect to the Atlantic provinces, stating that any two Atlantic provinces could block an amendment to the constitution, any two provinces in the Atlantic region. That included Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.

If you look at this particular arrangement, there's been a slight change which makes some of the provinces, in particular Prince Edward Island because of its population, third-class provinces, simply by adding two little words: that the amendment to the constitution shall be

agreed to by two of the provinces in the Atlantic region with at least 50 per cent of the population. The unfortunate thing about this, Mr. Speaker, is if you take Prince Edward Island and couple it with any of the other provinces, you'll never have 50 per cent of the population. In fact it requires three of the provinces to effect amendment to the constitution using this cumbersome, outdated Victoria formula. This is not the kind of amendment I want to see. It takes a small province, 150,000 people, and gives it a third-class position within Confederation. That in itself is enough to offend most people who have studied constitutional history and the amending process over the past three years.

That's one point. That's Section 41, that says by resolution of the assemblies, these kinds of changes can be effected. It then goes on, Mr. Speaker, to provide for another intrusion, which I think is the most serious of all. It says, well, let's try it with the resolution by the Assembly, and if that doesn't pass, then we'll use our old friend the referendum. Yes, the referendum, the old tone, the old position which keeps coming forward in most of the federal government's legislation. We already saw the history of the referendum Bill, introduced in 1970, which provided for a referendum across Canada. The position of this government is well known, in terms of a national referendum where the population of other parts of Canada could take away our rights. We all know that very well. To introduce it here again, to go over the heads of the Assembly, is a confiscation of the rights I have as a member of this Assembly, and a confiscation of the rights I have as an Albertan. It says that if the resolution does not pass, then we can call our own question, which would require a simple percentage agreement across Canada, 51 per cent. That could probably be found very simply in two or three of the provinces, probably not Alberta, and as well an agreement by referendum in any of the six provinces, passing the six provinces affected. What does that do? It simply takes away the right of this Assembly to change the constitution. I think that's the kind of unilateral action we just cannot stand for. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that with the added difficulty of acting without any kind of consultation, imposing the Victoria formula, which had been rejected out-of-hand, ignoring the consensus which was developed by the Alberta or the Vancouver consensus, taking away the rights of Prince Edward Island, imposing the referendum, we find that the whole thing, just on the amending process itself, is one of the worst kinds of reprehensible act we have seen for some time. I only hope that at some point we can find a way in which we can really move forward with constitutional changes which have some meaning, which reflect the heart of all the provinces and the people represented by the elected people. But unfortunately this process is not provided for today in this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the time is pressing close to the time to adjourn, and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's not proposed that the House sit this evening.

[At 5:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]