

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, April 13, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, the Hon. Ken MacMaster, Minister of Labour and Manpower for the province of Manitoba, accompanied by his executive assistant, Marg Conway. They're seated in your gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 31****The Pension Statutes Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 31, The Pension Statutes Amendment Act, 1981. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill has two amendments, Mr. Speaker. One corrects an oversight from the fall session of 1980 with respect to The Pension Fund Act. It puts the government, as an employer, in the same position as the employer Crown boards and agencies have been regarding employer contributions and their integration with Canada Pension Plan contributions. Secondly, an amendment with regard to those applying for the recognition of prior pensionable service provides additional time within which those persons can purchase increased pension benefits.

[Leave granted; Bill 31 read a first time]

Bill 25**The County Amendment Act, 1981**

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 25, The County Amendment Act, 1981. This Bill is designed to resolve the problems encountered by some county boards of education relative to school board representation.

[Leave granted; Bill 25 read a first time]

Bill 19**The Election Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 19, The Election Amendment Act, 1981.

The purpose of the Bill is to add the name of an electoral division which was missed in the printing of the

Act in 1980. It also clarifies the nomination process in an electoral division.

[Leave granted; Bill 19 read a first time]

Bill 32**The Fuel Oil Administration
Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of this Bill is to clarify and carry out the intent of the Legislature in 1976, as to the extent to which those engaged in sod, tree, and peat moss farming can use purple gas.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 19, 25, and 32 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Legislative Assembly the seventh in a series of small business guides. The document is entitled Selecting a Data Processing System in Alberta.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 100 students of the four grade 9 classes at Dickinsfield junior high school in my constituency. They're accompanied by four teachers: Mrs. Newton, Mrs. Annis, Mr. Kozub, and Mr. Sadownik. The grade 9 classes are beginning the governmental section of the social studies curriculum. They're here to watch the Assembly in action: the introduction of some legislation and, a little later on this afternoon, the question period. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, three distinguished guests from the town of Milk River. I would like to add my own editorial comments to the three individuals I'm about to introduce, as all three serve on the town council in that community.

First, Dale Baldwin, who is a leading member of the business community in Milk River, has served on the town council since the fall of 1977 and currently occupies a position I held on that council just prior to resigning my seat and serving in this Assembly: chairman of the finance committee. So as a resident and taxpayer in that community, I watch with a great deal of interest how our fiscal affairs are being handled.

Second, I'd like to introduce Greg Thomas, who holds a number of distinctions, one of which is that his brother is my executive assistant at the Legislature Building. Greg and I interned together during May and June of 1969, prior to our employment as teachers in the high school in Milk River. Greg was elected to the town council in 1974 and has played an active role in the community through

that period of time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce Cam McKay, the mayor of Milk River, who along with one other rookie was elected in a by-election in July 1969. I'm pleased to say that the friendship between those two rookies has grown considerably over the years. I might also say that Cam has served as the mayor of Milk River since the fall of 1971.

Mr. Speaker, these three individuals are in Edmonton today meeting with various government officials and some ministers to conduct the affairs of their community. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of members of the Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that the first meeting of the Nursing Manpower and Education Implementation Committee was held on April 8 this year. I met with the committee, together with my colleagues, the Hon. Dave Russell, Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and Sheila Embury, chairman of the caucus committee on health and social service. We were encouraged by the enthusiasm of the members of this newly established committee, comprised of representatives from the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, university nursing programs, hospital nursing programs, college nursing programs, the Alberta Hospital Association, the consortium of senior nurse educators, the Alberta Association of Registered Nursing Assistants, the Alberta Psychiatric Nurses' Association, and a member from the public at large.

The implementation committee is an important advisory body which has the capacity of bringing together the various groups involved in the nursing education sector and the service sector. This will enable the committee to incorporate a variety of viewpoints and information into directions and recommendations for action. Those recommendations will directly affect the future of nursing education and manpower in the province.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I emphasized this government's continuing commitment to quality nursing care throughout this province and to the major issues that will be addressed by the implementation committee. Briefly, these issues include: the development of ways to attract and retain trained nurses in active employment; the current supply and future demand for nurses; the need to expand existing training programs; the development of a system to monitor and regulate nursing education programs; and the development of future training needs for psychiatric nursing.

Several experts in the nursing and education field presented to the implementation committee background information on several of these issues.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to increase quickly and effectively the opportunities for nurses to re-enter the profession, I announced that one quarter of a million dollars will be designated during the new fiscal year for nursing refresher courses. These funds will be provided to expand the delivery of nursing refresher opportunities and reduce tuition costs to students. As well, careful consideration will be given to a proposal from Grant MacEwan Community College to develop an outreach instructional system. An additional \$200,000

will be committed in subsequent years.

In reviewing the tasks of the implementation committee, we emphasized the continued operation of hospital schools of nursing as important elements in the education programs in the province. In addition, we stressed the importance of the committee's role in advising on the management of the five-year \$1 million nursing research fund.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the positive and enthusiastic attitude of all members of the Nursing Manpower and Education Implementation Committee. I am confident that their actions and recommendations will put Alberta in the forefront in the development of nursing education, research, and services.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

McDougall School Acquisition

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my questions today are again in pursuit of the financial plan and responsibility of this government. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It also relates to the Provincial Treasurer's comments about Albertans lowering expectations. My question to the hon. minister is about how government is lowering its expectations.

Recently the minister put forward an order in council requesting \$20 million for McDougall school in Calgary. I was wondering if the minister could indicate at this time whether the government will be proceeding with the development of McDougall school as a southern hospitality centre for Conservative cabinet ministers.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ignore the last remark about a southern hospitality centre. I would point out that McDougall school is a very fine building. I've personally had the chance to look at it, and it's in wonderful shape, very historical. I think it will serve the needs of the people of Alberta very well indeed in the future.

The \$20 million alluded to is of course money that goes to the public school board of Calgary. They have plans for that money in the growth of Calgary and in the development of future schools. I think it's an excellent investment on the part of the government of Alberta and that, at such time as we proceed with the development of McDougall school for government office purposes, the people of Alberta will be very proud indeed of that facility.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it's lowering expectations, and everyone feels great about it — \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister was very clear. Does the government intend to use McDougall house as Government House south, in which there will be offices for cabinet ministers and the Premier?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the planning for the building is only in the preliminary stage. The building will require a complete evaluation assessment. I can assure members that it's in excellent physical condition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't mean to interrupt the minister, but I don't want to know the condition of the house. I want to know why \$20 million of taxpayers' money was spent on that building. It

may be a good one; I hope it is. What's the purpose? If there's no purpose, it just illustrates the kind of planning this government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I've been trying to answer the member over there, but he keeps interfering. Perhaps I don't talk as quickly as he does, but if he'd give me a little time, I'll try to answer him. The \$20 million is . . . [interjection]. Do you want to hear the answer or not?

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'm listening.

MR. CHAMBERS: The \$20 million is very good value for that land. As I said earlier, the \$20 million is recycled by the school board of Calgary for very good purposes indeed.

You're talking about the \$20 million for land. You know Alberta is growing all over, and I think we can all be proud of the growth of Alberta. As Alberta grows, we need government space. I'm sure there are provincial buildings and facilities in southern Alberta and all over, wherever they're required, and that government office space is required down there and in due course will be developed. As to its total use for work purposes, for visiting members of the Legislature who want space to work, we'll work out the final plan in due course.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I take note of the words "in due course" in raising my next question. The \$20 million came by special warrant. It's very clear that when a special warrant . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the hon. member wish to debate special warrants, or does he wish to ask a question for information?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is very clear. Why was it necessary to use a special warrant in this particular case, when the purpose is not clear at this point? Under special warrants it is a very clear criterion that expenditure of money is urgently required. Why did the minister require a special warrant at this time, when the purpose is not outlined?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the purpose is clear. It is to be used for government purposes.

MR. R. CLARK: What purposes?

MR. CHAMBERS: I might add, though, that the public school board of Calgary and the city of Calgary came to us with the proposition to buy it. The school has very few students left in it. It's a building of a very historic character in Calgary, and they don't have use for it. Therefore they came to us and said: look, can you use it for government purposes? We looked at it and evaluated it, and I think it would be perfect for government purposes.

MR. R. CLARK: What purposes?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why couldn't you put it in the budget?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Under those circumstances, where there doesn't seem to be any urgency in terms of the purchase, why was the \$20 million not budgeted in the 1981-82 budget that would be approved by this Legislature? Why not?

MR. CHAMBERS: Well, you know all moneys are approved by the Legislature. [interjections] The school board and the city of Calgary wanted an answer now, so we went the usual route with the special warrant.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I've already recognized the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill for a supplementary. Possibly there may be another one after that; I don't know. Then the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. OMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask the minister whether he could confirm that an appraisal done on that property came out at approximately \$30 million for the . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect to the hon. member, it would appear that he is supplying rather than seeking information.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase the question. Could the minister indicate whether or not that would be valuable parkland in the middle of downtown Calgary?

MR. NOTLEY: That's an opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: I must agree that that would be a matter of opinion.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister, please. The minister has indicated that \$20 million will be going to the Calgary public school board. Could he also indicate how much money will be required to renovate the building after it's acquired by the government?

MR. CHAMBERS: That's right. The \$20 million will be going to the school board. I might add that it's true that the appraisal value was \$28 million, I think, and the school board agreed to provide the other \$8 million as a gift to the people of Alberta. That will be properly and duly recorded in the building as it's developed in the future.

I don't have the numbers in front of me, but the renovations — and of course this is all subject to detailed engineering and architectural evaluation. The city of Calgary planned to develop, at their cost, a parkade that will accommodate about 800 cars, much needed in that part of downtown Calgary, complete with a structural slab on top. That will be a self-sustaining project; in other words, the city of Calgary will operate it and obtain the revenues, and eventually it will pay out.

The government will create the park on top of the

parkade, so there will be beautiful, open green space — again, I would point out to Calgary members — in an area of Calgary where green space is surely needed. That park will be thoroughly appreciated by the people of Calgary.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I must concur with the minister that the people of Calgary will enjoy the facilities once it's restored; there's no question about that. However, the question I put to the minister is: what amount of money will the Alberta government have to expend after acquisition to bring the facility up to usable, functional office space? The second part of that question would be: where are the funds coming from? Are they coming from the heritage fund?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I don't have a detailed cost estimate in front of me, or even done, as to what the cost will be. My initial estimate was somewhere in the order of \$3 million. It might be more or less, depending on when we get our final evaluation. It has turned out that the building is in excellent shape, but obviously we have to have the total plan for it completed before I could give the member specific information in that regard.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has indicated he doesn't know what the final cost would be. Is it normal government policy to undertake projects without knowing what they would cost?

DR. BUCK: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I should have an opportunity to respond to that. When we announced it, I put an upper limit on renovation I mentioned. It was some months ago, so I'm quoting from memory: I think it was \$3 million for the structural slab aspects and park, and then another 3 for renovations. If the member is familiar with architecture and structural design, you know you really have to get into a building in order to know what the final cost will be and the final plan you develop. Prior to accepting the offer from the school board of Calgary and the city, we had assured ourselves that the building was structurally sound.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, if I may. The minister indicated the reason he had to proceed with a special warrant was because of action by the Calgary Board of Education. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether there was a time limit on the offer by the board? In other words, did the board clearly say, take it or leave it? Was it specifically put to the government of Alberta that the government had to move within a specified time frame? If that is correct, then what was the specified time frame?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think the original contact by the board and the city — they met with me in my office last August or September, I believe, then proceeded from there. They were anxious to learn the disposition. For one thing, although there are not many students left in the building — 50 or 60, I think — the school board has to make arrangements to allocate them to a different school in the near future. So of course they were anxious to learn whether or not we were going to accept the arrangement. Therefore I felt it was prudent to move with a special warrant at that time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, then a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Would the hon. minister clarify for me at this time that he has met the requirement of The Financial Administration Act, that this project was urgently required, and that there was a deadline in payment of the funds? Or was it possible for the minister to make arrangements to put the amount of money in the 1981-82 budget and pay it accordingly, after it had been approved by this Legislature?

MR. CHAMBERS: I believe what I did with regard to the special warrant was completely appropriate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A waste of public funds. Terrible.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What caused the relations between the Calgary public school board and the minister's department to deteriorate to such a point that the Calgary public school board was not prepared to wait until the first of the fiscal year to get the \$20 million? What caused relations to get to that point, where the Calgary public board would not accept the minister's word?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, there's no deterioration of the relationship. I think the relationships we have with the public school board and the city of Calgary are very good indeed. It was appropriate to move at that time. As I said, there are children in the school whom the board needs to allocate to different schools next year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A lack of respect for this Legislature. Terrible.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the minister's concern about not putting forward a special warrant unnecessarily, in discussions with the Calgary Board of Education did the minister at any time explore the possibility of a commitment, pending an appropriation in the normal course of the legislative responsibilities during the spring sitting of the House? Was there ever any discussion of it with the Calgary Board of Education? And did the minister receive from the Board of Education an indication that they would not accept it, that they wanted the money right now, and that they wanted the money as a result of a special warrant?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think there was a preference that we move as rapidly as possible on it, and we did that. In terms of approving the costs for the renovation of the building, obviously the members will get a chance to review that in due course.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We've now had the original question, three supplementaries by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and about seven by other members. I have a fair number of members who wish to ask their first

question. So if the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a second question, we might go on to that, then to the other member.

Correspondence School Relocation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue looking into government performance and lack of performance, and raise a question with the Minister of Education. It's with regard to the decision of the government to move the Correspondence School to Barrhead, in spite of the fact that 72 per cent of the students and 74 per cent of the support staff oppose such a move, and that costs are going to be \$8.5 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the hon. leader wish to come directly to the question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm just reminding the hon. minister of the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully suggest that this is a question period, not a reminder period.

MR. NOTLEY: You have remind them a bit before they can answer questions. You have to refresh their memories.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right. Mr. Speaker, it makes their blood come with honesty, maybe. [interjections]

My question to the hon. minister is with regard to the planning that has gone on. Has the minister put in place a transitional plan with regard to this change of location, and have cost estimates and other provisions, such as support services, been made? If so, could the plan be tabled in this Legislature?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that a plan is in various stages of development, depending on which particular aspects of the move the hon. leader would like to direct his question to. With respect to facts, of the two facts he cited, one was in error: there is no cost of \$8.5 million associated with the move.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, then the hon. minister can relate the cost to this Legislature at this time. Would the hon. minister have a cost of the transition, and can we hear it in this Legislature?

MR. KING: We have a cost, Mr. Speaker. The figures are not at my fingertips. I'd be happy to respond if the hon. leader would like to put a written question on the Order Paper.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, how disgusting. How can the minister say that my figures are not accurate, when he hasn't a figure of his own? With regard to specifics, could the minister indicate the costs in terms of moving the school, staffing it, and providing maintenance services at the same level as they are at present? Has the minister any estimates with regards to those costs?

MR. KING: Not at my fingertips, Mr. Speaker. I would welcome written questions from the hon. leader.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Education could advise the Assembly of the number of jobs that will be offered in the

town of Barrhead, and the opportunities that will be extended to the people outside the metropolitan area?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly this additional question for additional statistics might also await the Order Paper.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister with regard to the purpose of the move. Could the minister indicate whether the move is for economic reasons, or is it for improving the quality of education, specifically to 5,000 students in Edmonton and area and 22,000 students across the province of Alberta?

MR. KING: Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, the decision was made on the basis of both considerations. There was first of all a question about whether or not the delivery of an educational service would be enhanced or impaired and, apart from that, there was a consideration of the long standing policy of this provincial government with respect to balanced growth throughout the province. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, for those who are interested, the decision was based upon the conclusion that education would not be impaired and might be enhanced, and that the policy of balanced growth throughout the province would definitely be enhanced.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in the minister's discussions with the staff who will be asked to move, or forced to move, can the minister indicate what liaison he has had with these people and how many of them are anxious to be relocated to Barrhead?

MR. NOTLEY: How many are going to quit?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my recollection only one is anxious to be moved to Barrhead, and that's because he's been living on a farm just outside of Barrhead for the last number of years and has been commuting to the Correspondence School operation located in Edmonton. Aside from the number who are anxious, an unknown additional number are quite prepared to move to Barrhead. None of the staff will be forced to move to Barrhead. All of them have been advised that the services of the provincial government, both the Department of Education and the personnel administration office, would be available to them to facilitate alternate employment if that was their wish.

Three committees are operating in the Department of Education. All of them have in their membership representatives of the management and technical staff of the Alberta Correspondence School. One is concerned with moving, one with housing, and one with the design and construction of the new building. So we have three committees actively at work, and all three include among their membership representatives of the staff of the Alberta Correspondence School. In my view the transition is going extremely well.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just one short supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate if there will be moving allowances, so-called fringe benefits, or compensation for people who have to relocate?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The ordinary services and programs of the government are available to all the staff of the Correspondence School. That particularly includes financial assistance, as well as personal service for reloca-

tion. For example, it includes up to five days' paid leave in order to house hunt in Barrhead. In fact a fairly large package has been distributed to all the employees of the Alberta Correspondence school. If the hon. member is interested, I'd be pleased to table it in the Assembly, because it would provide the kind of information about which he has been inquiring.

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

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister indicating that there's such an attractive package, can the minister indicate to this Legislature, with sufficient pluses or minuses, what percentage of all the people on staff at this time are going to make the move?

MR. KING: No I can't, Mr. Speaker, because the move is still almost two years away. I would hesitate to judge what would be the course of action of people 27 months from now.

TV Coverage of Legislature Proceedings

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Telephones. Could the minister please explain why the proceedings of the Legislature are not available on the same television channel in Calgary as they have been in the past?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, Calgary Cable TV made application to its federal regulatory body, the CRTC, to stop local programming on Channel 9 and have it put on what they call a mid-band range, I believe on Channel 20. The CRTC gave Calgary Cable approval to do that, and they're now carrying the Alberta Legislature proceedings on that particular channel.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand that if citizens of Calgary wish to view the proceedings on television, they have to purchase some special type of equipment. Could you please clarify that?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, before anyone can watch programming on the mid-band range, they have to have a little piece of equipment called a converter or an adapter. It's just like a hand-held calculator. They can either rent that particular piece of equipment from the cable company or purchase it in a store.

Mr. Speaker, the CRTC decision did not disallow the Calgary cable company to carry the Alberta Legislature on Channel 9. It is possible for Calgary Cable to carry it on Channel 9 if they wish. I would just simply suggest that those people who want it on Channel 9 contact Calgary Cable and indicate their desires.

Land Tenure Program

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government received a petition bearing the signatures of 75 adults, comprising 65 per cent of the adult population of Little Buffalo Lake, calling for a temporary moratorium on the implementation of the land tenure program in that community, the grounds being that it potentially prejudices the community's court action to protect the native land rights of its residents?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with a land tenure program in any community in Alberta, all of which are in the northern part of the province, by way of visits to the community the government determines whether or not heads of families in the community are interested. In the case of the Little Buffalo community, some 49 heads of families in that community, which is a substantial majority, indicated some months ago that via the land tenure program they were interested in being able to obtain title to Crown land they were living on.

That process then proceeded by way of officials involved in the land tenure program in my department establishing contact in the community and asking people to indicate their willingness to participate. During the course of this work, which has gone on for the past several months, certain individuals within the community — my understanding is with the advice of legal counsel from Montreal — circulated a petition that was indeed signed by the number of members the member indicated, and which came to my office.

In my view the people of the community are being rather badly misled by some misdirected legal advice coming from another part of Canada. That is unfortunate, because what we're really trying to do is provide an opportunity for people in Little Buffalo to have title to land of their own on which they can then construct their accommodations. The matter has nothing whatever to do with land claims, and I've indicated that quite clearly to all concerned.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the fact that a number of people who signed this petition are among the 49 heads of families the minister alluded to, and given both the problems this government created with respect to the passage of Bill 29 as well as the James Bay case . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to have a debate without notice concerning problems created?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the problems are there. My question to the minister is: when a sensitive issue like this is being placed before the people of a community, why do officials of the government of Alberta not clearly outline the legal implications to people before requesting signatures? To my understanding this was in fact not done and is one of the reasons there was a good deal of confusion and bitterness in the community.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we spend a great deal of time ensuring that particularly native people are able to understand what is being proposed in land tenure programs. It's my view that a good understanding is out there, and it's also my view that we should continue with the program.

Over four or five years we've had a lot of difficulty getting the ground rules established, so to speak, in making the program work. We've now transferred in excess of 250 land titles to people who never before held a title to any deeded land, so they can locate their homesites on it. I for one am not prepared to allow some legal counsel from another part of Canada or members of the NDP to tear from that objective.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do with the NDP or lawyers from Montreal. The question is whether or not there are unextinguished land claims, aboriginal land claims, in the area. The minister well

knows that. Why was there no consultation with the local people with respect to implications on the land claims? Clearly, the fact that most or at least half the people the minister alluded to have now signed this petition asking that there be a moratorium proves that the government's job was certainly ineffective at best.

MR. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason whatsoever the government should place a moratorium on a program that provides an opportunity for native people in this province to have title to their land. Obviously if people do not want to be a part of the program, they don't have to be. I should say as well that I clearly have said — as others in this government have said — that the land tenure program has nothing whatever to do with land claims. It would be beneficial to all if the hon. member and others would support the program and allow people to get title to their land and quit trying to bring red herrings into the picture with respect to land claims. There is simply nothing in this program that relates to land claims.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the minister table in this Legislature legal opinions that would confirm the government's viewpoint? The minister is not a lawyer. Competent lawyers who dealt with the James Bay case argue that in fact there is a real problem of prejudicing the land claims. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the hon. member asking the minister to table the legal opinions which he already has?

MR. NOTLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not. I'm asking the hon. minister if he would table in this Assembly any legal opinions this government has obtained, outside its normal sources, that would in fact back up his assertion that there is no prejudicial impact of the people accepting the 2 acres?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well that this government is not about to start tabling legal opinions in the Legislature or anywhere else. The member is perfectly entitled to seek his own legal opinions, as is anyone else.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps we could come back to this topic if there is time. The hon. Member for Bow Valley followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Water Management — Bow River

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Environment. Could the minister indicate what progress is being made with the rehabilitation of the Bassano dam on the Bow River?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the province has refused to become involved in taking title to the ownership of the Bassano dam until such time as the federal government and the Blackfoot council have clarified ownership. To answer the member's question, recent-

ly an arrangement has been made with the PFRA to do some upgrading work on the site of the dam to make it possible for it to function successfully this spring. As I understand it, the conclusion of the upgrading should be fulfilled some time this month.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What steps are the department taking to determine whether there should be further rehabilitation to the present dam or a new dam farther downstream?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we're reasonably satisfied that the present dam will fulfil the requirements of the general area. The subject has always been as to the responsibility because of the problem of ownership. We're satisfied that the million dollar upgrading presently being done by the PFRA, and hopefully concluded this month, will meet the requirements, and that the Eastern Irrigation District, in this particular case, will have a guarantee of water supply this spring and in the future.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what input his department will have to the study the PFRA is taking on the Bow River at the present time?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, in any work the PFRA is doing through the federal government, we provide expertise if required and any technical assistance we can give as far as studies. We encourage the work being done by the federal government through the PFRA. In that respect we co-operate as closely as we can.

Hazardous Materials

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. The question really flows from the work done by Reid, Crowther and Partners Ltd. for the Environment Council of Alberta on public hearings on hazardous waste management in Alberta, specifically that portion of the report dealing with transportation of hazardous materials which indicates that the department was involved in a spot-check program last year. Has the department continued the spot-check program of transportation vehicles other than commercial buses?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we're doing some major work in the handling of this kind of material. Not specifically in answer to this question, but we're putting together a very comprehensive committee to handle all aspects of it, keeping in mind that the handling of hazardous goods transcends a number of departments. In order to make this more viable a committee is being put together, including the Department of Environment — I don't have to name them; there are four or five departments — so we can get a handle on this thing in our dealing with the federal government. I don't have a specific comment on this particular report. I would be glad to get information on it as it relates to our department.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Having regard for the report from Reid, Crowther where they pointed out that one-third of the 1,500 vehicles stopped last year in this spot-check program had major defects, what steps have been taken by the minister's department since that time to expand the checking which was done?

MR. KROEGER: Oh, I missed the point, Mr. Speaker. We have increased the surveillance through the safety branch. I had a discussion as recently as last Friday with one of the people on-site. We intercept the trucks at weigh scales specifically and do very thorough checks. We'll be increasing that surveillance.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. What steps have been taken by the minister's department with regard to the recommendation that specific licences be implemented by the department for vehicles handling hazardous materials? Has that recommendation in fact been followed through?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any specific move we've made recently in that direction. Could I take that as notice?

MR. R. CLARK: To the minister. Has action been taken on the recommendation dealing with training courses or programs for drivers of trucks handling hazardous materials? Has that program been put in place?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, that would relate to the total approach we're taking to the handling of dangerous goods. We are moving up our total safety program through the safety branch, and this will be part of the ongoing system of training that is taking place, as well as the monitoring of the system.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, could either the minister of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury might follow the sequence and ask his supplementary question, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, that's a nice way of saying this is my last supplementary. Then I would put this question to the minister: in light of the last recommendation that Reid, Crowther and associates made that in fact the Alberta trucking industry would be very co-operative in implementing the recommendations put forward, has the minister met with the Alberta trucking industry specifically to discuss the question of upgrading the entire standards for the movement of hazardous waste materials in Alberta?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker, but my safety branch people have. I'll be glad to follow through on it.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question to either the Minister of Transportation or perhaps the Minister of Environment. Can either minister advise the Assembly whether or not it is the government's intention to introduce to the Legislature this spring comprehensive waste management legislation that would deal not only with the specific points the hon. member raised in his questions but the broader question of monitoring landfill sites and the whole question of hazardous waste management in this province?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, that kind of thing would follow after we've done an in-depth study of how we're going to manage the whole system. Because we are in the process of putting this kind of group together to bring in a comprehensive recommendation to the various depart-

ments involved, I wouldn't see any legislation coming immediately. But I would invite the Minister of Environment to comment on that.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, might I put just one further supplementary and ask the hon. Minister of Environment why the Department of Environment has not followed through on the action plan presented to the department in 1972 for the treatment of toxic and hazardous waste materials in Alberta? Why hasn't the minister's department followed up on that plan put forward in '72, rather than having some more studies?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I can't really respond insofar as 1972 was concerned. I'm aware of the study. As the member of the opposition knows, there have been further updated studies with regard to the problems of hazardous materials. We're not talking just about toxic materials now, but generally all materials on the road which cause problems.

We have commissioned the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct hearings specifically on toxic materials that cannot readily be recycled and could be dangerous to health. In that specific area, I think we are moving as quickly as we can. One has to remember it's a pretty complex area, and until we had the report and legislation at the federal level dealing with transportation and interprovincial movement, we weren't prepared to make a specific move in the area we are in.

To answer the member's question again, I'm hoping I can pull this whole complex thing together in the very near future. Since it involves a number of departments, it is a complex area. As the member knows, at present we are looking for siting areas to deal specifically with the toxic materials we have a problem with. And there is a reasonable time frame on that.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn. We're running out of time, and two members have still not been able to ask their first questions.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Could the minister advise by what date — would it be a year or two down the road — Albertans could expect a central disposal facility to be operational in the province? Further to that, what interim steps is the minister taking to deal with hazardous wastes that are presently within the province? I raise that in light of recent reports that the province is not prepared to take on and deal with hazardous wastes emanating from various municipalities in the province.

MR. COOKSON: If I could answer the last question first, Mr. Speaker, we are encouraging the industries themselves to retain on site any materials that are of danger to the public health. To a degree we can control that, because they are under our licensing procedures. The difficulty we find ourselves in — and the Minister of Social Services and Community Health may wish to respond in this area — is our regional, sanitary landfills, which we do not license. In those particular areas where we have difficulties at present, there is simply an interim storage procedure until we can solve the problem of permanent storage or destruction.

To answer the question on legislation, we have two internal cabinet committees. The Minister of Municipal

Affairs is involved through The Disaster Services Act; Social Services and Community Health is involved insofar as the health Act; the Minister of Transportation is involved; and the Minister of Economic Development is even involved, because it involves economics. Hopefully I can pull all this together in the foreseeable future, and I'll be able to bring in legislation that will accommodate all these variables.

Sunday Observance

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, my inquiry to the Attorney General concerns Sunday closing laws. Recently I've had about 150 letters expressing concern about what's happening, in our city at least. I think new stores that are not of an essential nature are opening every day. Could the Attorney General indicate if there are any plans or any way in which some control could be brought to the situation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members would know that legislation which covers Sunday observance is federal and, because of that legislation, certain charges are laid from time to time. The policy is that those charges are laid after the receipt of a complaint. From that point on it's fairly routine, in the sense of the laying of a charge and the proceeding that would take place following that.

I think what is involved in the cases is whether or not the business premises in question are ones that fall within the class of providing necessary services, as required. In the cases where the charges are laid, I think the allegation is that they do not fall within the exceptions of the legislation. I don't know what I can add beyond that in regard to enforcement at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that a couple of charges were made with minimum fines of \$40, and the places are still open for business. I believe that the provinces of Ontario and B.C., at least, have brought in special legislation. Has the minister had a chance to study that legislation as to whether or not it might be working satisfactorily and could be applied to Alberta's situation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, since last summer and in particular since last fall, I have received a large number of briefs discussing those issues from a wide variety of groups and individuals within the province. I think at this point the government does not have a policy decision to announce in respect of what might happen as a result of the representations that have been made.

I might add that there is maybe one other feature. By the taking of civil injunction proceedings, it is possible to restrain some of the businesses which have offended in a continuous manner. One of those was recently tried, and the Queen's Bench judge who heard it denied the government's application in that case for an injunction based on civil proceedings. That case is now under appeal.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question . . .

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

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It arises from the question of the Member for Calgary North Hill. With

regard to Bill 15 now before the House, would not the proposed amendment to Section 233, whereby if a municipality has a closing by-law, look after the concern raised by the Member for Calgary North Hill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly this matter of a legal opinion could be dealt with otherwise.

I believe the hon. Minister of Agriculture would like to deal further with a matter raised in a previous question period.

Grain Transportation

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a question asked on Friday by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. It pertained to the responsibility of liability insurance as it pertains to Alberta's heritage hopper cars. Under the interim operating agreement with the railroads, it is the responsibility of the railroad to provide both the insurance and liability coverage, and that would pertain to whatever railroad was using the car at that particular time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Point of Privilege

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, of which I gave due notice, I would like to raise the matter I raised last week. In summary, the concern we have as Social Credit opposition, or opposition on this side of the Legislature, is with regard to equal access for the media on both sides of the Legislature.

I would like to ask the Speaker to take the matter under consideration and look specifically at the size of the platform, the access to it, access of television cameras, et cetera, on the platforms, accessibility of good quality sound and hookups, and other general items necessary for equal access on both sides of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his observations and specifics. I have arranged to meet with the president of the press gallery, and I expect that by the end of the week I'll have some further information and possibly some remedies in mind with regard to the matter which, as I understand it, is not really a question of privilege but may well have the elements of a legitimate grievance.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to draw to the attention of the House a matter which appears on page 151 in *Hansard* of last Friday. With reference to the debate on The Alberta Heritage Scholarship Act, which I spoke to on second reading, and with reference to the high school achievement awards, the following words appear in *Hansard*: "They will be valued up to \$500." Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask that that be corrected to read "\$1,500" rather than "\$500".* That's the correct amount and my error in having said \$500.

DR. BUCK: I also rise on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have had an opportunity to review the *Hansards* over the weekend, and there's an error on page 121, about three-quarters of the way down on the left-

*See page 151, right column, paragraph 3

hand side. The number "74" should read "71".* And on the bottom of page 124, on the right-hand side, the number "74" should read "72".**

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member had an opportunity to listen to the tapes covering those particular passages?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I am reading from the *Hansard*.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I am aware of that. But I'm wondering whether the hon. member has had an opportunity to check the *Hansard* tapes recording those passages.

DR. BUCK: No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker. But I just want to make sure for the record that the number be 71 on page 121, and 72 on page 124.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did it say?

MR. SPEAKER: Our *Hansard* — and if I may say, I think it's equal in quality to any *Hansard* in the country — is understandably sensitive about allegations of error. [interjections] That's a sensitivity I share.

MR. NOTLEY: The member made the error, not *Hansard*.

MR. SPEAKER: I wasn't aware. I understood the member to say there was ... That's why I asked if he'd read the tapes.

DR. BUCK: It's the same thing as the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. The mathematics were wrong, Mr. Speaker, when I said "71". If the hon. member wants the information, I can reiterate it for him. That may be a little sensitive to the hon. member, so I will just let him read it and figure out the mathematics himself.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, also on a point of privilege, while we are correcting records, on Friday, during a discussion on a motion, I intended to refer to the proposed Nose Hill park in Calgary as being 2,400 acres in size. Probably through my wrong information, *Hansard* says 24,000 acres. I would like to correct it and have it be 2,400 acres.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to make an observation. I don't know if I can go so far as the hon. Minister of Government Services and reduce the import of what I'm going to say down to 10 per cent of what I began with, but it was just an observation in regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. The normal course would simply be that the correction be made in today's *Hansard*. If it appeared that the matter was coming forward as a correction to the *Hansard* on the day it was made, that would not be done.

MR. SPEAKER: It's my understanding that *Hansard* has an excellent method of handling this sort of explanation or correction of what was said by ensuring that suitable annotations are made in the bound volumes at the end of the year. As I understand it, those annotations are made pretty directly in the place where the remark originally appears.

*See page 121, left column, paragraph 6

**See page 124, right column, paragraph 6

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

Moved by Mrs. Embury:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate April 8: Mr. D. Anderson]

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise today on behalf of the citizens of Calgary Currie to speak in favor of the motion proposed so eloquently to this House by the hon. Member for Calgary North West, and seconded so thoughtfully in an excellent speech by the hon. Member for Innisfail.

In beginning my remarks, I would like to pay my respects to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. We in Calgary Currie feel particularly close to His Honour's family, since his daughter and son-in-law and their children live in our constituency and are well known within that district. I would also like to combine with other members who've spoken before me in congratulating the new Sergeant-at-Arms on his appointment. We look forward to working with him in this House in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it's traditional to rise — and I've done so in previous years — and express our esteem for you as the Speaker of this Assembly. I do so again, as in past years, with a sincere feeling that likely we have here the best Speaker in the British Commonwealth, if not the best chairman in parliaments across the breadth of the world. I might say that I've been particularly honored to have worked with you, sir, and the constitutional committee over the past number of months, and look forward to continued association and your assistance in this House in years to come.

At this time, since it's the first opportunity I've had to speak in any depth since the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury relinquished his position as Leader of the Opposition, I would also like to say that while we've been on opposite sides of the House, on opposite sides of quite a number of issues, over the many years that I've known the hon. member I've always had the highest respect for his abilities and his contribution to the province of Alberta in many different capacities. I wish him well in all his endeavors and his continued activity in this House.

Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to address my remarks primarily to the major sections of the Speech from the Throne. In doing so, I'd like to say first that in the area of housing, the government, in my opinion, has an extremely impressive record of dealing with the difficult housing problems faced by the people of this province at our time in history. Our growth patterns have made it extremely difficult for affordable housing in the natural way. I think this department has done a phenomenal job in accomplishing availability of housing at all times for some select groups such as senior citizens.

The department is planning a development in my constituency in the Lincoln Park area, which I think is an excellent one and will serve Calgarians well. I would be remiss though if, on behalf of the constituents of Calgary

Currie, I didn't express the caveat that we hope the Alberta Housing Corporation in that development will continue to communicate with the community associations and the residents in the area to ensure that transportation is properly planned for, that the densities are such that they don't cause difficulty in the community, and that parking problems are looked at carefully. I pledge myself to helping the department, and in particular the Alberta Housing Corporation, in communicating with the communities in Calgary Currie and ensuring that in fact that is the case.

I'd like to briefly congratulate the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation on the excellent report on workmen's compensation that was placed in this House, and in doing so also congratulate the members of the select committee of this Assembly who travelled extensively and put forth an excellent proposal. I note in the Speech from the Throne that we can expect some extensive changes in that area, and I'm sure they'll well reflect the recommendations made by that particular select committee.

In Advanced Education and Manpower, I would like to say as well that I've been pleased with the progress made in that department in areas such as funding for students in this province who have shown particularly great skill and knowledge. Of course that Bill was discussed for second reading on Friday. It is very much appreciated by the residents of Calgary Currie. Again I would mention to the minister, though, that the residents of Calgary Currie are still anxiously awaiting the further expansion of Mount Royal College, which in my opinion is required in Calgary to look after the growing needs of people to be educated in a variety of areas, and to deal with the particular expansion needs of that college. It has been proposed for several years, and we hope that indeed that expansion will take place in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to deal to a very great extent with the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Social services is a very difficult area for us at this time because of our rapid growth and the difficulties being faced by Albertans. I think there is a long way to go in social services, as there probably always will be. I believe things like the home care program, which has been excellent, need to be extended so that the people who now live in their own homes can continue to do so and won't be forced into institutions. Our pioneer home repair program, combined with the current home care development, has moved in that direction. But I believe we have to consider movement to a far greater extent. Despite those areas that one can always mention, which the government should consider programs and move in and develop new approaches to, it's my personal opinion that there has been a phenomenal — and I don't use that word mildly — amount of success and movement in the Department of Social Services and Community Health in the last two years.

Before this Speech from the Throne we saw a massive number of programs and actions take place that will improve social services in this province. Just to mention a few: the minister announced a symposium on aging earlier this year, which I was happy to press for in my first motion before this Legislature. I look forward to that to help us deal with the difficulties faced by the increasing average age of Albertans. I believe the establishment of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee was essential to help us understand and keep in touch with the various social care facilities in our province. The day care upgrading took us from a level of day care standards

which was not the highest in Canada to an approach to day care which is second to none in the country. I think that was a very impressive move. The immediate implementation of the Ombudsman's recommendations by the minister was an effective and quick way of dealing with problems foreseen in a very difficult area. The establishment of the Cavanagh Board of Review to deal with questions that were raised there — again a positive reaction to difficulties inevitably faced in a system as complex as ours. The child abuse hotline is another program essential to our province. It was introduced prior to this Speech from the Throne.

In the Speech from the Throne we have an amazing program outlined for the area of social services and community health: assistance for the disabled, in this International Year of Disabled Persons; decentralization of decision-making, which I think will start to bring our social services department even more in keeping with the times it faces; the implementation of improvements in the foster care program; more support for emergency shelters; and a number of other things.

I'd particularly like to say how much the citizens in Calgary Currie appreciate two moves. One is the move in the suicide prevention area, to deal with that growing and difficult problem, and the appointment of an advisory committee in that regard. The second is the introduction of the family and community services program to follow from the preventive social services programs. I believe both of those are essential moves. In my opinion, the minister responsible for this area has had to walk a very tight line between throwing good money after bad, in draining the economy of Alberta in social programs, and, on the other hand, making decisions as a government which would invest money in the preventive way so it could pay dividends in the future through assisting our people to help themselves down the road. I congratulate the minister on moving positively in the latter direction and making the decision to invest in those areas which will help our citizens to stand on their own feet down the road, when indeed our economy may not be as lucrative as it is today and, whether we want to or not, we may not be able to give the kind of government assistance that is possible at times at this point in our history.

May I just say that this year I'd like to help in some small way in the directions taken by the department of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I believe they are positive steps, and hope this House will consider them.

One is the introduction of a children's bill of rights, which I hope will not develop any new kinds of approaches to ensuring that children are looked after properly in our community, but will at least identify in a clear and fairly precise way what those rights are for the children of Alberta. The second is the introduction of a family institute Act. Members may recall that this member presented an Act by the same name in 1979. Some of the hon. members here will be happy to note that the member has learned a great deal since 1979 and in fact has spent two years talking to community organizations, universities, individuals, and organizations with respect to this particular approach. With input from those organizations and from members of this House, I have amended significantly the direction, but as a result of those meetings and discussions have reached the conclusion that this too is essential to our well-being in the future, in helping people to deal with their own difficulties and helping to keep the family unit, the base of Alberta, together. That will be discussed later, Mr. Speaker, when members of

this House choose to deal with that particular topic.

The last topic I'd like to deal with this afternoon is that of energy and then intergovernmental affairs. In energy, we know of course that the national energy program has caused rigs to leave Alberta in great numbers, a decline in general activity in the province with respect to the oil industry which jeopardizes self-sufficiency in the country and our own Alberta economy. I'd just like to say that in surveys announced by various sources in the past few months, there has been some indication of what Albertans feel about this. I'd like to make it clear what the constituents of Calgary Currie feel with respect to the national energy program and this government's approach to that program. In a distribution to each home in January and February, I asked the residents of Calgary Currie to answer a number of questions. Those questions related to the constitution and energy.

On energy, they were asked first to agree or disagree with this statement: do you believe that the federal government's energy proposals are unfair to Alberta? Mr. Speaker, I might say that an overwhelming percentage, 88.8 per cent, of Calgary Currie residents who responded to this poll said they strongly agree that the national energy program is unfair to the people of Alberta.

On the second question, they were asked to agree or disagree with the statement that the Alberta government's response to the federal energy moves has been necessary and well thought out. An amazing number of citizens in Calgary Currie, 86.3 per cent, agreed emphatically with the statement that the Alberta government has moved in the manner it should with respect to the national energy program. With respect to the tar sands plants, which has been questioned by hon. members opposite, they were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: the provincial government's decision to not proceed with future tar sands plants until a reasonable pricing arrangement can be arrived at with Ottawa is correct. Again, 86.3 per cent agreed with that particular statement. I think there's no doubt where the citizens of Calgary Currie stand with respect to the energy issue.

With regard to the constitutional issue, I have had the privilege of serving with you, Mr. Speaker, and other members of this House on the select legislative committee on the constitution. We've travelled from one end of the country to the other. I don't intend today to preclude the report that committee is likely to make to this House, but I would like to say that wherever we've gone, from Newfoundland to Quebec to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, there have been varying opinions on different aspects of the constitution and on different approaches that can or should be taken. But in every place our committee visited, to the chambers of commerce and the labor unions, to the different organizations, it has been my perception that Canadians have emphatically and in a dramatic sense opposed the unilateral action of the federal government or the constitutional package they've presented, that Canadians in general have been disgusted and appalled at the way the federal government has moved without agreement of the provinces.

I might say that that perception has been borne out in Gallup poll results from across the country. The Kershaw report from England has said that the federal government should not proceed until the provinces have also agreed. Eight out of 10 premiers, representing by far the large majority of Canadians, have disagreed with the package and asked the federal government to come back to the bargaining table. The Newfoundland court, in a unani-

mous decision, said it was illegal for the federal government to move unilaterally on constitutional matters.

The constituents of Calgary Currie were asked their specific opinion on that matter, and I might say that again the response was overwhelming. The first question asked with respect to agreeing or disagreeing was: the federal government should move unilaterally to patriate the constitution and make the changes that it wishes without the consent of the provinces. Of the citizens of Calgary Currie who responded to that, 94.8 per cent strongly disagreed, with the federal government receiving only 5.1 per cent of the support of those people who responded to this questionnaire.

The second question: an amended constitution should give the provinces the ability to protect their historic rights. Ninety-four per cent agreed with the provincial position to maintain control of its jurisdiction. The questions go on, 11 in number, one after the other, indicating that the people of my constituency oppose in the strongest possible way the federal government's direction and have given similar support to the government of Alberta in the actions it has taken.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these evidences have shown clearly that Canadians as a whole, specifically the people in my constituency, want Canada to be the nation it has been in years past, a nation that listens to all its parts and that in fact takes into account provincial and federal initiatives and makes sure we have our powers and rights delineated correctly. I would only express the hope that in coming months our government continues to act with the kind of determination, imagination, and skill it has in the past and that the federal government will come to its senses and listen to what's necessary in that regard.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, it's only my pleasure to speak in favor of this Speech from the Throne and to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor and those who put this together as an excellent document moving in the right direction.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the Speech from the Throne, I also want to send out my congratulations to the mover and the seconder and all those who have spoken in this throne debate, and our Lieutenant-Governor and Sergeant-at-Arms. I want to congratulate him and wish him all the best in the Legislature. He certainly brings us to order in great fashion.

I would like to make a suggestion to you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we should use a little caution if we happen to call on him for some of the other duties he has in here. I'll assure you that I think he might be just as effective in those duties. I'll make sure I don't get into a position to get evicted from the House. It won't be my efforts if that happens, because I do have a little fear.

MR. R. CLARK: That's of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. MANDEVILLE: That's not so, Mr. Speaker. I have a little fear when I stand up in the House. I've been in this House 15 years, and it seems I've never been able to get away from that fear. I think one reason is that what we do in this Legislature has an effect on so many people. We could be doing something in here that's going to affect Albertans or our constituents. I feel that every MLA in this Legislature has a job to do. It's getting harder and harder to fulfil the job we have to do as members of the Legislature, because we have to support our constituencies and the views of our constituents. I never did believe that strongly in the party system of

governing, but we do have our party lines and it's very difficult sometimes to have the party fall in line with what your constituents want you to do.

We in the opposition certainly think we have a role to play. Sometimes it is difficult because we have to be a watchdog for our government. So long as we're under the political system, it's the role we have to play as an opposition. I and I'm sure every member of the opposition want to be as constructive as we can. I know we sometimes get hammered for displaying this particular area of trying to be as constructive as we possibly can.

I am disappointed in the way politics is handled in some areas. It just appalls me to think what's happening in Ottawa today. We're tearing our country apart. We can't get our people together under the political system. Surely there has to be a different method of running the big business that governments are today, not only at the federal and provincial levels but at our local level. There's got to be a better system for running a business. As members of the Legislature, I think we are directors. We're elected by our constituents to be directors of a big business. I think that's the way all of us should try to act.

Down in my particular constituency, it's an oil town. We've certainly had a lot of problems there since the energy policy came down. We have the different organizations that have been set up. It's really hard to keep our people comfortable down there, with the dissatisfaction and the talk of separation. I certainly don't think this is necessary. I don't think this is the way we should be handling the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there's one area I want to comment on that I think causes problems in Alberta, and that is the heritage trust fund. We have \$8 billion in the heritage trust fund, and it causes some problems for us in Alberta. However, it causes more problems when we get farther out of Alberta, when we annoy people in other provinces with the amount of money we have. Maybe "annoy" is not the right term to use, but certainly people are concerned, and the federal government is going to be concerned so long as we have \$8 [billion] in our trust fund in Alberta. I know that a lot of times we find it hard to explain to some of our constituents why we're not spending more of this heritage trust fund money diversifying and building up Alberta. I hear that occasionally. Someone will say, we have the equalization payments through the federal government, through the federal system, where we distribute our funds to other provinces. Possibly that's what we should be doing in Alberta — do it through our equalization payment position that we have in Ottawa.

Possibly this is going to be a good week for us in Alberta. We have the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources meeting today with Lalonde in Winnipeg. Hopefully he'll be able to solve some of our problems. On Thursday we're going to have eight premiers of Canada meeting and coming up with some solution to the constitution. I think we have to see if we can come to some conclusion on the constitution. We've been discussing the constitution since 1867, 114 years ago, and we're still fighting. We still don't know how to handle the British North America Act.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely think a lot of this is a smoke screen. I think our present Prime Minister wants to go down in history as the prime minister who brought the constitution home from Britain to Canada. There's no reason why we can't bring the constitution home. I don't know why we want to entrench anything in the constitution; why it can't be Canadian made. There is just no

reason I can see that we can't bring that constitution home, other than the Prime Minister fighting it. I think it should be brought home and put on the back burner. Let it stay there until we come up with a formula that will be satisfactory to every province in Canada and to our central government. They say that the Bill of Rights or whatever the Prime Minister's trying to entrench in the constitution — possibly it will be entrenched. I don't know whether it will. But I've seen legislatures and parliaments bring in retroactive legislation, or there is some method of bringing in legislation — possibly even if we do get it back here, it can be amended. Possibly the courts are going to be concerned in this area.

The other concern is the veto that Quebec and Ontario are going to have. I disagree with it, but under the political system we face it. Where are all the votes? They're in Ontario and Quebec. No matter how we amend the constitution, Quebec and Ontario, with the amount of representation they have, are going to have the power.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the area that's affecting my constituency most is energy policy. I want to say that it's not only the federal energy policy that's creating problems as far as the oil industry is concerned in Alberta or in Canada. The high interest is one of the areas that's especially affecting some of our smaller companies. They've got capped wells and they're not able to have their cash flow. They had interest rates two or three years ago of 14 and 15 per cent, and now they're paying 20 per cent interest on those same wells without any cash flow. That's certainly hurting our oil industry.

The cutback we have in this province is certainly not going to help as far as some of our small companies are concerned. They're going to suffer as well, losing some of the markets we'll be losing as a result of the cutback. I certainly agree that the national energy policy has the biggest effect on it, but it's all these things. It's the interest rates, capped wells, the cutback, and the national energy policy. Then there's the uncertainty we have in the oil industry. They're never sure exactly what's going to happen, or when it's going to happen. When it came down on October 28, the budget indicated that the industry was going to have 8 per cent on the net revenue. However, there was 30 per cent on the consumers of this province and the consumers of Canada. Thirty cents on gas. That 30 cents on gas is going up on July 1 another 15 cents, and then on January 1, 1983, it's going up another 15 cents. That's going to be a much larger increase than 8 per cent. It's going to be closer to 25 or 30 per cent that the consumers of this province are going to be paying as a result of this excise tax that was put on natural gas.

One of the areas that disappointed me in the budget, possibly as much as anything, was when the federal government took 25 per cent of all Canada lands. I'm thinking of a company like Dome Petroleum. They invested a lot of money in exploration, up in the Beaufort Sea, where they can't market their product. They spent that money. What happens? The federal government takes 25 per cent of all the Canada lands. I thought that was a very serious move in trying to get Canada self-sufficient.

In the long term, Mr. Speaker, the most serious part of that budget was PetroCan. If a person takes a really serious look at that budget on the long term, right now a new company . . . Do you know, they own 7 per cent of the production in Canada today, which is pretty serious. What is going to happen 25 years from today when they get control? It's appalling. I think the only capital pun-

ishment we have in Canada is when they bought out Petrofina. What did they do? They took Canadians' capital to buy out Petrofina; then they are going to turn around and tax our profits to pay for their losses. [interjection] That's right. That's the kind of capital punishment we have here right at the present time.

I think this is the serious part. This is where we should be taking a really good look to make sure we don't get this type of thing growing too fast. What did they do? At the time the budget came down, I think it was around \$80. What did they pay for it? They paid Petrofina 50 to 75 per cent more than that to buy it. What are they doing? They're causing inflation. They indicated to me that it's going to be 1 per cent on the inflation factor.

While I'm on that topic, Mr. Speaker, as a free-enterpriser I'm going to say that we in Alberta are not lily-white as far as nationalizing is concerned. We have the Alberta Energy Company. We're in the steel business, the lumber business, and the gas business. We have Pacific Western Airlines. Yes, we bought out Pacific Western Airlines. It just proves to me that you should never get involved in just a little bit of this type of thing, because sometimes it comes home to haunt you. We should be in a position to be able to fight the federal government tooth and nail on PetroCan. That's going to be the demise of the oil industry over a period of years, because they'll eventually take control. What have they got now? They bought out Merit, Petrofina, and Pacific 66. What's it going to be like in a few years? They're going to buy out Imperial Oil and all the multinationals; then they'll have full control and we'll have no control of the pricing of oil and gas in Canada.

We really have to admit that with everything happening, the biggest thing is world price for our product. I'm going to be the first to admit that the principle of world price for our products is right. If I'm going to sell some cattle or anything, I want the world market for it. I don't want to sell anything below world markets. However, I think we as a province have to put in place some revenue-sharing program. I couldn't go out and sell to my farmers — and I don't think the hon. Member for Three Hills could say next spring: Mr. Farmer, I want you to pay double for your gas and oil; consumers, I want you to pay double for your gas and oil. We have to get some type of shielding in place for Albertans before we can go up to world price. We should have it in place so we can fight for world price. This is the biggest problem with our oil industry today. Our oil industry is moving out on account of they can go to the United States and get world price. So I think we have to take a really good look at that area and get something in place so we can shield the consumers of this province.

I've heard the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and the Provincial Treasurer indicate that Ottawa shouldn't be setting the sharing structure for our natural resources in the provinces. I agree with that one hundred per cent.

The reason I talked on these two topics, Mr. Speaker, is that I feel we're neglecting two very important areas. One is the unemployment we have in this nation and the other is inflation. We're just not giving them the attention they need. As far as inflation is concerned, I think the biggest offenders are governments. I recall talking to our last Auditor General from Canada when they took a survey on the efficiency of the federal government. Do you know what it was? Under 50 per cent. I think it was between 45 and 50 per cent. There is no way that you can run any business in private industry unless you have a 75

per cent efficiency rate. [interjection] If you're farming, right. You have to have an efficiency rate of 99 per cent. I'll get to that a little later on, too.

I think we have to start getting efficiency in our levels of government . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. MANDEVILLE: . . . right from the federal to the provincial to the local governments, then get right down to industry itself if we want to control inflation. The only way we're going to bring inflation under control is for all of us to take a hand, not for governments to be creating inflation. They tell me that when they bought out Petrofina it increased the inflation rate by 1 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I thought two areas in the throne debate had lack of concern; one was agriculture and the other was roads. If we're going to get the constitution and the energy situation solved, I certainly hope we take a better look at agriculture, because that is going to be our basic industry down the line. I'll agree that right now our heritage trust fund is coming from oil and gas. But someday those wells are going to stop pumping, and we'd better start putting things in place so we can see that agriculture is going to be our basic industry. I'm certain I would get the support of thousands of Albertans in making this remark. I am concerned about agriculture. I'm concerned that interest rates and high input costs are certainly affecting agriculture at this particular time.

In the throne debate I see they were congratulating ADC on the changes the minister made last April for our young farmers' program. I agree that it was an excellent step in the right direction. It's going over very well for any areas I have been involved in; especially in my own, it's been an excellent program. But I do have two complaints: the limited accessibility to ADC funds and the bureaucracy delays we have in getting these loans through.

Another area that gives me concern is guaranteed loans. When ADC first started in 1972, '73, or whatever year it was, farmers got guaranteed loans 15 per cent and 2 per cent over prime. Now they're paying up to 20 per cent on these guaranteed loans. I would like the minister to take a really good look at making some changes in this area, to take some of our heritage trust fund money to see if we can help some of these farmers who have guaranteed loans and are having a really hard time servicing their debt. I agree that some of the areas in agriculture were very good this year, but we do have farmers who have a serious problem as far as the guaranteed loans are concerned.

I would also like the minister to take a look at increasing some of the maximums, even for the young farmers' program. Right now it can't exceed \$300,000 with the assets they have. If we could add \$100,000 to that, I think it would put it in a better position for some of these loans to qualify. Also, most direct loans are around \$200,000. I would like to see this increased. As far as the net worth, \$400,000, is concerned, I think we should take a good look at increasing this to some degree. With the way our land values have increased in the last period of time from \$900 to \$1,500 an acre, it certainly puts a lot of our farmers in a position where they need more capital to buy their land to operate their farms.

Another recommendation I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the ADC boards themselves have been in there for a number of years and I think they should centre around establishing policy. I think it's their job as a

board of directors to establish policy as far as ADC is concerned. To a certain degree I think we should leave it up to the administration to approve the loans. I think it would help step up our program considerably if we could make those changes.

Loan processing was the other area that concerned me with the Alberta Development Corporation. Last year I recommended to the minister that we streamline the processing of loans. I think it would be very possible. I'm sure most of our local officers have been in place long enough that they could do a good job of processing some of our small loans right at the local level. Right now they approve them locally, send them to the regional office, and then they have to go to Camrose. I think there are too many channels, too many areas to hold up these loans. I'd say the big loans should go to Camrose, but I suggested to the minister, why couldn't some of the officers right in the local offices approve some of these small loans or the ones that are easier to process? I think it would certainly help in the processing of our loans.

Another area as far as ADC is concerned: the minister indicated under the young farmers program that the father didn't have to guarantee the loan or take the net worth of the father, the company, or whatever they were involved in. I've known several examples where loans officers or people who went out to get loans reported to me where they had to take the net worth of the parents before the sons could get loans through the Alberta Development Corporation. If we are sincere in retaining the family farm, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to shield our farmers in this province from gas and oil costs to increase the net income to our farm industry.

The other area I was concerned with is transportation, upgrading our secondary road program in this province. In 1966, the year I got nominated — and I got into the Legislature in '67 — we started a grid road program. It was supposed to be completed in 10 years. I look at the figures now, 15 years later, and we've completed only 50 per cent of that grid road program. The only way we're going to complete it is to get more money to our Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, so he can build new highways. What's happening now is that all the money that goes into the secondary road program is used for upgrading and rebuilding the first roads they built in 1967. Right now that's where they're using most of the money as far as the grid road program is concerned.

Another area we certainly haven't been spending enough money on is our primary highways; for example, Highway No. 1 in the southern part of the province, running from the Saskatchewan border to Banff National Park. When the Conservatives came in in 1971, it was paved from 4 miles west of the Banff park gate to 4 miles west of Strathmore. For anybody who travels that road, where is it paved today? To 4 miles west of Strathmore. We haven't had any twinning of Highway No. 1, with the exception of Medicine Hat and the Brooks area. We appreciate the twinning of the highway in Brooks and Medicine Hat.

Just to draw my comments to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to propose what the Social Credit approach would be to the problems outlined and which the throne speech has ignored. We still believe that agriculture is the most important long-term industry. We believe that government should play a supportive role to the agricultural industry by helping to minimize input costs. If re-elected to government, Social Credit would take the following initiatives in the way of agriculture policy: restructure the Agricultural Development Corpo-

ration to minimize bureaucratic delays and expand credit availability to farmers for other capital and operating needs; undertake an intensive five-year program to substantially upgrade rural secondary and tertiary roads, in order to ensure the movement of food market goods is done with greater efficiency and safety; establish a province-wide land-use policy designed to protect prime agricultural land from urban and individual encroachment; and ensure that the lowest possible energy costs are made available to agricultural producers, through the removal of all forms of provincial taxation on such energy sources.

Just before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two brief comments on two areas in my own constituency. Number one is the Bassano dam. Today I asked the Minister of Environment some questions on the Bassano dam. At present we are rehabilitating a dam that stores no water at all. All it is is diversion. We're going to spend \$1 million on the Bassano dam, and all it'll do is divert. But if we were to put in a dam a few miles downstream — I'll agree that it's going to cost \$200 million or \$300 million to do that, but if we do it, we have storage of 1 million acre-feet of water on the Bow River. It'll save us using prime land in irrigation districts. Inland storage is good, Mr. Speaker, but I think we have to be careful in using good prime agricultural land to store water on. Down in my constituency we have used some prime land because we don't have any storage on the Bow River. So I'd certainly like the minister to take a good look at going ahead with spending some of our heritage trust fund to try to conserve water, not only on the Bow River but on all our river basins in this province. We need some water resource development in this province, and I think the place to start is right down on the Bow River, because we can use the water on that particular dam for many different reasons.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that we live in the greatest nation in the world, Canada, and we live in the best part of the nation, Alberta. Let's all work for a better Canada and a better Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to revert to introduction of guests?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Assembly will agree.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(reversion)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and the Assembly. I'd like to introduce a group of school students who have travelled some distance this morning to be in the Legislature and look at the parliamentary process. The schools represented are from my constituency, the towns of Mossleigh and Arrowwood. The students have with them supervisors Judy Forestell, Karen Peterson, and Bill Hagedorn. I'd like them and their escorts to stand and be recognized by the Legislature.

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

(continued)

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to

enter this debate. First, before I get involved in my speech, I'd like to pass on my congratulations to the Member for Calgary North West and the Member for Innisfail on their fine performance in addressing the throne speech some days ago.

I wanted to spend some time on the throne speech debate, Mr. Speaker. As I was listening to the speakers before me, especially the Leader of the Opposition and some of the other members, some of the comments they were making disturbed me greatly. They started off with: 10 years of failures. That's a conclusion the Leader of the Opposition has come to, and for the life of me I can't see where he's been all this time. I've been in this House since 1971, the 10 years he speaks of, and I want to relate to my constituency the failures he speaks about. I recall so well the headline in the *Journal* in the Whitecourt area in 1967: Pulp Mill for Whitecourt. That got them by one election. Nothing happened. The next election, again the same headlines: Timber Development for Whitecourt Pulp Mill Assured.

DR. BUCK: That sounds like the Grande Prairie hospital.

MR. TRYNCHY: So what happened? The pulp mill came. It went to Grande Prairie; Whitecourt received nothing. Let's look at what happened since then in that area in regard to timber. We got Simpson Timber some years ago. B.C. Forest Products are moving and will be building next year. So if that's a failure, I welcome that kind of failure.

We didn't have one senior citizens' self-contained unit in my constituency over the 10 years — not one. As of this year, Mr. Speaker, six communities enjoy those benefits. Again, if that's a failure, my people welcome it.

Before I was elected in 1971, highways 43 and 16 in my constituency were paved. No other roads of any kind were upgraded or paved. A secondary road, or the grid system the hon. Member for Bow Valley talks about, was in the books, but nothing was done. Today we have pavement in many areas. Again, if that's failure, my people accept it.

We talk about recreation grants: no such thing under their system, before 1971. We have \$100 per capita today for every community throughout the province, which many of them have enjoyed.

"Decentralization" was not in their dictionary. They said that within 10 years, 80 per cent or better of the population would be living in Edmonton and Calgary. What do we see today? Just a little over 50 per cent in Calgary and Edmonton, and the rest in rural Alberta. We've moved a great way in decentralization, Mr. Speaker: Athabasca, Camrose, Ponoka, and a number of others.

We've talked about agriculture, which is very important to my constituency as it is to many others. In the past, what did we have? We never had a program where you could borrow money. We had a farm purchase board, and every year — the year of the election — they would announce a few dollars that you could use. I had a very good friend who was a member of that board, and just about a week or two after the election the board ran out of funds. That's the kind of support they had for agriculture. Today we enjoy 6 per cent loans to beginning farmers, and millions and millions of dollars in that program. Again, Mr. Speaker, if that's 10 years of failure, we'll accept it.

Mr. Speaker, I guess last Thursday, when the Member

for Clover Bar suggested that members of the government were other than members, was a pretty black day in my 10 years in this House. He suggested that if you voted with the government ...

DR. BUCK: You can use that word, Peter.

MR. TRYNCHY: ... time after time, you were not worthy of sitting in this House. Let me go back to the records for the years the hon. member sat before I was here. What do I see vote after vote after vote? I've checked this out. A question asked was: that a copy of the benefit/cost analysis in regard to expenditure on the Bighorn dam be provided. What was the answer? Ten in favor — the opposition members — and the rest against, with the hon. Member for Clover Bar supporting the noes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

AN HON. MEMBER: You had more discipline than we thought.

MR. TRYNCHY: Another motion, Mr. Speaker, just for the record: that the Alberta government develop industrial policies to widen the industrial base in both rural and urban centres. What happened there? Seven for, and 49 against. And of course the hon. member sat part of that delegation. It goes on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] And yet, when we take a vote, he suggests that we're not voting on our own. Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me greatly that we'd have an hon. member sitting in opposition on that side suggest that the other members elected here by the people of Alberta are other than hon. members.

DR. BUCK: I didn't say that, Peter.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it was the Chair's impression that a certain incident which took place last week was past history. I would respectfully suggest that it remain that way, and that we might avoid warming it up repeatedly.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments, but when I'm asked back home if I'm what the hon. member called me, surely I can respond that I don't think I am.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the Chair has no responsibility concerning what the hon. member says back home.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on. I think I've made the point.

There's been a suggestion that every office in government is veiled with bureaucracy and you can't get in. I'm sorry the hon. Leader of the Opposition had to leave. He called my office last Thursday, I believe, and asked for an appointment. Within two minutes he was in my office to see me and we discussed things. That's the way this government operates. In no place in government have I found a closed door. I suppose it's pretty nice to say that here, so people out there who don't know the difference will accept that. But that's not a fact. I guess we've got to say it because people they speak to are bewildered. They don't understand who's telling the true story of whether the offices are open or closed.

Mr. Speaker, they go on to say that we have to have more autonomy for MDs and counties. I wonder who they're speaking about. My constituency, the county of Lac Ste. Anne, has a heritage fund of \$3 million-plus. They do what they want with it, when they want. How much more autonomy can you give them? They appreciate it. They know that's the way to go, and not the way the opposition has been talking about.

They say that we have 90 hospitals on stream, and they congratulate us for it. After 10 years, they say, we should do something. Well, the problem is not the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker; it's the 20 or 30 before where we're catching up. A hospital doesn't go down in 10 years; a hospital deteriorates over a number of years. To suggest that 10 years ago we had magnificent hospitals and today we have none, is just so much nonsense. Mr. Speaker, they suggest we don't provide enough for health care and hospitals. In 1970 the total budget for this province was some \$1 billion. Today the hospital budget exceeds that. So I really can't understand their thinking.

Mr. Speaker, back home we're asked, what are special warrants? I guess everybody's asked this question. They ask how they work and why we use them. People I've talked to have heard the other side. Now I want to provide the other side, possibly with some facts. They suggest we should not use special warrants. Let me ask this question: which one would they see rejected? Would they take Agriculture, with some \$32 million, and say let's not approve it; a program that helped our hog producers over the past summer? Will they take Environment, which provided some \$230 million for land purchase, water, and sewer throughout the province? Would they say that? Would they suggest we not provide the \$59 million for hospitals and medical care? They're saying: let's not use special warrants; we're not an open government.

As we go through all these, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we listen to people, we hear them, and we react. A good example is my colleague from Olds-Didsbury, when the Olds arena burnt down. There was a commitment by the federal government for some \$2 million that was to come from lottery profits which could have taken anywhere from one to five to six years. They came to see us — so did the member — and suggested: could we do something. So we discussed it. I took it to my colleagues, and we approved it for \$2 million so they wouldn't have to carry that tax load over four or five years, but got it now. Is that not reacting? Is that not open government? Is that not listening to people?

Mr. Speaker, we talk about freedom of information. I wonder if any member in this House can't get the information he wants. In my 10 years I haven't yet been unable to supply information to my constituents, unable to find one case where I couldn't get that information, and yet we want freedom of information. We have that right now. All you have to do is ask.

We also hear that the government should have more public inquiries. I guess that's fair ball. Let's have a public inquiry for everything we do, and after we have that inquiry, let's have another one. Because every public inquiry is not 100 per cent unanimous. Somebody is against it. So if you have one, let's turn around and have another one because some people out there are still not happy. Let's review one after the other. I guess that's some of their philosophy.

We hear that we have a large heritage fund. The member speaking before me suggested it was too great. Well, what does it mean? You know what it means: about

one week's budget by the federal government, that's all. It means about a year's budget for us, the province of Alberta. What it really means is about \$3,000 to \$4,000 for every Albertan. You know, that isn't even a month's salary for some Albertans. So what do we do? Do we give it away? That's a suggestion. I say no. We set it aside, we provide the type of income, the type of programs we must have for our children and their children. It's not hard to explain what the heritage fund is about. Some members think it is.

We heard from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview: just spend it all, let's blow it. I guess their philosophy has always been: why worry about tomorrow; let's get rid of it. They say we're behind in spending, provincial funding. So I looked at the budget. I looked at our programs, and I asked myself: are we behind in health funding? The answer is no. Are we behind in education funding? The answer is no. Are we behind in hospitals or transportation? Again the answer is no. But to that member who has never met a payroll, never had people working for him, never had fiscal responsibility in the way of a private enterprise, I guess we can understand his philosophy.

They talk about long-range plans. He went on to suggest that we shouldn't dismantle the Crow rates. In all, he says, the farmers want the Crow rate. The farmers, if they understand the issue, don't care a hoot about the Crow rate. They want a return in their pockets. Let nobody fool the farmers that by the Crow rate we're getting more for our grain. We're not. It's coming out of our pockets to start with.

He talks about Wheat Board performance. This is a good one. He says 90 per cent of farmers support it. Well I wonder where he gets his information from.

MR. BATIUK: Ninety per cent NDPers support it.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, that could be so. Some years ago we had a vote on rapeseed marketing. The farmers spoke, and they chose the open market. What the farmers want, and I guess that's what we have to give them, is to be able to produce. All you have to do is get out of the way and the production will be there. They should have an option. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1952 — and this was Wheat Board policy at that time; it might be changed — if you grew feed in Alberta and you wanted to ship it to your farm or ranch in B.C., you couldn't do it unless you were within the quota. Your cattle could starve. That's the policy you had. That's not the kind of policy we can live with.

I recall so well in the '50s and '60s we had barley of good quality throughout the province asked for by the maltsters. Malting barley and no markets. Barley was selling for feed where it could get a 14 cent a bushel premium if it was sold as malting. Private enterprise took the initiative. They travelled abroad. They secured markets over in Germany and other countries. It wasn't too long after — but it was a while after — that the Wheat Board woke up and said: if they can do it, why can't we? That's the question my farmers ask me. Why isn't the Wheat Board doing that? That's a question that's still there today. At one time the Wheat Board had 50 per cent of the export market. Today they enjoy 9 per cent. What happened? Why are we down to 9 per cent. I suggest to you that government controls in Ottawa have done that to us. The United States, which has been getting out of government controls over a number of years, now enjoys approximately 60 per cent of the world market. So what does it say to us, Mr. Speaker? It says

one of two things. Number one, if the Wheat Board wants to do its job, it should get out and sell. Number two, they should work on improving the transportation system. If they want to sell, they have to have that crop available for market. We have some of the best quality grains in Canada. Our wheat is number one in the world, yet we lose sale after sale after sale by not being able to get it there on time.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the harbors in Vancouver. I was there two or three weeks ago, and a number of ships were waiting to take on grain. We drove past Neptune terminals. I don't have the figures for last year, but the year before some \$30 million worth of demurrage was paid by western farmers to the Wheat Board. Now everybody says, that's fine, it's demurrage covered by the Wheat Board, but nobody really understands that the Wheat Board doesn't have any funds. These funds come right off the top from the western producer. I suggest that if the Wheat Board would direct its attention to delivery and transportation and selling of our grains, they could stand back and the farmers would just let it roll in.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one more comment: it was suggested that our salary schedule is too low, and I guess that's to our employees. Yet as you go back over time, I recall so well that in 1952 my starting salary was \$175 a month, which netted me some \$2,000 a year. Today the same person could earn \$3,000 to \$4,000 to \$5,000 a month. Now you can figure out pretty quickly the increase. It's well over 2,000 per cent. You'll have to remember that in 1952 more than 30 per cent of your income was used to keep your home. That has been reduced dramatically to around 15 or 16 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at this document — we've all had a chance to read and review it — it's pretty impressive. It's very impressive. I just want to touch on a few of the items in my own department where last year and this year we provided programs that are new additions. A program initiated this year will be for hosting of national and international events by our sports associations in the province. A new program, the Alberta Seniors Games held in Camrose in August, 1980, will be held again every two years, commencing in 1982. We will continue to show support for the Olympics in Calgary in 1988.

At the request of the Alberta Games Council, we have done something that has never been tried before. The Alberta summer games will be hosted by five communities working together, instead of just having it in the larger centres. We have asked for and will be announcing in the budget a substantial increase to the operation grants for recreation facilities throughout the province. We will be expanding, rebuilding, and upgrading a number of provincial parks throughout the province, and this year we will also be starting something we've talked about, providing recreation areas in several regions throughout the province, which is something new.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say again that I was disturbed last Thursday with the comments in this House. I guess in the 10 years I've been here, we've always enjoyed good rapport between members. We always took it in good taste, and I hope that's the way . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the hon. member diverting again to last Thursday's . . . Surely we can lay that to rest.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I was, but to another item and not the one you're thinking of. [interjections]

In closing, it's a pleasure for me to join with my

colleagues again in extending congratulations to the two members who moved and seconded the speech, to the Sergeant-at-Arms — congratulations to him for his new job — and to you, sir, for keeping the House under control. Hopefully we'll continue in that manner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I'd just like to take a few moments to bring a few matters to the attention of the Assembly as they apply to my constituency. I'm so sorry the hon. Member for Whitecourt is so sensitive, but I guess when you're the Minister of Recreation and Parks you get a little sensitive once in a while. I'd like to say to the hon. member that I don't think anybody in this Assembly is anything but an hon. member. I'm sure we all try to be hon. members, so if some people feel dishonorable, that's their problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the hon. minister from Whitecourt that special warrants is an issue that really has some important ramifications. The ramifications are that you can fudge the budget. You can do that because the Provincial Treasurer indicates to municipalities, teachers, hospital boards, and everybody else that we have guidelines. So how do you break your own guidelines? You set up a budget, and then through special warrants you fudge the budget to make the percentage increases look smaller than they really are. I would never ever accuse this government of misleading the people of this province. I would never ever want to do that, Mr. Speaker. But basically that's what is happening, so I can understand how the Minister of Recreation and Parks would be sensitive about us questioning the use of special warrants. He will be hearing more about what we think about the use of special warrants to really mislead the people of this province as to what percentage increases are, because the government is well known to have one set of rules for its civil service and one set of rules for what it wants to do with its spending. But that can be touched upon a little later when we get the new budget.

Mr. Speaker, one thing does bother the taxpayer of this province, and this applies to spending restraints and guidelines and staying within those guidelines, be it municipalities or a provincial government. I think all we have to do is look at why the present president of the United States won the election, or one of the reasons. That present president says the taxpayer has just about had as much of government waste as he can stand. That's basically what he's saying. And he is not using a scalpel; he is using a big broad-axe in cutting government spending.

I think it's time that this government established some priorities again in what it's going to do with its programs and its spending. It's just about time the Premier got up again with his best Harvard accent, talking about priorities, because it's just about time we had some priorities established again, Mr. Speaker.

This throne speech mentions nothing imaginative about what we're going to do with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It has just become another savings account. The government could have taken some good advice in the report we tabled on some of the imaginative things that can be done with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Basically, the first thing to do is break it, one part being savings fund and the other part being diversification fund, because you can't have a savings account doing those two things at the same time. So there certainly is room for setting up revolving funds, and from those revolving funds — and these can be earmarked to certain

groups and special interest groups — you have a guaranteed return of income so that people would know what their income is all the time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly I have always said that this government knows how to spend, but I'm not so sure it knows how to manage. When we see the MacKenzie health centre triple under the budgeting of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, when we see Kananaskis go from \$40 million to \$210 million, we're really in the big leagues. The people of Edmonton are concerned about their convention centre doubling in value from \$30 million to \$60 million, or from \$40 million to \$80 million. They are just in the small leagues compared to this government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Assembly some of the problem areas that I feel should have been corrected by this time, because it is just about time this government quit blaming the former government on some of the programs it hasn't really taken action on. It's time the Associate Minister of Telephones stopped acting like a civil servant and started acting like a minister, because things should be done. I know there are other hon. members in this Assembly — that's the 30- and 40-mile radius thing, where we have toll-free or flat-rate dialing. A great injustice has been done in two areas of my constituency — the Bruderheim and Ministik areas — where people are within the 30-mile radius but do not get flat-rate dialing.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister — and I feel badly about saying it when he's not in his place, but I'm sure the hon. minister can read — that some of those injustices should be corrected. I've said to the minister on many occasions that if we are looking at a program of expanding a 40-mile radius, that would solve 85 per cent of the telephone problems as far as flat-rate dialing goes. Any politician who can solve 85 per cent of the problems, Mr. Speaker, is a heck of a politician. So I say to the government members and to the minister especially, have a look, get the 30-mile program completed, get on the 40-mile program, and you'll solve most of your problems.

Mr. Speaker, another area I'd like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Utilities and Telephones as it applies to natural gas is the program of assisting people who are using natural gas to dry grain, a thing I think other hon. members who have agricultural pursuits in their area . . . The program starts on October 1 and ends in March, when many farmers do three-quarters of the grain-drying from September 1 to October 1. So what are you giving them? Nothing. I'd just like to indicate to the other agricultural MLAs that this correction should certainly be made as quickly as possible.

I'd like to go on to the question of roads, Mr. Speaker. This government's record of road construction is appalling. Now I know the government members don't like accepting that. The twinning of the road to Fort McMurray should be half completed by now. Is it going to come as some great surprise to them that Alsands is eventually going to go ahead, and plants 4 and 5 are eventually going to go ahead? That is not forward thinking, when we are just doing a knee-jerk reaction to a special need. Those programs should already be in place. How about the road to Cold Lake? Fortunately the previous government built Highway 28 with wide shoulders so we can get by, but it's no thanks to this government. That road's been in place many years, hon. gentlemen and ladies of the government side. So let's get our act together. The people of this province demand roads.

Several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I was in our neighbor-

ing province of Saskatchewan. For a long time we used to look down our noses at our poor neighbor to the east and say: you can tell when you get from the Alberta border into Saskatchewan because their roads are so terrible. I challenge the hon. members of the government side: if you want an education, just go across the border. I was very impressed, and I'm not very often impressed with socialists. I don't have much to do with socialists, be they social democrats or any other closet kind of socialist.

They have a good road program. They have many, many miles of roads to be built. I'll grant you it's not as expensive to build roads in Saskatchewan as it is in Alberta, but I was quite impressed by their program. As my hon. colleague Mr. Mandeville mentioned, this government's record in building roads is certainly nothing they can pat themselves on the back about. The rehabilitation program: do we have a five- or 10-year program so that people in the business can gear up and tool up for that? No, we just go from year to year using ad hockery. That's not good enough. Mr. Speaker, that is the sign of a government that is getting tired. Not only has the Member for Clover Bar lost his hair since he came to this Assembly; I notice there's more and more gray on that side of the House, and more and more receding hairlines. That wouldn't bother me so much as the fact that their thinking is starting to get antiquated. They are losing freshness, drive, and the ability to come up with new programs and initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, in the question of municipal . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry have a question? If he doesn't, then he can sit down. If he has a question, I'd be glad to answer it. So there you are, Roloff.

Mr. Speaker, the question of agriculture. The people in the agricultural sector in this province say that all we hear about is gas, oil, Ottawa, and Alberta. They forget about us in the agricultural sector. They do, Mr. Speaker. Unless I missed something, I think the hon. minister responsible for the natural gas program said we're going to be benevolent and give that program \$1 million. Was that the figure? One million dollars? It's a good thing that somebody up there was looking after us this winter, because I think we would have had many very uncomfortable government MLAs if we would have had a severe January, February, and March weatherwise. The people of this province would have really found out what happened to the escalating cost of their natural gas; the natural gas that I used to think belonged to us, the people of this province. But in its wisdom the government thinks they want to put everything in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and then tell us that they know better than we do how to spend it on our behalf. Mr. Speaker, as a free enterpriser, I can't buy that. To me, the less government the better the government.

The government had better review its program of shielding the costs of production for the agricultural sector, the costs of heating our homes in the rural areas, and our diesel fuels and gasolines. They talk about efficiency. The farmers of this province are as efficient as they can get, but we've run out of room to be any more efficient.

Mr. Speaker, this government's record of funding our educational system is not improving; it's going in the other direction. The Minister of Agriculture flies so many kites. When he flew the one about how he was going to dismember the Alberta Teachers' Association, that was one kite I'm sure many of the backbenchers wish he hadn't flown. If their response was the same as the response we got, I'm sure the minister's aspirations about

being the next premier of this province certainly took a turn for the worse. That issue was not too popular, and I'm being very kind when we talk about what the minister was going to do to the Alberta Teachers' Association.

MR SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister of Agriculture does a fair amount of flying, but not too many kites.

DR. BUCK: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the Minister of Agriculture brought that to my attention, because I wouldn't want the Minister of Agriculture branded with the fiasco of what the Minister of Education was going to do to the Alberta Teachers' Association. So I appreciate that interjection. I like the Minister of Agriculture. In other year or so he can retire happily and go back to farming and pick up his pension. He's a nice gentleman. I like him. The only thing I don't like is that he doesn't care about agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I do like the Minister of Parks and Recreation. I do like one or two programs he has. I commend the government on the seniors games very, very highly. They were well received, well supported . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you do well? [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Did I do well? That was a good line, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate a good line when I receive one. But I'd like to know who the senior citizen was who made that remark.

Mr. Speaker, it was a good program and I compliment the government. I compliment the government on the fact that we will be having more provincial parks. I will be interested to see what goes on in the Heinesburg-Laurier Lake and Rosse Lake area. That's the area I grew up in. It's a beautiful part of the lakes and woods tourist area. It's a nice part of the province, and I certainly commend the government for looking at putting a provincial park there.

Mr. Speaker, the other issue that I would like to bring to the minister's attention — and I was very pleased with the speech that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care made about what really happens if we get rid of extra billing. I made this remark in the Legislature one time previously: if we remove the right to take away extra billing, then we have a fully socialized medical system in this province. I know my socialist friend the Member for Spirit River-Fairview thinks that would improve the medical facilities and care in this province. I say to my learned friend that all he has to do is go to Sweden; we were both there. There is nothing wrong with their health system, except it's very expensive; nobody is any healthier than they are here. But we go to that other socialist country, merry old England, where in their wisdom they have learned that the fully socialized system does not provide better medical coverage or better care, and you have the dual system where you pay taxes for the state controlled system, then turn around and buy private insurance so you can get attention. Mr. Speaker, that's a philosophical argument. I am just as concerned as anyone else in this province that everybody receive more than adequate medical coverage, but it can be done under the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I would like to say to the government that there are many good programs. Certainly you can't have all that money and not come up with some good programs. But the greatest way to become the ex-government is to become complacent.

You've lost your initiative, your drive, and your imagination. If you don't get it back, you may be the ex-government.

Thank you.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question.

DR. BUCK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would agree that Alberta has the cheapest farm fuel and heating fuel by far in Canada. I want to be sure he has that information.

DR. BUCK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway to know that Alberta also owns the gas and the oil. Therefore it should be half as expensive as it is now. Is the hon. member aware of that?

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said I could ask a question. I'd like to pop one to him. He suggested in his speech: spend, spend, spend. He sounds an awful lot like our friend from Spirit River-Fairview, to which he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have yet to hear something to which a question mark might be appended.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would confess to some schizoid tendencies, wanting to spend a lot and then accusing us of bad management.

DR. BUCK: If that's a question, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member was probably listening when I said that it's about time this government got back some priorities. This government needs priorities, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You win, Walter.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing the debate on this motion, I wish to commend the members for their excellent speeches. It was interesting to listen to reflections of the past 10 years of Progressive Conservative government under the leadership of our esteemed hon. Premier. As each government member spoke about his or her constituency, one gained a deeper appreciation for our total province and what is happening across this province, be it in education, agriculture, social programs, tourism, hospitals, highways, et cetera. That is certainly not to say there are not concerns and individual constituency issues. But as the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower stated his priorities for his constituency of Medicine Hat, each and every one of us identified the particular concerns and worked very hard toward their resolution.

I wish to thank the Premier for his leadership and the cabinet ministers for their co-operation and support over the past two years. To all members of this Assembly: I appreciate their kind remarks and thank them for their support, collegueship, and friendship. It has been my privilege to share this honor with my friend and colleague

the Member for Innisfail.

It is with deep anticipation that we will await the Budget Address of the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In this 10th anniversary year of Progressive Conservative government, it gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to move formally that this Assembly accept the Speech from the Throne.

Thank you.

[Motion carried]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

3. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor by such members of the Assembly as are members of the Executive Council.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the House was able to conclude the debate in respect to the address in reply prior to this evening, it's not proposed that the Assembly sit tonight.

[At 5:15 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

