

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Title: Wednesday, April 8, 1981 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, while I know that you have met His Excellency Ambassador Gyula Budai of Hungary, and his Second Secretary, Mr. Sandor Papp, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce these gentlemen to the members of the House. Hungary was a very fine host to us during our recent mission to Hungary where, among other items of discussion, in fact negotiation, and then a return visit of a mission from Hungary, we discussed such things as sales of canola seed, canola meal from Alberta, and shipment of Hereford heifers and bulls.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that while I was at the agricultural exhibition in Hungary, in fact a five-year exhibition, we had Alberta heifers there; I understand three of the bulls were sold at that time, were still on exhibit, and are now part of the Hungarian cattle improvement program. We also discussed there, and I understand have successfully negotiated, livestock transplants using Hereford cattle embryos, swine breeding, and testing cereal grains, oil seed, and forage seed, under Hungarian conditions.

The mission which was here two weeks ago was looking into grain elevator sales, grain dryers, a rendering plant, and pasture technology, including seed mixtures and management of pastures. We could continue into semen marketing and the use of leaf cutter bees in forage seed production, and spot market purchases of cereal grains and sales of our Durham wheat and barley.

Mr. Speaker, that is only in the agricultural sector. We could go on to the petroleum sector where Hungary, as well as Alberta, has expertise in enhanced recovery, specifically in carbon dioxide injection, and where our deep drilling technology is of great interest to Hungary as well.

Also, I would like to take this opportunity to thank our Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower for the co-operation of his staff in negotiations and discussions regarding our advanced educational institutes.

Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure that His Excellency the Ambassador will convey to the nation he represents in Canada our best wishes, regards, and appreciation for the welcome we received and, hopefully, for the co-operation and successful business conclusions we hope to have achieved during our visits.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Ambassador and the Second Secretary to stand and receive the applause of the Assembly.

Bill 221**An Act to Amend
The Municipal Election Act**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 221, An Act to Amend The Municipal Election Act. The purpose of this Bill is to limit expenses and contributions for municipal expenses and to require disclosure of the same.

[Leave granted; Bill 221 read a first time]

Bill 213**An Act to Amend The Wills Act**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 213, An Act to Amend The Wills Act.

The principle of the Bill is to recognize the very high mobility of Canadians today, and provide a system whereby registration of wills could take place in the province of Alberta. This would include that the testator may cause to be filed with the director of vital statistics the fact he has a will, its location, and the name and address of the witnesses to that will. It further provides that any member of the law society or other people, subject to regulations, could obtain both the information as to the location of that will and details of it. Finally, it's proposed that this come into force in July 1982.

[Leave granted; Bill 213 read a first time]

Bill 220**The Energy Conservation
Building Standards Act**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being The Energy Conservation Building Standards Act. I hope to get this on the Order Paper early enough to have it debated this session. It provides for building code changes and standards for a performance code to encourage energy conservation in commercial buildings.

[Leave granted; Bill 220 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the annual report of the Alberta Housing Corporation for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the annual report of the Alberta Research Council for 1980.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 27 grades 5 and 6 students from the Chris Akkerman school in the constituency of Calgary McCall. They are accompanied by their teachers Gail Bryant and Ross Bandurk, as well as several parents: Mrs. Patricia Matthews, Mrs. Ann Greer, Mrs. Freda Crompton, Mrs. F. Kitchen, and Mr. Stu Orr. They are

seated in the members gallery, and I would ask that they rise and that members give them the traditional welcome to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 12 students from the social studies class at Red Deer college. They are here today to view the proceedings and are accompanied by one of their instructors, Ed Kamps. I would ask that the Assembly accord them the usual welcome.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to introduce some students to the Legislative Assembly. I would like to introduce 41 students from the grades 5 and 6 classes of the Father Lacombe school in the Edmonton Glengarry constituency. With them are five parents and teachers: Mrs. Harris, Mrs. Schell, Mrs. Moore, Mrs. O'Keefe, and Mr. Johnstone. The students are studying government in the social studies curriculum and are here to see the Legislature in action. They're in the public gallery, and I'd like them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Chamber.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Dallas Schmidt, it is my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of this Legislative Assembly 31 students from the Thorsby grade 10 class in the constituency of Wetaskiwin. They are seated in the public gallery with their teacher John Elson, and I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Department of Utilities and Telephones

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, today I'm pleased to announce plans to effectively reduce the wholesale price of natural gas to rural utilities.

Alberta's rural gas program, the only one of its kind in the world, has made it possible for 200,000 rural Albertans to obtain the benefits of low-cost natural gas. To date the government has provided \$185 million in capital grants to assist rural gas utilities providing this worthwhile service.

Under provisions of The Rural Gas Act, Gas Alberta purchases and assures supply of natural gas for all rural gas co-ops. Effective May 1, [1981], the wholesale price which Gas Alberta charges to rural distributors will be reduced.

At the present time the non-budgetary administration and operating costs incurred by Gas Alberta are approximately 25.6 cents per mcf or 24.3 cents per gigajoule. Presently the rural gas distributors are paying 20.6 cents per mcf, or 19.5 cents per gigajoule, toward the actual cost of providing the service. Effective May 1, 1981, a further saving will be provided to the gas co-ops by reducing Gas Alberta's charge to 16.9 cents per mcf or 16 cents per gigajoule. This assistance will provide rural gas consumers with \$1 million in shielding in the upcoming fiscal year.

This new initiative, along with Alberta's natural gas price protection plan, reflects our government's commitment to maintain the lowest natural gas pricing for Alberta citizens.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of comment with regard to the ministerial announcement, I'd like to say we certainly welcome that type of move by the government and feel that it's in the right direction for rural Albertans. I can also say that last fall in the Legislature this item was raised by my hon. colleague, with regard to the high prices of gas in rural Alberta and increases in heating costs being very significant. We certainly appreciate that the government has come forward, and in this manner.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Constitution

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Premier is with regard to the upcoming constitutional meeting of the first ministers. I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether at this time the premiers have made a decision about meeting the Prime Minister.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question, because there seems to be some public confusion about a matter that I thought was relatively clear. The message that was sent on Friday, April 3, on behalf of the premiers of eight provinces — British Columbia, Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Alberta — by Mr. Lyon, the Premier of Manitoba, who this year is the chairman of the premiers, stated that there had been developed between the eight provinces a new Canadian patriation plan, including an amending formula, that had been negotiated between the eight premiers and could be discussed with the Prime Minister as soon as the Quebec government had had an opportunity to ascertain its final position after their current election, which is April 13. Premier Lyon's message went on to state that after the meeting of the premiers in Ottawa on April 16 — that is, of the eight premiers involved — subsequent to that, we would welcome an opportunity to discuss the accord of the eight provinces with the Prime Minister.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier with regard to the position of Ontario at the present time and, as well, entering into the federal court challenge or the challenge with regard to the decision of Newfoundland. Could the Premier indicate whether any conversation has gone on between Alberta and Ontario at this point in time with regard to that challenge?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there has not been conversation on this matter between the Premier of Alberta or the government of Alberta with the Premier or government of Ontario, but there has been communication, on behalf of the eight premiers I mentioned in my previous answer, with the Premier of Ontario on the matter. By the decision taken by the government of Ontario yesterday to intervene, together with the province of New Brunswick, with the Ottawa government in the Supreme Court of Canada hearing to commence on April 28, I believe, it would appear that the position is clear in the country: we have two provinces supporting the position of the Ottawa government, and eight clearly opposed.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the Premier had discussions with Premier Davis since Premier Davis received his mandate in Ontario — and now a majority — on the question of amending formula?

Perhaps I might pose a second question at the same time. Is the Premier in a position to indicate whether the eight premiers have in fact discussed with the Premier of Ontario the proposal as far as it has been developed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I wasn't clear in my previous answer, because I did think I answered that in the affirmative: not by the government of Alberta but by the Premier of Manitoba on behalf of the eight provinces, there has been communication with the Premier of Ontario on the matter. But the obvious conclusion of that was apparent yesterday by the intervening action taken by the government of Ontario in intervening on the constitutional matter with the federal government.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, may I pose one additional question. Is it the understanding or the position of the Alberta government that Ontario has decided that they are not prepared to look at this new amending formula which the eight provinces have developed? Or in fact has Ontario lumped that together with the whole package now before the House of Commons? I fear they have.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's a very important question. It's my conclusion and assessment, because of these events, that the government of Ontario is taking the position of accepting the entire Ottawa government constitutional proposals. Although I do recall, as I mentioned in a news conference on Monday morning of this week, that at a constitutional conference back in 1979, it was the Premier of Ontario who raised the concept that what we should do is get the constitution back to Canada, have a patriation of the constitution and agree on an amending formula, and then leave the rest until it was back here, so we weren't involved in this situation in the United Kingdom but that we were resolving the constitutional issue here in Canada. But that position has obviously been reversed by the Premier of Ontario, from what was expressed by him at the constitutional conference, I believe, in 1979.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier on this point. Is there a possibility that the federal government may accept the formula to be suggested and, Ontario and New Brunswick not accepting the proposal, the eight premiers in fact would be placed in a position of requesting the federal government to approach London with the absence of two provinces agreeing?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the question of the amending formula is a very important one, and I am concerned with the statements made by the Prime Minister yesterday on this important issue. What it seems to me is being stated by the Prime Minister — and seems so completely unfair and undemocratic — if it is his pet amending formula, then he can do it on his own, with no provinces agreeing or, at the most, two. But if the provinces which are opposed to his position propose a different formula, then it must be unanimous by the 11 governments.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in the House of Commons the Prime Minister suggested, or seemed to have suggested — and it's not exactly clear, because he seems to change his mind from day to day — that if the premiers had a formula that was contrary to the federal government's wishes, he's prepared to go to the people of Canada on the basis of a referendum. Mr. Premier, I wonder if you or this government have developed a position on that.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we certainly have, because we do not accept the concept that an amending formula in a federal state can be established by a national referendum, because that would give such unfair advantage to the large-population provinces. We'd be in a position then that the large-population provinces would have it both ways, as I have said on other occasions, with their nomination of membership in the House of Commons, but also on a national referendum, and you could have a number of provinces in the majority of population reaching a position where they disagreed with the amending formula being proposed but being overridden by the population-large provinces in the centre of Canada. That strikes me again as not in accordance with the very nature of the democratic system and the federal state in Canada.

MR. KNAAK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There was an announcement made in the House today about agreement between the government and the opposition with respect to the debate on the constitution. I wonder if the Premier has been able to assess that agreement, and to what extent that would impact on the provinces' position.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't change the provinces' position. It is important in the sense that it does permit the Quebec election to be resolved on April 13. It does permit the eight provinces to meet and establish or finalize accord on April 16, before the constitutional steamroller of Mr. Trudeau passes through the House of Commons and the Senate. So to that extent only, it is [of] some limited advantages to the provinces. But from that point on, as I understand it, there's a rather rigid timetable of limited debate which, on an issue as fundamental as this, is relatively close to being a sort of feature of semi-closure. But without intending to be critical of what has been resolved in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, my conclusion to the question raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud is that it does not alter in any way the position of the provinces.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question for clarification from the Premier. The Premier indicated that the two items of discussion are the patriation plan and, as well, the amending formula. Hopefully, I'm not asking for confidential material of the eight ministers, but are those the two items on the agenda of discussion of the eight first ministers, and would those two items of the agenda be the matters presented to the Prime Minister?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, in essence that's right. That's an accurate assessment of what has been agreed to between the eight provinces, that I mentioned in my first answer in this question period. There are other matters that involve the eight provinces that will no doubt be discussed, but as the hon. Leader of the Opposition concluded his question by referring to the portion that would be transmitted to the Prime Minister, he would be

right in his statement that it is a plan to permit the constitution to be resolved within Canada. The essence of that plan is patriation and an amending formula.

Nursing Home Review Panel

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's with regard to the announcement yesterday. I wonder if the minister could indicate why no senior citizens have been appointed to the Nursing Home Review Panel.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there's no particular reason for that. I indicated in the House earlier in the session that we had the choice of making up the committee by going to different groups and asking them to nominate a person to represent their group, or else we could get a broad cross section of citizens from Alberta. We chose the latter.

Several of the panel members, if they're known to the hon. member opposite, have had extensive work in the development of senior citizen programs and senior citizen housing in particular, and have that good understanding that's necessary to bring to the panel. Additionally, the terms of reference of course are written such that we expect there is going to be a very high level of consultation and discussion with senior citizens, both resident in the nursing homes and outside. So I'm not really too concerned about the fact that some panel member isn't over the age of 65.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the same vein, in light of a number of the labor disputes and labor groups involved in nursing homes, could the minister explain why consideration was not given to representatives of the employees of nursing homes?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, for the same basic reason, Mr. Speaker. I'm very hopeful that the panel will have full discussion with employees in every bargaining section throughout the nursing home system, and that will be encouraged. In fact we're depending to a great degree on the comments received from employees who do spend their daily working hours in the nursing home system. As a matter of fact, the comments received from some employer groups, the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and the United Nurses of Alberta, were certainly considered in drafting the terms of reference for the panel.

MR. NOTLEY: A question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly specifically what criterion was used? The minister indicated that the government chose not to go to the groups involved and ask for formal nominations, and chose instead to select people on the basis of overall general interest. What criterion was used in determining the selection of these people? Were nominations made by members of the Legislature? Were nominations made by other organizations? Was there informal consultation? What was the criterion for the selection of the people announced yesterday?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, when I was proposing the formation of the Nursing Home Review Panel, based on reports I had received from the Health Facilities Review Committee, the United Nurses of Alberta, and the Cana-

dian Union of Public Employees, I memoed my colleagues on the Executive Council with respect to proposed terms of reference and the proposed kinds of people we were looking for to serve as possible members of the committee.

Some of the criteria we were looking for were: obviously, an understanding of the medical problems involved; an understanding of the administration and working of a nursing home and the programs carried out within it; an understanding of and a compassion for the problems involved with aging and the illnesses of some of our aging population; and an understanding of how a hospital board or a district board works in an administrative sense, without specifically going to a hospital board that is directly involved with a nursing home. There is also the urban/rural and the obvious geographic representation that you'd like to get, as well as a good spread in age representation, I think, from younger people through to older people. And from a fairly lengthy list of suggestions I received, I put together the panel that was placed before the members yesterday.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister indicated that he had memoed cabinet ministers. Was the list in fact compiled as a result of the information supplied by members of Executive Council? Or in order to develop the list was there an effort to go beyond Executive Council and consult with other groups such as the Council on Aging, for example, before the minister finally selected the people from the short list, the list of recommendations he got from his cabinet colleagues?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I did voluntarily receive suggestions from other groups, and their suggestions were considered: the Alberta Hospital Association, which suggested specific names as well as kinds of people who ought to be involved; a church organization — I can't recall the specific title of the organization, but it was an alliance of Christian churches interested in the development of senior citizen homes; the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses; and I believe one other group, the Alberta Council on Aging, suggested voluntarily the kinds of people who ought to serve. Their suggestions were considered.

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

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care . . .

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] final short list that was announced by the minister yesterday included any of the suggestions from the groups the minister referred to a moment ago, or whether the short list was drawn from the recommendations of his cabinet colleagues?

MR. RUSSELL: I think we managed to cover all suggestions, Mr. Speaker, if not by name, then certainly by definition of field of interest. We made an effort to do that. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I'm standing here and giving the facts with respect to a panel that was composed by way of Executive Council decision. I think we're darned lucky to have a group of Alberta citizens who have come forward to serve.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could the minister please advise the Assembly what methods of communication will be undertaken by him to make sure that all groups, like the residents, the employees, or the families, will have input to this review committee?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference are very broad and allow the panel to do pretty well whatever it pleases with respect to visiting the nursing homes both within the province and without, talking to the residents of the nursing homes or the various employees, either privately or publicly, and receiving input from any interested groups. As well, they'll have the full support of the department, which has all the statistical and financial information which might be useful to the panel.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question to the minister. I'm sorry I didn't make my question clear enough. What I was trying to ascertain was what methods the minister will use so that the public is well aware of this committee. Will it be by letter to all the institutions, or will there be any public announcements?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the answer to that question, but certainly it will be made clear to the panel that they'll have the resources to do whatever means of communicating or travelling they deem necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: I should mention to the Assembly that I wasn't unaware that the hon. Member for Calgary North West wished to get the floor. Sometimes it seems more practical if a series of supplementaries from the same member is allowed, because occasionally one supplementary is a request for clarification of a previous answer. The same thing happened with the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud.

Workers' Safety

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. What information can the minister supply the Assembly today with respect to mandatory inspection of oil rigs when they are being reset up?

By way of information, the minister told us a year ago that this was going to be done as a matter of course. The information I have is that about 700 inspections are required a month, and only 534 were done for the first nine months of last year. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether as a matter of course we now have mandatory inspection of all rigs as they are being set up, and whether in fact that is being done on a regular basis?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, with the reduction of activity in the oil fields, the pressure is definitely being alleviated and removed. However, the program where the industry itself does the inspection, because it has the expertise to do it, was implemented over a year ago. The officials from the occupational health and safety division will routinely pay a visit or, upon request, perform an inspection. To my satisfaction, the co-operation between the officials and the industry itself is positive and working out very well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Considering the number of well sites that are erected, does the minister have any statistics at all on what percentage of these sites in fact are inspected by the branch itself after they've been set up, as opposed to the self-inspection and the occasional dropping in hither and thither by the department?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, that would be information that possibly could be obtained by a suitable question on the Order Paper. I don't have it handy with me here at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government of Alberta giving any consideration to the implementation of regulations, parallel to British Columbia's, which require a first aid attendant at rigs employing under 100 workers, which is the situation at most rigs? I raise this in view of the situation in northwestern Alberta and northeastern British Columbia, where you have legislation in place in B.C. What specific steps is the government of Alberta taking to ensure that Alberta workers have the same safety regulations to protect them as they do when they work in British Columbia?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, the regulations pertaining to The Occupational Health and Safety Act are in what I would consider their final stages of review, and are presently before the Legislative Counsel for drafting. Those concerns raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview are under review, and the discussions are taking place between the industry.

The question of having the same type of regulation as British Columbia, which provides for a first aid attendant at the rig: our regulations presently require and encourage that a person with first aid training be at all work sites — not only rigs, but all work sites in the province. This is our goal: to make sure somebody from the crew is prepared and trained to be able to carry out first aid.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, dealing with his area of responsibility. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the department has been able to clear up with the hon. Attorney General the question of whether charges can be pressed ahead, under the health and safety Act, with respect to the tragic incident that occurred at the Lethbridge Plaza? Has that been cleared up? If not, in re-drafting the regulations or in assessing the Act, is the minister prepared to introduce amendments to the legislation to make it possible to protect workers?

MR. DIACHUK: In the absence of the hon. Attorney General, I believe it would be only fair to say that the inquiry under The Fatalities Inquiries Act was carried out. Possibly the hon. member could present his question to the Attorney General when he returns.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the House whether it's the intention of the government to lay charges against Syncrude and Western Stress Relieving Services, arising from the tragic deaths of two oil workers on the Syncrude site? Is the government in a position to advise where we now stand on that matter?

MR. DIACHUK: The report from the inspectorate has been forwarded to the Attorney General's staff, and it's under review. As with all recommendations, once the Attorney General's staff complete their review of the information, they will make the announcement about any prosecution, and that then becomes public knowledge. At present it's still under review by the Attorney General's staff.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the Lethbridge Plaza incident and the Syncrude site question, what process is now taking place, as far as the government is concerned, to make changes in the Act so that in fact it can be enforced? I understand that the problem in the Lethbridge Plaza incident is that the department wanted to go ahead, but doesn't have the authority under the Act. What process is now in place? Is there consultation with industry, consultation with labor, or consultation among the Executive Council, as to what changes can be made in the legislation?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight, the department was not intending to go ahead, as the hon. member indicated. At all times in all prosecutions, the recommendation is made by the occupational health and safety inspectorate, and the recommendation is then considered by the legal staff of the Attorney General's department. That same practice occurred with regard to the Lethbridge inquiry.

I only want to assure the hon. members of the Assembly that a recommendation is taken seriously at all times, and quite often any reply from the Attorney General's staff has an influence on the procedures the inspection people carry out, in order to strengthen their information for future inspections. I hope that it is quite clear here too that the evidence was not that specific at any particular person or party. That is why the prosecution was not continued with, as recommended by the inspectorate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker a final supplementary question to the hon. minister. What assessment has been made of the rather remarkable testimony of the chief mining engineer with the Energy Resources Conservation Board, before the hearing of the tragic accident in Grande Cache, that occupational health and safety legislation is drawn up on the basis that it's a guide, but there's an understanding that it may be broken? Has this government made it clear to the ERCB that legislation passed by the Assembly of Alberta is to be lived up to, and that officials of all government agencies are to recognize it is to be lived up to? Or is it merely a guide, as the testimony indicates?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, not having before me the information the hon. member is referring to, I can only comment that at all times all departments of this government take seriously the regulations that fall under The Occupational Health and Safety Act and the Act itself. My officials have had good co-operation from the staff and the ERCB. Until the final inquiry is completed by Mr. Stephenson, I feel it would be premature to judge, on one testimony, that the regulations or the Act may be broken.

Health Care Cost Sharing

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or the Minis-

ter of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs concerns the question of balanced billing by medical doctors and, in particular, the position taken by the federal government.

I know the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has stated that he thinks the federal government should keep their nose out of this matter, since it's a matter of provincial jurisdiction, and he's right. I wonder whether the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has taken steps to get together with his counterparts in other provinces to take a joint approach to this problem.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it has come to the attention of various ministers, including the Provincial Treasurer, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and others, that it seems to be the clear determination of the federal government to remove from many of the cost-sharing programs in which it's now involved. After introducing the concept and new programs and providing some initial assistance in the funding arrangements, it now seems convenient for the federal government to move back from them.

Without responding specifically to the question of the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, except to say that the provinces have been in contact among themselves with respect to the broad problem of cost-sharing programs, I can assure you that under the leadership of the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and other ministers of this government, we are taking all steps possible to ensure that the federal removal from these various important cost-sharing programs is stopped.

Grain Hopper Cars

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. It's the continuing saga of the hostage heritage hoppers. [interjections] I have to be careful with that one.

I would like to know from the minister if he has had an opportunity to meet with his colleague the Minister of Agriculture to find out under whose authority the decision was made to have the hopper cars filled with rapeseed and put into the rail service?

MR. PLANCHE: I think the Minister of Agriculture indicated yesterday that he gave the indication that that would be an acceptable thing to do. I'd like him to respond perhaps in depth to that tomorrow, when he's back from Mr. Hansen's funeral.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate today to say one more time that what we have here is: a product, grown by Alberta producers and in an elevator for something in excess of a year, sold to someone; and the ability to move that to the customer being denied by the regulators — cars arriving that were not the property of the railroad but still of the province of Alberta, loaded and, hopefully, moved properly. Now, if we have to choose between who is or is not going to be favored by this government in that kind of decision, it's going to be the growers and producers, not the regulators.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we're finally making a little progress. The minister has been very free with his advice outside the House, but he hasn't given the House any information. [interjections] I hope it's not the rapeseed of the minister of world affairs that's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member would add his hope to the other three h's he had, he'd have four h's.

DR. BUCK: That's your speech for the year, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] At least I say something, not like the rest of you puppets over there. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's statement, can he indicate to this Legislature if it has been a conscious decision of the government to make this a test case? Is that what the minister is saying to this Assembly?

MR. PLANCHE: Again, Mr. Speaker, no test case is involved. It's a simple issue. We see it as one of great economic benefit to our grower producers to get their product to market on time at a price advantage. No test case is involved there. It's just a question of common sense, and responsible action on behalf of the agricultural sector.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, then to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate why the ordinary avenues were not pursued: that the cars be asked to be allocated through the grain transportation authority?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, in the first place the cars were still the property of the government until they came to stop in Alberta. Alberta Terminals Ltd., the customer, and the dealer all had requested, to no avail, cars for that particular shipment.

Treasury Branch Corporate Loans

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. It deals with the issue of policy on large corporate loans from the treasury branch. What role does the Provincial Treasurer play in large corporate loans made to customers of the treasury branches? When I say large corporate loans, I am thinking in terms of loans that perhaps would be in addition to 5 per cent of the loaning capacity of the Alberta treasury branches.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, over the years, I think indeed since many decades, the approach — and I have followed it — has been of enabling treasury branches to make their decisions with respect to their loaning policies. Those have been continued, have been standard over the years, and have been consistent over past decades.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate what size corporate loan the superintendent of the treasury branches can make before he consults with the Provincial Treasurer? I ask the question very specifically in light of the loan ATCO were considering last year which, had the loan been granted, would have been a very sizable portion of the lending capacity of the treasury branches. What I want to ascertain is: when does the Provincial Treasurer become involved in saying yes, a loan of that size meets the basic criteria? Or in fact does the Provincial Treasurer not become involved at all?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the basic answer is that the Provincial Treasurer has not and does not become involved. As with any other successful banking or financial institution, within its general procedures the treasury branch has levels at which various degrees of management must check with respect to loans. I think the fact

that proper and appropriate rules have been followed, and were followed in this case and others, is that the profit picture of the treasury branch has of course been very satisfactory and continues to remain that way. So the best national and provincial principles of good financial management and banking have been followed with the treasury branches, as with other institutions, and were in this case.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. No one is questioning the financial success of the treasury branches in the last year or for decades past, using the Treasurer's own comment. But the Treasurer is aware that in trust companies and banks, directors are consulted when very sizable corporate loans are to be made. The purpose of my supplementary question is simply to ascertain at what size corporate loan the superintendent consults with the individual who is ultimately responsible for the operation of the treasury branch, the Provincial Treasurer? We should be following the same corporate practice followed in the private sector, either in banking institutions, banks, or trust companies.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure the parallel is exactly the same, but the situation has been that there has not been a formal rule, regulation, or level of loan at which there is a formal consultation between the superintendent and the Provincial Treasurer. That hasn't been the case in past decades and is not now, by reason of the delegation of responsibility to competent people and managers in the treasury branch. Those decisions have been and are left with them, and I think the record of performance indicates that the decision-making with respect to the operation and performance of the treasury branches has been very, very good for the people of Alberta and for the government and the Legislature.

Prince Rupert Terminal

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. Can the minister advise the status of the Prince Rupert grain terminal? Are the agreements in place, and has there been any start on construction of infrastructure?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, my memory is that site clearing is under way and that there has been an extension until May 1, because one of the participants had to clear up some tax difficulties. Other than that, I know of no difficulty, excepting some of the soil tests indicate that the terminal may have to be moved some 40 metres. That could cause some slight delay.

That terminal is very important to this province, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the difficulties we're anticipating in moving grain during the 1980s and the 1990s. I think it's important to say in this House one more time that the government of the province will underwrite debt to \$150 million for that terminal, and some 50 per cent of anything over \$200 million, not including a grant of \$3.6 million, I think, as our share of the infrastructure costs. It will be our determination to see that terminal built, Mr. Speaker. We are only going to tolerate delays that are reasonable, but if the delays become unreasonable, we're going to be much more aggressive in seeing it built.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With the large coal deposits going to be developed at Tumbler Mountain, and that coal being shipped out over the line

to Prince Rupert, will the CNR be able to handle the volumes of grain and coal?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the forecast for CN's ability to do that. I know considerable capital expense has to be put into that line; there are some difficulties in soil stability. We're comfortable with the fact that the estimated throughput of the elevator will be correspondingly matched by the rail's planning at this stage, but I'd rather check on the forecast for the coal, because I'm not familiar with those numbers. I'd be happy to respond to that.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have there been any discussions with CNR regarding their plans for upgrading that line?

MR. PLANCHE: Yes, there have been many discussions, Mr. Speaker. But the problem comes back again to how they're going to service debt if they can't generate enough revenue. So we're back at the old Crow rate issue again, and the issue of cross-subsidizing other items Albertans want to ship and export as well. Those things simply have to be rationalized as part of a remedy for the whole transportation system.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister or his department done any studies or had any representations from people in the northern part of the province as to the possibility of an alternate route through the area where the supertankers are going? They're now going year-round now. Has that route been looked at? Has any representation or study been made on that alternative?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, it's not clear to me whether you're talking about vessel routes or rail routes.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, vessel routes.

MR. PLANCHE: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker. We did some fairly extensive studying earlier about vessel sizes as they related to the original Prince Rupert harbor: ducking in behind the island and facing the wind from the sea. Because of its proximity to Japan and because of the planning for docking facilities, we're confident that there is no difficulty in that area. If the hon. member has something constructive that we haven't looked at, we're happy to do that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister on a point of clarification. The information I have and that I've seen is that people in the Peace River block have suggested looking at a north route to go up where the oil action is, come up through that route, and then go into the Pacific Rim area. This representation has been made by some of the farmers in that area, and I'm sure the hon. Member for Grande Prairie is aware of that.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to consult with the member afterwards. Again, I'm not certain I understand. We're doing what we can in terms of rationalizing the rail system in the Peace River area to go more directly to Prince Rupert. We've looked at putting a railroad over the proposed Dunvegan dam. We've looked at rationalizing the systems between B.C. Rail and perhaps CN, which has now been rationalized into the

Northern Alberta Railways. But I'm not familiar with the item the member is referring to.

Home Births

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to question the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care about babies. [interjections] This is with regard to the recent announcement by Dr. Roy le Riche, registrar of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, concerning the banning of home births. I wonder if he would outline what discussions took place with him or his department before the college decided to move.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there was no discussion between the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the department with respect to the college's statement concerning the matter of home births.

My understanding is that the college did it on a strictly professional basis. The official viewpoint of the medical profession is that the tendency to encourage home births is potentially dangerous in a small percentage of births and safe in a high percentage, but that it is risky for the mother to take that chance. It is their way of encouraging pregnant ladies to make arrangements to have their babies in hospitals, where there are adequate medical facilities.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary. It appears that this decision by Dr. le Riche is a direct affront to parents' freedom of choice. What steps, if any, is the minister considering for creating flying squads and midwives, which are used in many countries where the infant mortality rate is lower than in the United States and Canada?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we have no such plans at present.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The stork. [laughter]

MR. RUSSELL: The facilities that are in place in the hospital system are more than adequate, and there is no reason the government should support, in a financial way, the duplication of another system. That is not to say that the choice can't stay with the parents, if they want to have a baby in the home atmosphere. I'm encouraged by the steps some hospitals have started to take to try to duplicate the home atmosphere in what they call birthing rooms in the hospitals, and encourage the father to be there and make the birth of the new baby a very meaningful family experience.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate whether he would prefer to have the stork deliver his future children at his home or in a hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think you have a rule against hypothetical questions.

MR. SPEAKER: There are some situations where it's more fun not to apply it. [laughter]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR
THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS 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 7: Mr. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's very, very difficult to follow that act, I must confess.

In rising to participate in the debate, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate you on once again assuming your duties as Speaker of this Assembly. I'd like to join with other members in paying tribute to the memory of the late Don Hansen, who was the member from the Bonnyville constituency from 1971 until 1979. While a quiet individual, Mr. Hansen made a very significant public contribution, in my view, and he will be missed not only by his family but, I'm sure, by people in his constituency and by those of us who knew him and respected his public work.

Mr. Speaker, since this is the 10th year of the Tory government in Alberta, it strikes me that in any assessment of the Speech from the Throne debate, perhaps we should look at the record of this government over the last 10 years, against the sort of philosophical underpinnings, if you like, of Toryism. I suppose if there are any, they were outlined in the guideposts for the future, first introduced at the Conservative annual meeting of January 29, 1966, and subsequently ratified and approved at the next annual meeting on November 25, 1967. Perhaps we can not only review the present Speech from the Throne against those guideposts, but I think it is also important to take a look at the record of the last 10 years.

I might just say at the outset, though, that once again we're told, when the hon. Lieutenant-Governor read the Speech from the Throne, that this government is going to concentrate on people issues. Mind you, we've had that said before. We had it said in 1979; we had it said in 1980. Yet the record of performance in these areas has been abysmal, to put it mildly. But let's look at this government's record on the basis of the sort of fundamental tenets of modern Toryism. The first one is:

1. We believe that public laws should be made in public. This principle must be protected against the comfortable drift to government by cabinet or through Order in Council.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the legislation we've seen presented to this House, legislation that provides record authority to order in council to make decisions — we had the referendum Bill, which forced even the government caucus to blush with embarrassment because almost every major aspect of a referendum in this province would have been referred to Executive Council. We have the interesting Special Warrant No. 289/81, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer just authorized: \$2.377 billion. The obvious reason that was required was that the

Legislature wasn't called so we could have interim supply.

But whose fault was that? The decision to call the Legislature is essentially a decision of Executive Council. Because the government hadn't called the Legislature into session, it ran out of money. So we have not only the \$600 million in special warrants that the hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about, but we have this granddaddy of them all, which is certainly the largest special warrant I know of in the history of Alberta. And I wouldn't be at all surprised if it is the largest special warrant in the history of any province. Although I have the Legislature Library working on that, they haven't been able to give me the information yet.

I think it's interesting that we get into this situation. This government should have called the Legislature earlier so we could have had interim supply voted, as is traditionally the case. But it wasn't done, so instead we have a special warrant. Another example of the "comfortable drift to government by cabinet or through Order in Council", which in 1966 and 1967 the Tories told us, we have to watch that. Well, they certainly have become victims of the concern they expressed about their predecessors.

Mr. Speaker, we look at "public laws should be made in public". Of course this government has consistently opposed the freedom of information legislation that has been presented by both the hon. Member for Clover Bar and me, legislation modelled almost identically on the legislation the former Member of Parliament for Peace River Ged Baldwin has pressed on with federally. Finally we're getting some action from even Mr. Trudeau on that question; a little encouraging sign from that quarter. But in Alberta, no move, notwithstanding principle No. 1, that public laws should be made in public, and the public's right to know.

We have the announcement of the very important review of nursing homes. One would think that if there is one major undertaking that should be done in public — no question about it — and that the report should be made public, and there should be public hearings, it should be the inquiry into nursing homes. But we're told by the minister that that's going to be up to the board of review; it may or may not be public. It may be done in the open or it may be done behind closed doors. Something as crucial as the investigation of nursing homes in this province — we find that 38 of the 41 private nursing homes don't meet the national accreditation standards, but we're not going to commit ourselves to an open, public enquiry. That will be decided by the review panel. Mr. Speaker, if this government is really serious about cardinal principle No. 1 — open, public administration, so the people know what's going on — one would think we would have a commitment to a public inquiry of nursing homes.

I go on to signpost No. 2:

2. We believe in local government . . .

Well, that's nice. And we're going to return:

- . . . the decision-making process by local councils, school boards and other municipal authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the people on the Berwyn hospital board were here today, so they could describe in full detail the consultation that took place with the Berwyn hospital board about the relocation of the new Berwyn hospital in Grimshaw, 6 miles down the road, without ever a motion being passed by the Berwyn hospital board, the decision being made one hundred per cent by whoever — Tory caucus or the decision-makers in Edmonton, but certainly not by the local authorities.

Yesterday we had the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs rising in his place and telling us how well we're doing in shielding municipalities, and that the shielding rate is going from 9 per cent up to 11 per cent. But was there any consultation with local governments? Was there any formal consultation with the Urban Municipalities Association or the rural? Oh no, that's a unilateral decision of the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Unilateral decisions by Ottawa are bad — and they are bad. But unilateral decisions by this government, when it comes to dealing with municipalities, well that's a decision of the Provincial Treasurer and Executive Council. Mr. Speaker, that's not what they said in 1967. They seem to have changed just a bit, just a bit. The leopard has changed his spots on this one.

Then we have another very strong signpost a little further down the document: we believe in the rights of the individual citizen, and they must be solidly protected. We all support that; no question in theory. Except when one looks at the changes in The Individual's Rights Protection Act and what we've done to the Human Rights Commission in this province, we have made it literally a toothless tiger. We've allowed the cabinet to make decisions that in fact ought to be undertaken by the Human Rights Commission. We don't have the independence that the Human Rights Commission ought to enjoy, being answerable to the Legislature instead of answerable to the Minister of Labour. So one really wonders how strong that commitment to individual rights is when you see what has happened to The Individual's Rights Protection Act. And of course, Mr. Speaker, it's the rights of liberty and privacy.

One has to wonder about the rights of privacy when in 1979 we had officials of the Department of Social Services and Community Health come calling on the Metis communities in the province, and we had that argument in the House. I still remember some of the hon. members — the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry talking about government documents, government offices, and government employees. Then, finally, the Ombudsman looked into it and told us very clearly that the government was way out, that it was wrong, totally wrong. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that's supposedly concerned about privacy and freedom to pursue one's own destiny, but it was the government that stumbled and fumbled and bumbled into one of the worst violations of civil liberties that has been witnessed in this country for a long time. One has to call it the way it is.

MR. COOK: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: If the hon. member wants to raise a point of privilege or order, fair enough.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to me in his speech. I think it only fair that I ask him to comment on whether it's the right of a member to be silly in his speech, as he is obviously demonstrating right now, and whether he proposes to incorporate that in his bill of rights.

DR. BUCK: You're digging yourself in deeper, Rollie.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, someday the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry will learn the rules of the House, and I'm sure we'll all appreciate it when he does. But in the meantime, I suggest that he spend a little more

time reading *Beauchesne*. Maybe we can send him a copy, and he can do that for the next few minutes.

MR. COOK: [Inaudible]. . . have *Beauchesne* right here.

MR. NOTLEY: Then read it. Read it, my friend, read it.

Now we can go on to signpost No. 5. I don't blame the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry for being a little embarrassed, you know, for some of the things he said during this Metis raid question in 1979. That's almost as bad as the two-by-four incident a little later on in that particular session, when he became the centre of more interest on the part of Edmonton and district firefighters than any other member of the Legislature in the history of this building. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, two-by-fours, Metis raids: we all know some of the problems of the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

Let's go on to signpost No. 5:

We believe that a provincial government should always have a long range plan for its future development. We believe that new legislation should be enacted within the framework of such a plan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that certainly is interesting when one looks at the record of this particular government. Yesterday in the House we were asking the government where they stand on the Crow rate, and we get an incredible mishmash of: I'm not sure, we're looking at it, and we're not quite sure how we can do it. Ten years into the Tory administration and we're still studying something as crucial as the transportation of our grain. Then we get the hon. Member for Vegreville suggesting yesterday, as a positive contribution, that he wants to withdraw Alberta from the Wheat Board designated area, a position I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure is opposed by 90 per cent of the farmers of that hon. member's constituency. [interjections] But you know, that again illustrates no long-term planning at all in that important area.

Diversification — I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition quite properly pointed to this. In 1971, when the Tories came to power, diversification was one of their principal planks, and rightly so. All members recognize that we have to diversify the economy of this province, that we're overdependent on non-renewable resources. But you know, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the figures supplied by the Alberta statistical review, the evidence is just overwhelming. This province is more dependent on non-renewable resources in 1981 than it was in 1971. It's more dependent on oil and gas than at any time in our history. Without going into the statistics in detail, the information supplied by the government's own statistical branch clearly shows, in my judgment, that 10 years of Tory leadership have led to a province which is less diversified and more dependent on non-renewable resources than it was a decade ago.

Then, Mr. Speaker, for a government that talks about long-term planning, we have the rather incredible example of 'ad hockery' in northeastern Alberta, where we have municipalities that are more than a little concerned over the problems of getting money from government programs. We have the situation in Cold Lake, where they literally have to question whether they can even pay their employees because of money that should have been forthcoming under provincial plans from this government. As an example of 'ad hockery', we have the provincial funding of municipal water and sewer systems: in 1979-80, \$19,800,000 budgeted; actually spent, almost \$40 million — \$39,557,000 — an unbudgeted excess of 99 per cent. No question, Mr. Speaker, that we have to get on

with this job. But why wasn't there more planning? 1980-81, \$46 million budgeted; \$124 million spent, an unbudgeted excess of \$78 million or 171 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the point I think needs to be made is that signpost No. 5 was that we were going to have long-term planning. You look at the administration of government in this province and the one thing that is clearly absent is any kind of coherent long-term planning. We've not moved to diversify the economy. We don't have clearly thought out positions on things as important as transportation, the freight rate system of this country. In north-eastern Alberta we have chaos created not by the actions of even the private companies, who want to get on with the job, but by the actions of this government in not pulling its act together. Mr. Speaker, no one who goes out in that part of the province, I don't care who it is, can come away without a sense of frustration over the problems that people have to face there because of a lack of long-term planning by this government. So signpost No. 5 doesn't really mean too much in 1981.

Then:

We believe that adequate warning should be given of proposed new legislation to those affected and that a full opportunity should be granted, particularly to those adversely affected, to air their objections in a public forum.

Ask the firefighters how much public participation they felt they had when we changed the legislation in 1979, except as members of the gallery coming day after day after day to remind this government that at one time they believed in open government. Ask the president of the Alberta Federation of Labour. Ask any of the executive officers of the Alberta Federation of Labour how much consultation really took place before Bills 79 and 80 rammed through this Legislature last fall. No, Mr. Speaker, we sure do not follow the principle of adequate warning and full public debate.

You know, when this government came to office, they were prepared, and I compliment them. In the election campaign in 1971, we had the discussion of higher royalties. Then in that first term, in the first few months, there was a lot of interest in increasing royalties. This government, to its credit, decided we should have full public hearings on the oil royalty question. We had the officials of most of the large companies attend. We had representatives from almost every group in the province make submission.

That was the kind of thing we do from time to time. That's the kind of thing that a government that's prepared to be open does. But when was the last time the Legislature ever went through that kind of process? When was the last time we committed ourselves to really doing the kinds of things this government claimed they were so solidly committed to do when they were courting the voters of Alberta in 1967 and 1971?

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are several other points I want to make here. Signpost No. 7 talks about education:

We believe in any establishment of priorities, that expenditures on all aspects of education ...

and that's a good point

... (not just on the bricks and mortar of education) must be given the highest priority to equip younger Albertans to compete in the decade ahead.

A very sound point. But in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, there's no mention of some of the major educational issues. Now we know that one of the reasons there's not a great deal of mention is because the Minister of Education has got himself into so much trouble over

The Teaching Profession Act. He's the only minister I know who has single-handedly got not only the ATA but the Alberta School Trustees' Association mad at him at the same time.

In addition to that, no mention of the Kratzmann report. I know the Minister of Labour doesn't like it. The Minister of Education doesn't like it. But why have the Kratzmann report? It came about because of the action of this government during the Calgary teachers' strike. And now that we get the report, all of a sudden it's abandoned totally, no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne. One would have thought we would have had some indication from the government on this important report, as to what they propose to do with it. Are they going to implement it, implement part of it, or are they going to reject it in its entirety? But it's not even mentioned, even though the report was commissioned as a result of action taken by two hon. ministers in this House.

Well, we've got the Northland school situation, Mr. Speaker. We had the Swift Commission make recommendations in 1975. Virtually nothing was done with those recommendations in 1975, and I would defy any member who has taken the time to visit some of the schools in the Northland School Division to come away and say we can be satisfied with the conditions in that school division. We've had a report on our desks for the last six years, but no commitment to action and no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne, no mention of it. So much for this government's commitment to education in signpost No. 7.

Signpost No. 8:

We believe that one of the greatest challenges of provincial government is to administer welfare in relation to need without detracting from human dignity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the situation in our private nursing homes. Some hon. members may disagree; the other day the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care tried to convince us that everything was fine. But when one looks at the growing evidence from workers, from people who have parents or loved ones in some of these institutions, we have some of the best nursing homes in Canada, but we have some of the worst. That's the real truth of our nursing home situation. Yes, we do have some fine nursing homes. But we also have some nursing homes that are not adequate, and in my view we should not sort of drift over that. I would just underline what I said a moment ago: what we need at the moment is not a review such as the one announced by the minister; we need a full-fledged public inquiry, so we know where things stand on the operation of nursing homes in this province.

But I want to move just a little bit further on this question of "administer welfare in relation to need without detracting from human dignity". Of course we have the new program with respect to getting young mothers out in the work place, nothing wrong with that in principle. But if you're going to get young mothers on social assistance out in the work place, one of the things you're going to have to do is make sure you have enough adequately subsidized after-school care facilities. When I look at the government's own figures and find we have one subsidized space for every 117 eligible children, the fact is that we've got a long way to go before we can develop a program "in relation to need without detracting from human dignity".

Mr. Speaker, I think signpost No. 9 is the one I must confess I enjoy the most. It talks about fiscal manage-

ment. In those days, 1966 and 1967, there was an accumulated surplus, nothing as fancy as the heritage trust fund. The old Social Credit government never really had this flare for PR. It was called an accumulated cash surplus. Nothing could be more boring or dull than that, but it was essentially our Heritage Trust Fund in 1966. Anyway, the Tories were telling us:

We do not believe that the necessity for financial responsibility should be an excuse for ultra-cautious fiscal policies. We believe in the concept of putting one's money and resources to work for improvement and development. We consider unnecessary hoarding of surplus funds as a lack of progress.

Well, Mr. Speaker, "We consider unnecessary hoarding of surplus funds as a lack of progress." When one looks at the way we have shifted our ground on the heritage trust fund, from a vehicle which can be a major instrument of diversification, if you like, to essentially the largest piggy bank in the history of Canada, one really has to wonder if we haven't fallen back to "unnecessary hoarding of surplus funds". So, Mr. Speaker, there is signpost No. 9 shot down by the record of this government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] . . . the policy of pay as you go.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right, that's right. Indeed they were.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks on these signposts. Signpost No. 11 talks about their development programs, and it makes this point:

It requires an acceptance of the dangers of the trend in international business to larger and larger integrated [companies] . . .

You know, Mr. Speaker, if one needs any evidence of that, all one has to do is look at the dispute between Alberta Gas Chemicals and Celanese, which was given the okay to expand its operation. There is no doubt that Alberta Gas Chemicals made some pretty strong statements. I'd just like to quote several statements from this firm, an Alberta-based firm, about an action of a government which one would think should be encouraging more Canadian ownership.

This is what the senior vice-president of Alberta Gas Chemicals has said, not the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview, not even the red Tory hon. member for Edmonton Glengarry. This is the senior vice-president of Alberta Gas Chemicals:

We are shocked and dismayed to learn of this turn of events. We are still having difficulty in believing that the Alberta Cabinet [could] sacrifice an Alberta company for the sake of a multi-national.

That sounds like Roy Atkinson talking. That's even further left than Ed Broadbent, you know.

The Alberta Cabinet know full well that their approval [of] this application can result in the shut-down of one or more of AGCL's plants at Medicine Hat and a layoff of the personnel involved. This matter was clearly pointed out to the Cabinet by the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board following their lengthy hearings and investigation of the matter. Cabinet has completely failed to heed these warnings by the ERCB and repeatedly refused to recognize the current and future over-supply of methanol in the markets served by Alberta methanol plants.

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, and I think these are indeed

noteworthy observations:

We fail to understand why the door is always open and the giveaways are always available for the multi-nationals, but the home-grown Alberta owned and based companies have to fight tooth and nail to get anything from this government.

I think that says it pretty well about this so-called industrial strategy of the government of Alberta, which shows that signpost No. 11, our emphasis on greater Canadian ownership, seems to have gone down the drain as well.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I want to draw together where we're at. We've looked at some of these signposts and where the government's level of performance hasn't met the promise of more than a decade ago. But I think what's perhaps even more important is to look at what has happened to Alberta in the meantime. Because if you look at the percentage distribution of provincial income in Alberta between 1970 and 1979, and compare that with the rest of the country, you get some remarkable statistics.

In 1970, wages and salaries made up 48 per cent of the gross provincial income; in Canada, 54.5 per cent. In other words, in 1970 we were very close to the Canadian average. In 1979 the Canadian average was 55.5, but Alberta had dropped to 37.4. Farm income, 3.5 per cent in 1970, dropped to 2.8 per cent by 1979. Small business — this government claims to be in favor of small business — 6.2 per cent in 1970, 2.8 per cent in 1979. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1970 we were almost exactly comparable to Canada as a whole: 6.2 per cent in Alberta, 6.3 per cent in Canada. But in 1979, small business is 2.8 per cent in Alberta, 4 per cent in Canada. So we've significantly dropped in relationship to small business's total participation in the gross provincial product.

On the other hand, if you look at corporate profits, in 1970 we were slightly above the Canadian average, but only slightly: 12.3 per cent, compared to 9 per cent. In 1979 we are 23.8 per cent, compared to 13.2 per cent for all of Canada. So in the area of corporate profits there is absolutely no doubt that where wages and salaries have shrunk as a percentage of the personal income and the provincial product of this province, corporate profits have gone up higher than in any other part of Canada. Investment and interest income, 7.6 per cent in 1970, doubled to more than 15.5 per cent in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, these figures, taken from the Alberta statistical review, lead me to the conclusion that in the last 10 years Alberta has become a less egalitarian place in which to live. We have a maldistribution of income. Rather than moving towards a more diversified economy, we've seen that in 1981 our economy is more dependent on non-renewable resources than it was a decade ago. We have the highest level of foreign ownership of any part of Canada. We have a government where even the corporate sector is saying, why give all these things away to big international companies and deny opportunities to Alberta-based and Canadian companies? What we have, Mr. Speaker, is 10 years of government in which we have moved fundamentally away from the guideposts of 1967.

I would say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure that members of the opposition are not going to ask, nor would expect, the members of this government caucus to agree with the positions of our respective parties. But I would say to all of you that if you would read your own guideposts and make this government commit itself to following through on the principles this party offered itself to the people of Alberta on in 1967 and 1971, then we'd have a much stronger document in the Speech from

the Throne that was presented last week.

Thank you.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to have this opportunity to participate in the throne speech debate in this Third Session of the 19th Alberta Legislature. I'd like to join with other members in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, and in addition join with other members who have congratulated our new Sergeant-at-Arms. I have to do that because his brother is one of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal principally with two areas today: one, as the Speech from the Throne affects my constituency and, secondly, with certain initiatives of the Department of Utilities and Telephones. But before I do that I want to make a few comments about the previous speaker. I'm sorry he's not able to be in the Assembly.

After listening with I think considerable care to his comments, I'm rather pleased that certain aspects of my education were limited in terms of perhaps statistical studies. You know, statistics are a very fascinating thing. The manner in which the Member for Spirit River-Fairview compared job creation and economic development as it relates to the gross domestic product is almost like comparing apples and oranges. I'm wondering why over 60,000 new jobs were created in Alberta last year. I'm also curious as to why people from Ontario, the Atlantic provinces, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan have moved to Alberta because of the economic opportunities. I just have difficulty following the kind of statistical base the hon. member referred to. The amount of activity and the climate for investment in Alberta have made the growth in this province spectacular in terms of the Canadian context. I'm rather curious to know how the hon. member would dampen that activity and reduce the amount of investment in Alberta, and thus reduce the number of jobs.

The member made other comments with respect to the fiscal management of this government, criticism of the manner in which we have conducted our affairs, and criticism of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I suppose it's useful for the hon. member to be reminded that the hopper cars, the learning resources, the financing for Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, \$1.5 billion worth of housing mortgage loans, financing assistance to Alberta Government Telephones to avoid the necessity of going into the international markets, provision of irrigation, improvements to irrigation, flood control, development of parks, are all benefits of the heritage trust fund. If we followed the hon. member's thinking, I suppose we would spend that rather than retain the assets and use it for the benefit of Albertans. I simply don't understand that kind of thinking.

In the course of our responsibilities as MLAs, I'm sure all of us listen to our constituents, take their advice, and confer with them. My colleagues on the government side of the Assembly do this. In our caucus we regularly discuss the input from our constituents. After listening to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I wonder whether he is talking to constituents in Oshawa or in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to speak a little bit about the Lesser Slave Lake constituency and, on behalf of my constituents, make some comments related to the throne speech. First of all, for members who are not familiar with the Lesser Slave Lake constituency, it's over 17,000 square miles of some of the most beautiful country in Canada, with beautiful lakes, forested areas, and agricultural land; rich in resources, but principally rich in peo-

ple. As I indicated, our most important resource is our people. Other resources are agriculture, oil and natural gas, forestry, commercial and sport fishing, trapping, and recreation.

First of all the agricultural aspects, primarily undertaken in the central and western portions of the constituency: the people in the constituency welcome the throne speech announcement by the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife opening up 275,000 acres of agricultural land to provide more agricultural opportunities for young farmers in this province. We welcome that in our constituency, as well as the studies being undertaken to expand agricultural opportunities along the south shore of Lesser Slave Lake.

The initiatives by the Minister of Transportation, providing additional funds for roads in improvement districts, are most important and welcomed. The provision for road construction at the same time as lands are being opened up is most important. In the throne speech there was reference to more emphasis on drainage projects in northern Alberta, and we welcome that. As members of the Assembly are aware, one of the major projects under the heritage fund capital projects division is a lake stabilization project that will assist in providing 60,000 more acres of farmable agricultural land. This is an example of long-range planning and useful use of our resources.

I want to talk briefly about the beef industry in my constituency and the concerns expressed to me about the present situation in the beef cattle industry. On examining the situation and looking at all the factors causing concerns, and the present lower prices for beef cattle producers in our province, I suppose one of the things is the kind of interference with the market place that is taking place in other jurisdictions. It's the kind of thing the member who spoke previously alluded to, that the government should get more involved in. Yet our beef producers are independent businessmen, entrepreneurs who are disturbed and being affected by actions by other governments, federal and provincial, that impact on this most important industry. As all members are aware, 40 per cent of the cattle in Canada are produced in Alberta. Yet the Crow rate, the feed freight programs, the assistance programs provided by other provincial governments, are impacting negatively on our own beef producers. I want to express that concern.

Mr. Speaker, the oil and gas industry is most important to our constituents. In pre-session meetings they expressed their anger and frustration with the October 28 national energy program. They have supported our government and will continue to support it in our efforts to have these most unwise and poorly thought out proposals corrected in the interests of Albertans and Canadians. The effect on the constituency is being felt, particularly in the eastern and northern parts. I'm sure the constituents realize the long-term importance of reaching a reasonable and comprehensive package for Canada.

I'd like to talk briefly now about the forestry potential in the constituency. There are about eight forest product manufacturers, primarily using spruce and pine in their manufacture of forest products, spread throughout the region in the Lesser Slave Lake constituency. We believe there is tremendous potential for the use of poplar particularly throughout all of northern Alberta and in other parts of the province. We welcome the announcement by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources that a thorough study would be undertaken to determine whether we could improve the viability and use of poplar. As we move into the '80s and '90s, the value of wood

fibre in the world is going to grow and increase dramatically. We must assure maximum utilization of this fibre, and that there is proper reforestation. Alberta has one of the best reforestation programs in Canada, including the heritage fund \$25 million reforestation project, that will provide benefits to Albertans in the next 50 to 100 years. So I support all our efforts in developing and obtaining maximum use of our forest products, particularly the under-utilized poplar.

Another strength of our Alberta economy within the constituency is the potential for tourist development along the beautiful, white, sandy shores of Lesser Slave Lake, the northern lakes where the trout fishing is superb. I'll provide any members who would like them, with brochures after we've completed today's activities. One of the events that takes place each year is the golden pike contest. A fisherman who is successful in angling and catching a golden pike could get a \$10,000 prize. We have two provincial parks, one of them referred to in the throne speech, where additional work will be undertaken. We welcome that.

I'd like to talk now about some of the people issues in my constituency: some of the things I think are important, and some of the initiatives of the government that are helpful and welcomed by constituents in northern Alberta and throughout the province. Of particular interest to us were the initiatives of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to improve local government within the improvement districts; that is, the strengthening of local self-government, the addition of advisory councils, the strengthening of the councils of the Metis settlements. Constituents' reaction to this has been most positive. It's in complete contradiction to the understanding the Member for Spirit River-Fairview had of the initiatives of the government in terms of local self-government and initiative. This program of strengthening Municipal Affairs administration offices, strengthening the improvement districts' councils, adding people who will assist in administration of local affairs, is so very important to the people of the north. I'd like to mention just one particular area in my constituency, Wabasca, where an office of the Department of Municipal Affairs will be established. This goes hand in hand with our program of providing land to the community through our land tenure program; the establishment and completion of construction of a beautiful health care complex in that community; the additional funds for improving roads, power, and utilities; the extension of many of the services provided, such as recreation programs; the old PSS program is now being extended to the reserves. These are the kinds of people programs welcomed by people in the northern communities. Others are the community vocational centre program, where advanced education programs are taken right into the communities; the strengthening of our college and vocational centres system throughout the province. All these initiatives are welcomed by the people in my constituency and, I believe, throughout the province. On another specific capital item mentioned in the throne speech, I wanted to convey to the Minister of Housing and Public Works our appreciation at the commencement of planning of a new provincial building in Slave Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move briefly to some of the priorities of the Department of Utilities and Telephones, and list them in this way. Our major responsibility is to provide utility service efficiently and at the lowest possible cost to Albertans throughout the province. First I'd like to talk about electric utilities and some of the priorities and initiatives undertaken within the department in

the last year to year and a half. You've heard mention in the House of our interest and commitment to developing alternate or renewable sources of electric energy for the people of Alberta. To that end, we are working very diligently to develop the hydro-electric potential at Dunvegan on the Peace River and near Mountain Rapids on the Slave River, as well as negotiating intensively with Manitoba and Saskatchewan to develop a western electric power grid that would bring renewable energy from the Nelson River system into Alberta. We believe these initiatives are important so that we can balance our supply of energy between thermal, which is non-renewable, and water power, which is renewable; to provide that balance for Albertans in terms of efficiency of operation of the system, reduction in pollution, and long-term benefits that accrue from the use of hydro development.

Mr. Speaker, another priority has been the examining of our rural electric system very closely, and looking for ways we might improve service to rural Albertans. Presently approximately 350 rural electrification associations provide most of the electric needs to farm families in Alberta. They purchase power from the utilities in the province. Because the system is now over 30 years old in some parts of the province, it needs some attention. It's been very difficult to determine how that assistance may be provided to the rural electrification associations. In examining the assistance that the government has made available to the rural electrification associations, over \$100 million in 3.5 per cent loans have been taken up by the rural electric utilities. This 3.5 per cent capital helps them undertake most of their work. But we have a major difficulty in terms of how we achieve the necessary rebuilding. That matter is under review, and we hope to be able to arrive at some helpful assistance in resolving some of the concerns of the rural electrification associations.

The rural gas program, that I mentioned earlier in a ministerial statement, has been a tremendous success. Natural gas has been provided to rural Albertans as nowhere else in the world. We now have about 70,000 rural families connected to natural gas as a result of this program; about 200,000 individual Albertans. This is tremendous. When the program was initially established in 1973, we expected there would be about 80,000 potential customers. It now looks as though approaching 100,000 rural families will benefit from this program when it's ultimately completed. So it's a very important program in terms of life style and convenience to rural Albertans. We've had some difficulties with pipe that had to be replaced because it was of inferior quality. We've about two-thirds completed with the program of replacing that pipe, completely at the cost of the provincial government.

The remote area heating allowance was a new initiative that we announced last year. That's been tremendously well received by people who don't have access to natural gas and, in some regions, are unlikely to have it because of rocky terrain such as in the Banff area, or extensive, very long distances of muskeg where it's difficult to provide natural gas. The take-up of this program of 35 per cent rebate on home heating costs of fuel oil and natural gas has been very well received. Mr. Speaker, that makes me wonder where the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was when all these programs were developed and provided to his constituents and to others throughout the province. It demonstrates an interest in people and a desire to provide needed services to Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, we've been working very hard on a couple of other areas. One is an examination of our

existing policy as it relates to the approval process for major electric transmission lines in the province. This was partially introduced by the Member for Three Hills when a resolution was brought to the Assembly, debated, and passed. We are in the process of examining ways in which our transmission line procedure might be improved, and I hope to be able to file with the Assembly later this session further information on how we might improve this process.

Another area we've been heavily involved in, Mr. Speaker, is energy conservation. I know this is of considerable interest to all members of the Assembly, particularly the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. We have been working with a committee made up of a number of departments including Labour, Housing and Public Works, Energy and Natural Resources, our department, and others in developing a comprehensive understanding of ways we might suggest improvements to energy conservation programs. We cannot simply adopt programs that have been undertaken in the United States, because our utility consumption patterns are different, our use of electricity and natural gas is different from most parts of the United States that have undertaken these programs. We must have a properly developed conservation program. That planning is under way, Mr. Speaker.

I alluded earlier to the natural gas price protection plan, and members will recall that legislation that committed the government to five years' additional price protection at the very least was introduced and passed in the last session of the Legislature. That has been well received.

One difficulty that consumers have encountered is the imposition of the national energy program natural gas tax that has caused a great deal of concern and anguish for Albertans. We are concerned as well, and hope the federal government would see the light and understand that this tax is highly discriminatory and has a harmful effect on Albertans, particularly, and on other Canadians who would like to use natural gas, and is driving up their home heating costs unnecessarily.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks I'd like to say that I'm proud to be an Albertan, I'm proud to be a Canadian. I'm very honored to be a member of this Legislature and to have an opportunity to serve a group of Albertans in the Lesser Slave Lake constituency. The strength of our province is in our people. Our people still have that entrepreneurial spirit, that will to work, that adventuresome spirit that made the west strong. That is the reason our province is the outstanding example, in terms of its progress, people, culture, and economic development. It's because of the people of this province.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to again have the opportunity to deliver remarks on behalf of the constituents of Edmonton Norwood, to express some of their concerns, and to communicate to them on a broader scale some of the activities the government has undertaken and is planning to undertake, which we trust will stand in their interest, making for a better life in this province.

I'd like to join with my colleagues in expressing my congratulations to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for his delivery at the opening of this session last Thursday. As well, I'd like to express my congratulations to our new Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Lacombe. I'm sure we all appreciate the continuation of the tradition, decorum, and service he will provide to this Assembly, that has been so well known over the years. I congratulate my

colleagues from Calgary North West and Innisfail for their contributions in moving the Speech from the Throne and for setting such a high standard for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin my remarks with respect to those areas of government service, programs, and policies that impact mostly on my constituency and constituents. With regard to the impact on my constituency, I would like to begin in the area of community support. Our major cultural/recreational grant program, established some years ago, evolved from what had begun in 1972-73 with a program for improvement of community centres — community halls, as we called them — to upgrade them, to assist the many volunteer people involved within community organizations to continue the kind of services with our families, with the young people, that could never be purchased by financial support.

The worth of the evolvement of the major cultural/recreational grant has been realized in at least two communities in my constituency. A major recreational facility was developed in Delton a few years ago. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to deliver to them the substantial funds, well over \$80,000, to assist in the kind of development they had there. I'm very pleased that, currently, I have confirmation from the Minister of Recreation and Parks that another community is on its way to receiving support under this program, and that is the Alberta Avenue/Eastwood community recreation centre.

Why is it so important? Many of my colleagues and members of the Assembly have some appreciation and recognition that the constituency of Edmonton Norwood has some very concentrated and unique problems of its own. It has many of the benefits in a very positive life style, but it also has many social problems. There is a high concentration of single-parent families and many new Canadians. I know we all recognize the difficulties that arise from a concentration in the mix, where income levels are not substantial and the ability to cope with today's life styles is very difficult.

Within the constituency of Edmonton Norwood, under the neighborhood improvement program, last year we completed the Norwood centre and the improvement of the boundaries within a small aspect of the what we call the Norwood centre. With the kinds of housing improvements that were available, in street and lighting improvements, recreational facilities that were made available for the young people — absolutely no parks were available in the whole community. The only playgrounds available were those around schools, and they were inadequate.

So the expansion and availability, particularly for the younger citizen within the constituency, have meant a great deal to that centre. We have a revitalization of the community, with many young families establishing there, and the young mothers and fathers participating extensively in the community programs at the Norwood centre. They have to be commended. Day care service is provided there. It seems that the facility is bursting at the seams, I would say, for a very long period of time, from early morning till late evening, seven days a week, when activity is carried on. It's a real dedication on the part of the parents who voluntarily take the time to see that the young people are well engaged with worth-while activities rather than getting into various difficulties in the neighborhood.

The new grant that is now being made available to Alberta Avenue/Eastwood will help resolve much the same kind of problem. In the constituency of Edmonton

Norwood we have a fair number of young people who are very active and sportsminded. We have young coaches for hockey teams, skating, and a great number of activities for young people. Amidst the many difficulties the constituency citizens face, I'm very proud to know that they are working so hard at resolving so many of them. So I'm very pleased that we have developed programs that really could be experienced as of benefit and assistance through a direct manner.

I'd like to say that changes have been made in the day care program, and that it is continuing to be expanded and reviewed, to have the flexibility to meet and resolve the special kinds of problems where there is a high concentration of single-parent families, where they need not just the normal kind of day care service but, in addition to what the children need, the parents need counselling. The low income level that is prevalent on the part of a lot of families in many households — I'm pleased that the change made in the subsidy for day care, I guess started two years ago, which follows the child, enabled many parents to take their children into the number of privately operated day cares that exist within the constituency. Of course there are problems with this particular program that need to be resolved. As with any new program, there's a matter of time and resolution.

The family day home, being revised at this time, is very important. I received a number of communications with respect to problems being faced by family day-parents. They thought the program was going to be completely discontinued. And the need exists for single parents who have their own emotional difficulties, as well as coping with problems with their children. They need support. I'm pleased to see this support being developed to be more effective and available in the manner that would most benefit those who truly need it. It certainly is important that part of the program includes counselling to assist the day-parent in dealing more effectively with the children they will have in their care.

Another aspect that I hope the Minister of Social Services and Community Health will consider or include at some time in his program is with respect to shift care. I say "shift care" because one refers to day care and automatically thinks of the 7:00 to 6:00 or 8:00 to 7:00 time frame and really doesn't facilitate the single parent family where perhaps the mother works or in some cases the father is required to work shifts. There really isn't a service available to assist that kind of situation. Perhaps the minister would look at the possibility of developing a program of some co-ordination where volunteer organizations could undertake to develop a kind of shift care program that would meet the needs of many of my constituents. I'm sure that's not an isolated case. I'm sure my colleagues in this House have situations of that nature.

I'm pleased with the introduction of the legislation put forward yesterday with regard to family and community support services. I suppose this not only replaces but expands the previous preventive social services program that was in existence over many years. I suppose there are many shortcomings in that program, or perhaps it wasn't quite as effective or beneficial as one would have liked it to be. It is hoped that the expansion under this new legislation and somewhat replanned direction of this particular service will meet the kinds of needs found in the communities and what it is intended to do.

Another area I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health — and I'm sure he has already had other representations —

is with regard to an after-school program. I suppose that particular issue was one of the points raised this afternoon by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I didn't disagree with although there wasn't much else I could commend him on in the posture and the position he had taken, because it was totally negative. Mr. Speaker, nothing is accomplished through negativism. It certainly must be through positive thought and action.

The after-school program for single parents in some ways again would meet the needs of single parents whose work period extends beyond the time that the child is out of school and is really too young to be responsible for his or her actions in returning home, and ensure that no unfortunate incident occurs. Even if the young individual has matured to an age sufficient to be responsible for how they conduct themselves in the absence of their parent, the possibility of incidents occurring caused by others who prey on young people and on society is really difficult.

In the Edmonton Norwood constituency, I know a number of programs are being worked at very diligently with a lot of very dedicated volunteer parents and individuals. But we can expect our volunteers can give [only] so much of their time in certain areas. Then there are physical costs that must be met. I hope there is closer consideration for meeting that particular need.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer briefly to programs on housing, particularly senior citizen housing programs, which again are very relevant to my constituency. In 1971 when I was first elected, in my entire constituency we had one senior citizens' residence called Elizabeth House. Of course there was the new Dr. Angus McGugan nursing home that had just been developed and the Norwood auxiliary hospital. But as far as lodges or independent, self-contained, senior citizen units are concerned, there really wasn't anything. I'm very pleased to say that over the years we have really accomplished a great deal.

I'd like to convey to you the appreciation that seniors in homes in my constituency have for the fact that the government has provided this housing. We're in the process of constructing our sixth residence. I think the first one was officially opened in 1975. Since then we've had four additional ones, and we're now constructing one. So there's now a total of six. The citizens are very happy regarding the provision being made.

In addition to that, as I go door to door in my constituency many seniors are expressing their real gratitude for the pioneer home improvement grant program that originally started with \$1,000 and now is \$2,000. I know that many of my constituents have taken advantage of that, and it has enabled them to remain in their homes.

Of course there is now the other problem with respect to the overall rise in our cost of living, utilities, and property taxes. They are facing some hardships with regard to meeting those particular aspects of their daily living; that is, the cost of home heating and taxes. I think that probably the matter of home heating and some of their other costs would be bearable if property taxes hadn't taken such an extensive move upward. An area I'll be referring to, that I hope we as a government and the Minister of Education will consider down the road, is development of a program to decrease some of that property tax, which would fall within the ambit and ability for the provincial government without interfering with the process and jurisdiction of the municipality.

The other aspect of the new announcement made with respect to the senior citizens' facility grant program which provides recreational and cultural props, so to speak, in

senior citizens' centres is very important. Not only government but many private organizations have been providing senior citizens' cultural/recreation centres, of course at very extensive cost. But the furnishing of some of these centres in the sense of providing a piano, an organ, and other kinds of recreational items is always a problem. I'm sure that some of the facilities in my constituency will be able to utilize that particular program.

Last fall as I was going through my constituency attempting to get an assessment of the feelings of my constituents, I came across some of the handicapped who are living in their own homes and have, in today's very high cost of living in the province of Alberta because of the buoyancy of its economy and the pressures brought about by the influx of many people into this province, been able to live in their homes and to have had funds available to make the kinds of adjustments to the residence that enable them to freely and easily move in and out of their residence.

Assured income for the severely handicapped is another program, perhaps straining somewhat in its adequacy, that has been welcomed. I hope the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is examining that particular program and its adequacy in light of today's very high costs they're experiencing if they're living in their homes. I'm not sure whether that is something the minister is able to look at within the current year. I know that we have been putting forward so many massive programs and expansions that no doubt there has to be some sort of limit. I don't want to put expectations across where it is not feasible to bring them into reality, but I would simply suggest to the minister that he examine the allocations and the amounts and how they fit with today's costs.

I'd like to commend the Minister of Social Services and Community Health with regard to the group homes that have been established in my constituency. They have been integrated into the community in such a manner that the majority of people in the community are not even aware of their existence. In other words, they have fitted into the community very quietly without creating any kind of concern or disturbance, and this is really the intent of the program. I want to commend the minister and suggest that he might communicate that to the people in his department who were instrumental in carrying out the policy and the approach they have taken to the communities in implementing this particular aspect of the program for the mentally and physically handicapped.

I think the minister has just sent me a note with regard to the assured income for the severely handicapped and the size of the program now. I appreciate that the amount of \$492 per person is one that he can't move upward, except that at the time the program was put in place, that figure was determined by examining the costs that one faces. I would just like to say that perhaps he may not be able to move it upward at this time because the budget certainly has been set, but I would just suggest that for a future year. I think the minister can live with that.

I'd like to refer to two communications I have been receiving from my constituents, because they have been in substantial numbers. One is with respect to educational financing and the disparity in the assessment base that is creating a real problem as to support in both the public and separate school systems. The reality in the increase in the supplementary requisitions, based on the assessment base available to each of the school systems, has created the problem that because the assessment base is considerably smaller in the separate school system, the amount of

funding available per student in that system is quite far behind that in the public school system. Parents in the separate school system are concerned of course that the cost to ratepayers who have allocated their support to the separate system is very high.

I am pleased to say that part of the Speech from the Throne contains an indication that the Minister of Education is having a review of educational funding. I'm certain that in the review, the minister will take into consideration the extra-curricular courses that now fall under the supplementary requisitioning. It might very well be considered whether they are not more properly included under the school foundation plan. As one aspect of decreasing overall, regardless of the system the support applies to, it will alter across the board the amount of supplementary requisitioning that would be necessary in the programs.

Many changes have taken place. It has been accepted and found necessary that many of the extra-curricular courses and programs now within the system are really a requirement in order to meet today's educational standards in the real world. So I'm pleased to say that in our speech we have that review taking place for this year, and I'm sure the minister is dealing with this matter on a priority basis. Perhaps in the not too many distant budgets, there will be a reflection of substantial change in that area.

The other item of communication of significant degree I've had from constituents is with respect to Sunday closing. I think it's important perhaps to express the kinds of concerns that have been put forward in letters to me, with regard to the impact if more major retail outlets are allowed to remain open for business on Sundays on a seven-day-a-week basis, the kind of stress that would put on the family unit, and on employees as to the time they might have for relaxation and for their own personal planning and life. They have expressed to me the opportunities that now exist for shoppers to purchase all the kinds of needs they have because of the extensive evening hours there now are with the major services open.

I recognize that I have about two minutes. I would like to utilize that to cover some matters on nursing homes. I am really appalled by some of the statements by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, using statistics that 38 of 41 nursing homes are below a particular standard or level. I'd like to know just what kind of rationale he uses for his statistics. You can interpret statistics in many ways.

With the articles that have been carried in some of our daily journals in recent weeks — I have made it a particular point to visit nursing homes which perhaps might have had some greater difficulties or concerns expressed. I found that the residents in some of these nursing homes are simply appalled. They don't like the kind of communication that is being written about their particular nursing home. This isn't coming from the owners or operators of the home, from the administration or staff; this is coming from the seniors living in these nursing homes. They say, we are being taken care of very well. Of course there are some problems in some areas. But to write the kinds of rhetoric that's been going on — they simply tell me they don't like it. Those aren't my words; they are words of people in these nursing homes.

As chairman of the Health Facilities Review Committee, I have found in my visits to nursing homes, and to all the health facilities, that generally there's very good co-operation in bringing about corrections when problems or inadequacies are identified. We recognize that there is

a shortage of professional staff. Certainly there can be no denying that the regulations are not met in that respect in many instances. They are not met because the people are simply not available in many areas.

I have to congratulate the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and jointly the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and the Minister of Social Services and Community Health for putting together a program reflecting the concern of nursing manpower. The education program for nursing and research that is being put forward must really be complimented. There has been, of course, real concern about the adequacy of the preparedness of nursing care today because of changes in the entire health care system. The kinds of needs that exist today in many of these facilities are quite different, quite advanced, from what they had been a number of years ago. The pressures, the expectations on the part of citizens for what they want to receive in these facilities, are much more demanding. These are some of the kinds of things we must resolve.

The matter in nursing homes — the seniors are aging very much. A different type of care is necessary now. We need more professional nurses who have training in geriatric care, and who have more training to be able to cope more effectively with those citizens who have reached a stage of some degree of inability to function well mentally. There are many new problems. The nursing homes are attempting to cope with all of these on a day to day basis, which is not easy when you do not have adequate professional staff with the kind of training that has been required.

I'm pleased [with] the incentive, the direction the minister has taken to try to bring about — perhaps to communicate to a lot more young people that there's a real future in the health care system; there's a real future in nursing care, not only for young women but young men too. There's a great deal of requirement. Many male residents in the lodges and nursing homes are quite concerned that there aren't enough, or aren't any, male nurses. I would just like to throw that out: when there is counselling in the schools, when there are programs being put forward for young people in their consideration of what ...

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but she's rather substantially over time, largely due to my inadvertence.

MRS. CHICHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to have brought these remarks forward. I'll conclude other remarks on another occasion.

Thank you.

MR. STROMBERG: Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and greetings from the people of the Camrose constituency. May I, on behalf of my constituents, offer my congratulations to you. I believe, sir, that of the speakers currently serving in the different Legislatures across Canada, you have kept your seat the longest. In other words, you are the dean of the speakers of Canada. I would also like to offer my congratulations to Mr. Lacombe. He brings a distinguished, 25-year military career, and a career as a sportsman and a fisherman equal to my own. [laughter]

I would also like to offer my condolences to the family of Don Hansen. Many of us in this Legislature served with Don on many committees. I especially think of the select committee of the Legislature on crop insurance that Don served on. We spent that summer travelling Alberta.

Don had what I call good common sense. We asked his judgment on many occasions. Don was a good MLA to his constituency and to his people.

Mr. Speaker, it's been quite a year in the Camrose constituency. We started out a year ago on January 1 and kicked off our 75th Anniversary. We had a polar picnic on Mirror Lake in Camrose. We concluded last December 30, the end of the anniversary, with another polar picnic. Princess Margaret visited our fair city. Three thousand people came out to wish her well. Also, what a fall, delivering the gold medallions to Alberta pioneers. The stories that they were ...

AN HON. MEMBER: By stork?

MR. STROMBERG: I beg your pardon? Mr. Speaker, I have an interruption. Do you mind?

AN HON. MEMBER: It's the stork flapping its wings.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret, under the circumstances, that the Chair has difficulty intervening or chairing these interruptions.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Quite an experience hearing the stories of these Alberta pioneers and what they have seen in one lifetime: seeing the first train, the first airplane, the first car. One lady told me of her experience in 1902, coming home from school and stopping at a neighbor's for water. The neighbor said, you've got to come out to the road; I want to show you something. Out on the road was a set of tracks. She asked these schoolchildren, what is that? They guessed everything under the sun, but they never thought of an automobile. That was quite an experience. These people who have survived two world wars, Spanish flu, the dirty '30s, and in a sense have the change from the car to pictures on their TV screen of the rings of Saturn 3 billion miles away. I doubt if my generation or my children's generation will ever see such a change in that short a time.

Mr. Speaker, we have quite an event coming up next year in my constituency, the 100th anniversary of St. Thomas Church and the 125th anniversary of the community of Duhamel. In two weeks' time, I believe we have the Minister of Culture visiting our rose constituency and viewing Driedmeat Hill, which we hope we can get declared as a provincial historic site in order to keep the department of highways from taking out the gravel.

Two days ago in his remarks in the Legislature, the Member for Edson showed concern for a non-renewable mineral versus a renewable source, timber versus coal. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to show you and the members of the Legislature a map of my constituency. You will notice, Mr. Minister, the north boundary is up here almost at Sherwood Park. The south boundary is the constituency of Stettler. Now, the area covered in yellow ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Gold.

MR. STROMBERG: ... or gold, the party colors, represents mineable coal, estimates by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. There are 28 townships of some of the finest land in North America, 28 townships that the ERCB estimates can be recovered through underground or strip mining. I think I'll file that with the Speaker.

In all regard to coal, which has been referred to over

the years as the poor man's gold — you go back in the history: child labor, 10 to 12 years of age, used in the pits in Europe, pulling out coal cars; the death of minors to blacklung; the mess, the moonscape left in Kentucky and eastern Tennessee, and also the moonscape in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, at Forestburg. However, I do think coal is finally becoming King Coal. It's coming into its own and coming fast. Compare an acre of prime Alberta farmland in my constituency against an acre of prime forest in the Edson-Hinton area, and an acre of coal in the Dodds-Roundhill area. It would take one acre of prime Alberta forest, 300 years of growth to equal the starch produced from that coalfield. But it would take 3,000 years of continuous wheat to equal that one acre of coal. Countries in Europe, and especially in Asia, that are now being financially hurt due to OPEC oil prices are turning to the generation of electricity through thermal power and the burning of coal. The Member for Grande Prairie mentioned this afternoon: do we have enough trackage to Prince Rupert? I think we're going to have to triple track that route out there with the demand for our coal throughout the world. Now the slurry pipeline might be moving some, but the Coal Association of Canada predicts that two coal mines must be opened up every year for the next 20 years in western Canada. Mr. Speaker, as coal prices track OPEC prices, I think we've got a secret weapon in coal. When our oil wells run out and our revenue runs out, I believe the royalties from coal will far surpass the royalties from oil and natural gas in the next generation.

However, about a month ago the committee of this Legislature hearing briefs and submissions throughout Alberta on surface rights, appeared in my constituency at Killam. I congratulate them. You were really appreciated by my constituents. You heard their views, concerns, and ideas. At that hearing I presented my ideas as to how we as a government might encourage the reclamation of land in Alberta that someday is going to go under the shovel. Mr. Speaker, I offered 7 or 8 points. Number one: if there is a willing buyer on one hand, and a willing seller on the other, fine and dandy, let it be. If the coal company can make the deal with the farmer to get his land, that's well enough. Number two: if there is not a willing seller, that that landowner have the option of leasing his land to the mining company for the period of the actual mining and the length of time it takes to restore his land, and that he be compensated for the value of the revenue he would normally be producing off this land for that length of reclamation.

Number three: in the state of Montana, the coal company will give the farmer the option: look, we've got another ranch, another wheat farm in another state; it's equal to yours; it's yours free. When we're through with your land and we've reclaimed it, you get your old farm back free of charge. Before a mining permit is issued by the ERCB, that that landowner be given a topographical map showing the elevation of his land after reclamation. I think you have to realize that after the shovel has gone through and disturbed anywhere from 50 to 200 feet of soil, that land will never look the same again. The country will be drastically changed. The waterways will be altered. Where there were sloughs and tree clumps, they'll be gone. But I think that maybe the planning can be put back before the shovel comes in, and the reclamation planned. The land must — and I say "must", Mr. Speaker — be restored as good or better than it was before; and the mining company be required to post a very substantial bond, several times the value of the land.

And after reclamation, if the landowner is not satisfied as to the quality of that reclamation, he can have the option of calling that bond, subject to the opinion of the Surface Rights Board; and since the majority of the water aquifers are in the coal seam itself, that water be guaranteed and supplied to an active farm for an indefinite period of time after reclamation. That's extremely important.

But, Mr. Speaker, after reclamation the elevation of the land is considerably changed. After you've taken out an average of 30 feet of coal, you have a surplus of soil, usually in the neighborhood of 50 feet higher than it was before; the same thing at Fort McMurray after the sands have been put back. So you can imagine coming back to a farm that's sticking up 50 feet higher than it was before. No one knows, but it will probably take maybe 200 years till the land settles or compacts. We have to insist that all future roadbeds and farm sites be compacted to a depth of 30 feet. Can you just imagine the problems this gradual sinking is going to incur to foundations and roads, 30, 100, 200 years from now. I think a good example of what can take place is at Pigeon Lake and Wabamun Lake, formed thousands of years ago when the coal seam burnt out. Maybe after we've mined this coal out of Alberta we're going to have some just tremendous inland lakes, man-made by the way, too.

I would like to recommend that through the Alberta Research Council the government of Alberta greatly accelerate the research needed in reclamation. What I've seen of research in Alberta, it's on a garden-sized plot and being done by the mining companies. I think we should have research on 40-acre plots, where it's been mined out and put back.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose one of the bigger problems for urban members is not realizing what it means to own land — love of the land. I can remember the controversy of Dodds-Round Hill, a proposed power project of \$2.5 billion. At that time it was larger than Syncrude, and this government wisely turned down the permit to go ahead. I interviewed every farmer who would be affected for their opinions. In his broken accent, one very old pioneer said, Mr. Stromberg, where I come from in the Ukraine, we died for 14 acres of land. When you're living in the city it's easy to sell your house and move up the ladder. It's a fact of life; nothing's thought of it. But when you have three- and four-generation farms, that house, that barn, isn't built overnight. That barn was built once every 10 years, when you got a decent wheat crop.

We've had the opportunity to entertain some members at our annual barbeque at our farm. There are three generations of landscaping at my farm, and my son — well, he'd darned well better be the fourth generation farmer if I've got anything to say about it. But what would take place? The power company or the coal company would buy my land. I have no say as to the price; it would be through arbitration. I would have the opportunity to bid on my buildings by public tender. Some of them I would bid on. If I was successful, I'd have to move them to a new location. Some of the buildings would not be worth while buying back, but there'd come a day that the bulldozer would come in there. They'd pile up the buildings, set a match to them, bulldoze down our hedges, bulldoze down the elm trees my father did not live long enough to see mature. Before that happened, before they set fire to that, I would have to move my mother out of this province because it would kill her. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, I would be tempted to take the shotgun off the wall.

Mr. Speaker, these recommendations sound like a lot

of dollars. But according to the ERCB, there are 8,000 tons of recoverable coal per acre. I'm speaking of the average coal in my constituency. If you value this coal at \$20 a ton — that's very reasonable; the BTUs in it would probably put it up to about \$24 today — that figures out to \$25,600,000 per quarter. As I said before, as coal tracks OPEC prices the amount spent on reclamation is really going to be peanuts. So why don't we give the landowner a break and spend some money on reclamation?

Well, I think that's long enough, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I move that we adjourn the debate.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. House Leader ...

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry to interrupt the hon. minister. I was going to put the question on the motion.

Does the Assembly agree with the motion to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. House Leader and the hon. Deputy House Leader, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:25 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]