

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Monday, April 6, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask hon. members to remain standing for a moment as a tribute to our respected former colleague Mr. Don Hansen, and as a tribute to the service which he has rendered to his constituency and this province.

[In tribute to the late Mr. Donald Hansen, members of the Assembly observed a few moments of silence]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 8****The Credit Union Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 8, The Credit Union Amendment Act, 1981.

The amendments provided for in the Bill reflect the growing strength and maturity of the credit union industry in the province of Alberta, and will see the shifting of responsibility in loan matters to the individual credit unions and to the stabilization corporation. In addition, alternative methods of voting will be provided to members of credit unions, having regard to the large growth in the membership. The stabilization corporation, which guarantees members' deposits, now has assets of \$21 million, and the growth of total assets of credit unions has been phenomenal in that that's moved from \$24 million in 1959 to over \$2 billion last year.

[Leave granted; Bill 8 read a first time]

**Bill 5****The Department of Agriculture  
Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, The Department of Agriculture Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of the Bill is to have loan guarantees in a form that is approved by the Provincial Treasurer.

[Leave granted; Bill 5 read a first time]

**Bill 4****The Livestock Brand Inspection  
Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Innisfail, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, The Livestock Brand Inspection Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of the Bill is to allow for commissions to be paid to those persons who collect inspection fees on behalf of the government.

[Leave granted; Bill 4 read a first time]

**Bill 15****The Municipal Government  
Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 15, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1981.

There are a number of important areas of amendment affecting municipal government in this legislation, among which are some proposals with respect to the system of annexation as presently outlined in The Municipal Government Act; in addition, some proposed changes with respect to the manner in which citizens petition for a plebiscite. Some important changes are being proposed with respect to violations for infractions of early closing and closing day by-laws in our municipalities. Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments affecting the fines for violations of certain provisions in The Municipal Government Act, in addition to some important administrative changes.

[Leave granted; Bill 15 read a first time]

**Bill 11****The Alberta Municipal Financing  
Corporation Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 11, The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1981. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this short Bill has only one amendment. It proposes a raising of the cumulative borrowing limit of the 25-year-old Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation from \$3.2 billion, which is the existing limit by legislation, to \$4.3 billion. The purpose of this proposal is to accommodate municipal and school requests with regard to their probable borrowing requirements for capital financing to mid-1982.

[Leave granted; Bill 11 read a first time]

**Bill 6****The Attorney General Statutes  
Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to introduce Bill No. 6, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1981.

This Bill will make certain changes in The Commissioners for Oaths Act and The Notaries Public Act that for the first time will involve the conferring upon Members of Parliament and Senators from Alberta the same privilege of being a notary public and a commissioner for oaths as automatically extends to members of this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, it would not be addressing in any sense the merits of the matter to note that it's an unprecedented level of co-operation, instigated in this particular case by a former member of this House who is now a Member of Parliament.

In respect to the balance of the amendment statute, Mr. Speaker, some important changes are being made in regard to the Master in Chambers, an official of the court system who is able to make certain directions and orders

on behalf of judges in the legal process, normally non-contentious matters. The duties of the Master will be expanded under three Acts: The Motor Vehicle Administration Act, The Execution Creditors Act, and The Possessory Liens Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 6 read a first time]

**Bill 24**

**The Motion Picture Development Act**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 24, The Motion Picture Development Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. The purpose of this Bill is to create a corporation to promote the development of the motion picture industry in Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 24 read a first time]

**Bill 13**

**The Department of Hospitals and Medical Care Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 13, The Department of Hospitals and Medical Care Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of this Act is to give the minister of the department authority to construct hospitals and transfer the administration of those appropriately.

[Leave granted; Bill 13 read a first time]

**Bill 9**

**The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 9, The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1981. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. The purpose of the Bill is to increase the statutory limit of a revolving fund operated by the Department of Education for the benefit of clients of the school book branch.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

**Bill 23**

**The Alberta Heritage Scholarship Act**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 23, The Alberta Heritage Scholarship Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide the administrative framework and machinery by which we will administer the \$100 million commitment towards scholarships provided in last fall's capital projects appropriation Bill from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. This provides that the administrative responsibility will rest with the expanded Students Finance Board, and will carry forward the commitment with respect to recognizing and rewarding achievement and excellence on the part of

Albertans through the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 23 read a first time]

**Bill 21**

**The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 21, The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of this Bill is to clarify the regulation-making power of the minister and the department, and to make other administrative changes necessary with respect to the reclassification of institutions served by the department.

[Leave granted; Bill 21 read a first time]

**Bill 10**

**The Department of Housing and Public Works Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 10, The Department of Housing and Public Works Amendment Act, 1981. This Bill will delete the order in council requirement for leases, easements, and disposition of improvements on Crown land, and will expand granting authority to include Public Works.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

**Bill 16**

**The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 16, The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1981. This amendment Act is to reaffirm and clarify our ability to assess and tax large equipment, such as for coal mining and oil sands use.

[Leave granted; Bill 16 read a first time]

**Bill 3**

**The Livestock Diseases Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Livestock Diseases Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of this Bill is to provide an appeal procedure for those people who dispense drugs related to the agricultural industry and whose licence has either been suspended or cancelled.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 read a first time]

**Bill 22**

**The Manpower Development Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 22, The Manpower Development Amendment Act, 1981.

As hon. members may recall, The Manpower Development Act was introduced in 1976 to bring together The Apprenticeship Act, The Tradesmen's Qualification Act,

and The Welding Act, and to introduce new concepts and practice to apprenticeship. The Manpower Development Act provides for participation of the general public through the Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Board, local provincial committees, and the Manpower Advisory Council.

This Bill amends the provisions respecting the appointment of members to the Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Board, in areas of residency qualifications. The local and provincial advisory committees will be renamed apprenticeship committees to avoid misinterpretation of their functions, which include other than advisory matters.

[Leave granted; Bill 22 read a first time]

#### Bill 14

##### The Interprovincial Subpoena Act

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 14, The Interprovincial Subpoena Act. In a nutshell, this Bill will permit subpoenas issued from courts in other provinces to be recognized in Alberta in matters of civil law, and further allows courts in Alberta to issue subpoenas that will be recognized in other provinces with similar legislation.

[Leave granted; Bill 14 read a first time]

#### Bill 2

##### The Lloydminster Municipal Amalgamation Act, 1981

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 2, The Lloydminster Municipal Amalgamation Act, 1981. The purpose of the Bill is to provide legal status for the Lloydminster charter, which came into effect on February 1, 1979, and to provide that the charter shall have full force of law.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

#### Bill 17

##### The Police Amendment Act, 1981

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 17, The Police Amendment Act, 1981. There are two important facets of the Bill: first, the Act will permit those communities presently served by RCMP under contract the option of establishing or not establishing a police commission; second, the Act permits regulations to be established providing disciplinary proceedings for special constables.

[Leave granted; Bill 17 read a first time]

#### Bill 12

##### The Innkeepers Amendment Act, 1981

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, The Innkeepers Amendment Act, 1981. This Bill brings in amendments that will take care of problems for innkeepers.

[Leave granted; Bill 12 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills numbered 16, 3, 22, 14, 2, 17, 4, and 12, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

#### Bill 201

##### The Freedom of Information Act

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill on behalf of my colleague the Member for Clover Bar. I might add that I'm sure my colleague would feel that one should save the best for last.

The Bill to be introduced is Bill No. 201, The Freedom of Information Act. This Bill provides protection for individual Albertans against the circulation of confidential information of a personal nature and, secondly, assures that Albertans will have access to information processed and handled by the government.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

#### Bill 202

##### The Consumer Purchasing Power Index Act

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that the last Bill was the best . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: I hate to disagree, but mine is last.

I beg leave to introduce Bill 202, The Consumer Purchasing Power Index Act. The purpose of this Bill is to establish a realistic basis on which to compare and assess the relative purchasing power of today's consumer.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley for first reading of a Bill entitled The Consumer Purchasing Power Index Act, would all the members in favor of the motion please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed please say no. The motion is adopted.

#### Bill 203

##### An Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 203, An Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act.

This is enabling legislation, its purpose being simply to allow individual municipalities, which so desire, to provide their citizens with access to the assistance of the Ombudsman on matters of municipal jurisdiction. The same principles which moved this Legislature to establish the office of the Ombudsman for provincial concerns apply to this Bill in its extension to municipal concerns.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of procedure. At the moment, I think the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley was not declared to have been read a first time. By way of a signal from the Clerk, I gather that he hasn't received the necessary copy. But my understanding of the rules is that so long as the

printed form is available prior to second reading, that would be adequate, and the Bill could be read a first time on the statement made by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: That would appear to be the case. In that event, I called the motion and declared it carried. Perhaps the hon. Clerk would make the necessary declaration.

[Leave granted; Bill 202 read a first time]

#### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the annual financial statements of the five provincial general hospitals for year ended March, 1980.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Forest Development Research Trust Fund annual report for 1979-80.

#### head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it is my distinct pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 60 grade 6 students from the Belvedere school located in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. They are accompanied by their teachers Georgia Kortes, Carol Symons, and Doug Buchanan, and their bus driver Doug Tebby. I would ask that they rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I have the privilege of introducing to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, Japanese exchanges of the Alberta-Hokkaido dairy exchange program. The group consists of 11 members who are spending a week on an orientation course before they go to their host family farms to spend a full year. They are seated in the members gallery with their interpreters and a member of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Spencer Goddard. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 10 staff members of the institutional services mental health department in my constituency of Edmonton Centre. They are accompanied by their group leader, Mrs. Jane Gateman, and are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the House.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it's also my privilege to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, students from the Leduc grade 9 class in my constituency. They are seated in the public gallery with their teacher Verna Schraefel, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce a special guest to the Legislature — and special he is, because in 1980 he celebrated his 75th birthday and received a gold medallion, and is truly one

of our Alberta sons of the soil. He is seated in the members gallery with a member of the family. May I ask Mr. John Youzwysyn and the other member of the family, Mike Youzwysyn, to stand and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 32 grades 7, 8, and 9 students, representing nine nationalities. These students are from the McDougall junior high school in Edmonton Centre. Accompanied by teachers Miss Muldonado, Miss Marianne Ritchie, and Mrs. Joan Neal, they are seated in the public gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Government Fiscal Policies**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature, Albertans have heard that we must lower expectations. Today in question period I would like to look at the motives for that particular statement.

My question is to the Provincial Treasurer. Does the government feel that lowered expectations are really necessary in terms of reduced revenue that may be forecast, or at the present time is the government engaged in some type of creative bookkeeping to set the stage for a political war with Ottawa? What are the motives?

MR. HYNDMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the budget is the proper place to discuss those matters further and at some length, so they can be discussed intelligently. I look forward very much to debating them with the hon. member when the budget comes down very shortly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. In terms of discussions of the budget, I think some of the ground rules should be established in this Legislature. From some of the information from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, this government has some \$18 billion available to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister is as follows: in light of the predicted revenue that is available to this government, can the government indicate why it is necessary for Albertans to lower expectations of the government? Or is it just because the government wants to create an attitude of war with Ottawa?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, these matters can't be discussed intelligently when they're in isolation with figures that are being bandied about by the hon. member opposite. I suggest that we debate them and debate the revenue picture of the province when it is better known, after the forthcoming budget, which will be down on April 14.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. These are not figures that are bandied about; they are figures that have been provided by this government and by the minister's department.

My question to the minister, if he wants a straightforward question so it's easy for him to answer, is with regard to the principle relative to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. This will give Albertans an indication of what to expect in terms of lower expectations. In principle — and I'm not asking about percentages — is the government going to change the principle of placing 30 per cent of royalty revenue in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Mr. Speaker, all I'm asking is: in principle, can the minister indicate the government's position at this time?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, in principle that subject is established by the Legislature every year. The government, as a responsible government, will propose a figure to the Assembly this fall for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1982.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I ask the question directly: will there be a change in principle from the 30 per cent established in previous Legislatures?

MR. HYNDMAN: As members know, Mr. Speaker, last fall the 30 per cent figure was passed for the fiscal year 1981-82 beginning April 1, just a few days ago. As indicated in the throne speech, because of the imprecision with respect to revenue flows in the future, which has occurred this year by reason of the Ottawa energy program, the government is not in a position at this moment to know what the recommendation will be to this Assembly this fall, in five or six months, with respect to the percentage that would be in the Bill presented to the Assembly this fall for the ensuing fiscal year. Therefore I think it is a very responsible approach, because we don't know what the figure would be, whether 30 per cent or a different figure. There may be a modification, but we'll present that after we have assessed, and after the Assembly has assessed, the revenue picture in the months ahead.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer for information for this Legislature. Could the minister indicate whether the projections made by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources on November 17, 1980, with regard to real returns from the sale of Alberta petroleum and natural gas production are still valid? Or have other studies been done since November 17 that could be tabled in this Legislature and made available to members for consideration?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, revenue and other projections are constantly updated from time to time. Of course the budget, which will be forthcoming in a matter of days, will contain revenue projections and statements as to the expected revenues from non-renewable natural resources and other sources over the coming year. So they will be available to the Assembly in a matter of days.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the hon. minister with regard to my initial objective, the motives. Could the minister clearly state in this Legislature that the request to Albertans to lower expectations is not based on the fact that the government needs some type of lever or instrument to continue the fight with Ottawa, that it is because there will be reduced revenue in this province?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is increasingly obvious — certainly to Albertans generally if not to all members of the Assembly — that the Ottawa energy proposals do have, and will be having, a negative effect on aspects of revenue for the province of Alberta, and that therefore it is important and prudent that that consideration be taken in mind with respect to future budgeting.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, when we have an average of \$6 billion projected in this province, it's a little difficult for me to see where Albertans must lower expectations.

MR. SINDLINGER: Could I have a supplementary, please, Mr. Speaker? Could the minister indicate to the Legislative Assembly whether or not long-term forecasts are done in regard to these projections we've been talking about?

MR. HYNDMAN: As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, forecasts are done from time to time and on a regular basis. I might mention, particularly with respect to changes in federal policies over the last six to 12 months, that it's difficult to project or predict what the revenues or flows in volumes will be, particularly in the energy area. Therefore there are certainly ranges which can be and are available with regard to volumes and prices in the years ahead, but nothing more than ranges.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would it be possible for the minister to provide those ranges for information to the Legislative Assembly, and to give some indication when the heritage fund would be required to meet general expenditures for government services?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's not possible to make those predictions with any degree of accuracy or to provide information that would be useful for debate. The ranges are provided and would be provided with regard to the next fiscal year when the budget comes down, but I think most hon. members will find that any projections made over the last six to 18 months in fact have been quite different from what has occurred. So it's not possible to prepare or table long-range predictions.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given the fact that you have indicated that long-range forecasts have been done, and we do appreciate that they are imprecise, can those ranges still be given to the Legislative Assembly for the information of members?

MR. HYNDMAN: I doubt that, Mr. Speaker. In the planning for the budget, I think it's necessary to try to inject as great a degree of precision as we possibly can. But I don't think it would further the debate in the Assembly, or the public interest of the province, to present very wide ranges of what are really unpredictable numbers, unpredictable volumes. This government will present the facts and figures which it believes are in the best interest of the province; therefore the Assembly and those on the other side who have different points of view can present their views and budgets when they wish. [interjections]

**Budget Date**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. In answer to a question, the Provincial Treasurer indicated that budget night was Tuesday, the 14th. On my calendar it usually would be the 17th, which is a Friday night. Can the minister verify that it is the 14th?

MR. HYNDMAN: Perhaps the hon. House leader should answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to some hon. members that in all probability budget night would be the 15th. But recently the matter has been reviewed, and we now consider that it should be on Tuesday night, the 14th. So I welcome this opportunity of giving hon. members that information.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it's this kind of reaction we have from this government with regard to expenditures, of planning after the fact when things happen, that's very disturbing.

**RCMP Contract**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Solicitor General. Again it looks to be an area of lack of performance by this government. At the present time the negotiations are continuing between Ottawa and Alberta. What guarantee have we as Albertans that the same level of RCMP service will be maintained, even if Alberta is not able to agree on the same percentage of funding by the federal government? Will any RCMP services in Alberta be reduced because of the negotiations?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any change in the level of service.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General. Have we the Solicitor General's assurance that if Ottawa does not give as much money to the program as they have in the past, and Alberta may have to finance a greater share of the program, the level of RCMP service will be maintained at a good quality level or higher level than at the present time in this province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, it will be the government's intention to maintain the high level of police service that's available. As to the outcome of the negotiations, I can't predict at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the negotiations, when the province may have to put a greater amount of funding into the program, could the hon. Solicitor General indicate if there will be any effect on the funding provided by municipalities in this province to keep the service at the same level?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting further and further afield into the area of hypothetical questions. Perhaps he could relate his question to fact.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, could I pose a supplementary question to the hon. Solicitor General, and ask him to assure the Assembly that no burden will be placed on municipal governments and their taxes this year as a

result of a wrangle between Alberta and Ottawa over RCMP financing.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can't give any such assurance.

**Constitution**

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Premier. I wonder if the Premier would clarify to the House his public statement regarding the present federal constitutional package, that Alberta would oppose and continue to oppose the federal constitutional package, even if the Supreme Court of Canada approved that package. In other words, has the Alberta policy regarding the present federal constitutional package changed?

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy of Alberta and many of the provincial governments — surely all the provincial governments — that constitutional change should be recognized as the prerogative of elected people; that is, legislative assemblies and parliaments make the law for Canada and the provinces. But clearly the Supreme Court's role in this particular constitutional debate must be seen as an arbiter. It's an arbiter of perhaps narrow legal questions.

Mr. Speaker, of course that does not remove the question as to whether or not the central government can change the federation we now have. That is, is a unilateral process acceptable and one which the people of Canada can accept, from a parliamentary point of view? It is our view that even though the Supreme Court of Canada will be called upon to arbitrate the legal matters, in particular to decide whether or not there is a shift in the division of powers, if in fact that does take place, the conflict and the divisive nature of that unilateral move by Mr. Trudeau and the central government will continue to be debated and argued here in Canada. It is for that reason that while we recognize the importance of the Supreme Court of Canada, we recognize much more the importance of elected people in the Canadian law-making process.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify further for all members of the Legislature and of course the public at large. As I understand it, is the hon. minister indicating that the main thrust of the opposition to that is that it's a unilateral move by the federal government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that has been the opposition. Certainly the eight provinces are now clearly opposing, because it is a unilateral process which, as a result of our interpretation, and I suppose reinforced by the Newfoundland Court of Appeal, does change the division of powers in Canada. I think that is a significant principle, and therefore we will continue to oppose that unilateral process. There was an opportunity for some consensus this summer, and I think the statement on Friday by the chairman of the Premiers' Conference, Mr. Lyon, shows again that there is consensus among eight provinces, particularly with respect to patriation and a constitutional amending process.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise whether it's the government's intention to make any time available during the spring session to deal with the constitution by specific resolution of the government? More particularly, is either the minister or the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether or not the details of the agreement of the eight premiers, which I gather is going to be released on April 16, will necessitate a change in the resolution passed in 1976 binding the government of Alberta to a particular patriation formula?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I recall very well the resolution, passed 70 to one last fall in this Assembly, which I think clearly states the opposition of this Assembly to the unilateral process of Mr. Trudeau and the Ottawa government. So I don't think it's necessary for us to bring forward another resolution to show our displeasure with that particular process.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unless someone wants to change their position.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I understand there may have been some change in his position.

Mr. Speaker, at this point it is not our intention to develop fully the amending process which has been agreed to by the eight provinces, simply because it has been agreed among the eight premiers that they will debate that in public on April 16 in Ottawa.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was a nice effort to slide around it, but my specific question to the hon. minister is: as a result of the agreement Mr. Lyon announced the other day, will it be necessary to have a resolution put before the Assembly to deal with the 1976 resolution of this Assembly which binds Executive Council?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, without suggesting the specifics which might be in any amending formula which the provinces have concurred in, I can give the assurance to the Legislative Assembly that the guideposts recognized in the debate in November 1976 are reflected in our amending position.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Again, a nice try, but we're not talking about the guideposts; we're talking about a very specific motion of this Legislature which binds the government of Alberta. As a result of the discussions leading up to and taking place on April 16 and thereafter, is it going to be the intention of the government to introduce a resolution, if necessary, to free the government from the provisions of the 1976 resolution, which is very, very specific?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have read the resolution, and I have read the debates in this Assembly. I also happen to have been here. I realize the positions outlined by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and I can assure him that I recognize fully the responsibility which the resolution gives the government. But I can only go on to say that whether it's a guidepost or a principle, we have recognized those principles in the amending formula. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that when the formula is presented, he will be able to read and judge for himself whether or not we recognize those principles.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, just on a supplementary point of considerable interest to the Legislative Assembly. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview is so strongly in favor of us supporting the resolution that he opposed.

MR. NOTLEY: To the hon. Premier: I'm certainly not here to defend the 1976 resolution; that's not the point. The question really is: as a result of the discussions, are we going to be in a position to debate in this Assembly a resolution which will allow the government to accept an amending formula which I suspect certainly will not be able to meet the test of the specifics of the 1976 resolution?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I won't react to that editorial comment, because the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is surely speculating. When he sees the amending formula in front of him, he can judge it then.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister or the Premier. It comes from the statement the minister just made. Is the minister or the Premier in a position to indicate to the Assembly that the discussions taking place with the premiers in Ottawa will in fact be public?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we've finalized the arrangements for the meeting itself yet, but I'm sure some portion of it will be public in terms of improving public communication and awareness for that small minority of Canadians who favor Mr. Trudeau's position.

MR. R. CLARK: I would hope that the discussions would be public.

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Has the government given consideration to the possible need for a debate in this Assembly, following the potential agreement that has been mentioned? I recognize it's of a highly speculative nature. But at the same time, when one's talking about the constitution of the country and the effect it has on this province, has the government given serious consideration to a debate in this Assembly, on the premise that an agreement is worked out with the eight premiers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's something we'll give ongoing consideration to. The Member for Olds-Didsbury is well aware that we had extensive debate on this subject last fall and that during the fall session of 1976 we, alone among the provinces, I guess, presented our position paper and had a debate on the particular question of the amending formula. But it may evolve that it is in the interest of the Assembly to consider the matter further. I think we'll just have to see how matters evolve and the timing of those matters. We would neither accept the suggestion nor reject it at this point.

#### Native Assistance

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs. It flows from the recommendations, almost two years ago now, of the standing committee on the heritage trust fund for financing for native business ventures, also the minister's announcement of almost a year ago of venture funding, and the recent announcement in the Speech

from the Throne. In view of these promises, is the minister in a position to outline clearly to the Assembly today what effect, if any, these promises will have on the plight of the members of the Bigstone Band in Desmarais now facing 60 per cent unemployment?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first question, a business assistance program for native people was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and that is prepared and ready for the native people. Basically, it's assistance with respect to business know-how, business expertise, and business advice. This program is ready. The native venture capital is not yet completed, but we are getting a great deal of response from the private sector. Hopefully we will have something further to say on that this summer.

With respect to what has been done for the [Bigstone] Band from Wabasca-Desmarais, the offer has been made by the MLA from the area and myself to meet with the chief and members of his band, if they so desire, when they come to Edmonton.

Also, the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife; the minister from the Wabasca-Desmarais area, the Hon. Larry Shaben; and I were there three months ago at the request of the band and the Metis population of the area for a community pasture. The Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife offered two sections for that community pasture, my department offered to pay for the fencing materials around the area, and the chief of the Bigstone Band and the band agreed to match the minister's offer of two sections of land. An agreement was reached whereby a community pasture was set up. At that time we also offered to do an economic study of the area, if so requested. No request has yet been received.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether or not both the venture capital program, when it is unveiled, and the business assistance corporation will be available to treaty Indians as well as non-status Indians? Have we worked out the programs in such a way that they don't get caught in yet another federal/provincial conflict?

DR. McCRIMMON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will be available to both.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What formal consultation took place with the Indian Association of Alberta, the Federation of Metis Settlements, and the Metis Association of Alberta, prior to the government's announcement of the business assistance corporation? What specific consideration was given by the government to the concern of the Indian Association of Alberta that there should be native control, and not simply a set-up whereby government and business look after the administration and funding of the program?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Metis Association and the consultation with them as far as the business assistance program, it was at the request of the Metis Association that the government followed up the business assistance program and followed it through. It was at the recommendation and request of the Metis Association of Alberta.

With respect to your second question, the history of government operating native ventures in conjunction

between government and native ventures has not been too good over the past number of years. If the venture capital program goes ahead, it will not be run by government but by private enterprise.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister said, if it goes ahead. Can the minister give the assurance to the House that, as a result of his initial statement as well as the heritage trust fund recommendations and public announcements made before by the minister, it is a question of when it goes ahead, not if it goes ahead? Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as part of that question, my direct question to the minister is: what provision has been given to the concern expressed by the chiefs in Alberta that it shouldn't be just a case of private-enterprise funding under some company's control, but that in fact there should be native control through native entrepreneurial skills?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, several of the bands have been invited to participate in the private enterprise section of the venture capital, and one of the bands has indicated that it is quite prepared to participate. So it's not just controlled by a company or a limited number of companies; it's the participation of a good many companies plus, if they so wish, native bands and native groups within the province itself. So it's not limited or restricted to any group.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to report to the Assembly whether or not the government of Alberta has the support of the Alberta Indian Association for the business assistance corporation proposal as well as the proposal for venture capital?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I've had no formal statement from the Indian Association of Alberta that they are not in favor of it. Some may be, and some may not be. You don't ask them for a formal statement on every piece of business that comes up.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just a bit of information. You might contact the president of the Indian Association, and it would be fairly clear.

The question to the hon. minister: given the potential for destructive impact of major resource proposals near native communities on hunting, fishing, and trapping, what provision has the minister's department or the government of Alberta made for direct consultation with the people involved before major resource projects go ahead? Specifically, why was there no consultation with the people of the Wabasca-Desmarais community before the okay was given to proceed with the Gulf project in that area?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I think a reasonable amount of care has been taken with respect to wildlife and environment as far as the major developments, the megaprojects and the other projects that have gone in. A set of rules have been followed by the various companies involved, I believe. I have a little trouble following just what the hon. member is trying to get at.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Why was there no formal consultation with the people of the communities involved with respect to a project in the middle of their traditional hunting and trapping area?



Why did no one from the minister's department or the government of Alberta sit down with the people of the area involved and discuss the implications of the project with them before it proceeded? This has been done in other areas. Why wasn't it done in the case of the Gulf project near Wabasca-Desmarais?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, if there is a problem in that respect, I have heard very little of it, and I have been up in that area a great number of times. I have never heard this mentioned as a damaging effect on the wildlife or the area. I was up there just three months ago, and I've been up there half a dozen times over the last couple of years. This is the first time — and it's unusual that it would come from the floor of the House, when I have met with the chiefs and members of that area many, many times.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I can assure the minister that on Thursday, when he meets several hundred people on the front steps, he'll hear about it.

I would ask the hon. minister what specific steps we may see from the government of Alberta to deal with the unemployment problem, and whether or not there will be any discussions with the officials of Gulf Oil to encourage native employment at this particular project. Mr. Speaker, I raise this in view of the fact that the first march on the Legislature by the people of Wabasca-Desmarais was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member's question was complete. The postscript concerning marches on the Legislature is unnecessary.

MR. NOTLEY: Let's have the answer.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure Gulf Oil is quite open to having discussions on this matter, as is the government, if the native people in the area bring it to the government's attention. But until they ask it, I see no reason. How do I know the story I'm getting here today is right or not?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Why has the government not developed a policy that would include consultation with the people affected, so that job opportunities in the area could go to people who live in the area?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the history of Syncrude disproves what the hon. member is saying. When these megaprojects go ahead, I think the companies have been pretty conscientious and pretty good about trying to get the native people working in them as much as possible. This is why they're prepared to back some of these programs we're discussing. As a matter of fact, a great number of business people are having a gathering this weekend to see what can be done to assist in this matter. So I can't quite agree with the hon. member's thinking.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Why is the government not taking the initiative in terms of policy? Many companies are doing an excellent job. But why is the government not setting that kind of consultation as a policy, so that manpower in the area can take advantage of the opportunities? Why is that not

a policy of the minister's department? Why is the Native Secretariat not doing that as a matter of course, rather than leaving it up to the well-being of the companies involved or the happenstance of somebody contacting the minister's office? Why isn't that done as a matter of course?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member would take a look at our training programs through Advanced Education and Manpower — we have one of the best training programs in all of Canada for native people, just for this type of purpose. He may have a bit of tunnel vision, but if you look across the broad concept and the number of native people who are trained in the various universities, NAIT, SAIT, and various training programs — there's a long list of them. I'm sure the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower could follow up with quite a list of specifics on this area. I think perhaps the government is taking quite a bit of leadership in this direction.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the hon. minister. Fine, there are programs through Advanced Education and Manpower. However, my question to the minister is simply: why is there no policy in place from the minister's department . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is repeating a question that he has put previously at least once and at considerable length.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase the question and ask the minister when we might expect legislation presented by the government to authorize the Minister responsible for Native Affairs to enter ongoing negotiations so that in the future when projects like Gulf's proceed, there is local consultation and the maximum use of local manpower.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, my department is not in the training program. That is the prerogative and responsibility of the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

When you get back to the original question, this is a small pilot project in the Wabasca-Desmarais area. It's not a major project in any way, shape, or form. On a major project, yes, there is this type of consultation. But on smaller projects, I think perhaps the hon. member is a little premature.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and possibly the Acting Minister responsible for the Energy Resources Conservation Board. Could the ministers establish for the House whether there was consultation with the local people in the Wabasca area by Gulf Oil, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, or any other agencies of government involved with that project in any way, shape, or form?

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I believe there has been considerable discussion with people in the area. I know that with this project there has been discussion with Native Outreach, various branches of government, and

there has been considerable discussion before the project went ahead. I suppose how much discussion there is depends on the size of the project. On a small pilot project — there has been discussion to try to get the native people involved, and quite a number of them are involved in the actual project at Wabasca-Desmarais.

#### Day Care Standards

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Presently day care regulations do not require any staff training in early childhood development. Is it the minister's intent to bring in any regulation in this area?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question of a registry and staff training is currently being addressed by the Provincial Day Care Advisory Committee. It is the government's intent to move in two different directions on this matter: first, to work with the colleges in recognizing the program through colleges in Alberta and, second, an apprenticeship program that will be available through various day care centres across the province.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has proposed the maximum number of children in a day care centre will be 52. Could the minister indicate what's going to happen with those centres that have enrolments greater than 52?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the new regulations require that all new centres established have a combined population of 80 or less. Centres are in existence today that have students additional to that number. We have made provision in the regulations for a maximum of 100 children, depending on the circumstances. Those centres currently licensed above that limit are allowed to stay at that figure until such time as the centre changes hands. They are then required to come down to 100 if the space in the centre allows; otherwise there's a further reduction. All new centres establishing, Mr. Speaker, are established up to but not exceeding the figure of 100 spaces.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any requests, complaints, or input from day care centre operators or owners with regard to the new ratio? For an example I'm thinking of the one where there are three children to one staff member, or a maximum of six children under 18 months and have to have two staff members.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, just so that *Hansard* very clearly reflects my answer to that last question, the figure should have been 80 spaces rather than 100.

With regard to the new staff/child ratios which all day care centres must meet by August 1, 1982, there's a phase-in to that level between now and that time. More details will of course be provided following the Budget Address by my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, but it's our intention that the government will provide the additional funding so that any improvements in either the staff/child ratio or space allowances are not passed on to the full-fee-paying parents in day care centres. Therefore we will see an increase in the operating allowances provided by government to day care operators. That allowance is based on the total number of children in the centre, not just those who are receiving a subsidy or whose parents are entitled to receive a subsidy.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister also explain why no representatives of non-profit or municipal day care centres are on the Day Care Advisory Committee? My understanding is that it's private day care centres that are on the committee.

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker, that information is not accurate. Parents and day care operators from both the private and the public sector are on the Provincial Day Care Advisory Committee.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would also indicate to the House whether the policy regarding day care has changed recently, in that the standards are equal to and exceed those of the rest of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has successfully made a supplementary ministerial announcement.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, then I'd like to have the minister indicate whether the policy regarding day care has changed recently.

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In September 1980, I believe, we announced enriched standards which are to be met by all licensed day care centres by August 1, 1982. As I indicated earlier, there is a phase-in to allow day care centres to meet that objective on an orderly basis between now and that time.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Just before we go on with further business, the Assembly may have noticed some hesitation with regard to a Bill dealing with The Consumer Purchasing Power Index Act. I had made a wrong assumption. I had thought that that Bill had perhaps reached the Clerk, but it had not. The Clerk was actually in order in not calling it for first reading. I should say that if that happens on another occasion, I'll intervene to ensure that the Bill goes through the usual process. I had assumed it had, but of course to comply with our *Standing Orders*, a Bill must be scrutinized in advance to make sure that it does comply with the procedures and requirements of the Assembly.

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

Moved by Mrs. Embury:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate April 3: Mr. R. Speaker]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to extend my sympathy, and certainly my understanding, to the family of Don Hansen. As I was reviewing some of the *Hansards* earlier today, I noted that Don was in our gallery last fall. My feelings are certainly with them at this time, and I join other members in that condolence.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the throne speech. As well, I'd like to congratulate Mr. Lacombe on his new responsibilities as Sergeant-at-Arms. I'd like to give my appreciation again to my colleague Bob Clark for his service in this Assembly as Leader of the Official Opposition. As well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to the new leader of the Alberta Social Credit Party, Mr. Rod Sykes, who brings some very interesting background to our provincial party. As all recognize, he has been an undefeated mayor in the city of Calgary. He has much public and business experience and brings a very new and fresh approach to the Social Credit Party. We feel that some of the very basic principles Mr. Sykes stands for are necessary in the leadership of Alberta, and certainly are in tune and in line with the principles that have guided Social Credit and brought this province to the point it is at today.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that as House leader of the opposition I have two tasks to perform. My first task, which hopefully has been obvious in the opening days of this Legislature, is to judge the performance of this government. In my earlier remarks this afternoon that is my intention: to judge the last decade of performance of a Conservative government in Alberta and, after making judgment, to determine the conclusion.

Secondly, my responsibility as House leader in this Legislature is to place before this Assembly some alternative policies and programs that have the Alberta Social Credit Party as their label. We feel that some significant areas need more attention, a priority attention not only of this government but of our caucus. Priority areas include such general areas as municipal affairs, economic development, social development, agriculture, education, and transportation. We have selected those as our six areas of focus for this legislative session.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to my first topic and talk about the last decade of Conservative or Tory government in this province and, after examining the record and taking the lid off and looking at the real things that were happening, examine my conclusion, which was very simple: 10 years and 10 failures. That's the conclusion I came to; not minor failures, but failures in 10 major areas of this government's responsibility in the last 10 years. I'd like to look at those 10 failures.

Mr. Speaker, I've categorized those 10 failures in three general areas. There were two failures in economic responsibility: diversification and rural development. I looked at social responsibility. We can raise three failures: first of all, in terms of general social policy; secondly, in terms of providing health care facilities such as hospitals; and thirdly, a failure in an attitude in reaching Albertans in dealing with the teaching profession of this province, failures in the area of education.

I find five significant failures in the third general area I would like to examine — failures to meet certain goals established by this Lougheed team back in 1968 to 1971; goals that are on record and that have been failed by this government. I categorize those five failures under Ottawa/Alberta relations, lack of open government, a decline in the rights and powers of this Legislature, unlimited government, and denial of local autonomy in

this province of Alberta.

Those are 10 areas of concern in which I find failure by this government. I'd like to examine each of those general areas in more detail. First of all, economic responsibility, the topic of diversification. I was very pleased to see that diversification was mentioned again in the 1981 Speech from the Throne. But, Mr. Speaker, I have found that mentioning topics in the Speech from the Throne does not mean that this government carries out the objectives they established in that particular speech.

I'd like to review the record from 1971 until now to show what has really happened with regard to diversification in this province. I quote the hon. Premier, from March 12, 1971: Alberta needs a decade; it will take a decade to get ourselves away from our overdependency on natural resources and to build a broader based economy with the difficulties we have. Well, Mr. Speaker, a decade has gone by; our dependency on the petroleum sector has only increased, and we are in a more vulnerable position than ever before in terms of our economy.

In that speech the Premier went on to say about rural Albertans and smaller enterprises: We would offset the obstacles of smaller enterprises; we would have a program so that smaller enterprises could truly compete. I think we should examine the record in the last decade to see what's happened to that. We have seen just the opposite: big businesses growing larger in Alberta, greater corporate concentration, intervention by this government in various private businesses, and a reduction in small businesses.

The other day I mentioned in the Assembly that there has been a net loss of over 250 manufacturing firms in the last decade in the province of Alberta. At the same time we see the petroleum industry dominating our economy. Today the petroleum sector accounts for one-half of our net value of production, whereas in 1971 it was only one-third. What a drastic change. Haven't we done something in the last decade? Mr. Speaker, the conclusion can only be that Alberta's economy is even more vulnerable, the government has failed in its goals to change that dependency, and Albertans are now asked to lower their expectations.

It isn't Albertans who have failed. This government across the way has failed. If they would have met their original commitment and not have failed in the last decade, we would not have to talk today about lower expectations. We could talk about being positive, moving ahead, and leading in this province, rather than backing up and blaming it on Albertans. Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough.

Giving all credit to the Premier, in 1974 in a speech to the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, the Premier said, we're still trying and we're going to do it again. But in June 1979 I remember the Premier saying in realistic terms, maybe we can't do it. We must modify our expectation about diversification. I'd like to quote the Premier from *Hansard* of June 14, 1979:

We look to [economic development] as a desirable objective, but we also have the reality in the province that limited opportunities are available [to] us in diversification of the province's economy.

Mr. Speaker, to me that was just an admission failure at that time and it couldn't be done. Maybe we needed a fresh face to lead this whole concept of diversification.

As I've said, we as Albertans are victims of an unstable economy. At the present time, if we continue to have rapid reduction of oil and gas revenues, we in Alberta are very vulnerable. We have a large government, growing

rapidly, and no indication in the throne speech as to how this government may turn it around. We have a large civil service and large expenditures. As I raised in question period, I'm afraid the indications are that we are going to change the 30 per cent going to the heritage fund to some percentage lower, which says to me that this government's only alternative is to take away from the heritage fund, put into the General Revenue Fund, continue the expenditures as it's happening, and not make some of the decisions that have to be the responsibility of government. Mr. Speaker, that is a concern for me.

Along with general diversification, we must look at agriculture to really diversify our economy. Agriculture is the backbone and the place where diversification can take effect in some way. In 1971 the Premier of this province said he wanted to help rural Alberta and provide equal opportunities. I'd like to quote the rural economic strategy of the Conservative government at that time. The Premier stated:

Rural development programs to stimulate the growth of smaller centres would include improved highways facilities . . . all with the objective of equality of opportunity throughout the province . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can witness what has happened in the last 10 years. As I travel around southern Alberta they ask me, when is this government going to build some highways? They say, are they building them all in northern Alberta? When I travel in northern Alberta they say, are you people down in the south getting all the highways? When I get bouncing back and forth, I say to myself, really, where are highways being built in this province?

The present Minister of Transportation has admitted in this House that we are a decade behind in highway building in this province. We're \$1.8 billion behind in expenditures just to bring the highway system up to standard so it can meet the requirements of market transportation, social transportation, or whatever in the province of Alberta. One of their original objectives, an easy one to attain: an expectation by Albertans that we would build a highway system to meet our needs. We're behind a decade, and the failure is very obvious. Mr. Speaker, that's the second one, in terms of economic responsibility by this government.

I think this government should look at helping smaller businesses and giving more assistance to the farmer. Just before I came into this Legislature a lady phoned me and said, we're trying to get three sons established in farming. She said, I want to say something to you; I don't know whether you've heard it. I hear that other provinces in Canada — Hydro-Quebec — are getting money at interest rates between 9.5 and 13.5 per cent. My sons have to go to the bank and borrow money at 17 to 20 per cent. Are we not Canadians because we're Albertans? Can we not be treated equally like other Canadians? That's all we're asking for, nothing different: equal opportunity for credit at a reasonable rate.

I walk down the streets in my constituency and talk to businessmen. They say, look, there's pressure on my business because I run on an operating loan that's 19 to 20 per cent. Why can't we be helped like the other provinces in Canada? They're not saying other provinces and other people in Canada shouldn't have access to our money from the heritage fund. They are saying, give us equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I think a whole sector of our economy in Alberta, small businesses, farmers — people who want to start new businesses would do it if they had access to

reasonable credit by interest rates comparable to what we are using in other parts of Canada. That's a very simple, straightforward thing that could be done. Does this government listen to that? No. The few loans given by the Agricultural Development Corporation touch very few farmers and don't touch the broad cross section of the agricultural industry at all.

So I can only conclude that in a decade this government has turned its back on the rural people of Alberta and really isn't interested in diversification because it couldn't accomplish the goal. They have put it back in the throne speech at the present time to make us as Albertans think they're really going to accomplish it. I hope this government doesn't have another decade to fiddle with the concept of diversification like they have in the past.

My second area of concern about this government, Mr. Speaker, is in social responsibility. Is it performing or not? Well, in my terms it has failed to live up to standards and the qualifications of a government that leads and takes on its social responsibility. If a government fulfils its responsibility, it should be able to plan and have a positive social policy. It should be leading with social policy. But when I examine what this government does, Mr. Speaker, it is not that way. We have conflict, confrontation, citizens who are angry about things that are happening and the needs that are not being met. We have people who are in a crisis situation, crying for help, but this government waits and reacts. I'd say it's a sort of no-policy approach. It's often too little, too late, and somewhat insensitive to the human needs of all Albertans. I'd like to give some examples — there are five or six, and more that I could really raise — when I make that kind of charge about this government.

I look back at the foster care committee report, or the Catonio report, that changed foster care in this province, examined the training and the requirements for foster parents. How did that report come about? Well, the whole area was ignored. The people cried out. There was public anger. The Ombudsman investigated, and then finally the government moved — reaction.

What about the scandals in child welfare that my colleague the hon. Bob Clark raised in the Legislature? They reached an unbelievable proportion. Again there was public outcry, outcry in this Legislature; then we had the Cavanagh report. The Cavanagh inquiry committee is working at the present time to investigate treatment centres, detention homes, and foster care. Good idea. The committee will come up with some recommendations. Again this government will react after the fact, instead of taking social responsibility.

We discussed day care in the Legislature today. One of the hon. members said, are we leading in day care in the province of Alberta? Well maybe we are at the present time, but let's look at history and the last decade. This government was pushed, questions were raised, crises occurred, but there was no definite policy. A Price Waterhouse study came about. At that point the Price Waterhouse study indicated that Alberta had the lowest day care standards of any province in Canada. After that study we upgraded, and conditions are better. We reacted. That's all right. We reacted and did something. But it wasn't leadership in terms of social responsibility.

It took 16 months before this government reacted to the recommendations of the report of the mental health advisory committee. Then something happened. The Torrance report presented in this Legislature the other day with regard to shelters for battered women — there's only half enough space provided at the present time. I'm told

that as many women as are able to obtain shelter are turned away. Equally as many are turned away because the facilities cannot handle this need at the present time. When will the government react?

The year of the handicapped: as I reviewed the throne speeches over the last decade I found that eight out of nine speeches mentioned the fact that this government was going to deal with the handicapped. What do we have at the present time? We have some odds and ends in the Throne Speech, no real leadership, no concerted effort on behalf of this government. It lacks co-ordination and a real focus on meeting the needs of the handicapped and dealing with them. I know a committee exists in the province to give out something like \$200,000 to various groups, but what's \$200,000 at the present time to as many groups across this province? I feel sorry for that committee in attempting to meet its needs. We gave \$75 million to a disastrous celebration last year — \$75 million — and there's some little sum of \$200,000 to \$250,000 given out to needy groups or volunteer groups that want to help the handicapped in this province. Mr. Speaker, the priorities are all mixed up and confused — for 10 years no real application of policy by this government to that social need. But we're going to try to react, and that's what's happening in 1981.

I even find that after 10 years of experience this government is not applying itself to some very difficult problems and situations occurring in this province because of the oil boom, the expanding economy, the mobile population, and people coming from other parts of the province. For example, the divorce rate has gone up since 1971. I don't blame this on the Conservative government, but it's gone up nearly 40 per cent since then, from 225 per 100,000 people to 310 per 100,000. The suicide rate in Alberta has gone from 182 in 1971 to 319 in 1979: over a 70 per cent increase. It's interesting that 41 per cent, or 133 of that 319, are persons under the age of 30.

We know the rate of alcoholism is up. In 1977 the opposition did a study to look at inner-city problems of Calgary and Edmonton. Even if it was a report of the opposition, there were some good recommendations that should have been taken into consideration by this government: alcoholism, as I've mentioned; transients; lack of medical care; and one very important one, that the people in those areas felt the ministers of this government were not listening to them or could not hear the problems they were having. They had never seen a minister in the inner cities of this province, never seen a minister down to talk to them and discuss their particular problem. Whether they had seen their M.L.A., I haven't the slightest idea, but the comments in that report were that they'd never been able to talk directly to a minister about their problems.

Alberta's rate of violent crime is the highest in Canada. Mr. Speaker, we've learned today that the hon. Solicitor General really isn't concerned about settling agreement about a future RCMP program in this province. I think if the crime rate is up, there should be a concerted effort to do something about it, but we got these offhanded answers from the Solicitor General here today.

I raise those problems because they are real problems in Alberta society. My expectation of this government would be to look at them, assess them, and attempt to determine in a positive and planned way what the role of government is. But I don't think that's the way this government works. These problems will simmer, stew, create various kinds of problems, and cost many lives and

taxpayer dollars. This government is not on top of the problems to come in with preventive programs that help people within those areas. I have seen no evidence at the present time or in the last 10 years where that kind of approach has been used by this government. It's react, react, and react, and that is a failure to take on the responsibility that was given to this elected government in Alberta.

I said I had two other social responsibility areas that I was concerned about. I'd just like to say about hospitalization, fine, it says in the throne speech that 90 hospitals are in various development positions. Sounds good. But my obvious question, and it should be the question of every member of this Legislature, is: what has been happening for the last 10 years? Why are we that far behind that we must have 90 hospitals in various stages of development? Mr. Speaker, that's just evidence of failure in the last decade. Maybe we're finally meeting the need, maybe the waiting lists will change, maybe health care will be available to Albertans when they need it. At the present time — and I have phone calls like other members, I'm sure — people phone and say: when can I get into a hospital? Can you help me move up the waiting list? I think that's an unfair situation here in Alberta.

When we look back over the last 10 years, I don't know what's happened. We had three years when no hospitals were built, no planning, three years of freeze and indecision, and now we're living with the results. The hospitals we're building today have to be smaller in size. The costs are higher. I'm sure they're not going to meet the current needs, never mind the future needs of the province of Alberta.

So when you examine the last decade and judge the performance of this government in hospitalization, it's failure. Now we're scrambling to pull up our socks and look good. Mr. Speaker, that kind of government isn't good enough.

The third area in social responsibility is certainly education. I'd like to lay before this Legislature two areas of concern. First of all, I'm sure every member of this Legislature remembers the commitment of our Premier, of the Conservative government, of the Tory party when they campaigned throughout this province back in 1971 that they would eliminate or hold the line on the education tax on property. As I talk to school boards across this province, they are alarmed. They say, what happened? How did this happen to us? They recognize that in 1971 the school tax on property was 15 per cent, and they look at it today when the school tax on property is 35 per cent of the total educational cost; 35 per cent on the backs of the taxpayers of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I hope the people of Alberta recognize that and examine that this government again has failed to keep a very basic commitment they made in 1971.

Secondly, the quality of education. I know this government wanted quality of education, but it's very clear to me that the only way you have quality of education is to have a happy teacher in the classroom, a teacher supported by a happy superintendent, a school board that has some responsibility. In the last couple of months, Mr. Speaker, we have had a situation where the quality of education in this province, if it has deteriorated, can be blamed directly on the attitude of the Minister of Education. The minister — and the message is clear to the teachers out there that they are being blamed for what this government feels is a lack of quality education. The teachers are saying, I'm trying, I'm doing my best; the minister doesn't support us. I remember back in 1971 lots

of teachers supported this government. But I want to say that that is certainly going to change.

The teachers in this province are somewhat demoralized, and I'd like to tell you why. First of all, the report from the Department of Education, and all the teachers know about this: there is a plan to put in provincial inspectors so this inspectorate can walk into the school, inspect the facilities, inspect what the teacher is doing, saying, look, you didn't do this and you didn't do that. They're coming down right from the central part of government to put the strong arm on the teacher. Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. Professionals in the classroom need support, encouragement, and assistance in whatever way, because they have a tough job out there, working with our young people and training them toward the needs of today. When they're demoralized and feel that their government is not behind them, it's tough to do a quality job in the classroom. This government has done that.

What's the second thing this government has done in terms of demoralizing the teachers across this province? They say they shouldn't be involved in their own professional organization in terms of certification. Mr. Speaker, that's unfortunate. Teachers are equally as responsible as other professionals, where the professionals are able to control and to direct their own professional organization. I think that is unfair, when you select a group from this province and say they can't deal with their own members. The teachers across this province certainly feel that.

The other thing that was of concern to teachers was the announcement — a kite or whatever — by the minister indicating that requirements now would be only three years of training. I had a number of teachers write to me, phone me, and catch me on the street. They said, doesn't that minister have any respect for how we have tried to upgrade ourselves, meet the requirements of four years? I remember one young lady came to me and said, look, I spent my summers, my evenings, away from my family in order that I could meet the four-year qualifications; now the minister is saying it's not required and they don't respect it anyway. Well, Mr. Speaker, that kind of indication to our educational system — school superintendents, teachers, school boards at the local level that are trying to do their job — really doesn't give them much encouragement. I think that's unfortunate, with the number of dollars this government is spending. We could do better. To me, this ends a decade of education in terms of failure. This government could certainly do better in terms of social responsibility.

The third area I said I would like to talk about in judging the performance of this government is how they met their commitments in terms of the image they created back in 1971. Is the face of government they gave to Albertans in 1971 still the face of government in this Legislature in 1981? Mr. Speaker, I question that it is the same. I'd like to look at five areas, as I mentioned. First, back on March 4, 1968, I felt that the Premier of this province set the ground rules this Tory government would follow in terms of its relations and its work with Ottawa. At that time he said very clearly to the Legislature that he had concern over an anti-Ottawa attitude, that we shouldn't be anti-Ottawa in everything.

MR. R. CLARK: Who said that?

MR. R. SPEAKER: The Premier said that to the Social Credit government in 1968.

MR. R. CLARK: The present Premier?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Premier Lougheed, when he was Leader of the Opposition, said that we shouldn't have this anti-Ottawa attitude. The other thing he said that was very, very interesting was that, along with that, we should have an attitude of good will. I can remember the Premier pacing back and forth across the floor over here, saying this is what we're going to give Albertans, good will, not an anti-Ottawa attitude; we're going to negotiate; we're going to go to Ottawa. That was the present Provincial Treasurer's former slogan: go to Ottawa. Man, they forgot all that. Today we have confrontation, an anti-Ottawa feeling. There's anything but good will. There's war, and that is the Premier's own word. We all have to bleed for him. Many small businessmen in various towns have to close up their businesses. Families have to drop their mortgages. We have to bleed with the Premier, who gets a guaranteed salary, and all of you smiling MLAs. We have to bleed with you because this government has failed in its original objective to have good will and the ability to negotiate with Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, this government has failed in that responsibility. I think that's very, very unfortunate.

The lack of negotiations by this government has got so bad that we decided that if they can't get together with Ottawa and talk even about the energy question, which this government hasn't for the last four months, how can we continue to support that kind of system? We'll support this government when it negotiates in good will, when it deals with Ottawa in good will. But, Mr. Speaker, to this point in time good will has not been the theme of this government. In the last 10 years good will has been nothing but war and failure.

I looked at the Order Paper today — I just happened to glance at it as I was sitting in the Legislature — and noticed something very interesting. Four of the government motions are trying to blame Ottawa about various things. You know, they're not really saying, look, we're going to work with Ottawa and work this thing out. Ottawa's bad about interest. We reject a market assurance plan; bad old Ottawa is going to put that on us. If the hon. member would have examined that, it wasn't even the federal government that put it into place.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to withdraw from the Canadian Wheat Board, bad old Ottawa's Canadian Wheat Board. Bad old Ottawa — that doesn't create much good will under those particular circumstances. The hon. member will certainly recognize that next Thursday we hope to put a positive motion, and bring it in as our designated motion, to indicate that there are some actions this government can take to present some good will towards the energy negotiations that should go on between Alberta and Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, that's failure.

Open government was the other cry I heard back in 1970. This government gave that face to Albertans and tried to tell Albertans that we are open. They said every Albertan could come and talk to the Premier and the ministers. Lots of information would be provided in this Legislature. If motions for a return or questions were placed, ministers and the Premier would bend over backwards to provide information.

They said there would be a free exchange of ideas in this Legislature. Any backbencher could stand up and put his position forward very clearly. Well, this lone little desk answers for that one. That's what happens when you try to express your own personal opinion in the Conservative party. Is that an open attitude? Mr. Speaker, it

certainly is not.

What about the Premier's office and the minister's office? Every office has built in a bureaucratic cushion. Back in the time of premiers Manning and Strom, the citizens of Alberta could phone directly and talk to the premier. What did this Premier do? Right off the bat, what did this Premier do in open government? He built a big hall, put a doorway in the hall, closed the door so you had . . . As I recall, it would take at least three doors before you could ever get to the Premier. They've staffed it with all kinds of people. We didn't even have security people during our time. I'm sure there are security people who sit in there all the time. Open? Mr. Speaker, I'd say the whole personality of open government was lost a long time ago as far as this government is concerned.

I'd like to ask some other questions. Is open government present when this government won't support our freedom of information act? I don't think so. Is open government here when public funds — and that's a very interesting one — are used to tell Albertans what they should know about government programs. I think of the \$0.25 million used to put out the heritage logo and to tell Albertans: man, you're out there getting lots from the heritage fund. Here's what we're doing for you. The good old great Tory government is doing all these things.

The energy question and the constitutional question: pamphlets were distributed all over the province to tell Albertans what the Tory government stood for in these specific areas. That's not open government. Open government is being available so that the people of Alberta have input and can tell their politicians, their elected members, what they should be doing in various areas. But it's unfortunate that this Tory government feels they have to use public funds in an attempt to tell the people what to do.

No, Mr. Speaker, in the last decade it hasn't been the concept of open government that has failed; it is this Tory government that has failed to bring forward a good concept of open government. Mr. Speaker, to me that is the second failure in their personality and their integrity.

The third area I want to look at is the supremacy of the Legislature. I want to revert to the remarks of the Premier in 1968 to 1971. The Premier made some interesting remarks that the Legislature has supremacy over government, that there was an eroding of the power of the Legislature, and that we're going to reduce the fields over which the provincial cabinet has control.

Mr. Speaker, as we examine the record, that whole concept has been very quickly lost in the last decade — 80 per cent of the trust fund under a small number of cabinet ministers, \$6 billion decided by an inner cabinet. We find as well that most of the decisions of this government move from that inner cabinet out to the caucus, out to this Legislature. I don't think that says much for the conservative members on the back bench, but that's the way it happens, Mr. Speaker.

What else have we noted? Increased regulations, increased orders in council; in other words, government by cabinet. In special warrants, last year there was \$245 million; this year, \$590 million. Twenty-three out of 26 departments asked for special warrants because they couldn't plan their budgets ahead of time. What does that say about the Legislature? Mr. Speaker, it very definitely says that the Legislature is ignored.

The other thing that concerns me is the timing of this Legislature and how this government thinks it can control the timing of the Legislature at its own whim and fancy. It was very interesting to find today the earliest action

I've seen from this government in a late Legislature. It's unbelievable what happened earlier today in terms of the presentation of Bills, reports, and otherwise. This government has never been that active. Maybe because the Legislature is late this time, it helps them.

In terms of the budgeting process, the fiscal year starts on April 1. Why haven't we a budget in place by that time so that we as legislators approve the budget before the expenditures take place? Mr. Speaker, I feel that is an abuse of the supremacy of the Legislature.

What about public input? This time of the year most citizens are thinking in terms of the summer; farmers are out on the land. Are they going to have time to come and have input to their government, to make good representation? Maybe this government doesn't want the people of Alberta to know we're in the Legislature. To me, that is a violation of the supremacy of the Legislature.

The fourth area that I feel was part of this government's personality deals with the concept of limited government. I look back again to the Premier's remarks in 1968 and 1971. The Premier had some great concerns — and he overused that word continually — a concern for this and a concern for that. He said some interesting things. He said, I'm going to take the lid off this enormous bureaucracy in Alberta. He said, when new programs are brought in, we should try to phase out the old programs. He was concerned about the 17,000 civil servants we had at that time, and he scratched around all over the place to find that 17,000. Well, what has been this government's performance in the last decade with regard to those basic tenets? The lid is higher, and we have 40,000-plus civil servants in the province of Alberta. It has over-doubled in one decade, one decade in 20 per cent of the history of this province.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, when I examine old programs that have been phased out, I can't recall one program of any significance in the last 10 years that was phased out. It's been a total, complete, expansionary approach to adding programs and adding to the budget. No critical decisions have been made, Mr. Speaker.

What is interesting though — and I think this just adds to the failure of this government to really think about limited government — is that they introduced a new policy which really wasn't prevalent during the time of Social Credit, a program of hiring ex-cabinet ministers and friends of the Conservative Party. When I was thinking about this I thought, you know, I used to be critical of Ottawa and the Trudeau government the way they hired their friends and put them into all kinds of positions, but I think this government makes the federal government, the Trudeau Liberal government, look very innocent. That's not a concept of limited government. A limited government is a government that performs and meets certain goals and needs of Albertans, and the best qualified person is put into a position to do the job. His political affiliation should not matter. I think this government just doesn't look at it that way, and we have the present position: a Provincial Treasurer who's concerned about the fact that Albertans must lower their expectations. If we would have had better planning, a better priority setting, a better understanding of public needs, and less intervention of this government into the private sector — and the housing field is the best example — if we would have had this government meeting those requirements in the last decade, we would have had a budget in place where we could have said to Albertans: look, we know how we're budgeting, we have things in control; have confidence in us and we'll continue on in

the 1980s in the province of Alberta. But what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? We're saying to Albertans, expect less, lower your expectations. You Albertans out there have been too greedy; back off. That is not the way to have a limited government or a government that is responsible. This government has failed in that concept and in their original intent as leaders of this province.

Local autonomy: I think the biggest concern of local governments is that they really don't know how much authority they have. Hospital boards do most of their checking with Edmonton before they make a decision. MDs and counties say to me, we have little flexibility in spending. We need more flexibility; give us a chance to administrate and decide what our own local priorities are. When I met with the school boards of southern Alberta just after Christmas they said to me, we have two concerns. One, there are too many strings attached to grants; it doesn't allow us to meet some of our local needs. Secondly, whenever the moneys come from the government, and this information is available to us, the increase in the amount of money has been less than the rate of inflation. They say, how can we meet our responsibilities? There's no way, Mr. Speaker. The only way they do it is to place more tax on their property, and that's why we're up to 35 per cent. This government has failed to really have trust in local governments across this province. I think that can change. I think there are improvements this government can make, because the local people are elected by the same people we are and have equal capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to sum up my remarks on my judgment of this government. I feel that we've had a decade of failure. If we really examine what this government has done, and if we don't get lost in terms of government spending — that there's money here, there's money there — if we examine this government in terms of what they promised Albertans 10 years ago and what their performance is today, my only conclusion is failure. As I said, economic responsibility, the goal of diversification, has not improved. Rural development and highway systems have not met expectations. People are concerned out there. In terms of social responsibility, there has been no leadership. It's been a reactionary kind of government. No one has sat down and said, what are the problems; what are some of the things we can do to deal with these problems? Why is the minister always in trouble? Because of the reactionary approach. You've got to wait till the problem gets to a crisis, then you have a political problem. That's what's wrong with that situation.

After 10 years we now have 90 hospitals on stream. It's unfortunate. I give the minister full credit for getting the hospital program on stream. He is trying. But he's got an awful lot of catching up to do. That's an unfortunate situation, and not totally the responsibility of the minister but of some of his past colleagues. It's going to be difficult not only to meet present needs but to build for the future. I'm sure the minister's going to try, and I give him full credit for that. I'm glad to see that we have those kinds of programs in place. But still, when you look at the last decade, we can count it as a failure.

In education there should be a re-examination of the educational tax on property. Up to this point the government has failed because the load on the taxpayer is significantly greater. In terms of this government's support for the teachers and the professions in this province, teachers out there are demoralized. It wouldn't cost very much for this government to say that we're behind the profession, we're going to support them, and that if we

want quality education in the schools we're going to do everything possible so the teachers can do their job. That's a positive approach, not the feeling they have at present that this government is coming down from Edmonton, from the Department of Education, from central government, and putting the finger on the teacher. There are lots of responsible teachers, responsible school boards, and good superintendents who spend hours and hours and hours with their teachers encouraging them, supporting them, and taking their responsibility. I think it's incumbent on this government to do that at this point in their history. That isn't going to cost much. That's just good moral support, and it's so essential in keeping our people in the province enthused about their responsibility. I'm sorry that the Minister of Education has failed in his attempt to do certain things in the area of education. Often ministers are criticized because they don't spend money. My criticism here is not money; it's attitude. That is something that can be turned around.

I've said there are five aspects of failure in terms of credibility of this government. Ottawa/Alberta relations: I'm not hopeful about the constitution or the energy debate. I don't see any clear results coming out of that. We've been stalemated, and I can only conclude failure.

I'm convinced open government has failed. You as Conservative members of this Legislature should examine that, because open government relates directly to political acceptability out at the constituency level. Open government is a concept very important to the democratic process, and it's unfortunate that it's failed here in Alberta.

Supremacy of the Legislature: it's important that this Legislature make all the decisions for the people of Alberta. Some of you who are sitting on the back benches should examine that concept, because at present ministers are making many decisions that you should be involved in as backbenchers. I think you will feel prouder 10 years from now to be sitting over here because you stood for something than to sit on the back bench and not stand for something you believe. The cabinet position isn't all that important; it isn't that important in a lifetime. The more important thing is that when you were in the Legislature you stood for something you believed in. Why am I giving free advice? I think it's important that this Legislature has supremacy.

Limited government: we failed again. This government continues to expand, and I see no guidelines for budgeting. I've tried to find out what those guidelines are through questioning the Provincial Treasurer, and I feel they are not coming forward. It's the usual answer: wait till the budget. If a government is administering and a minister knows what the guidelines are, they can be laid out clearly in this Legislature before or after the budget comes down because they are consistent. Budget guidelines do not change from one budget to the next. If they are solid principles, they will stand at any time in this Legislature. The minister has not advised me what those basic tenets are, so I can only say that in the last 10 years we have not had limited government by any kind of guidelines. Municipalities — and I've mentioned this — are treated more like children and there's a lack of trust. There have been 10 years for this government to build that trust and it has not occurred.

Mr. Speaker, that's how I see this government after 10 years. They have a lot of things to do. I remember the Premier's comments 10 years ago: everything is not so great in good old Alberta. Well, today in 1981 I hope this government recognizes that things are not all that great in



good old Alberta, that there are some things this government can do.

I'd like to outline what we feel are important Social Credit alternatives. As I said earlier, we have six priorities, six areas we think are significant and should be looked at, not only by this government. We feel we must put forward some positive suggestions for this Legislature to consider. Each of these areas will be handled by my colleagues in the Legislature. As the Legislature progresses, we will be presenting resolutions, Bills . . . [interjections] It's just called good housekeeping.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will raise questions in the Legislature with regard to various programs and be able to point out not only to this Legislature but to Albertans that we as a Socred Party have some special items to stand for. I want to talk about each one very briefly.

Municipal Affairs: Mr. Speaker, we are committed to resource revenue sharing. We want to create respect for local autonomy. We feel the municipalities of this province should be treated by the province as this province wishes to be treated by the federal government. In terms of transportation, we think a five-year program for highway building in the province of Alberta should be enunciated; a significant increase in the first year of expenditure on highways.

Health care: we feel there should be more autonomy for local boards in hospital operations as well as in construction. Two or three weeks ago I had the opportunity to visit one of our rural hospitals. They had some renovations they wished to put in place. They had the charts drawn; they looked at the building; they knew where the renovations should take place. I said, how long will it take you to get the renovations done? That's what I'm interested in. You know what to do. They said, by the time we draw the plans, do various things, talk with the government, it looks like a year and a half. Mr. Speaker, you can imagine what would happen to the cost in a year and a half. Why can't some of the local hospital boards make more decisions?

We believe there should be more home care in this province, more services under the health care program. We're going to recommend to this Legislature a broadening of that program. We believe there should be recognition of the more important role of various health care workers. We feel some health care workers are not given equal treatment in the province of Alberta.

Economic Development: we want to place an emphasis on economic diversification. We feel that's possible in the province of Alberta. We think there should be reasonable interest credit for small and medium-sized businesses in the province of Alberta, not just for megaprojects. We want to encourage Alberta-owned businesses. Mr. Speaker, we think Albertan ownership and sharing of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is very important. We also believe the Heritage Savings Trust Fund should be accountable to this Legislature. We want to enhance the competitive, free enterprise system in this province and reduce government intervention as much as possible. We hope to demonstrate that program by making suggestions to this Legislature.

What about agriculture? We must show a respect for agriculture, Mr. Speaker, as it is the backbone industry in the province of Alberta. We are going to recommend an overhaul of the Agricultural Development Corporation. We think the concept should return to talking about agricultural loans around the kitchen table. We think a broader cross section of farmers should have access to loans from the Agricultural Development Corporation.

We would like to look at a new type of low-interest loan. We want to encourage Alberta processing and promote marketing of agricultural products not only in Alberta but out of Alberta. My colleague Mr. Mandeville, from Bow Valley-Empress, will be outlining that in his speech later on in this debate.

In terms of education, it will be our objective in our policies and programs to restore trust and confidence in our teachers, superintendents, and school boards across this province. We wish to give greater parent choice in the kinds of schools available. Mr. Speaker, we feel that at this time parents would like to look at various private schools, public schools, and other systems available to them. We'd like to see that all education costs are funded by the province. We think the commitment should be made with regard to the education tax on property. This government should make that commitment, but if it doesn't, we are prepared to do that.

As Socreds, Mr. Speaker, we feel we can get better performance from this government. We will take our responsibility as opposition now, and if this government isn't prepared to lead and meet some of the areas of neglect, we are willing to take our responsibility in this Legislature.

I'd like to conclude with a few other remarks in terms of the Alberta/Ottawa negotiations and the good will that should go to Ottawa at the present time. We're concerned about the energy negotiations that are going on. The Conservative government has said that our energy resources, our oil and gas, can be given away for 75 per cent of value. I'd like to place on the record that we as a Social Credit Party feel we should be negotiating for 100 per cent. If we own our house, we sell it for 100 per cent. If we sell our farm, we sell it for 100 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I think that's the way it should be here in this Legislature. But at the same time the power and the responsibility is to negotiate with regard to the sharing of royalties and taxes. I think that's significant and necessary.

Open government: that is certainly supported by us. Supremacy of the Legislature: we hope to bring the power back into this Legislature. Limited government: we will come forward with guidelines we think can give not only clearer priorities, a hold on the civil service, but there should be a significant limit on the special warrants. If members of the Legislature will note Motion No. 209 on the Order Paper, we have said there that special warrants should be limited to 8 per cent, and if they're any larger than that, we should bring the Legislature back into session. Then the whole idea of urgent spending would be dealt with by the Legislature, not by an inner cabinet group. Local autonomy: as I've said, we would support revenue sharing, reduced strings, and more capital and operational decisions by local boards across this province.

Mr. Speaker, as a Socred Party and the potential alternative government in this province, we feel we can offer a fresh approach not only in this Legislature, but we can do as well as this Conservative government and even better. We can be number one if we work hard. That is our goal at this time, Mr. Speaker — maybe in the next election — if people will recognize that it's necessary to have a fresh approach with Social Credit.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly a pleasure for me to be able to participate today in the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would also like to offer my condolences to the family of Don Hansen, a respected

former member of this Legislature. He was a seatmate of mine when I first entered the House, and I've always respected the advice and judgment he gave me.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate His Honour for the manner in which he carried out his responsibilities as Lieutenant-Governor in the past year during the 75th Anniversary of our province. He has set an excellent example for Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to congratulate you on the decorum you have constrained upon this House in your tenure as Speaker. It certainly is the best Assembly in Canada in which legislators are able to responsibly express their opinions and exchange ideas. It's due in no small part to the way in which you handle your responsibilities.

I'd also like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the Member for Calgary North Hill and the Member for Innisfail. They have set a fine example . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: North West.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker; Calgary North West. I apologize to the hon. member for that slip-up.

I'd like to say that the Member for Calgary North West and the Member for Innisfail have set a fine example for the level of debate we have in this Legislature on this particular motion. I'd also like to congratulate our new Sergeant-at-Arms, Oscar Lacombe, and give him my best wishes. I know that he will carry out responsibly the duties of his office.

In my remarks today I was going to cover briefly initiatives in the Speech from the Throne and some constituency concerns, give members an update on the status of the Syncrude project, and comment briefly on our constitutional committee, but the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition have necessitated that in beginning today I at least comment on the outstanding decade of performance by this government. It has been a decade of achievement, a decade of celebration, I believe.

Let's look at the position of Albertans today. We have the lowest personal income tax of any jurisdiction in this country. We have no sales tax. We have no gasoline tax. We have the lowest corporate income tax and, at the same time, maintain the highest level of services on a per capita basis of any jurisdiction in the country. Over the last decade we have seen the establishment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, a concept of a savings account, unprecedented in a parliamentary democracy. We have seen expenditures in the area of health sciences: the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. We have seen a \$300 million heritage medical research fund set up. We have a hospital construction program of over 90 projects, totalling over \$1.25 billion. We have more hospital beds per capita, equal to any jurisdiction in the country.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about our hospital program, what was the policy of Social Credit? They weren't reconstructing any new hospitals in rural Alberta. They were following a policy of centralization. The hospitals in rural Alberta were being left to fall apart, and it's taken the initiative of this government to recognize and maintain a high level of hospital care for rural citizens in the province. We've had a hospital debt retirement program.

You talk about open government. When this government was elected to assume the responsibilities of government of the province in 1971, there wasn't a *Hansard*. There wasn't a written record for citizens to read and find

out exactly what happened in this Legislature. It was in this Legislature, the first Legislature in the British Commonwealth, that TV cameras were permitted in an Assembly. We speak about open government: the initiation of cabinet tours to give citizens of this province an opportunity to speak with ministers, and for ministers to have an opportunity to hear first-hand their concerns; the establishment of a regional information telephone enquiry system to permit citizens to phone toll free to contact ministers, members of the Legislature, or people in the departments.

We've had an unprecedented involvement of caucus and members of this Legislature in decision-making. I don't believe any other caucus operates the way this one does, and allows an individual member the opportunity to speak up, be heard, and be involved in the decision-making process. Look at our colleagues in Ottawa, for example. How often does the federal Liberal caucus meet? What input do they have? What input do even the cabinet ministers in Ottawa have in terms of decisions made by that Executive Council? Mr. Speaker, I've heard of conversations of cabinet ministers who were not aware of the decisions which had been made by the inner cabinet in Ottawa. Just phenomenal.

Let's look at the gross domestic product realized in this province, unprecedented in terms of Canada. Let's look at government spending as a percentage of gross domestic product, and we'll see that in Alberta we have the lowest amount of government spending as a percentage of gross domestic product of any province in this country. That's an impressive figure.

Let's look at rural Alberta. The population in rural Alberta was declining in 1971. People were moving out of our smaller centres. We have seen a reversal in that development. We have seen an increase in population in our rural centres which, I would submit, suggests there has been some economic development in our rural areas. We've seen the decentralization initiatives of this government, which have been very positive in terms of seeing the population increase in our rural areas. In fact in some cases the rate of population in our rural areas has outpaced the rapid population growth in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, a decade of achievement: a billion-dollar debt reduction program for our municipalities. Incredible. The percentage of small businesses which have been incorporated in this province at an unprecedented rate in terms of the country, greater than any other area of the country. We've seen research dollars go into the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. We've seen the purchase by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund of grain cars to move our grain to markets. We've seen the establishment of the Alberta Energy Company, the establishment of the Alberta Opportunity Company to provide loans to small business. We've seen the establishment of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation to provide loans for our farming community at interest rates of 6 and 9 per cent. We've seen housing starts at an unprecedented level; the formation of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation which has financed so many homes for the citizens of our province. We've seen a natural gas price protection plan which shelters Albertans from the high cost of energy. Mr. Speaker, these are a number of the positive areas in which this government has responded.

To add to this record of achievement, I'd like to review some of the senior citizens initiatives this government has come up with over the last decade. We've seen the reduc-

tion in health care premiums for our senior citizens. We've seen unprecedented numbers of senior citizens' lodges and self-contained apartments being built by this government. We've seen an assured income plan introduced in Alberta for our senior citizens and disabled people. We've seen an Alberta pioneer repair program, which will allow our senior citizens to stay longer in their own homes and to make necessary repairs. We've seen a co-ordinated home care program introduced.

In the area of education, we've seen special education programs introduced: funding allowed for special education teachers to help resolve some of the learning disabilities of our students. We've had the highest number of new apprenticeship positions of any province in the country.

Mr. Speaker, those are areas I wanted to comment on, resulting from the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He uses statistics to some degree to suggest there is an over-reliance on the energy sector. Well, surely we must see these energy projects go ahead if we are to meet the energy requirements of other Canadians. We must also recognize that industry and development are going to take place in an area in which we have a natural advantage, in particular the petroleum and gas resources we have in the province. But this doesn't mean that other sectors haven't expanded. To get a true comparison, one should really look at those statistics and at the rate of increase in other sectors, in manufacturing, industry, and agriculture. It's true the energy sector has outpaced the others, but there's been a tremendous rate of growth in those areas too.

The hon. leader comments on the social effects of growth on our community. Surely we recognize we have these social problems that are attendant on rapid growth in a society. But surely, recognizing we have those problems, we have to deal with them, and have been dealing with them, I believe, in a very responsible manner. Surely it's better to have those kinds of problems than the problems of high unemployment, seeing our citizens having to move out of the province in order to get jobs.

With regard to the RCMP, the policing strength in the province, I know the Solicitor General has requested from Ottawa an increased number of RCMP officers to police the province. That request has not been granted over the past few years. There certainly is a serious problem, but if officers are not supplied to us, how can we effect some of these increased measures the hon. member is suggesting?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has expressed some concern about statements of the Provincial Treasurer that we should be lowering expectations with regard to our programs. I wonder where the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been. Our resources are under attack by the federal government, and I believe this government is acting responsibly in order to protect the birthright of our citizens. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that perhaps we should capitulate in some of these areas and these federal/provincial problems will disappear overnight. Surely we can come to an agreement. We could agree to the Ottawa oil pricing initiatives. We could agree with them on the constitution. We wouldn't have any more problems with federal/provincial relations. But surely we have to act responsibly to protect the interests of Albertans in these areas.

I really am bemused by the statement of the hon. leader with regard to his position on energy pricing, suggesting on the one hand that we're not negotiating and, on the other hand, saying that his first table offer in such negotiations would be to request 100 per cent of the fair

market value of our resources. Well, I just suggest to him that he wouldn't even get to the negotiating table if that were his first offer. I really think they suggest, on the one hand, that we should capitulate, but the other hand they put forward almost non-negotiable tenets of policy. [interjections] I'd just like to ask the hon. leader where he really stands in terms of these federal/provincial confrontations. Where does the Social Credit Party stand on the market assurance plan?

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to turn to some of the very positive initiatives in the Speech from the Throne. I've just outlined that I feel we've had a decade of achievement, not the type of decade the hon. leader has suggested. Many positive social initiatives were announced in the Speech from the Throne. There is recognition of the international year of the disabled: a number of programs to assist our disabled people and help our handicapped citizens. I applaud the government for initiatives which they suggest in the Speech from the Throne they are going to enact.

We see the announcement will be made shortly with regard to a new institute of technology to provide adequate training facilities for our citizens in the trades and technologies area. We see there is going to be a response to the increased challenge in areas of nursing education and research. We see there is going to be a major review of the education finance plan of the province, something which I think all of us would agree to. But it must not be a quick, knee-jerk reaction to one report in a labor dispute. It must be a comprehensive, overall review to ensure that expenditures we make in the future are correct in terms of education financing of the province.

In the area of Social Services and Community Health, I've commented on the International Year of Disabled Persons and opportunities the government is going to make available for our citizens in that area. Again in social services, a new family and community support services Act will be introduced. We see there are going to be expenditures by the province with regard to suicide and crisis intervention, supporting our volunteer groups in this area. We see an announcement that decision-making in the Department of Social Services and Community Health is going to be decentralized and six regional offices are going to be set up. I must commend the minister on this move because he's had a certain number of challenges in his department. I think this is a positive response to challenges he's had in his term of office. We see a commitment for increased support for our foster homes in the province, also a suggestion that the Alberta assured income plan for our senior citizens will be increased in the future. In the Speech from the Throne there's also a program announcement with regard to increased support for emergency shelters for women in our province.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to agriculture. There is recognition in the Speech from the Throne that agriculture is our primary renewable resource industry. Very important. The government recognizes that farm input costs must continue to be constrained. We must recognize that we have the lowest farm input costs of any province in Canada today. There is further advice with regard to the new food processing development centre being built in the Leduc area, which I'm sure will assist our agricultural industry in developing new techniques for processing and marketing. We also see in the Speech from the Throne the comment about the significant support the hopper car purchase program from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund will have for our grain produc-

ers. Surely this is one of the bold ideas of this government in the last decade. There are a number of other very important announcements in the Speech from the Throne, but perhaps I will leave those to some of my other colleagues to comment on.

I'd now like to turn to some matters of local concern and provide hon. members with an update of what is happening in the dynamic and diverse constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. In the Speech from the Throne, I see there will be two new provincial buildings, one for Pincher Creek and the Crowsnest Pass. Their support for the educational consortia concept will serve the postsecondary needs of citizens in the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest area by setting up the Crowsnest-Pincher Creek educational consortia.

The Speech from the Throne also comments on the development of improved recreation facilities for southwestern Alberta. I believe there will be further announcements in that area, particularly with regard to the Crowsnest forest. These new recreational improvements will not only provide opportunities for our citizens but will provide needed employment in the Pincher Creek and Crowsnest Pass area. The department of Public Lands and Wildlife is proceeding with the Allison Creek brood stock station, now halfway through construction. This new brood stock station is going to provide fish eggs for the Sam Livingston Hatchery in Calgary. It's part of a program to enhance the fishing experience for citizens of the province of Alberta.

Last year we had a southwestern Alberta tourism study, conducted by the Department of Tourism and Small Business. In the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, two follow-ups from that study will be: a study into the future viability of the West Castle ski area, which has been well-received by citizens in the Pincher Creek area, and an examination of the potential for an historical village concept in the old, downtown Coleman area.

With regard to Hospitals and Medical Care, I see the Pincher Creek hospital is progressing well towards a tender date this fall. I'd like to congratulate the minister and the board of the Pincher-Creek Municipal hospital for their efforts to see this project coming to fruition.

In the area of transportation, there is continued construction on Highway 3 west of Coleman in the Crowsnest Pass. Also I understand that Highway 22 which runs north from Lundbreck to Longview will receive considerable attention this year. Looking at Highway 22, I'd like to suggest to hon. members that we should be upgrading and paving this highway from Lundbreck to Longview. A number of people suggest that we should be twinning Highway 2 from Claresholm south to Fort Macleod. I sincerely believe we should be looking at upgrading roads like Highway 22 and Highway 23 before we move towards the twinning or four-laning of the Claresholm south portion of Highway 2. I say that because I think we need to put a grid system in place across the province prior to concentrating all the traffic in one major north/south artery. I'm sure the twinning of Highway 2 south from Claresholm will come in its own due course.

I'd now like to turn to some of the problems and concerns we in the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest constituency have experienced. The pine bark beetle is still alive and continuing to ravage our forests. I'd like to commend the forest service for the efforts they've made to date in attempting to control this little beetle in its progression northward. I was recently on a tour of the Castle area. The hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry accompanied

me. He took up an offer I made to my caucus colleagues to have a first-hand look at what this little beetle can do. It's obvious that it's out of control on the B.C. side of the Alberta-British Columbia border. In fact infestations now are far north in areas adjacent to Banff National Park and Kananaskis Country on the B.C. side. I just hope we're able to control this infestation, otherwise I believe we're going to have disastrous results on our forestry resource. However, there are some concerns about the nature of some salvage operations taking place in the Castle River drainage. The department is looking very closely at what our future salvage program for these logs will be in that area. If we have merchantable timber there which can be salvaged, I really believe we should go in and log it. But we must take environmental and recreational concerns into consideration.

Last fall we had the announcement of the construction of a dam on the Oldman River for the 1990s. I've met with a number of concerned local citizens, particularly those who'd be affected if a reservoir were constructed at the Three Rivers site, and have had some discussions with them with regard to how the province would approach compensation if the project does proceed at the site. Currently a time period is being allowed for the Piegans to come forward with a proposal, to see whether the reservoir could be located at the Piegan site. I think it is responsible on behalf of the government to look at this alternative, and I hope the Piegans will come forward quickly with a proposal for us to look at.

In the Crowsnest area, it's been nine months now since Coleman Collieries closed down. That's had quite an impact on the Crowsnest Pass. I must state, though, that there seems to be a very positive attitude in the Crowsnest regarding its future. A new industrial park is being created. From this we hope to be able to take advantage of an opportunity to set up a service centre for the coal industry on both the Alberta and B.C. sides. I'm hoping there will be some positive developments in the near future with regard to coal development in the Crowsnest Pass area, and I'm offering my encouragement to the companies that presently hold leases in that area. One of the problems we've had historically has been the location of infrastructure coal load-out facilities, in particular our experience with Coleman Collieries. I have made representations to the Minister of Environment that we set up an advisory committee to look into the question of future location of load-out facilities to serve the new coal development that will take place in the Crowsnest Pass area.

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to comment on a most difficult question that has faced the citizens of the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest Pass area, the recent decision with regard to the location of a 500 kilovolt line proposed by Calgary Power. This has certainly been one of the most difficult issues I've had to deal with in my term of office. I've expressed concerns regarding the impact of this project on the agricultural lands and on the Crowsnest Pass valley. Unfortunately, regardless of the final decision on matters such as this, the public interest, in this case the need for electricity, impacts upon the rights of individuals. The Executive Council, which has authority over matters of interconnection, has stated that it is not satisfied that the most suitable point has been chosen for the 500 kilovolt interconnection on the Alberta-B.C. border. They have requested the Energy Resources Conservation Board to inquire into and report on alternative locations for interconnection with B.C. Hydro in the general area of southwestern Alberta and the most suitable point for the interconnection, considering all relative matters. Basi-

cally the impact of this decision by Executive Council will provide for reconsideration of the interconnection point and a hearing by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, particularly as it affects the Crowsnest Pass area. I'm satisfied that this matter has received a full and fair review, and I'm satisfied the agricultural concerns have been considered. Nevertheless the requirement for electricity for southwestern Alberta by 1983, and the need for a future three-way tie to Lethbridge, have resulted in the necessity to approve construction of the line from Langdon to a point near Chapel Rock. I am satisfied of the validity of those two factors. On behalf of my constituents I've expressed my concern over the original ERCB decision with regard to routing as it affects agricultural lands and the Crowsnest Pass. I've arranged meetings with cabinet ministers and with a cabinet committee of those opposed to the power line routing. I have personally shown ministers the impact the line would have on agricultural operations and the Crowsnest Pass, and I have participated in numerous cabinet committee discussions and cabinet meetings on this matter. I am pleased that the government has listened and responded to the concerns expressed to them by the citizens, particularly in the Crowsnest Pass. This proves that our government does listen, that it is responsive.

On the other hand, there are those who feel that their concerns have not been considered, particularly those involved in agricultural pursuits in my constituency. In our society there is increasingly the view that if a decision is not favorable to one's point of view, one's concerns have not been considered. I do not question the validity of that point of view of those individuals, for I have been an advocate of their concerns; however, in the decision-making process, all relevant facts and matters are considered. The final requirement to have security of supply for electricity to serve the needs of southern Alberta in 1983 has to be one of the most relevant considerations. Any further delay would jeopardize the electrical needs of citizens after that time period.

I respect the difficult decision which has been made, and am satisfied that the concerns of my constituents have been thoroughly considered. The Energy Resources Conservation Board, which has the decision-making authority with regard to transmission line routing, is now charged with the responsibility to enquire into the most suitable interconnection point. At these hearings, which I understand the ERCB will be conducting, an opportunity will be made available for all interested parties to have further input.

Mr. Speaker, that basically covers the concerns I wanted to express with regard to matters in my constituency.

I would now like to comment and report to the members of the Legislative Assembly with regard to the Syncrude project, upon which board I have the responsibility of representing the people of Alberta. Over the past year, a number of incidents have impaired the operation's ability to function at full capacity, particularly an explosion and fire in the hydrogen compressors last December 20 which limited the hydrogen capacity of the project into the first part of the year. The hydrogen capacity has now been restored, and two new compressors have been ordered.

It is my view that the normal start-up shake-down associated with a project of this size has now been passed, and we will see an increased level of performance at Syncrude over the next years. I might note that the record of performance over the past year is quite signifi-

cant, given the number of incidents the plant has experienced, including the unscheduled coker shut-down last year, the problems with the hydrogen furnace, and the explosion in the hydrogen compressor.

I'd now like to go over some of the significant highlights of the project, some of the records which have been set over the last year. On July 20 a weekly record was set in mining 1,171,000 bank cubic metres of oil sand from the dragline operation. In July this year we set a monthly record for the amount of oil sands processed, 7,350,000 tonnes of oil sand. On April 3 there was a record two-coker feed rate of 149,700 barrels of bitumen. During April last year record shipments of synthetic crude were reached; on April 18, 142,100 barrels were shipped; on April 29, 143,000 barrels were shipped; and on April 30 164,100 barrels of synthetic crude were shipped. This was given that the capacity of the pipeline is only 164,000 barrels. I'm not sure how they squeezed that extra 100 barrels in. A record was set in June last year for the number of barrels of production in a single month, 3.65 million barrels, and a weekly production record of 1.05 million barrels of coker feed was established for the week ended July 6. On March 5, 1981, coker number one passed the one-year mark for uninterrupted operation. This is significant, given the size of the cokers, and is the best record we've had to date on a coker run at the operation.

I'd like briefly to go over the distribution of expenditures and commitments of the project to September 1980: 62 per cent of expenditures were in Alberta, 13 per cent in Ontario, 4 per cent in the rest of Canada, and 21 per cent were outside Canada. With regard to staffing the project at the point of hire, 52 per cent of the staff of Syncrude are from Alberta, 18 per cent from Ontario, 27 per cent from the rest of Canada, and the other 3 per cent from abroad. I might note that approximately 200 natives are employed in Syncrude through their native recruiting program.

I would again like to return to some of the significant statistics for the project over the past year. In mining, 67.1 million bank cubic metres of oil sand were mined and 27.1 million bank cubic metres of waste removed, for a total of 94.2 million bank cubic metres of material moved. That is a significant figure. In the extraction part of the operation, 65.8 million tonnes of oil sand were processed, versus 49.9 in 1979. With regard to synthetic crude shipments, 29.6 million barrels of synthetic crude were shipped in 1980, versus 18 million in 1979. The 50-millionth barrel of production came on stream and was shipped on December 15, 1980.

With regard to the return to Albertans of a project of this size, I think we must commend those individuals who negotiated back in January 1975 in Winnipeg, with regard to the nature of the agreement, the Alberta joint-venture payment, and the 50 per cent of deemed net profit which comes to Albertans as a result of this project. Unaudited statements show that approximately \$122 million will flow to Alberta as part of the joint-venture payments for the year 1980 as a result of the project. Surely that shows the wisdom of the people who negotiated on behalf of the people of Alberta back in January 1975, when this project was on the skids.

Presently Alberta Oil Sands Equity, or the province of Alberta, has 8 per cent equity in the project, and up to February 1981 we had committed \$156.4 million. With regard to our equity participation, to the end of December 1980 — and, again, this is unaudited — the nine-month statement showed an approximate return to Al-

berta, equity, of \$31.7 million.

I believe we will see significant new production records set for Syncrude in 1981. I might mention that in terms of housing units constructed by the housing arm of the Syncrude project, Northward Developments Ltd., 2,969 housing units were constructed in Fort McMurray by Northward Developments to serve Syncrude employees.

The one sour note in terms of Syncrude decision-making over the past year has been as a result of the national energy program. The board of directors has found it necessary to suspend indefinitely plans for expansion, which would have brought on stream an additional 75,000 barrels of production for Canada. This is sincerely regrettable when we know we can reach those levels of production. It is a direct result of the national energy program, the pricing regime proposed by that plan, and the taxation regime which has been found unfavorable to an expansion project at Syncrude. This is just one area in which the national energy program is operating against the best interests of Canadians, in order to ensure supply for the future.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps my remarks have gone on long enough, and I may be running out of time. I would like to have commented on some of the activities of our constitutional committee, which travelled across the country. It was certainly one of the highlights of my term in this Legislature. I'm sure other members would like to comment on that. I end my comments with that remark.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:23 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to express my message of sympathy to the family of our former colleague Don Hansen. I always enjoyed Don and his wise country wisdom very much. If Don were with us today, I think he would want me to say some of the things I'm going to, because he wouldn't want to see the Leader of the Opposition get away with some of the things he just finished saying before dinner. I had prepared an outline for a speech in this throne speech debate that dealt primarily with hospitals and medical care matters, and perhaps I'll get to those. But I must say that my attention was diverted by some of the outrageous things the Leader of the Opposition said today. I think I would be derelict, or at least missing a good chance, if I didn't respond to what the poor, misguided chap said, and at least try to set the record straight.

I understand what the leader was trying to do, Mr. Speaker, because I've sat over there, and it's not an easy role to fill. In some ways it's fun because when you're in the opposition, of course, you have the freedom and the chance to see everything that's wrong. You have the instant answer to everything that's right, and you don't have the responsibility for carrying out all your instant answers. So in a way I appreciate what the leader was saying and some of the things he was trying to do. But I've always believed that if you're going to be effective in

opposition, you should have a positive alternative. I suppose the easiest thing in the world is to get up and recite a litany of complaints, all the things that are wrong. But it's rather hard to come up with credible alternative proposals. I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. leader said about many things, about open government, the state of the economy, local autonomy. Of course I, like many members, could easily think of many rebuttals to the points he made. I'm sure those statements will be corrected as the debate goes on.

There is one thing I feel obliged to make some special comment upon, and that's about the statement in which the hon. leader said he was not hopeful over the energy stalemate. Of course, Mr. Speaker, none of us is. But we in government feel we are in a very good position, having outlined in great detail a plan that is good for Canada and will be good for the Alberta-based oil industry and for the owners of the resource, the Alberta citizens. Therefore I must admit that I was thunderstruck when the Leader of the Opposition came up with his proposal of how to break the stalemate, or how to negotiate or walk that last mile. Those are terms he has used on other occasions in this House. If I heard him correctly, he said that the official position of the opposition would be to go for 100 per cent of world price but adjust the royalty distribution. If that's wrong, I'll stop here and be corrected. But if it's right, I'd like to go on and criticize that, because I think it deserves criticism.

We in this House are aware that the members of the Social Credit Party have taken delight in the fact that they've been able to say that when they were in government, they never sold the oil for less than world price. That's true; they never got less than \$2.70 or \$2.80, or whatever the going price was in the pre-OPEC days and in the days of the international tensions and so-called energy crises that we seem to be facing at regular intervals today. So that is true. However, they were retaining only 16.66 per cent royalty for the owners of that resource. So although it was going at world prices, the owners weren't getting very much of a benefit from it — one-sixth of the value; the other five-sixths were going elsewhere. Many of us remember the very extensive public hearings and very difficult position the government took at the time, when the oil royalties were changed and moved upward to the approximately 40 per cent to accrue back to the owners of that resource, and that's where that matter stands now.

So I was fascinated by this proposal and, over the dinner hour, thought what it would mean as an alternative to the government's present position with respect to energy negotiations. If we held out for 100 per cent of world commodity price, it would mean we would get somewhere around \$40 a barrel for the oil. I don't know what adjustment in royalties the Leader of the Opposition had in mind, whether he meant more for the companies — we've heard the criticisms of that in this House — or whether it meant more for the federal government, in order to do goodness knows what with. We know that the more that's diverted their way, they can certainly spend it. Unless there is some other party I'm missing, the adjustment in royalties would mean that those funds would go either to the companies or to the federal government. I really don't know one good argument why either of those parties should have an increased royalty share. I'd love to debate that particular proposition on the main street in Vulcan. I'd be amazed if any of the leader's constituents support that position.

In attempting to negotiate or make a contract, I think it's very easy to sign an agreement. Anybody can reach an

agreement. The challenge comes in negotiating the terms of the agreement. For two reasons I'd like to go back to the July 25, 1980, proposition of the Alberta government with respect to energy pricing and resource development. I think it's timely that the program was reviewed. It is a good one and still stands on its own merits today. I think it would be good to look at that program in light of the suggestion of the official opposition with respect to breaking the stalemate. So let's go back to the July 25, 1980, Alberta energy proposal. That was the one that was so close to being reached with the Joe Clark government, and then adjusted slightly in order to try to reach agreement with the present federal government. This was the agreement that even the *Toronto Globe and Mail* called a very generous offer, a rich offer to the rest of Canada. It was an offer that I think all the members in this House can say with some pride looked at Canadians and the Canadian interest first. It supported the Alberta industry and the families and the peripheral industries that rely on that resource development. It was good economically and would have led, in the longer term, to Canadian self-sufficiency.

First of all we said we would phase in the Alberta oil price to 75 per cent maximum commodity value over a period of years. The Leader of the Opposition says their position with respect to that would be to go for 100 per cent of commodity value. He didn't say whether or not it would be phased in over a period, but presumably they're going for more. They would be taking a course that would have a more harmful effect on the total Canadian economy.

The second point in our 1980 energy proposal package was that natural gas pricing would be tied to oil. Presumably the price of natural gas would go up, if it follows that it's a percentage of oil. We're looking then not only at the harmful effects that would accrue to industry but to all the other Canadian domestic gas users outside Alberta and their heating costs. So that's the second point the package of the hon. Leader of the Opposition would do. I think it would work an economic hardship on Canadian industry and Canadian domestic gas users, if he meant that the gas price is tied to oil and that oil would be at world commodity value.

As our third point in the package, we said we would substitute natural gas for oil. That principle is self-evident in its economies and advantages, but the points I mentioned about the Social Credit alternative suggestion would also apply there. The fourth very important point of that energy package, Mr. Speaker, was the development and phasing in of the new oil sands plants. If members will recall, last summer the government committed \$7 billion of equity and debt investment in Alsands, Cold Lake, and the third plant that would follow.

I don't know where the official opposition stands on that either. I've heard it said from the opposition members that they would like to see us make a separate deal on the synthetic oil sands plant and separate that from the negotiations on the conventional part of the oil industry. We know that would be very harmful. We know that under the present conditions our conventional industry is losing investment, manpower, jobs, and activity. I think it would be a very backward step if this government were to say: that doesn't matter; we're so anxious to put our \$7 billion of investment plus added infrastructure costs into oil sands plants that we'll sacrifice those investments and those jobs in the conventional industry and go for the shorter term thing, the development of the synthetic oil plants. The Leader of the Opposition did not refer to that

aspect today, so I can only assume that the way I have described it is part of their alternative energy package with respect to breaking the stalemate in the negotiations.

The fifth point of our package was to maintain the conventional oil and gas exploration industry, by way of assuring that royalties and revenues that now accrue to the various parties remained at the same level insofar as the government was concerned and that the incentive plans that are now in place would be maintained at appropriate levels in order to keep seismic and exploration work going at a vigorous pace. As a sixth point, we commented on additional investments in Canadian energy self-sufficiency, things like the Q & M pipeline, getting conversions of existing refineries to take Canadian raw products, converting existing energy users from one source to another in other parts of the country, establishing the western Canada electricity grid: all those things that would lead to self-sufficiency, an important part of the package that is now on the negotiating table. I don't know how going for world price and adjusting the royalties would in any way help those very positive things that were outlined in that package.

The seventh point in that package was a \$2 billion commitment from the funds that would accrue to western Canada from the owners of the resources that we're talking about, by way of transportation improvements that would aid in the diversification of our economy and the support of the agricultural sector. Again, a very important thing — I didn't hear it mentioned in the hon. leader's remarks, and perhaps I'm being unfair if I say that their energy policy seems to be, go to world price and change royalties. I would think they would be very pleased to support that \$2 billion investment or, if they weren't, at least to provide some kind of alternative suggestion. But there was no mention of anything of that sort in the leader's remarks.

In return for those seven points, Mr. Speaker, the government, acting on behalf of the owners of the resource, asked for two things: no tax on gas exported out of Canada and no wellhead tax on gas or oil produced from wells in Alberta. So that's part of the package. I think it was a good one, and it was timely that it was repeated here in the House. We're looking at a situation today that must be particularly galling to the owners of the oil and gas that resides inside Alberta by way of mineral resources, when we're getting roughly \$20 a barrel for that oil and the rest of Canada is paying other producers approximately twice that. As the mover of the throne speech debate said, in the evening we go home and watch commercials on television, paid for with our tax dollars, urging us to buy Canadian — as if Alberta oil were not Canadian.

Against that background and against the previous comments about being worried about the negotiation stalemate, urging the government to walk that extra mile, urging us to separate the development of the oil sands plants from our impasse over conventional oil and gas production, I must admit I was expecting something better, something more dynamic, something more realistic, Mr. Speaker, than saying let's go for world price and make adjustments in royalties. I don't know who's doing the research on that kind of proposition, but it seems to me it requires a lot more homework.

What we had last July, Mr. Speaker, and what still stands today, is a plan that's good for Canada. It's good for Canada economically; it's good for Canada's energy self-sufficiency. If we don't keep those two basic premises in mind, I think perhaps some of the other smaller details

that have tended to cloud the issue might dilute the argument. But I think the hon. members who make up the official opposition should be under no illusions about the determination of this government to stand by the basic terms in that very important energy package.

I must admit I was flabbergasted when I saw on the Order Paper the notice of a motion that is to be debated in this House later this week, calling for a suspension in the reduction of our current production. To me that seems a very wise thing for this government to have done, for a number of reasons. First of all, obviously it has a very good bargaining strength to it. Secondly, to save that resource makes sense by way of conservation techniques in the long run. Thirdly, it makes good sense economically, because we know that as long as it is in the ground it increases in value, and there ought to be no pressures on us to come to a deal very quickly in order to release that locked-in production. So I must admit I was quite amazed that in this very serious time, in negotiating an energy agreement, probably one of the most important agreements that will be reached between Canada and a province during the coming decade, the suggestion from the opposition was that we should remove or suspend that production reduction for a month, hold fast for world price, and start fooling around in some way with the royalty make-up. It boggles the mind that a suggestion like that could arise from this House. So I wanted to make those corrections, Mr. Speaker, before talking about hospital matters.

The first thing I want to talk about is medicare, which I suppose in a way is tied into the same kind of situation we have in the energy debate going on by way of other departments. You'll recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1969 and 1970 the provinces were brought into the federal medicare plan by way of opting-in legislation. No particular pressure was applied to the provinces; it was strictly voluntary. The only thing the federal government said at that time was, we will tax you and collect the revenues from you for your share of the plan, but there's no pressure on you to join and get your share of the revenues back. You can stay out if you want to. If you recall the economic situation in Alberta and in the other provinces at that particular time, you'll see there really was no choice. So it wasn't long before all the provinces opted in. I think it was in 1970 that Alberta opted in.

Four important principles underlaid the plan. First of all, it had to be publicly administered, and I think all the provinces have done that. In Alberta it's administered by a division within my department, the health care insurance plan. It had to be non-profit. In a way that's kind of humorous, because I don't know how anybody could dream that a government-sponsored medical care plan could make a profit. It had to be universal insofar as access is concerned; that is, all Canadian citizens had to have access to it. And it had to be portable. Those were the four basic premises.

We've now seen a very disturbing development whereby the federal government, that arranged the plan and determined the terms of entry into the plan, is now suggesting there may be two changes. First of all, there may be a withdrawal of funding from the federal level and, secondly, in order to get whatever funding is left, additional conditions may be imposed. Those conditions may be based, in part, upon what Mr. Justice Emmett Hall reported when he reviewed the medical plan last year.

I think members in this House should have no illusions as to the total package Mr. Justice Emmett Hall outlined

in his review blueprint, and what was so eagerly adopted by the federal government. It's simply state medicine, and it can be called no other name. Now many critics in Canada have said, well, what's wrong with that? There are many things wrong with it. I hope this government and this province would resist very vigorously any move to take us down that road.

In my discussions with ministers of health from other provinces, I think we can all quite honestly say on behalf of the constituents we represent that by and large our citizens are getting excellent health care. We know there are criticisms of the system and that because of changing conditions there are always things that need correcting or could be made better. But I believe that the package of services available, the institutions in which those services are rendered, and the technology that supports those services are unparalleled in their availability to every man on the street in any other country in the world. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because countries that have gone to the purely socialistic or state medicine approach are finding two things: the level of service to the individual citizen decreases in value, and the level of costs to the public purse increases in value.

If we look the other way, at countries that have the purely private-enterprise form of medicine — and the United States is an example — where private hospitals or the private practising doctor render services to people who may not have insurance coverage, we see families financially crippled for the rest of their lives in attempting to get basic health care. So I sincerely believe that the system now in effect in Canada, which seems to be a happy blend between the two, is probably about as good as we're going to get. There are enough public services there on demand for the citizen, yet providers of the services are still allowed some flexibility and some professional discretion in providing those services.

At our last meeting, the other ministers and I put out a communique saying we all support medicare. I don't think there is anywhere in Canada a government, federal or provincial, or a political party, in office or opposition, that wants to see medicare harmed. We do want to see our health system preserved and maintained at a good level, though. Those two things aren't necessarily one and the same. So we support medicare; we are very cognizant of the advantages it has brought our citizens. But we're very concerned about the potential harm that could be done if the federal government insists on pursuing its course as outlined in Justice Emmett Hall's report.

I must admit that I look with some sadness at what's happening now in the province of British Columbia between their government and their medical association. I've talked with many members of our medical fraternity here and am impressed by their desire to do the things we expect them to do: to serve on hospital committees; to serve on abortion review committees, although the work is distasteful to many of them; to lecture in universities and teach; to spend extra time with patients; and to have some time to do their own reading and research — all those things for which there is no remuneration. I think we would be very narrow-minded and blind, almost, if we looked only at the schedule of fees and said, thou shalt work this much and no more for this schedule. That's all we expect you to do, and that's all the law will allow you to do.

I think that would be a tragedy, Mr. Speaker. I say that because we are working so hard to build the foundation for a good health care system. The buildings and equipment proceeding at an unprecedented pace in all



parts of Alberta are exciting, because they're going to provide the basic skeletal system for services for our citizens. The research funds are going to be there, a guaranteed source of revenue for medical researchers and scientists to come and work, knowing the tap can't and won't be turned off by a government that may find itself in some difficulty for whatever reason. That's exciting, and I think it would be a tragedy if we permitted the federal government or our own indiscretion to strike a negative blow at professional groups that are so essential to provision of those services.

We know the challenges our hospital boards are going to be faced with in coming years, with respect to not only equipping and commissioning the new buildings going up, but also staffing them. My colleague's budget, that will be brought in in a few days, will indicate in a very dramatic fashion to all members of the House just what the ongoing impact of some of the recent salary settlements has meant, not only to the department's budget but to the total provincial economy. So there are serious but exciting things.

In conclusion, I just want to say that I think the capital part of the program — that is, the nuts and bolts that people see — is well under way. Not all projects are going as quickly as we'd like to see, but many and most are on schedule. Just by way of passing, the little 10-bed prototypical hospitals that we designed as an experiment are now out for tender, and the communities they are going to serve are very excited. That's something developed, made, and invented right here in Alberta. I'm excited and happy about it. Later this summer, you'll be seeing and hearing more about similar prototypical hospitals based on 25-bed modules. We'll have more coming off the boards in the range of 25 to 100 beds for the larger communities.

So there's lots of excitement going on, lots of opportunity going on. Mr. Speaker, I think those things are captured in this throne speech, and the promise and the challenge of the 1980s, the desire to serve the people, the excitement that will come about with seeing these programs successfully implemented is all there.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to participate in the Speech from the Throne tonight. I also would like to offer my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion, and also to the new Sergeant-at-Arms. With his enthusiasm as he calls the House to order, I think there certainly won't be anyone caught snoozing or drifting off.

I would like to make a few comments tonight relating primarily to several areas of the throne speech. I want to make some comments related to social services and to health care, and a few shorter comments on local government finance, to name the main areas.

I'd like to start with social services, and the areas that were emphasized in the priorities. A concern of mine for some time relates to the family unit, and to problems we have seen in the family. The family unit is the cradle of our society. It's a place where there should be love. It should be a healthy environment for the members of the family, where they should feel secure and be cared for. Unfortunately, many homes across not just Alberta but North America have become a battlefield; homes not restricted to any income or educational level.

What happens in these homes when parents become the attackers of their own innocent children? Social scientists have done a lot of studying in this bizarre behavior, and

some findings have been revealed, such as that battering persons were often themselves abused when they were young. Also research has shown that there is little love in these homes, as the abusers often have not been loved themselves. Anger builds up, and where is the release? It's not taken out at the office or with friends. It's taken out with the wife or children within the home. But a positive thing is happening out of this very tragic situation, and that is that discussion has developed. We've taken this concept, this tragic situation, out of the dark.

Last year the Minister of Social Services and Community Health announced a major public awareness program relating to child abuse. A child abuse hotline was established, that would be staffed by trained social workers 24 hours a day; social workers who deal in this area, who are familiar with the tragic calls that would come in. The Speech from the Throne promises a new program to support women's emergency shelters.

These programs are extremely important. The Torrance Consulting report tabled in the House last week says: "Experience has shown that battering situations are a major reason for the existence of many single parent families." The report shows that many of these women have limited marketable skills, and if they are to support their families, they must have a realistic education; training options that will recognize their full potential rather than simply putting them into the work force in the shortest possible time. I would request that the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, together with the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, consider the establishment of a joint committee to review the needs of career training for battered wives, and respectfully ask them that actions be taken that are necessary to implement such new training areas.

Violence in the home or elsewhere, such as the hideous example that occurred in Washington recently, is a problem that cannot be solved by government alone. No matter how much protection is given, this type of action that shivers the very fibre of our society continues. I believe we are working in the right direction to find answers by further assisting in the sheltered workshop programs. In addition, in my mind, we must work in the preventive field. I believe that the local community can play an extremely important role in identifying need and possible solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to describe an example of a preventive program I was involved in. I worked for a number of years as a volunteer for a number of years in the establishment of a program funded under preventive social services. One area of concern we identified grew out of an emergency mother relief program. The need showed young mothers, geographically removed from their families — often from their parents, from any aunts and uncles who could provide support — living under a very high degree of stress, confined to the home with a constant responsibility for young children. Some information came forward to our volunteer group that a mothers' day out program had been established elsewhere, after investigation into suicides of several young mothers. As with most preventive programs, the effectiveness is nearly impossible to evaluate in precise terms. However, while I volunteered as one of the program co-ordinators, we knew we had greatly assisted several of the young mothers who were under extreme stress.

It is impossible to identify whether we prevented a domestic tragedy from occurring. But at least for six hours a day, and a few times a month, or in certain cases once a week, these children were supervised in a program

which charged a nominal fee to cover the cost of the program. As the workers were all volunteers, the costs were nominal. Meantime the mother had a six-hour period where she could go out and think of herself and of her interests, and not always have to be concerned about little people around her. Normally a mother was allowed to utilize the program once a month. But in a situation where we did identify an unusual problem, the mother was allowed to use the program at least weekly. This happened in a few situations.

I've described one type of preventive program that was established within a local community. It filled a definite need. As a consequence of the involvement I've had in these programs as a volunteer, needless to say I'm extremely supportive of the new family and community support services legislation that was introduced this morning. I strongly believe that the local community is often the best area to identify programs that can support the family. I think the new legislation, which continues generous funding and also encourages local decision, is a very healthy and proper way to go.

After introducing a motion last year related to the development of new programs to identify disabilities at the earliest possible age, I'm also extremely pleased that the Speech from the Throne announces increased child development services for the handicapped in rural communities. In addition, I am pleased that amendments to The Mental Health Act will be proposed to establish boards at the two Alberta provincial hospitals. The Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, happens to be in the St. Albert constituency. I believe we have come a long way in accepting that mental health problems have to be approached in the same positive way we approach other health problems. By giving these two hospitals boards that are responsible for policy, we also give them a political voice with which they can communicate directly to government without having to go through the system. I believe this is an important step forward in supporting the patients and staff in those two institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make a few comments relating to the finance of education. Nearly all of us would agree that education is the prime investment for our future. The Speech from the Throne says that "Stage two of a major review of the education finance plan . . . will begin this summer". I know this is a very thorough study, and I commend the minister for taking this important step. I am particularly concerned about problems faced by our school boards, who have tried to work within the spending guidelines, who are facing problems of large increases for utilities, busing costs, supplies, capital construction, and of course salaries which take up the lion's share of the expenditures. I await the outcome of this study eagerly, as it is immensely important, particularly to the communities that have a limited tax base.

In addition to the study on education finance, the Speech from the Throne promises a study, in co-operation with the Alberta Urban Municipalities and the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, to recommend improvement in existing provincial/municipal fiscal relationships. I'm sure this study will be welcomed by the local governments. I have particular concern for the small growth areas that have faced huge expenditures, particularly improvements of water and sewage systems to mention two. In addition new policing costs, that look like they'll be passed on from the federal government, are causing great concern. This whole area of municipal finance is one that I know is an ongoing problem, and I hope this detailed study will assist us in

getting some direction, perhaps some new ideas.

I look forward to the improvements to be made in the existing annexation system. But I will leave further comments on annexation until the proposed legislation and the subject returns later in the session.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the appreciation of the St. Albert constituency for the approval of the addition to the Sturgeon General hospital, which will nearly double the capacity of this facility. The Sturgeon does a very large volume of emergency care. In fact it's equal to the Misericordia hospital, which is four times as large as the Sturgeon. Indeed if it were not for the resources that bless our province, we would not be able to support the level of care that Albertans have become accustomed to. I fully endorse the review of the nursing home situation. Alberta has moved dramatically in a number of essential areas.

The Speech from the Throne demonstrates the deep sensitivity this government has for the needs of the people of this province, regardless of what the Leader of the Opposition said earlier. A great deal has been accomplished in the area of social services, housing, and hospitals, to name three of the priorities set out in the Speech from the Throne. However, as our society changes so do the needs and involvements of our government. We can be thankful that we have strengths in this province in the culture of our people and the determination to contribute to this country, a determination to work hard as an equal province. We in Alberta will continue to accept other Canadians and new Canadians who have come here to play their role and take their share in the developing of this province.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a great many efforts by many Albertans, including yourself and the members of your committee that travelled the breadth of this country communicating our concerns and positions. I'd like to compliment the work that you and your committee did. From all the reports we have received, I think you and your committee did a class one job. At this time I'd also like to thank the mayor of St. Albert, Richard Fowler, who wrote to each municipality in Ontario. As a result, Mayor Fowler has received back a large number of answers from these municipalities.

I would like to read a couple of short paragraphs in his letter that he did communicate as a concerned resident of the province of Alberta. This is addressed to "Dear Council Members" in each of the, I believe, 800 municipalities in Ontario:

I am writing to you as one member of Council to another to ask your assistance in helping to resolve the impasse that appears to exist between the Federal and Provincial Governments on two major issues affecting all of us — the Constitution and Energy Policy.

I'm not reading the entire letter, but I would like to read two paragraphs, one related to constitution and the other to the energy concern:

Like us, I am sure your municipality is a member of one or all of the municipal associations in Ontario; and while those association constitutions recognize in their voting procedures the predominance of population in the major centres, I am sure that none of those constitutions allow for any municipalities, irrespective of population, to have veto power when it comes to amending the association's constitution. Likewise, we in Alberta are concerned that by granting veto power to two of the provinces in Canada the other provinces are being relegated to second-class

status.

Further on in the letter, Mr. Fowler says:

I find it hard to understand the present policy which calls for Canada to pay the world price for foreign oil rather than 75 percent of the world price for Alberta oil; while at the same time dozens of exploration and drilling firms leave Canada because of lack of activity resulting from the absence of an acceptable energy policy. I also find it hard to understand why Alberta would be the only province in Canada which is taxed by the federal government on its natural resources (oil and gas) whether those resources are exported or not.

I know that many other Albertans made considerable effort trying to communicate our position to the rest of Canada, and I think that that will go a long way. Many Albertans contribute to make Canada a stronger and more united country. I pay tribute to each of you who played this important role and to all the rest of the Albertans who played such a significant part. I think this type of effort is extremely essential to a more united Canada.

Thank you.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, in starting my remarks this evening I would like, as an alumnus of the association, to congratulate the proposer of the Speech from the Throne. I might say she was much more colorful than I was in her aqua suit and an orchid, but maybe it's just as well I didn't dress that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. REID: I agree completely.

I'd like to start my remarks with a short review of what's happened in the constituency it's my honor to represent in this Assembly. We had the usual accumulation of 75th Anniversary events, from homecomings to construction of facilities, and I won't go into any details as it's been well listed in a review prepared by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. One of the most significant things that has happened in the constituency has been the opening of what is called the Yellowhead consortium. For those who don't know what that is, it's a consortium of different postsecondary educational facilities to provide services in those areas of the province that do not have the population bases to support a junior college, an institute of technology, a university, or any other facility of that type.

The Yellowhead consortium has come to fruition very quickly and, since its official opening, has already started many courses in communities in the constituency and is obviously going to be a going concern. I understand some other areas of the province are going to have consortia quite quickly, and I wish them luck and tell them it's an excellent proposal. It works very well, and it does provide the service.

The four communities in the constituency have been extremely busy this last year. Jasper, in our national park, has started negotiations with the federal government — and I hope there is more success and sincerity in those negotiations than there has been in others in recent times — towards reaching a state of autonomy and self-government for the town within the national park. At the moment those negotiations are in a hiatus because the federal government feels it needs a legal ruling from its own Department of Justice on the possibility of excising the townsites from the national park under the National

Parks Act. Again, I hope more speed is shown there than there has been with some other negotiations with the federal government. Also in Jasper, as part of the provincial government's responsibilities, we have a senior citizens' apartment which has just gone out to tender and which is so necessary for the senior citizens who live in a very restricted municipality where because of those restrictions rents are high and are certainly beyond the capability of most senior citizens. The apartment will be a welcome addition to the housing accommodation in that community.

In the town of Edson, we had the opening of the new nursing home and the associated changes to the hospital. I'd like to thank both my predecessor as the member of the Legislature for Edson constituency and my wife, who took over and pinch-hit for me when I was grounded by some British Columbia weather. The new provincial building announced in the throne speech will also be a welcome addition to Edson, which has grown very rapidly due to coal and oil developments. The old provincial building, in spite of considerable renovations, has become completely insufficient for the purpose.

Also in the town of Edson there has been an interesting development. They have decided to use their major cultural and recreation grant to build a recreation centre. But just as an indication of how the plans of mice and men "gang aft a-gley" — that's Scottish, for the benefit of the member for Edmonton Glengarry — that centre was going to be constructed partly by the grant, partly by money from the town of Edson, and from ID 14. But they were also going to rely to a considerable extent upon funds from private industry, from the oil and gas industry in the area.

It's interesting to note that the funds, the cash flows, of those companies have been so restricted that it now appears there may well be a deficit on that centre of some \$400,000 to \$500,000, that was going to be raised largely from private industry. This is a direct result in that constituency, not of the slowdown of production authorized by the government of Alberta, but of the national energy program — if it is a program — of the federal government. Those companies have cut back so much because of that, that they do not have the cash flows to provide that very necessary funding under an admirable joint program between private industry, local government, and the provincial government.

Also in the Edson area we have a senior citizens' apartment block that has just gone out to tender and again, partly because of the cost of renting in the particular town, it's very necessary. In Grande Cache we have under construction the British Columbia Forest Products sawmill, under the Berland-Fox Creek allocation of timber. They have already started building roads and will shortly start cutting timber to supply that sawmill. It's interesting to note, in view of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, that a program is already started to enable the Metis of that area — those Metis who were expelled from Jasper National Park when it was formed — to function as contractors supplying logs to the British Columbia Forest Products complex. Also in Grande Cache, there was a very recent visit of the Northern Alberta Development Council. They had some 20 briefs submitted from a town of 5,000 people, obviously very busy people.

Lastly in relation to Grande Cache, I'd like to draw to the attention of all members of the Assembly and to anybody else who may care to be interested in visiting that town, especially tourists, that there is now blacktop

on Highway 40 all the way to Grande Cache. It opens up a beautiful area of this province to tourists, both Albertans and non-Albertans. There is country there and experiences in the area in Willmore park that are quite the equal of anything within the national parks, without the crowding, the noise, and the queues to have food or get gas.

Although I live outside it, my own home town of Hinton has gone through the annexation process that is going to be changed. They have some 700 or 800 acres which they will sadly need for housing for the developments in that area. Again in Hinton we have under construction a recreation centre using the MCR grants. We have yet another senior citizens' apartment block just about ready to go to tender. This is not to show pride in what's going on in the constituency, but what I've done is very briefly to indicate the involvement of this provincial government using the money from our Alberta provincial resources to better the lives of the people of Alberta, in housing for senior citizens, recreation complexes, tourism, and in a nursing home.

Amongst those funds, we always think of the money that comes from oil and gas. But we also get a small amount, albeit very small in relation to that from oil and gas, from coal development. At the moment, two coal projects are just about to get off the ground in the constituency, one in the Obed hills, and the Gregg River complex near Cardinal River Coals at Luscar.

This subject of coal mines leads me to discuss our other natural resources in that area. This winter a select committee of this Legislature has been touring the agricultural areas of the province, discussing the surface rights question in relation to agriculture. But there's another form of agriculture to do with trees. It's another renewable resource of this province. It will be here long after the coal, oil, and gas are gone and, through the forest pulp and paper industries, will probably be a very important section of our industry in the future.

This forestry industry is subject to pressures from the development of our non-renewable resources, just as the agricultural industry is. The oil and gas industry, in the process of seismic work, the putting in of roads, the developing of pipelines for taking the gas and oil out, and for the supply of electricity to those facilities, has had a very marked effect upon the forested areas where it has been active. It's very well documented in the report on *The Environmental Effects of Forestry Operations in Alberta*, produced by the Environment Council of Alberta. That report documents very well what has happened, and the damage to our forested areas from non-renewable resource development.

But also in that report, I think in figure 6, is an indication of the effect, on one major forest area only, of the potential damage to that forest by coal development. Almost a third of the St. Regis forest management agreement area is sitting on top of coal beds. At the moment, our coal developments have mostly been in non-forested areas, at least as far as merchantable timber is concerned. The Luscar development at Cardinal River is in the high foothills, and largely in a non-forested area. The development at Luscar Sterco, southwest of Edson, is largely going to be in an area that was previously worked over by coal mines and, to some extent, is currently the only area where coal is competing with forests. But the Obed development, and others that are on stream, will seriously affect the possibility of growing trees.

In this province we have the Forest Development

Research Trust Fund. It's interesting, reading through that report that was tabled today in the Legislature, that the projects under that research last anywhere from one to 10 years. That happens because it takes 60 to 100 years to grow a tree, and it takes 10 years for some research projects to show any results. It might well be an idea to consider using the Obed and the Luscar Sterco areas as an experimental development, to see if we can truly return the forested areas of this province to productivity after open-pit coal mines have been in operation. We do not know, and we may seriously affect a permanent renewable resource by extracting a non-renewable resource, largely for use outside our province. This would not prevent us, in the meantime, from using underground coal mining techniques, which of course do not affect the capability of growing trees.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some remarks to some other parts of the Speech from the Throne. The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has already beaten me to the subject in that area, and the Member for St. Albert got ahead of me on the subject of social services. But I would like to address some remarks to the International Year of Disabled Persons. It's important to realize that a disability is not necessarily a handicap. Many people have disabilities, and in spite of their disability lead full, productive lives. In spite of their disability, they enjoy life. They are self-supporting; in many cases they support their families. In many instances they do this with the aid of government, but they also do it to a large extent because of the assistance they get from private industry and from employers.

The process of disability starts at conception. The prevention of disability covers a multitude of areas, from antenatal care through the intensive perinatal nurseries — which this province excels in and which are as much a part of the treatment of disability as any other later on — and the rehabilitation facilities that are operated by the compensation board and in private clinics and in general hospital services. Those parts of the disability programs of this government and of private enterprise are just as important as the additional programs that are going to be introduced this year. When an international year is declared, one tends to forget that programs are already in place. In particular for disabled persons, there are considerable programs in this province, operated, as I said, by government and by private enterprise and industry.

I mentioned the Workers' Compensation Board rehabilitation facilities. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to be asked to serve on the select committee on the compensation Act, which presented a report to this Legislature last year which, to a considerable extent at least, is going to be implemented by legislation at this session of the Legislature. I considered myself fortunate because of the people who served with me on that committee, in particular the chairman. Members of the official opposition were on that committee. I suppose that having been on one committee like that I have been doubly blessed by being asked to serve on the current select committee on the constitution, where I have also served with members I would not normally have served with, namely the recently retired Leader of the Official Opposition, the Member for Olds-Didsbury. I'd like to pay tribute to him as a member of that committee, as an Albertan, as a messenger, as a diplomat, I might almost say, on behalf of Albertans. I'm not taking away from the work of others; I'm just paying a special tribute to him. I would also like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your capabilities as a diplomat, both on the committee and with the other people we

spoke to.

I thought the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest would address some of the subjects of the committee on the constitution, but because of his extra-curricular activities while on the committee, especially in Newfoundland, maybe he felt he should not.

MR. KUSHNER: Tell us more.

DR. REID: No, I shall not tell you more. Maybe you can ask him.

Mr. Speaker, we had a mandate to communicate with other Canadians, and I think we fulfilled that mandate very thoroughly. Communication is a two-way process. We had a mandate to communicate to the rest of Canadians the Albertan position on the constitution, which inevitably spilled over onto energy matters. But in that communication process we also had a mandate to listen to other Canadians. On behalf of Albertans we expressed our objection to the constitutional proposals of the Trudeau government, to the process, its unilateral nature, its complete disregard for the customs of Canada, for the entity that is Canada. We also objected to an amending formula which, almost unbelievably, would entrench in the constitution of a country a principle of inequality between provinces. We also objected to the entrenchment of rights in the constitution of a parliamentary democracy, in particular when that entrenchment process spreads into the federal nature of this country, where in its rights one order of government, the central government in Ottawa, would specifically interfere with the jurisdiction of the other order of government, the provinces.

We objected to that entrenchment of rights also because in a parliamentary democracy, Parliament is supreme, not the courts. It's all very well in a republic, where you have the Napoleonic code of guilty until proven innocent, and where everything is based on a system of distrust. But that does not work in a parliamentary democracy, where we believe in innocence until proven guilty, and where we really believe that one has rights, unless they are specifically taken away by legislation, as opposed to a republican entrenchment of rights, where you do not have them unless they are given to you. That was a rather difficult message to get across, but I think most people we spoke to understood it.

We also were getting across the Alberta message and attitude to the provincial ownership of resources and the essential part it plays in the financial independence of provincial governments, thereby giving them the independence to stand up to the central government when it chooses to try to be dictatorial. The provincial resource ownership question led almost invariably to discussion of the energy issue, where essentially we tried to get across that all Alberta asked for was fairness, nothing more than that; just to be treated fairly, like other provinces have been historically.

My remarks have not been a preview of the report of the committee. It is not yet written, because of course we have not yet visited Ontario, and we may also visit British Columbia. But we have visited the other seven provinces and the two territories. We have been literally from Signal Hill, at the entrance to St. John's harbor, Newfoundland, to Whitehorse. I understand that's a distance of some 4,000 miles and inevitably shows up the tremendous geographic size of Canada and therefore the diversity of our country. We spoke to all parties in all legislatures, either in formal committees on the constitution, similar to our own or, where such a committee did not

exist, to separate caucuses. We spoke to student forums, Kiwanis clubs, boards of trade, federations of labor, associations for the advancement of colored people, and groups of professors. We spoke on television shows and radio talk shows.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a unique experience. It has been different from Premier talking to Premier, minister talking to minister. We have been Albertans speaking to the rest of Canadians in all walks of life and in all categories. As a result, I think I could fairly say at this time — and this is not prejudging the report — that the large majority of Canadians in all walks of life, in two territories and seven provinces, eight if you count Alberta, do not want the Trudeau, Ottawa, Liberal proposal. They do not want it, and a large number are not prepared to accept it. That is not just an Alberta feeling.

Indeed it's a disappointment to me that the large majority of Canadians have a far better understanding of this large and diverse country than does its Prime Minister. He was born in a province that has historically had difficulties with Confederation. He's had 12 years experience as Prime Minister of this country. He's had the opportunity to travel Canada and to talk to Canadians. It's a tragedy that he doesn't understand his country, because if he did he would never have introduced those proposals in Ottawa.

I'm convinced that the work of the committee, of individual Albertans who've been traveling this country and talking, of other Canadians, in particular the official opposition in the House of Commons in Ottawa — that the work of all those people has been well justified. Other members of our committee may well address other aspects of our travel and our discussions.

I would just like to close, Mr. Speaker, by reinforcing the statement in the throne speech: "The year 1981 may prove to be a crossroads for the evolution of Canada's federal system of government." I've spoken before in this House about Canada's system of evolution rather than revolution in government. It's my sincere conviction that if Canadians in all areas of this country continue to object to Trudeau's package, their efforts will bear fruit, and we can return to that evolutionary process by co-operation, consensus, and eventual agreement on bringing the constitution of Canada back to Canada. When, rather than if, we finish that process, it will allow us to hand on to future generations the same kind of country we've inherited from previous generations: a diverse country, to be sure, but a country flexible enough to contain that diversity; a country with freedoms, responsibilities and, above all fairness for all Canadians and all regions of Canada.

Thank you.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure tonight for me to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I'd also like to congratulate Mr. Lacombe for his new position.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition said he was going to judge the performance of this government. I suppose we all do that, in a sense, and I have no problem with that. I feel the Speech from the Throne is unique in that it gives the government an opportunity to inform the public of the programs and accomplishments of the preceding year. It also allows the government to inform the public of what it can expect in the year to come. It gives the government an opportunity to bring to the attention of the public the concerns it might have in regard to the

general well-being of the province. It could almost be called a forecast of provincial programming and a look at the guidelines with which the government will guide the province through the coming year.

It also affords those who take part in the debate an opportunity to express their feelings on these programs, to see how the guidelines laid down by the government affect individual constituencies. They can compare their value with the value of the programs across Alberta. It gives one the opportunity to express the concerns of constituents and to assess the programs the government has put into effect to offset and counteract some of these programs, and to relate that effect to one's own riding. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to start out by outlining to the Assembly some of the concerns that have been brought to me over what the government has done or plans to do to offset some of these situations. Keeping in mind that we're judging the performance of the government, I would like to use my own constituency as an example. We will see what has happened in that area.

But before I do, I would like to extend my thanks to the government and the Minister of Culture for picking Drumheller as the site for the major paleontology museum for all Alberta. This is something the people of Drumheller have been working for and looking forward to for many years, and it's going to be a great boon to the economy of Drumheller not only for tourism but for the great spinoff benefits that will be felt throughout the area. Even the construction of such a project over the next few years will give the economy a much needed boost, an economy that right now is experiencing rather a slowdown because of the shut-down of the mining industry in the valley and the cutback in the gas and oil industry in response to the federal government's energy program. But the ongoing and continued benefits of this increased tourism and the many spinoff benefits connected to this resource will be the major benefit in the long run. So again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the government and the Minister of Culture for picking Drumheller for the site of the museum and for diversifying the economy of my constituency.

The people of Drumheller are just now realizing the effect this large museum will have on their economy. As I said, this, coupled with the fact that it is coming at a difficult time, with the shut-down of the mine and the cutback in industry, is certainly going to be a very welcome program in my area.

In regard to some of the concerns of my constituency, I suppose the major concern has been the disagreement between the Ottawa government and the producing provinces on energy and constitutional issues. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Drumheller constituency that I have talked to — and I have certainly talked to a great many over the last year — are 100 per cent behind this government's stand on energy and constitutional issues. That doesn't mean that, like all rural constituencies, we don't have some concerns. In the Drumheller area there has naturally been some loss of jobs due to the cutback in the oil industry, as there has in other constituencies dependent on gas and oil. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, they realize that if the Ottawa government has its way with the constitution and its absolute determination to nationalize the gas and oil industry within Canada, this country of ours will no longer be the same. We'll be living under an entirely different set of rules from that which we've had in the past. These changes will only lead to the deterioration of the free-enterprise system as we know it today, which has

been so essential in building this country and this province.

I certainly don't feel that Drumheller is the only one hurt in this respect. From travelling across this province on the surface rights committee, I know that many areas are hurting, some to more and some to a lesser degree than my constituency. Most rural areas have been hurt to some degree. So what is this government prepared to do to offset the situation and make it easier for people who have been hurt with the energy package brought out by the Ottawa government?

Again let us take my constituency as an example. The Minister of Transportation announced last week that, over and above the regular transportation budget, another \$30 million would be spent in MDs, counties, and LIDs throughout the province to take up the slack for some of the small, independent contractors who have really been hit hardest by the slowdown in the gas and oil industry. Although this is not an extremely large program, when you take into account that it is over and above an already expanded road program now in place and on which all major contractors will be able to bid, and the fact that it is only for the smaller companies, I believe it will have a very significant effect on the small contractors within my constituency.

I guess you could ask what else we as a government are doing to offset these hardships. In Strathmore the plans are proceeding for a youth development centre. In Drumheller we'll see the construction of a new courthouse, to say nothing again of the major paleontology museum, which will guarantee that Drumheller will have an active construction industry for two or three years. My colleague is writing me notes.

MRS. CRIPPS: I am not.

MR. L. CLARK: When the museum is completed, it will guarantee continued economic advantage for the entire region. Although it is very difficult for a government to bring aid to every individual vocation or trade that could be affected, I have great confidence that the people of the Drumheller constituency and the people of Alberta will be able to make the necessary shifts into other occupations to see them through this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to touch on agriculture, because agriculture is the mainstay of the Drumheller constituency. In fact, with a little research I did with the help of some people in the building, I found that just under 9 per cent of the total grain grown in Alberta was grown within my constituency. These figures are from the Wheat Board. If anybody doubts them, I'd like to show them to them. In fact, I'd be very pleased to. It shows the real importance of the agricultural industry within the Drumheller area. Naturally with this much activity in agriculture, some concerns have been expressed by the farming community. The main one expressed to me is the continual movement of the Wheat Board into a position of absolute control over not only wheat but the entire grain industry in western Canada.

I was just amazed at some of the remarks the hon. Leader of the Opposition made tonight. In one breath he stated he believed in the free-enterprise system and in the other he was taking this government to task for not going along with the Wheat Board taking over complete control of the grain industry. I wonder who is writing his material these days. I know it isn't the people in Vulcan and Arrowwood, the farmers down in that area.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In no way did I indicate that I was for taking over the Wheat Board. I think the hon. member should correct that.

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that he hinted very strongly that we were bucking the federal government's move in the grain industry. [interjections]

If I may now continue, Mr. Speaker. We as a government, and the people of Alberta as a whole, are certainly against the absolute control of our gas and oil industry by Ottawa. I believe we should be just as interested in the takeover of another important industry in this province; that is, the grain industry, which is on the verge of coming under absolute, complete control of the central government by the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, my constituents were very pleased when the Minister of Agriculture announced that Alberta was not really in favor of the Wheat Board's MAP program as they laid it out, which really took over control of all grains.

To continue in agriculture, last year some hog producers in my area came to me with concerns over hog prices, their major concern not really being the price of hogs so much as losing the hog industry within Alberta. Again I believe the government, with the co-operation of the Minister of Agriculture, saw fit to introduce a temporary loss program as an interim measure. It was very well received in my area, as I'm sure it was in the rest of the province. A new stabilization program for the hog industry is now being looked at, and I'm sure it will be received favorably too.

One other concern expressed many times in the last year has been the beginning farmers' program under the ADC. Again I believe the government has responded by improving the program until it has now met with almost universal acceptance across Alberta. They've done that by removing the last-resort funding aspect and by giving starting farmers 6 per cent for the first five years. There is some concern yet with the administration of ADC programs. But with co-operation of the farming community and the department, I believe this can and will be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go now to the area of education. I spent last Saturday afternoon with some parents, trustees, and teachers of the Starland School Division, to listen to their concerns on early childhood services, and to the problems of the small rural school division with a dropping student population, the problems they have in supplying an education system in an area of low population with long-distance travel. Their concern with ECS was mainly the cost of the rent charged for the portable classrooms. The rent is universal across Alberta, \$180 a month. But because of the low enrolment the past year, this added expense has made it very difficult to operate. Their concern was that in areas of greater population the classroom can be used by two or more classes five days a week, where in their case with just a few children, they only have one class per day, three days a week, which makes a greater expense to fewer students and families.

The concern of the board members who attended the meeting was the rising costs of education in the rural areas. Starland operates six schools: one in Delia, Morrin, Verdant Valley, and two Hutterite schools. Leaving out the Hutterite schools, the average pupil/teacher ratio is 14:1, so the teachers are not loaded down with students. Over the last five years the student population has

dropped 102 students, from 637 to 535 students, with the resulting loss of \$150,000 in operating revenue. To a rural school of this size, any drop in revenue adversely affects either the programs or the taxes. The concerns brought to me were that the funding of schools is based on a per student grant, but the taxes or supplementary requisition that the local people pick up is based on acreage. As the student population drops throughout the MD, the government share of funding drops accordingly. To keep even the minimum education standards within their system, there has to be a corresponding increase to the rate of taxation to the taxpayers of the MD. It is estimated that this year there will be an increase of 37 per cent in the supplementary requisition throughout the Starland School Division.

I'm using the Starland School Division as an example because it's really typical of a large area with a low population, and great distances to transport the children. They are eagerly looking forward to some change in the funding formula for the rural school districts, which would allow them to have more educational opportunity. They seem to feel that the present system, with the declining enrolment grants and the other small school grants, is not sufficient to make up for their area.

While I'm on education, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to the government and the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower for setting up the Big Country consortium, which I feel will be a great benefit to the area by offering many courses which the students could not otherwise take or afford because of the distance they'd have to travel to the cities of Edmonton or Calgary. This is something that Drumheller also has been working towards, and it's really reassuring that it's now in place and in operation. It will be greatly appreciated by all the people of the Big Country.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, in my maiden speech in this House, I mentioned that I thought it would be appropriate for Alberta to build senior citizens' lodges on some of the Indian reserves in this province, using the same criteria we use in all the other areas for senior citizens' lodges. I'm very pleased to see that this program is going to be available on the Blackfoot Reserve as an experimental project. I'm sure that if the Blackfoot people wish to make use of this program, it will be of great benefit to them. Housing has also been a problem on the Indian reserve. I'm also pleased to see that the Alberta Housing Corporation has extended its mobile-home program to include treaty Indians throughout the province. I believe it's important that all Albertans have the same opportunity to receive provincial services.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that 1980 was a very busy and interesting year for both the government and the people. We had a good year in agriculture, with better than average crops throughout the province. We have seen a tremendous construction phase in the hospitals and health care fields. We've seen expanded housing programs that have helped bring affordable housing to all those people who have seen fit to migrate to this great province of ours from the rest of Canada and from other parts of the world, and there's been a great many of them.

We have also seen the people of this province and country become more informed and much more aware of what is taking place within its boundaries. With that awareness, a great concern is beginning to be felt across this land for what is happening within our country, not just from the politicians and the newsmen but from the ordinary person on the street. The oil man, the construc-

tion worker, the farmer, the rancher — everyone you meet — is concerned, and rightly so, about the direction in which the Ottawa government is moving. It would be reassuring if we had a federal government that would listen to the people and put forth an honest effort to remedy the situation, but this is not the case. Today Alberta and western Canada find themselves with two choices: one, they can bow down to the wishes of Ottawa and let them take over our natural resources in western Canada, and take complete control of the grain and agricultural industry; or we can stand together as a country and fight with every legal means at our disposal.

If the Ottawa government is allowed to have its way in amending the constitution of this country, it will bring about a great change for Canada. It will also force many people in the western provinces and in Alberta to reconsider the position they have taken and the role they will play in the future of this country. There is no doubt in my mind that if the Ottawa government continues to force its present socialistic policies on the rest of Canada, sooner or later there is going to be a great confrontation, an upheaval within this country, from which it may never recover.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate on the Speech from the Throne, I join with others before me in congratulating His Honour, and wishing him long life and good health in his capacity as our Lieutenant-Governor; yourself as the distinguished Speaker of this Assembly; and of course, our new Sergeant-at-Arms. He will be so well applauded by the time this throne speech is over that he will be well and truly recognized, no question. May I also join in congratulating the mover and seconder for their very worth-while contributions to the debate in the fine traditions of this particular Assembly.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I was looking forward with some anticipation to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition today, but of course it was a great disappointment to me because it was nothing but a warmed over rehashing of similar old criticism that is leading his particular party nowhere in Alberta — tired clichés and warmed-over criticism. If he wants some inspiration, he should look to the speeches delivered in the Senate by the former premier of this province, Senator Manning, who indeed has a grasp of the serious problems facing Alberta and Canada as a result of the actions of the government presently occupying the Treasury benches in the House of Commons. But I assume he's too busy reading other people's speeches to do that. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make sure he was alive and well, and I'm glad to see him stirring in his spot.

I look forward to the return to the Assembly of the Member for Clover Bar, to enliven that particular corner. I'm sorry we won't have him with us for a few days, but we can anticipate his lively return.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time this evening discussing my constituency and some of the concerns and plans I have as the Member for Medicine Hat. Suffice it to say that the first and most important thing affecting my constituency since we last assembled has been the matter of the federal government programs. These programs have placed an extraordinary hardship on the people of my constituency, with the wellhead tax on natural gas which is owned by the people of Medicine Hat. I must say that I agree whole-heartedly with the actions being taken by the city of Medicine Hat with

respect to their protest against this unfair and unjust usurpation of the rights of Albertans and the people in my constituency.

I don't want to dwell on that, however, because I recall from my participation in the state of the province address last fall, and again on other matters under consideration, that my predictions at the time were that it would be an extremely difficult load to bear, and everything that has transpired since then has proven that to be the case. In fact southeastern Alberta is feeling the pinch in a very major way, not just in my constituency but in the neighboring constituency of Bow Valley, represented in this Assembly by a member of the opposition who will no doubt participate in the debate and raise the same concerns that I have with respect to the serious impact this is having upon the oil and gas industry in southern Alberta.

I did want to touch on some of the things that have happened in Medicine Hat, which I think are of significance to my constituency. The number one priority I have had since I was elected is to see a great improvement in the Trans-Canada Highway, and of course much of that progress is now taking place. Soon we will have the completion of the second Trans-Canada Highway bridge across the South Saskatchewan River, and the highway will be twinned up the Redcliff hill, with a new interchange being constructed there at present. It's a very great cost, which many people do not recognize. It has been estimated that to build the bridge alone is equivalent to about 20 miles of twinning on level ground, and we have plenty of that between Medicine Hat, in my constituency, and Strathmore, in the constituency of my colleague the Member for Drumheller. So we expect that the Trans-Canada will be improved, developed, and twinned. That is one of my long-range ambitions, and I am certainly going to continue to press for that completion.

In addition I am very grateful that the river valley park, announced as part of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division, for Medicine Hat is well under way. It has long been a concern of mine that that river valley park be developed and that the river valley be utilized in a similar manner to what has been done in this great city of Edmonton and in the city of Saskatoon in our sister province. These two cities have led the way with respect to how to utilize the river valleys in their environs.

I'm very pleased that Medicine Hat College is proceeding with its major expansion, both in terms of the trades and technologies, and with student housing, which has been pressed for in my constituency for some time. I'm pleased to have had something to do with seeing that it is going ahead. As well the hospital expansion is well under way. The first major components of the regional hospital in Medicine Hat have been completed, and the second and most important phase is well under way in its planning.

I want to say just a word about the planning process. There has been criticism of the fact that it is time consuming and that there have been delays associated with the planning process implemented under the leadership of my colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. At the same time, I think it has become very evident that that same delay and careful planning have helped the hospital board in Medicine Hat to avoid several mistakes. Had they rushed forward with the building plan even as late as a year ago, they would have repeated mistakes made elsewhere. So while it has been somewhat of a frustration, I have been informed that the hospital board and their planners are very happy indeed



that they took the time to plan effectively. That major project will be undertaken in the next few months.

Now as to things that are still to be done, I have had a great concern about the administration of justice in my constituency, with respect to the courthouse situation. While it is true that the new courthouse for Medicine Hat is not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, I think it need hardly have been mentioned in view of the fact that it had been budgeted for and announced four years ago and repeated in each subsequent budget.

I want to bring to the attention of members of the Assembly that I'm assured by the Minister of Housing and Public Works and the Attorney General that the plans are still there, providing we can obtain agreement from the city of Medicine Hat. After protracted negotiations, the city of Medicine Hat agreed to sell the province land immediately adjacent to the existing courthouse, which is one of the finest courthouses in Alberta. It was built at the turn of the century and is in fact an historic site. Having practised in that courthouse for a number of years and having discussed it with many members of the bench, they all agree that it is one of the finest facilities of its kind in the province. I don't want to see it disturbed in any way by an addition to it of glass and chrome which would detract from its natural beauty.

So for a number of months, in fact years — I said four years; I guess that's what it is — we have been trying to get the city of Medicine Hat to sell us the adjacent land so we could put a new facility there to house the provincial courts. An agreement was arrived at with the previous city council. Unfortunately, after a change in some elected positions, the matter has been reviewed and I regret to say that the commitment of the previous council has now gone into the ash can. I regret that very much indeed, Mr. Speaker, because it will mean one of two things: a protracted delay while negotiations resume to have that land made available, or the necessity of moving the courthouse to another location.

After considerable thought on this matter, I think it is fair to advise the members of this Assembly, and through them the people of my constituency, that it has become inevitable that we will have to move the new court facility from the downtown core into another part of town, probably to be built in conjunction with the addition to the provincial building which was announced in the Speech from the Throne. I say this with regret. But in recommending to my colleagues what should be done in my constituency, I have no alternative but to make that recommendation at this time. There is room on the land which the province owns, and I suppose we're going to save some money because we own the land at the provincial building site. We'll save some money, but at the same time the downtown core of Medicine Hat, which in my opinion sadly needs some impetus, some additional investment, will be deprived of that investment.

That of course is something that must go ahead, because within the community in which I live there is a very real need for expanded court facilities, as there is in many parts of this province. So my number one priority for my constituency has to be the courthouse and its new location in conjunction with the expanded provincial building. It is not something I have sought, nor do I particularly want to see it happen. It has been forced upon this government that that move must be made.

The second priority I want to try to press upon my colleagues for the future is to recognize voluntary organizations by having government participate with voluntary organizations in the funding of new capital facilities. And

the next one that I particularly want to impress upon my colleagues for my constituency is the expansion of the Medicine Hat Family YM-YWCA. In that area the people of Medicine Hat have gone out and raised several hundred thousand dollars on their own initiative. I believe that when they do that sort of thing, serving a voluntary organization that serves the families in our community and the young people as well as older people who are now taking more interest in their physical well-being, they should be supported by having the government come forward with matching dollars. That is my second priority for my constituency.

The third one relates to the subject of the construction of a new facility, which in Medicine Hat is called the Hill Preschool Neighbourhood Centre, a facility which will be designed to accommodate young children, both so-called normal children and children suffering handicaps or disabilities. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the beauty of our participation, if we see fit to do it, will be in co-operation with the municipal government and with voluntary organizations serving the community to try to deal with these problems of young people. In my community there is a broad base of community support, and it involves fraternal organizations such as the Elks Club, service organizations such as the Optimist Club, and many smaller organizations whose members have participated by walking in walkathons, participating in other ways in raising money from the community towards providing this type of facility. I want to compliment the public-spirited people in my constituency, as throughout this province, for the work they have done with respect to this fund-raising. When they do that, I believe it is incumbent upon our government and municipal governments to share in the responsibility of providing those facilities. So that's my third priority.

Finally, in terms of my priorities in asking my colleagues on the front benches and around the Treasury Board table for additional funding for my constituency, I want to return to the subject of administration of justice. There we have had, unfortunately it's true, an increase in the number of crimes being committed in this province, and people charged, apprehended and brought to justice. I believe it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we move towards the establishment of regional remand and detention centres in communities such as Medicine Hat, and perhaps others throughout the province.

Certainly the need has been identified very clearly by the city of Medicine Hat, communicated to my colleague the Solicitor General, and I support that approach. It will make it much easier for local police forces — and Medicine Hat is served by a very fine municipal police force and the surrounding communities are served by a very fine RCMP detachment. The town of Redcliff, in the constituency of my colleague the Member for Cypress, is served by its own municipal police force. They should have available to them a proper remand centre in our region, and I encourage the Solicitor General to consider that in the coming few months.

Mr. Speaker, those are the four areas I want to pay particular attention to as the Member for Medicine Hat. I think it's incumbent upon me, as the Member for Medicine Hat, to communicate to my colleagues in this Assembly and to the people in the constituency what I believe to be my priorities when I come to government and ask the government of Alberta and the people of Alberta to participate with me and with my constituency in providing facilities for the people in southeastern Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I want now if I could, to turn to my department for a few moments, and to say that with respect to initiatives taken during the past year, I want to emphasize one area and to pay particular tribute to citizen participation with government, once again in providing services on a very broad scale to the people of this province. I refer to the 1980s advanced education endowment fund. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the last year a commitment was announced by our government of \$80 million in extra funding to postsecondary education to match the commitment of the private sector. I want to tell members of this Assembly what success we have had to date since that fund was announced.

First of all we have received 198 requests for matching endowments, 198 in the first year. Those include capital and, for the first time, we will match the income from endowments. The message has to get out there that what we're talking about is the public sector participating with the private sector. The private sector does not necessarily mean big business, although we encourage big business to participate. It also means encouraging big labor unions. It encourages foundations, individuals, service and fraternal organizations, to participate with the government in providing additional funding to postsecondary education.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing in the world that I want to see happen to postsecondary education, is that it become one hundred per cent dependent upon the government purse. That, I suggest, would be a tragedy for postsecondary education in this province. Therefore we will rely upon the students participating with respect to tuition fees. At what level they will participate, I intend to discuss very carefully with them over the next few months to see if we can arrive at an agreement with respect to a long-term tuition fee policy. But it must be an element of the continuation of postsecondary funding in this province.

I want to encourage the private sector to get involved. The 1980s advanced education endowment fund is certainly one such vehicle. For members of the Assembly who are not aware of it, I want to pay particular tribute to one donation of \$8 million to the University of Calgary. That's 10 per cent of the fund, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of this Assembly and, indeed, the people of Alberta, I want to pay tribute to Ralph Scurfield and his family, and the Nu-West Group, for that magnificent gesture. As a result of that, the University of Calgary will have available to it, over the next few years while the building is under construction, a total of \$16 million: \$8 million from the public purse and \$8 million from the private purse.

As well I want to say how pleased I was that Carma Developers came forward on that same morning at the University of Calgary and put up \$400,000 toward the establishment of a Chair for the management faculty at the University of Calgary. We will match the income that endowment will bring, enabling the University of Calgary to take a major step forward with regard to attracting the very best people to that university. I encourage other institutions in this province to do the same thing, to get out there and encourage the private sector to participate with them in providing postsecondary opportunities to the people of Alberta, to the young people who are our future.

Mr. Speaker, for a moment or two I want to touch on the success of our regional expansion. I appreciate the comments made by members here about the operation of

consortia, a nice Latin word. Singularly it is consortium. It's going to confuse a lot of people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Advanced education.

MR. HORSMAN: Advanced education. Well, I have always said that I am pleased to be the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I'm also pleased that I'm the only person in the department without a doctorate, because at least I can understand myself. [laughter] So much for tonight's Latin lesson.

I want continue by saying how pleased I am that consortia are in fact established, and will be established, to provide that regional opportunity in postsecondary education that has never before been available in Alberta, and then to say how well the planned expansion in the college system is going with respect to the development of trades and technologies. Student housing is either under way or tendered. The new technological and trades wings at the various colleges are either under way or close to being tendered. Those services will be available in the coming years to the people of Alberta, almost everywhere that people can come into close contact with a postsecondary institution.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, a new institute of technology is being planned for the greater Edmonton area. With respect to institutes of technology — and I will save my remarks for when the Bill is introduced — we will be moving to provide board-governed status to the technical institutions in this province, both the southern and northern Alberta institutes, plus the new institute yet to be named and located. I think that is a step forward, because it will allow the public to participate more fully with us in planning educational opportunities for the young people in this province and, indeed, for the young people in Canada who are coming here in increasing numbers to obtain job opportunities and their education.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days there have been a number of comments with respect to the level of funding provided by this government to postsecondary education. I want to touch on one aspect of that before the budget debate, in which I hope to participate in view of the very major role that advanced education plays in our budgeting process. Over the last four or five years, federal government participation in postsecondary education in Alberta, in real dollar terms, has remained constant at between 20 and 22 per cent. Any notion being put about in this province by people involved that we are somehow diverting so-called federal dollars from their intended purpose, is totally misleading and inaccurate. I shall be dealing more with that. Members of the Assembly who receive such allegations should be prepared to answer them, and I intend to do what I can to provide them with that information.

To conclude, I want to touch on services to the handicapped offered by my department. They are significant. Over the past year we have announced a major five-year project, with programs which have been supported with taxpayers' dollars in the following areas: teacher training at the University of Alberta of the hearing impaired and of multiple disabilities, and a learning disabilities project at the University of Calgary. Secondly, with regard to rehabilitation worker training: therapeutic recreation at Mount Royal College, rehabilitation studies at the University of Calgary, and early intervention personnel at Grant MacEwan college. Thirdly, vocational skills training at Fairview College, Lethbridge Community College, Red Deer College, Mount Royal College; a special career project at NAIT; and special services at the University of

Lethbridge. In addition, a proposal for special education teachers is under development at the University of Lethbridge, and funding has been approved for interpreters of the deaf at Alberta College. All these are new initiatives, Mr. Speaker, designed to assist those in our society who are less fortunate, to try to overcome those disabilities so they can become fully participating members of our society. In recognition of the international year of the disabled, the Speech from the Throne made special reference to the programs undertaken by my department.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we have indeed taken those necessary steps, when identified by institutions, to provide the necessary funds so they can provide the training. That of course is the proper, traditional and, I trust, will be a continuing role of my department, not to direct but to respond and work in co-operation with those institutions, to identify the problems and provide the necessary funding to deal with them.

Just one other thing, and it was touched upon by the mover of the speech. I believe the nursing program which was announced will be a very exciting, new initiative. The key thing you must keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, is that that committee which has been established is an implementation committee, not a committee to study studies. It

is indeed a committee which will implement the recommendations which have been approved and adopted by the government with respect to the subject of nursing manpower training, re-entry, and new program development.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it has been an exciting year in postsecondary education, and I look forward to new initiatives to make sure that postsecondary education is available to all Albertans, wherever they may be in this great province of ours.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is intended that the House sit tomorrow evening and that the debate continue in respect to the address in reply.

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

