

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, April 14, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, Senator Della Briotta. Senator Delia Briotta has been in Canada since April 8, meeting with various governments and Italian communities across the country.

I have learned that the Senator has followed a number of different pursuits during his life prior to his present position as Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, including that of a primary teacher, obtaining a Master of Arts, as well as having published a number of essays on local history. Within government he has been a member of the Commission for Agriculture, Labour, and Foreign Affairs. He has dealt with problems such as immigration and sat as a member of the European Parliament.

Senator Delia Briotta's visit to Alberta is particularly timely in view of the joint efforts of the Italian community and the province of Alberta in response to the severe earthquake Italy suffered last year. The people of Alberta raised over \$460,000, which was matched by the province of Alberta. These funds were used to purchase temporary buildings requested by the government of Italy to be used as schools, medical clinics, and town centres. Forty-nine of these structures were flown to Italy by two Canadian aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to ask the Senator and his delegation to rise so they may receive the cordial welcome of the House.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report for the year ended December 31, 1979, regarding financial statements of the Special Areas Board, as required by statute.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to table the 1980 annual report of *Alberta Hansard*.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it's a privilege to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, grade 9 students from the Ellerslie school in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. George Rice, Karen Shevy, and Ron Jeremy, and bus drivers Ken Staughan and Ken Schiewe. They are seated in both the members gallery and the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, today it's indeed my pleasure to introduce to you and to hon. members of this Assembly students from the Memorial Composite high school in Stony Plain.

Included with the group from Memorial Composite high school are a number of British exchange students from Southampton, who are here for a two-week visit. They are doing a number of tours in the province of Alberta and seeing our way of life. After April 27, a number of the students from the Stony Plain composite school will be travelling to Britain on the exchange class. The students from Britain are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Jerry Richardson, and the Stony Plain students are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Mike Martyn. They're in the public gallery, and I ask the students to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Energy Negotiations**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I thought that possibly the minister would like to have given us a message of good will within the opportunity of Ministerial Statements. Since the minister hasn't done that, I'd appreciate very much if the minister could indicate at this time some of the results of the meetings in Winnipeg. Specifically, could the minister indicate whether any consideration was given with regard to the temporary suspension to oil cutbacks, the postponement of additional cutbacks as of June 1, or any other specifics?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I will respond first to the latter part of the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition by saying that in Winnipeg we did not discuss the questions of the production cutbacks. We did discuss the other wide range of energy issues. As I said late yesterday afternoon in Winnipeg, I feel we made some progress. Each side brought forward some new approaches. As a result we agreed to hold a further meeting, probably in late May. In the meantime our respective officials will be doing some more work on gathering and assessing data.

I simply conclude my answer by saying that while we have made some progress, I wouldn't want that to leave an optimistic impression, because I think it is very clear that there is a long way yet to go before we could reach an agreement.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources with regard to the discussions. Could "made some progress" be an indication that some movement has been made from the July 25, 1980, position of the government?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I guess we have to do this every day during question period, and again point out that we're simply going to impair our capacity to carry on these negotiations if we reveal in the House the particulars of what was discussed or particulars of proposals made by either side. As I said the other day, in this kind of matter one has to have some strategies and some tactical plans. Certainly you can't discuss details of proposals or suggestions without revealing to a greater or lesser extent what that strategy or those tactics are. Certainly there's no point having them if you're going to

reveal them publicly. The question really involved an answer that would relate to that. I don't think I can go any further than I went in response to the first question by saying that some new approaches were put forward.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the position of the government and understand that technique in negotiations. Could the minister indicate whether the tar sands or the Cold Lake development were discussed?

MR. LEITCH: As I said, Mr. Speaker, our discussions on Monday covered the wide range of energy issues. But as I pointed out in response to the first question, we did not discuss the matter of production cutbacks.

Dickson Dam

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment, and ask the minister if he could indicate to the Assembly if the Dickson dam completion schedule is still in the '82-83 time frame, if my memory is accurate. Has a decision been made on whether recreational activities will be able to be carried on at the site once the construction is completed?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's our hope — and I think everything points to this — that the dam will be filling in the spring of '83 and, unless something unforeseen happens during the interim, that should be our target.

Insofar as recreation, in the general area we have a special advisory committee, chaired by the Member for Innisfail. They are making recommendations to us with regard to any additional public lands above the high-water mark that might be available when we're completed with negotiations for land purchase.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would the hon. minister indicate to the Assembly what circumstances have led to the change in the government's commitment? When the government made the announcement in '75, there was a clear indication that there would be considerable recreation potential. What has led to the government now shifting its position?

MR. COOKSON: The hon. member of the opposition must be hearing something I don't hear, because there's really been no change insofar as recreation. I think the policy has always been that we'll provide as many facilities for recreation as possible.

One has to keep in mind, though, that in the case of dams being constructed in the province that will have fluctuating water levels, very careful consideration has to be taken as to what can be developed with access to the water, for example, or along the shoreline, because of the hazards of the fluctuating water levels.

So certainly in the irrigation areas of the province it is a policy to minimize as much as possible the problems that could be associated with joint use of such a facility. Those particular restrictions may not be the same as a dam such as the Dickson dam, for example, which may not have the fluctuating water levels of irrigation reservoirs. I guess to conclude, I'm open to any suggestions we can live with in the province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly what has changed since '75, when the government made the announcement that the dam would be going ahead, and one of things the government tried to convince people in central Alberta was good about the dam was the great recreational potential? What has happened since that time, that the minister is now in a position where he has to indicate to the House that recreational potential may very well not be realized?

MR. COOKSON: Perhaps the Minister of Recreation and Parks would like to add to the comments I've already made, Mr. Speaker. If the member of the opposition is talking about a provincial park, that comes under his jurisdiction. He may want to refer the question to the minister concerned.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, noting the lack of enthusiasm by the Minister of Recreation and Parks to pick up the ball from the Minister of Environment, I'd ask the Minister of Environment one additional supplementary question. What has happened to raise the price of the Dickson dam from the less than \$40 million initially estimated by the government to a figure that is now in excess of \$132 million? What has caused this almost 300 per cent increase in the cost of the dam?

MR. NOTLEY: He had the Kananaskis planners in charge.

DR. BUCK: It's called Tory budgeting.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, if the member of the opposition looks carefully at the original estimate, which I think was around \$66 million, in that area, and takes into consideration somewhere in the area of 10 to 12 per cent escalation in costs; the projection now is that by 1983 the costs will have totalled about \$132 million. I haven't done the rapid calculation on this, but I think if you work the figures out, it should come pretty close to the included inflationary costs.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might pose just one additional question to the minister. Are there any other factors that have led to this 300 per cent increase in the cost of the dam, other than the cost of inflation?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check very closely, but my understanding is that a fair number of the tenders we have received — as high as six to eight different contractors are tendering — have come in pretty close to what we estimated in terms of tendering costs, taking inflation into consideration. The area where we may have been out in our original estimates would perhaps be land purchase. At the time I think it was said that we should be as generous as possible to the farm people in the general area, and I think the member of the opposition would support that position. At the time we couldn't predict just what those costs would be. But certainly if the correspondence I've received in terms of land purchase is any indication, we were certainly generous in our land settlements, because I've had no correspondence to the contrary.

MR. R. CLARK: To the minister: according to the minister's own officials, the additional land costs will add about \$7.5 million to the total cost, which is going to be \$132 million. Mr. Minister, I take it from that answer

that the only cause for the 300 per cent increase in the project, other than the cost of inflation, is the \$7.5 million of additional money that had to be made available to the landowners, which no one is arguing about.

MR. COOKSON: As I say, I think that's the information I have too, Mr. Speaker. Unless there are some other unknown factors, the land certainly came in higher because of our generous policy to the relocation of the landowners. The tendering was pretty close to what we estimated, as close as you can possibly be with these large tendering projects.

Fire Safety Regulations

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Labour deals with the regulations pertaining to high-rise hotels. Can the minister indicate if he or the government is considering any changes to the fire safety regulations as they apply to high-rise hotels?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I presume by that that the hon. Member for Clover Bar means the regulations which apply during the construction phase, as opposed to those which apply during the maintenance and operation of the building. The regulations applying during construction phase were just amended, as all hon. members know.

In respect of the question of high-rise buildings, and particularly hotels, there are about three different initiatives: one of them is supported by the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs; one is at the instigation of the National Research Council, or a subcommittee of that council; and I believe one is a private endeavor. As the results of these initiatives become known, they will be reconsidered.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister had any liaison or discussion with the members of the Alberta Hotel Association as to placing sprinkler systems in high-rise hotels?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not had discussions with the Alberta Hotel Association. I can advise the members of the Assembly that when the review of the proposed National Building Code commenced last year, the information was supplied to all parties who indicated interest.

I did have the opportunity to speak to a number of groups representing different business and regulatory interests and indicate that that review would be under way during 1980. Some 83 groups, I believe — and I stand to be corrected, because I don't remember exactly now — made submissions concerning the regulations. I was obviously not in personal communication with each one of those groups, but I could get the list and review it if the hon. member wishes.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate at this time if the government is considering mandatory sprinklers in new hotel construction?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the government, or at least the department, is keeping track of the initiatives I mentioned earlier, not just with respect to hotels but generally with respect to large buildings.

There have been some interesting new developments which offer some quite new and markedly advanced tech-

nology and potential savings, one of which is being promoted commercially in the Edmonton area and I believe may have been installed or is in the process of installation in a number of buildings, and which uses the main sprinkler system for heating and air conditioning the building. As these things develop, they are being reviewed. But I would say that underground areas in large buildings, rooms with certain functions, and rooms over a certain size must be sprinklered.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Can the minister indicate if he or his department are giving consideration to making suction fans in hotel stairways mandatory? When investigating some of these high-rise fires, it appears that many people perish in stairwells. Is the minister looking at that as a stopgap measure, until this other legislation is in place?

MR. YOUNG: In the National Building Code and the Alberta Building Code are 13 different systems intended to inhibit the spread of smoke within a building. Pressurizing parts of the building relative to other parts is fundamental to the largest number of those alternative choices which are available to a builder.

I don't think I can respond further to the notion of fans, which may be an exhausting exercise — exhausting for the hon. member as well as for me, Mr. Speaker — because that clearly comes under the broader grouping of having different air pressures in different parts of a building to inhibit the smoke.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on the last point. Can the minister bring before the Assembly any studies his department has had done on the use of exhaust fans as a measure that can be used until we get these other things in place?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Building Code is based upon the recommendations of the National Research Council and subcommittees thereof which make a recommendation for the National Building Code. As nearly as I am aware, all the elements of the Alberta Building Code which apply to tall buildings are taken directly from the National Building Code. The Alberta government staff and interests of the province of Alberta are represented in a number of ways on the subcommittees of the National Research Council. In that manner the research presumably is done at that level. I can assure the hon. member that the Alberta Building Standards Council reviews all incidents in Alberta, also makes recommendations to the National Research Council subcommittees when there is evidence that any of the existing code requirements should be open to reconsideration.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up to the questions asked by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. When these studies with regard to mechanical preventions were being done — I'm referring to smoke, exhaust fans, and water sprinkler systems: these are not fail safe. When these studies were being made or when the minister's department was considering these fail-safe methods, was he considering as well the possibility of having the contractors install heliports on these buildings for evacuation purposes, in consideration of the possibility of these other mechanical items failing?

MR. YOUNG: On checking, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that that notion was one of those advanced to the Building Standards Council, which did not greet it with great favor, so it did not get included in the code. I have been advised, and am having a check done on it, that the officials who certify pilots would remove a pilot's licence if the pilot were found to be hovering a helicopter over a building on fire, unless there were very, very unusual circumstances. Indeed the circumstances might have to be so unusual, they would not include the case of a fire.

RITE System

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Government Services. Can the minister inform the House if any changes are contemplated in the use of the RITE number, especially as regards the irrigation districts?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, members will probably recall that in the early part of 1981 the government announced an improvement to the regional information telephone enquiry system — that's the first time I've ever got that right — which extended the system to the citizens of that 14 per cent of the province who were not then able to get onto the system, and also extended the system to community volunteer non-profit organizations. It is my understanding that the irrigation districts try very hard not to fit into that definition.

MR. THOMPSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In my constituency the only real complaint with the use of the RITE number is the overload factor. Is the minister aware of this problem and, if so, is he prepared to alleviate it?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, we had a number of complaints about overloading prior to the improvements done about the time of the January 1981 announcement. Since that time I think most of the overload or related problems have been handled. The best advice I have right now is that the system is working without too much congestion.

I can relate that we have undertaken to review the whole matter within 15 to 18 months. If the overload is not too great, we would probably seriously consider extending the opportunity to use what is a very popular system to other organizations such as the irrigation districts. I'm sorry I can't give that commitment right now that we will extend it to them, but certainly it is under active consideration.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Zenith number directed only at 427 numbers, or at all government services?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that under advisement and get back to the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Natural Gas Tax

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Has the minister had any recent discussion with officials of the Federation of Gas Co-ops with regard to the federal excise tax on natural gas?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I meet with the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops on a regular basis. That was one of the issues discussed at our most recent meeting.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any reports of the gas co-ops experiencing difficulties with collecting the federal tax on natural gas and having to forward it to Ottawa within the 30-day period?

MR. SHABEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Because of the billing procedure, the time lapse between the consumption of natural gas and the actual billing, and the requirement of the federal excise people for the payment of that tax, the rural gas utilities have indicated that they are having difficulty in collecting the tax. Representations have been made by the federation to federal officials on this matter.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have the minister or any official from his department met with any federal officials with regard to the problem gas co-ops are facing with the 30-day period?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, matters related to energy and discussions related to all aspects of the national energy proposals, are being dealt with by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Then a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the minister made any representation to Ottawa with regard to the difficulties our gas co-ops are experiencing with the 30-day period they have to collect the gas tax and forward it on to Ottawa?

MR. LEITCH: Not specifically, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Could the minister advise whether the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops had any success when they went on a mission to meet with the federal government in this regard?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Alberta rural consumers, a number of directors of the federation did travel to Ottawa to object to the imposition of the excise tax. Of course we in this Assembly share that concern with the imposition of this tax. I haven't seen any evidence of any change in the national energy program as a result of their representations.

Trappers' Compensation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. It flows from concern with respect to the trappers' compensation board. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly why it's necessary for a trapper to fill out the statement in a statement of claim that "should this claim be false . . . the Trapper Compensation Board will assess the cost of this inspection to me"? Mr. Speaker, I ask this in view of the fact that even Revenue Canada doesn't demand that kind of information. Why so stringent?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the trappers' compensation board was structured this past fall and is composed of three members: a chairman, a representative from indus-

try, and a representative from the trappers' association. In the statement of claims the trapper puts forward, he outlines the damages he feels have occurred because of resource development. From the past performance of the trapper and the amount of revenue he has obtained within the period of three years prior to the damage occurring, they determine the amount of compensation which would be payable.

In regard to the specific proposal, we do have people out in the field working with these people who are putting in these claims, to make sure the claims are justified. The people we have out there are not only going to be looking at the damage claims, but also be aware of the way the trapline is being maintained and the amount of fur being harvested.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly we all want the claims to be justified, but my question very directly to the hon. minister is: why force the trapper, for many of whom English isn't their first language, to sign an affidavit which in effect is more stringent than many legal requirements, including that of Revenue Canada? Will that not in fact act as an impediment to submitting justifiable claims to the trappers' compensation board? On what basis did the government conclude that this kind of statement was necessary and that all costs of the investigation, which could be very substantial, would be attributed to the trapper?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, we do have people in the field assisting these people to submit their claims. The fact of the matter is that this is public money that is being dispensed. We feel that the criteria we've established can easily be met by the trappers seeking compensation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Bearing in mind the minister's answer, why is the government only making available three positions for inspectors at this stage, in view of the widespread concern among hundreds of trappers in this province? Almost without exception, they've expressed concern that three inspectors aren't nearly adequate. If we're going to have them helping to fill out claims . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. NOTLEY: Just a minute. My question is: why are not more inspectors being scheduled to be appointed? [interjections] Just calm down. The question is there. Why only three inspectors?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you recognize that not all trappers will be submitting claims. The three people we have appointed are stationed regionally throughout the province, and we feel they'll be able to handle all the claims which will be forthcoming.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm glad that the minister is so confident. Trappers are not.

My question to the minister: is the decision to proceed with the advertising for three positions a result of the unanimous position of the trappers' compensation board, or is it in fact a government position? Has concern been expressed to the minister by trappers that three positions are in fact totally inadequate?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge we've had no correspondence where the trappers have said that three weren't sufficient.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, then. The present compensation deals with property only, as opposed to loss of income. Why does the government not include loss of income in terms of the trappers' compensation Act, considering that some trappers face the loss of many thousands of dollars? Why only loss of property, as opposed to loss of income?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we do take into consideration the amount of money received from trapping in the two previous years when the compensation is applied for, so that is a factor taken into consideration.

MR. NOTLEY: Just so there's no misunderstanding, the minister is saying that in addition to loss of property there will be full compensation of loss of income? Along with that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I had suggested that the previous supplementary might be the last one. I realize that hon. members occasionally stretch the situation a bit, but when it gets stretched into two or three questions rolled into one, I think that's going too far.

Family Day Home Program

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It arises from a letter I have from a constituent, a copy to the minister, asking questions of the minister with regard to the administration of the day home program. I would like the minister to advise the House if the program is run by the city of Calgary or by the province, or is an integral part of a PSS program. Could the minister please advise?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the family day home program is one which some municipalities have accepted as part of their preventive social services responsibilities. Other municipalities are still examining the various options open to them.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be — at least in the mind of the mayor; perhaps the communication between the mayor and the minister isn't as good as it might be. I'm wondering if the policy decisions of the province have been transferred to the mayor so he knows what our objectives are in this particular program. Has the minister been meeting with or consulted the mayor?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there's any misunderstanding between Mayor Klein of the city of Calgary and me. Yesterday morning I did receive a telex from him with regard to some concerns as to the import of a question asked in this Assembly last week. I followed that telex by phoning the mayor at about noon and suggested to him that, with the information which will be made available following the Treasurer's Budget Address this evening, I'm confident the officials of the city and the province will adequately be able to address the issues outstanding. I further suggested to the mayor that if for

any reason our officials are not able to come to an agreement, on Saturday the 25th of this month there be a meeting of the mayor, members of city council, and Calgary MLAs who are able to attend.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether he has received any representations from day home organizers to the effect that the province handle the administration of both the day home program as well as the day care program, to try to streamline administration? Is the minister prepared to give consideration to such a proposal?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, that matter was very carefully considered by the Provincial Day Care Advisory Committee. The recommendation was made and implemented by this government that day care is in fact preschool care and that care provided for youngsters who are school age should be handled in a different way.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly appreciate the complexities, because a number of the after-school programs are operated through day care centres. One reason we want to ensure that there are the fullest meetings in terms of information between officials from the various municipalities and the department, is to ensure that there is a very smooth transition and that children who require care, and in many cases can best receive that care through day care centres as well as other facilities, continue to do so.

Telephone Directories

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Associate Minister of Telephones. I wonder if the minister could inform the Assembly of the reasoning behind the decision by Alberta Government Telephones to rearrange the areas to be included in some of the rural telephone directories.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, several changes were made in the last year with regard to the directories. One of them was with respect to a problem that existed between Edmonton Telephones and AGT, so some of the surrounding communities do have their own separate directories.

However, I believe the question the hon. member is referring to is with respect to directories that apply further out. Some changes have been made, but I would have to take it as notice as to why those changes took place.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Associate Minister of Telephones. It's with regard to the Edmonton directory where the black pages, you might say, for Stony Plain and other localities outside Edmonton are included in the back of the book, but the Edmonton telephone book that comes out to the rural part of the province hasn't got those listings. I wonder if the minister can clarify or find out for the Assembly why that has taken place.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, in the areas immediately around Edmonton, AGT is providing its own directory — white pages, right now, and also yellow pages. Certainly those communities are included in the black pages of the Edmonton directory. But as the hon. member has pointed out, they are not included in some of the directories that have gone out to that area. We're checking out the reasons for that.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise if he has received any concerns relating to not having an adequate number of yellow pages from the Edmonton directory being made available for people who are using the telephone directories within the entire region.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there were some concerns immediately after the directories came out some time ago, but since then I haven't received any complaints or phone calls with regard to that.

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Programs

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, who is the chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. I'm sure he will be very anxious to answer the question. I wonder if the hon. member would indicate to the House whether any new policies or programs regarding education in alcohol and drug abuse have been developed recently, regarding the commission.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that today is budget day, and I think there is invaluable information available after the budget speech tonight. I would be somewhat reluctant to comment on the specifics, lest I disclose information that really would not be applicable until we debate it here in the Assembly.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, then. I wouldn't want him to expose anything that's going to be discussed tonight.

Mr. Speaker, have public relations regarding alcohol and drug abuse been extended to schools in a significant way in recent times?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very important question. I'd like to comment from this point of view: in my opinion as chairman of the commission, there has been a reawakening throughout Alberta in terms of the community responsibilities dealing with problems such as alcohol and drug abuse.

I'm impressed with the co-operation we've had from school authorities. The programs evident in our schools are carried out on a regional basis throughout the province, not in concert with the Department of Education or its minister, indeed not even in concert with the school boards, but with the principals of schools who have undertaken, it seems as a personal commitment in educating youngsters in this province, a commitment to education being more than academics, indeed being some life style orientation.

So although there will be more as a result of the budget speech to be announced shortly and the appropriation passed by the House, I'd have to say that it's very encouraging to see the sense of commitment by school teachers and administrators in the province of Alberta to a very, very important matter.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member would further clarify that particular point. He indicated in concert with this and that, but is it in concert with the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission with the educational system?

MR. GOGO: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought the fact that I was on my feet indicated that I was responding

from the point of view of acting as chairman of that commission. Indeed it is through the initiatives of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission that these programs are taking place.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's nice to hear. I wonder if the hon. member would answer the final supplementary. Is the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission considering phasing out therapeutic facilities such as Henwood, then deploying to active hospitals such patients who would ordinarily use such facilities? Or is the commission considering not building such facilities in the future and just leaving those that are in existence?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in terms of definitions, although the medical community tends to view most people who have a problem of that nature as patients, we term them clients.

The Henwood facility is indeed really the flagship in terms of treatment facilities in Alberta for alcohol and drug abuse. There was no intent at all with regard to reducing either the budget or the level of facilities provided for inpatient or outpatient treatment for those with the illness of alcoholism in the province of Alberta. So in substance, I'd have to respond that indeed we're looking at and seriously addressing what expansion is necessary in the future in terms of the treatment of alcohol and drug abuse problems.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Minister of Transportation revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, last Friday I made a fairly lengthy introduction of some young people from special areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KROEGER: Today I will give a very short introduction of some adults from special areas. But since you're being so agreeable, maybe I'll cross you up. I just want to put you on the alert that while there are only about 15 of them, compared to the group they're facing, any time the odds are 15 to 1 against them, they're even. In the visitors' gallery are members of the Special Areas Board. Would you please stand and receive the welcome of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with other business, I'd like to rise on a point of privilege. I'm sorry I haven't been able to give you the one hour's notice. This information was just brought to my attention. It's my understanding that members of the press have been given copies of the budget for their perusal without the normal lockup.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you, sir, to find out who authorized that and on what basis it was authorized. I would remind you of the debate that took place in the House of Commons recently — February 26, 1981, to be

exact — when members of the Conservative opposition in the House of Commons quite properly raised a point of privilege concerning the press obtaining copies of the budget without . . . At that point there was a lockup, but there'd been a leak. As a result of the leak, the opposition raised the matter as a point of privilege. It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there was no formal lockup. Keeping in mind the traditions of our parliamentary system, which clearly indicate that the budget is to be kept completely confidential until such time as it is read to all the members of the Assembly or whatever the parliament may be, I would say that in the absence of a clearly defined lockup, there is in fact a question of privilege which members of this House must consider.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the absence of a lockup opens the opportunity, or the possibility at least, of information which is not going to be formally released until 8 o'clock tonight being made available, and the whole purpose of keeping this information confidential until it's read, so people can't make financial transactions on the basis of information on the budget, is defeated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon the government to indicate on what basis this was done, why it was done, and if in fact it was done, as I'm given to understand it has happened, what precedent the government can cite to justify this particular action. I raise that bearing in mind that a number of precedents indicate that pre-release of this information leads to automatic resignation. The most important case was Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Labour government of Great Britain in 1947, who accidentally, just in an off-hand way, walking out of the House of Commons, made information available to the press, which was reported. That particular gentleman had to resign.

I'm not suggesting today that we have that serious a breach of privilege, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, that if this government is going to take the Legislature seriously at all, any information given to the press can only be done strictly in accordance with a lockup. I might just conclude my question of privilege by recalling that when the Premier made his speech last fall, there was a lockup regarding the press at that time. I think that was appropriate at the time; it would seem to me equally appropriate today.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm interested that the hon. member raised that issue today and chose to use the happenings in the House of Commons in February in respect of the tabling of the estimates as a precedent to some extent, at least for the purposes of argument. That of course was not in respect of the presentation of the budget, because in the House of Commons the budget and the estimates are normally not provided at the same time. In fact the budget was presented in October, the estimates in February. That was in accordance with a standing order of the House of Commons requiring that they be presented to the House by March 1 each year.

I would say, though, Mr. Speaker, that as to matters of precedent, there are more important considerations. It's often been noted here that the traditions and precedents that really apply are those of this Assembly; that the traditions and precedents of other parliaments are of assistance and can certainly be turned to and looked at, but the important one is the one established here. The tradition in the Assembly here is that a procedure to which the members of the press gallery agree should be followed each year, and it is the same tradition. It is recorded as a

resolution of the members of the press gallery, and by tradition has not required that they be locked in until the time the budget is presented; that they have the information presented to them and make certain undertakings in regard to that. I'm pleased to provide additional copies to hon. members, if given a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The result is that in the tradition of this Assembly the arrangement is that in accordance with a meeting of the press gallery executive committee on February 1978, still in effect now, a number of conditions are set out: first, that only paid up members of the gallery are permitted to attend the budget briefing and that in order to receive an advance copy of the budget and estimates, a member must attend the news conference. No copies are distributed later in the day, until after the speech has been concluded.

These documents are distributed ... on an honorary and confidential basis and are embargoed with no discussion with anyone prior to the ... speech at 8:00 p.m.

Then there are some conditions relating to tapings.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point raised is always a valuable one. To have the opportunity to discuss what the proper acts of the members of the Assembly may be is always useful, but to try to intrude into a well-established practice in the province some references to what may have occurred in another parliament is of no assistance in dealing with the question of privilege raised by the hon. member today.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond briefly to the minister's response. I would say to the members of the House that we simply cannot ignore the practice of other parliamentary institutions. A very clear precedent was set in the Mother of Parliaments. That precedent is that the budget must not be released until it is formally read in the British House of Commons, because of the possible financial implications to the jurisdiction of pre-release of the budget. During the discussion in the House of Commons over the estimates, the same argument was made. I might point out that the argument was made most persuasively by Mr. Sinclair Stevens, the hon. Member for York-Peel, who observed quite properly that this kind of information, if made available in a properly constituted lockup, protects the public. On the other hand, if there is a breach of that, in my judgment the public interest is not properly protected.

Frankly, this is the first time in my years in the Legislature that I am advised there has been this kind of agreement with the Press Gallery. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that as a practice I don't think it is acceptable in this House. If there is going to be pre-release of the information, I have no quarrel with that as long as there is a properly constituted lockup. But I don't think we can simply say that we're going to leave it up to the honor of individual members of the press to decide whether or not this long-standing precedent, that dates back scores of years in our parliamentary system, is going to be lived up to the letter.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, while I'm unaware of the specifics of the actions over the last three years, I think the long-standing tradition in our parliamentary system is clear: if there is going to be pre-release of information to the press, it must be done, as it has been in other jurisdictions, in a properly constituted lockup.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of privilege, I'd like to make two points. I was not aware

of the agreed regulations, but I'd like to raise the point with regard to who is held responsible when information may get out to someone in the financial world or to someone inadvertently or intentionally. Is the Provincial Treasurer held responsible when that information does leak, or is the press person, if identified, held responsible? Is there something in those regulations that looks after that concern? That's my one question.

The second is with regard to the effect on the financial community. I think today may be an unusual situation, or a typical situation where we could have some difficulties, in that it is Tuesday of the week. At the present time, the stock market is open. If certain information is in the budget that would affect that market, it certainly could be to the gain of an individual or a group of individuals. That is of much concern. Historically, I had always been under the impression, but have not been directly involved in releasing budgetary presentations to the press, that the information was to be confidential. I recall that one of the reasons we had our budgets released on Friday night was so we didn't affect the stock market in any way. That is of great concern to me if it does happen. Hopefully, the honor system holds true, but it doesn't necessarily have to.

I would make the other point, Mr. Speaker, that there may be these loopholes. As legislators and persons responsible in this province, we should set up a committee or refer the matter to a committee for review.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition has perhaps raised an issue which has not occurred and is not relevant, and that is the suggestion or the implication of a leak. I know of no suggested or implied leak. I hope he was not trying to suggest that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure members of the Legislature that I was not making any accusation. I was raising the possibility that it could happen. Hopefully, it never does.

MR. HYNDMAN: Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that it's my view that certainly it's been the tradition of this Assembly for many years, if not many decades, to follow the procedure which has been followed. I suggest that that procedure is a very valid one. The budget of this province is a complex document, incorporating the estimates and large amounts of money. It is because the government feels that the media generally can be trusted with the information, for a number of hours, that the information is made available to them on a preliminary basis; in this case, early this morning. There's a great deal of information to review and assess. There is an opportunity for them to meet with me and ask questions, which has occurred. But it seems to me that's a useful exercise for the media.

If the members of the opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview feel that's not appropriate, we could perhaps reassess, for a future year, whether or not there should be advance release. We're prepared to trust the media. We feel the hon. members opposite should be prepared to do the same.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I rather resent that last inference by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Certainly. Cheap shot, Lou.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My remarks in no way made any inference about not trusting the press. I think that was a little unfair, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There's obviously only one thing the Chair can say at this point, and that is that I'll give the matter the most careful consideration possible and report back to the Assembly as soon as that has happened.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions 1, 10, 11, and 12, and motions for returns 113 to 119 inclusive stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

202. Moved by Mr. Little:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government of Alberta to consider the establishment of a task force to study the need for human tissue for therapeutic purposes, medical education, and scientific research, and to recommend appropriate ways of meeting any such need.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity this afternoon to speak to Motion 202. There are three main purposes or objectives in introducing this motion: one is to make members of the Legislature, and the public, more aware of the organ transplant program, and to this end, each member of the Legislature has been handed one of these pamphlets; secondly, to encourage the donation of human organs; and three, to alleviate the anxiety and suffering of those many, many persons in this province who are waiting for a transplant.

At this point I think it might be useful to review briefly the history of transplants in the world. Believe it or not, the first human transplant was in 1667 in France, when lamb's blood was transmitted to a human; in 1818 the first blood transfusions in England, person to person. In the late 1800s, blood, skin, and bone homotransplants were common in a clinical atmosphere. The very first human organ transplant in the world took place in Boston in 1951. That, Mr. Speaker, was a kidney transplant. Seven years later, that was followed by the first transplant in Canada, which was also the first transplant in the British Commonwealth of Nations. That took place in Montreal in 1957 and involved the transferral of one kidney to an identical twin, which eliminated the need for tissue matching.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

However, Mr. Speaker, the transplant that brought the attention of the whole world and actually brought us up to the age of the transplant was performed by Dr. Christian Barnard in South Africa, in 1967. That is a date I would like to see recorded in our history, members of the Assembly. On that date, December 2, 1967, Dr. Christian Barnard removed the heart from a young accident victim and transplanted it into the body of Louis Washkansky, an aged and critically ill grocer in South Africa. Unfortunately, Washkansky lived only 18 days. But that in no way takes away the skill and dedication of the

doctors who performed that operation.

Dr. Barnard in company with 20 other expert surgeons performed the operation. It was totally successful. Washkansky died from pneumonia brought on by lowering of the immunity mechanism of the body. Once again, science triumphed in that we gained further knowledge of immunology and further knowledge of open-heart surgery, to which I believe some members of this Assembly can attest.

I think it would also be of benefit to review the legislation this province enacted through the years to not only recognize but support, by both legislation and financially, human organ transplants. In 1967 The Human Tissue Act provided that any person 18 or over in his or her last illness could allow lawful removal of organs by the medical profession by signing a document in front of two witnesses, both of whom were adults. The Human Tissue [Gift] Act in 1973 replaced the above Act. It made the same provisions, except the age of 21 was replaced by the age of majority as were the possible witnesses to the signature. The Act extended also to inter vivos donations — that is, while living — as well as post-mortem donations.

A most important piece of legislation brought into the House by, I believe, the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods was The Fatality Inquiries Act of 1976, which supplemented the above Act by allowing any unidentified body to be donated to a university on request or demand of that university and allowed for removal of the pituitary gland from all deceased.

Currently in Alberta a number of agencies are active in the procurement and distribution of organs: the CNIB; the Kidney Foundation of Canada; the Human Parts Bank of Canada, under the direction of Mrs. Mae Cox of Edmonton; and the human organ procurement exchange program to educate medical staff and the public about the need for organ donations. Both these programs are supported by a substantial annual grant from the government of Alberta. The two young ladies in charge of these programs are Miss Janice Mann for Calgary and Miss Pauline McCormick for Edmonton.

Last year the government approved a proposal for a \$10 million blood transfusion service building to be located at the University of Alberta. It is hoped this can be expanded into a comprehensive tissue bank storing bones, joints, corneas, skin, blood, and cells. Mr. Speaker, the most important of all the legislation was in 1977 when the Department of the Solicitor General began attaching an organ donor card to the Alberta driver's licence. We will speak to that at more length in a moment.

The order of use or preference for the various organs are, first, corneas. More cornea operations are completed in this province than any other type of transplant. This is partly due to the fact that the cornea is inert; that is, it can be stored and used at a later date. However, cornea donations are not nearly answering the demand.

Second in order are kidneys. From the first transplant in Boston in 1951 and the second in Montreal in 1958, there have been 20,000 successful kidney transplants. Indeed the medical staff at the Foothills hospital tell me it's almost routine now and more successful than many other operations. Approximately 2,000 persons in the country are on renal dialysis at any particular time. It is estimated that 1,500 of these are good candidates for transplants. However, approximately 800 Canadians each year are added to the list; that is, 800 Canadians suffer kidney failure and must spend the rest of their lives attached to a

dialysis machine or be candidates for kidney transplant. This is where our real problem lies, Mr. Speaker. Only 304 kidney transplants were performed in the country last year — 1,500 candidates, then another 800 added to this list each year. So unless we get more donations, the programs cannot possibly survive.

A few minutes ago I mentioned The Fatality Inquiries Act of Alberta, which allows medical men to remove the pituitary gland. This also is a very, very important area. One in 100,000 people will suffer from dwarfism as a result of a lack of secretion from this particular gland. But it takes up to 100,000 glands per year to satisfy the present need, and presently we are getting less than half of that. Other tissues: skin, bone — and to allay the rotten rumor I've heard from time to time that some persons have accused me of having a selfish motive in bringing in this legislation, I would like to transmit to all members that I am not looking for a scalp. [laughter]

I mentioned, that a short time ago I visited the renal unit at the Foothills hospital. There are no words I can use — no words you can read, no pictures you can see — to impress this Legislature nearly as much as a visit to that unit. Reporting constantly to that ward are 37 persons who must be attached to the machine every week for four hours to purify their blood, another four hours of recuperation. Most of them could be relieved from this desperate prognosis if they had a kidney transplant. I talked with a number of persons who were on dialysis. I also talked to a young man, 32 years of age, supporting a wife and family, who had both kidneys removed the previous day. They were diseased because of an occupation. At 32 years of age this man is faced with dependence on a machine unless he can get a kidney.

One thing I would like to make clear is that a transplant involves only one kidney. A good donor supplies two and can look after two persons, providing a tissue match can be made. However, with 20,000 successful transplants since that original one, the outlook is very, very positive. Dr. John Klassen, who guided me around that unit, said their success rate at the present time is well over 90 per cent. It isn't a last resort. There are patients who received a kidney that didn't work out; that is, it was rejected. They can go through surgery again and receive another kidney.

There was also a young boy, 16 years of age, who had a kidney transplant. I didn't meet the boy, but Dr. Klassen showed me the letter from him. He said: Dr. Klassen, for the first time in my life I can run, I can play, I can use roller skates; I can't thank you enough for what you've done for me. The team there can do a great deal more if they have enough organs to supply the need.

A few moments ago I indicated the large numbers in Canada who require kidney transplants. I haven't got up-to-date statistics on Alberta, but this is what took place in the transplant program in Calgary and Edmonton last year. At the Foothills hospital, 22 kidneys were removed, eight were transplanted, and 14 were sent to various hospitals around the country. In Edmonton, 36 kidneys were removed from 18 donors, 17 transplanted, 14 sent to various other hospitals, and five were not used for a variety of reasons.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I've given you an historic background; a history of the legislation, which is most encouraging. So what's the problem? The problem is that not enough donations are being harvested — you'll find that an odd word, but that's the term they use in the renal unit. There aren't enough organs being harvested to look after the demand. I would suggest that the stated pur-

poses of the Bill, to make the public more aware . . . In fact in one of the Scandinavian countries you have to sign out; if you don't sign a document that you want out, it's taken for granted you are in the donation program. We've got to make the public more aware.

We must take a look at the driver's licence donor card. Once again, the Department of the Solicitor General does not maintain records, so we can't determine how many donations were a direct result of the driver's licence. But I can tell you that in other jurisdictions where statistics have been carefully recorded, it just hasn't worked. It hasn't worked for several reasons. First of all, no central registry indicates that the person has agreed to donate his organs after death. Most times in the case of a fatal or near fatal accident, be it an industrial or a car accident, the first people on the scene, the police, take possession of the valuables for safekeeping. Not infrequently days go by before it is determined that the deceased, or the cadaver, is an organ donor. We also find that in spite of that little document that goes with the driver's licence, most hospitals will not accept it. Most hospitals and most medical men, who are afraid of the legal implications, insist upon clearance from the nearest relatives before they will accept the body as a donor body. These are the problems we have to overcome.

My motion indicates that I would like to see a task force appointed to study all aspects of the problem. But I do have a couple of suggestions. If we could have this information recorded in a central registry on computer with 24-hour access, not only to indicate that the person is a donor but to indicate the witnesses, the nearest kin, this problem could be looked after very, very quickly, because organs do not last. In fact the most successful kidney transplants are taken directly from a person who is, as they say, brain dead. That is not a derogatory expression. The body is healthy, but for all practical purposes the person is dead. That can be easily determined.

AN HON. MEMBER: A Sacred.

MR. LITTLE: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that what we have done this afternoon will make the public and the members more aware. I trust that every one of them will fill out this little form before they leave this afternoon.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, with a piece of prose that was found on the bedside table of a Calgary lady a year ago, hours after she died. It was found on the bedside table of Patricia Jane Finn, the wife of Frank Finn, the president of the Calgary Stampeders; a very fine lady. I had met her on more than one occasion. This prose is not original, but it does indicate the thinking of Patricia-Finn. With your permission, I would like to read it to you.

The day will come when my body will lie on a white sheet neatly tucked under four corners of a mattress located in a hospital busily occupied with the living and the dying.

At a certain moment a doctor will determine that my brain has ceased to function and that, for all intents and purposes, my life has stopped.

When that happens, do not attempt to instil artificial life into my body by the use of a machine and don't call this my deathbed.

Let it be called the Bed of Life, and let my body be taken from it to help others lead fuller [and better] lives.

Give my sight to the man who has never seen a sunrise, a baby's face, or love in the eyes of a woman.

Give my heart to a person whose own heart has caused nothing but endless days of pain

Give my blood to the teenager who was pulled from the wreckage of his car, so that he might live to see his grandchildren play.

Give my kidneys to one who depends on a machine to exist.

Take my bones, every muscle, every fibre and nerve in my body and find a way to make a crippled child walk.

Explore every corner of my brain.

Take my cells, if necessary, and let them grow so that some day, a speechless boy will shout at the crack of a bat and a deaf girl will hear the sound of rain against her window.

Burn what is left of me and scatter the ashes to the winds to help the flowers grow.

If you must bury something, let it be my faults, my weaknesses and all prejudices against my fellow man.

If, by chance, you wish to remember me, do it with a kind deed or word to someone who needs you. If you do all I have asked, I will live forever.

If Patricia Finn were here today, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure she could make the appeal much more eloquently than I.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has made a very eloquent introduction of his motion. I'm surprised at what a good medical historian he is. I have three policemen in my background; I understand that's his background, and I don't know as much about policing as he knows about medicine.

It's a very suitable motion this year. After all, this is the International Year of Disabled Persons, as declared by the United Nations. Because of that, the subject of disabilities and handicaps is going to be on most people's minds at various times during the year. Earlier in the throne speech debate, I said that one must make a differentiation between disability and handicap. Not all disabled people are handicapped. On the other hand, many people are handicapped and their causative disability is not always very obvious. A perfect example of that is the person who has serious kidney disease and has to spend time at a dialysis unit, sometimes twice a week, in order to continue to live. I'll get back to that subject later on.

There are three aspects to this motion, Mr. Speaker: therapeutic purposes, medical education, and scientific research. I'm going to apply most of my remarks this afternoon — I suppose naturally, being a doctor — to the therapeutic purposes of the motion and the study of human tissue.

The medical aspects of taking human tissue from people who are dying or recently dead apply to very many organs in our body. The classic one, and the one that has gone on most successfully and of course in the largest numbers, is the cornea on the eye. To put that in perspective, it only applies to a certain number of blind people, those who are blind because the front window of their eye is diseased to the extent that it cannot let light through or cannot allow light through in a suitable way for the rest of the eye to function.

Unfortunately corneal transplant does not give sight back to a diabetic who has lost his eyesight because of disease of the retina, to people who have had massive hemorrhage into the eye, or to people who have disease of the optic nerve that carries the message back to the brain. But there is still a significant number of blind people whose sight can be restored to a very useful level by the transplantation of the cornea from someone else. I checked just today, and currently in Edmonton 140 blind people whose sight could be restored to a functional level are waiting for corneas from others. With the current rate of supply of corneas in Edmonton, that means a two to three year wait. In the meantime, by the time we run through that list, at least another 140 people will be waiting. In other words, we have a roll-over system, and they are never getting closer to the end of the problem. That's only the cornea.

For a blind person not being able to see, he can still function in many ways and can travel with other people's help. He can do everything except see and take part in sports that require sight. Even then, on the ski hill you will sometimes see blind people skiing with the assistance of others.

I'd now like to address the other very successful program, the kidney transplantation program. Here we're dealing with a very different problem. The cornea is relatively inert tissue, and you can take a cornea from anyone and transplant it to another person. It has no blood supply. There is no difficulty with tissue typing. There is no problem with rejection of the tissue in the ordinary, accepted meaning of that word. With the kidney we are now talking about transplanting a whole organ with a very large blood supply and with all the tissue typing difficulties that people understand when it's applied to blood matching. Tissue matching is even more difficult, because there are more problems with incompatibilities due to the various types of tissue and the antigens that can be produced.

The result of this is that when a kidney is obtained, it may not be possible to use it in the location where it has been obtained. For that reason the human organ transplant exchange system, which works across the breadth of Canada, was developed. Kidneys obtained in Edmonton may be used at the Dalhousie Centre in Nova Scotia; kidneys from Quebec might be used in Vancouver.

That may sound like it's very easy to get a kidney, but it isn't. Again I'll just give the Edmonton figures. At the moment approximately 60 people in Edmonton are on constant dialysis once or twice every week because they do not have a kidney of their own that functions any longer because of disease. The only alternative for them while they wait for a kidney — and that wait may be five years or more — is to go once or twice a week to one of the dialysis centres in this province and spend time on a dialysis machine where their own blood goes through the machine. The by-products of our bodily systems normally excreted by the kidney are removed by the machine, and the person can then go back to a form of living for

another three to five days.

During the time they're on dialysis, people are not well. The day before they have the dialysis they usually feel very tired. They have a lack of activity because of that fatigue, and they are prone to many other infections and diseases during that time. Also of course, unlike the blind person I was talking about, they have very marked restrictions on their mobility. They can make arrangements to have dialysis in Edmonton and then take a train, car, or plane to Vancouver for a week, but they have to make arrangements to have dialysis continued while they're in Vancouver. Of course most of the dialysis programs are functioning at the limit, and it may not be possible to arrange dialysis in another location.

I mentioned the tissue antigen typing problem that exists with kidneys because they are whole organs. That problem came to most people's knowledge at the time of the first heart transplant performed in South Africa, which the hon. Member for Calgary McCall mentioned. The problem of tissue typing is that even when it is done with the accuracy that is possibly available at this time, there is still some incompatibility on every occasion unless the donor is an identical twin. The incompatibility may be very slight and may not require constant drug therapy, but it usually does require some therapy with drugs that affects the immunity of the recipient to infection and, in some cases, cancer.

So the recipient does have some difficulty. But compared to the person on dialysis, the person functioning with somebody else's kidney, with the aid of immuno-suppression — as the young gentlemen mentioned by the hon. member — is able to live in an almost normal fashion. Many of these people are young adults, or indeed teen-agers who have suffered from diseases of the kidney in childhood. The procurement of kidneys for these people restores them to probably 80 or 90 per cent of the normal function available to those age groups. It gives them a normal life they can enjoy. They can travel, and as long as they keep under immuno-suppressive therapy, there is a very high success ratio with implanted kidneys. The more recently the kidney is obtained to the transplant time of course increases the effectiveness of the transplant and the duration of its function.

Currently in good centres the success ratio in transplanted kidneys is in excess of 90 per cent. This means that for those 10 per cent in whom it fails there is also the possibility of a further transplant, hopefully with a better tissue match and longer success. But second tissue transplants in the case of kidneys puts those people on the waiting list I just mentioned, 60 in the case of Edmonton.

In relation to rejection and the tissue typing problem, when the first transplants were done in non-identical twins, the drugs used at that time were toxic of themselves. Their effects on the other immune mechanisms were serious and, apart from that, their side effects were also serious. With the passage of time there has been a gradual improvement and evolution in immuno-suppression, so that the rejection mechanism by the recipient of a kidney or a heart can be controlled with a minimum of side effects and a minimum effect on their other immunities. Recently there has been investigation of a new drug produced by the Sandoz Corporation in Switzerland, a drug called Cyclosporin A. That drug would appear to be a considerable improvement in both effectiveness and safety as regards side effects. In Canada there is currently a 12-centre study, called a randomized double-blind study, of its effectiveness. That study is being carried out in centres in Edmonton and Calgary,

these being two of the 12 in Canada.

If Cyclosporin A turns out to be a genuine and successful improvement, it will be very effective in the case of kidneys and in the case of bone marrow transplants. Bone marrow transplants are not quite as simple as blood transfusions. They are required by people who have to have certain drug therapy and total body irradiation for leukemia and other diseases of the bone marrow. Although easy in theory and sometimes successful in practice, the bone marrow transplant program has given us considerable problems.

I'd now like to mention yet a different use of human tissue, the use of the pituitary mentioned by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. Corneas, kidneys, and bone marrow have to be obtained under very sterile conditions, and relatively soon after death. Because of the requirement for blood circulation through the kidney at all times, the kidney has to be taken almost immediately after death or, in the case of the brain-damage highway accident, in the process of dying. We can take the pituitary under less sterile conditions, and for a considerable length of time after death, and extract from it the growth hormone that is required for that small percentage of people — and even amongst those who are dwarfs, who have decreased growth, only a certain number of them suffer from pituitary dwarfism. We can take the pituitary, extract the growth hormone and, if we have enough, we can give those children normal growth, so that to all intents and purposes they will be normal human beings in stature.

At the moment, because of the restriction on availability of the growth hormone, we are looking at standards where for boys we cut off the growth hormone when they get to approximately 5 feet 2 in height. Don't ask me to put that into the current metric system; I refuse. We have to cut them off because we don't have enough growth hormone. We take girls to a height of 5 feet 4. That's mainly so their pelvises will grow large enough so that if in the future they decide to have babies they will be able to have them. That may be a sexist approach. If that's the case, then for once it's the male who comes off short. We have increased the supply of pituitaries by the availability through The Fatality Inquiries Act from people who come under the medical examiner system. But most of the shortfall that exists will have to be made up from other pituitaries. Those will have to be pituitaries voluntarily donated by people, either the person prior to their death or their relatives.

In the case of this particular problem there is the possibility, through recombinant DNA research — what is called recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA as people prefer to call it for obvious reasons — of producing the human growth hormone in adequate quantities to get rid of this particular problem. Indeed the preparation is available just now on a research basis to see if it will work without producing side effects. Of course it's difficult with that kind of research to be absolutely sure that the synthetic product is exactly the same as the human growth hormone.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall mentioned the most spectacular transplants that have been done to date, and that is in the entity of heart transplants. As he mentioned, they were first done some 13 years ago in South Africa, based on work that was done at the Stanford medical centre by Dr. Shumway. In actual fact, Christiaan Barnard was a pupil of Dr. Shumway. He learned the technique at Stanford doing operations on chimpanzees, and happened to be the first person success-

ful in using that technique on human beings. After the initial flurry of excitement — and you may remember Dr. Cooley in Texas who was transplanting sometimes five hearts a week with remarkable lack of success because he did not have the immunologist required. It's a team approach that's required. After that initial flurry of excitement and failures, most people thought that cardiac transplantation had come to a stop. It has not. It has continued with Dr. Shumway at Stanford in a very successful manner. At that particular location they have acquired considerable expertise in controlling the rejection of that very large and functioning organ. It's still going on at Stanford and, interestingly enough, Dr. Shumway is still using his original surgical technique. But again, the immuno-suppression has been considerably improved. He is currently using Cyclosporin A as an experimental immuno-suppressive.

I've talked at some length about the different organs that can be used and are being used successfully. Some other organs have been considered and used on occasion. Liver transplant has been tried and has been temporarily successful. Lung transplants have been tried, so far with a marked lack of success unfortunately. There have been other more exotic uses of organs: middle ear and larynx. But I think even the ones I have mentioned of cornea, kidney, pituitary, and heart have shown a marked benefit to the living that can be obtained from the body of the dead.

From the original identical twin concept to the current tissue typing and immuno-suppression, the advances that have happened are only the beginning of what will probably be a long trail for human beings. One thing that makes us different from other animals is that we are never satisfied with the status quo and always want to improve, if that is the right word. We always want to try something different and advance. Essentially the problem at the moment is one of recruitment of donors, either the persons themselves or the relatives of somebody who is dying or recently dead; of identifying the potential donor and obtaining the organ and, in some cases, transporting the organ, which indeed might be from Vancouver to Halifax.

The problem of transportation of, say, a kidney has resulted in the development of transport boxes. Flying kidneys around in jet fighters, courtesy of the Canadian Forces and the U.S. Air Force, is now an accepted practice of medicine. Those boxes can also be used for transporting kidneys from a major hospital — such as there will be at Fort McMurray, where there is not a transplant team — to Edmonton or Winnipeg. That itself would increase the availability of organs for transplant. In the case of corneas, they could be obtained in much smaller hospitals than the Fort McMurray hospital, and could be transferred successfully to centres such as Edmonton where corneal transplant is available. That problem has been solved. The problem really is one of recruitment and identification.

The motion brought forward by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall to urge the government of Alberta to establish a task force, or at least consider the establishment of such a task force, hopefully would address those two remaining problems. It could be very important to any of us, but at the moment it is very important to a group of people who could function with much greater success in life, and who could enjoy life much more than they are currently able to do. For that reason, I would recommend the motion to the members and urge their acceptance of it.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise and speak positively with respect to Motion No. 202, as proposed by my colleague for Calgary McCall. I'd like to commend him for the manner in which he presented his argument and the sensitivity he showed with respect to the issue, in particular the very sensitive manner in which he read the concluding remarks.

With respect to the two speakers who spoke before me in the debate, I find also that considerable information has been given. I really regard the debate — thus far, at any rate — as being most informative and, as a matter of fact, indicating a very high level of expertise and sensitivity with respect to the discussion.

I can't help but comment with respect to some of the comments made by the Member for Calgary McCall when he mentioned the early transfusion of lion's blood. It was a rather esoteric reference, and I wonder what happened after the lion's blood had been given to the patient.

With respect to the issue before us in the Assembly at the moment, I know there is considerable interest throughout the province in this area. I also realize a considerable portion of that interest is to be manifested at the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary in particular. So the comments I place before the Assembly today have been gleaned in some measure from Dr. Marvin Fritzler, who is involved in research at the University of Calgary. His area of research and expertise is with respect to lupus erythematosus.

I understand that if a tissue bank is created, obviously it brings into existence the kind of storage facilities required. That in itself needs a fair amount of research, not simply on the matter of the costing component but the whole matter of the location and type of facilities required. Obviously, if we're going to deal in the area of tissue banks, their locations, and the whole creation of the facility, no matter what specific tissue or organ will be handled in those facilities, what is needed is sophisticated personnel. We're talking about a very limited resource not only in Canada but in the world. We're talking of sophisticated personnel, persons of international renown.

In effect the motion before the Assembly today is one that requires some comity arrangements with other jurisdictions. For example, we may also be involved in terms of continental policy with regard to certain areas of tissue collection or expertise in terms of the personnel required to do the transplants. It is my understanding, with respect to operations and transplants involving the liver, for example, there is one specialist in North America at the moment, and that person is located in Pittsburgh.

With respect to bone marrow transplants, the facility in operation at the moment is located in Seattle, Washington. Fairly recently, no less a facility as the one in Denver was considering establishing a bank with respect to bone marrow. They discovered that in fact it was still better to continue to co-operate with the present facility in operation in Seattle. That Seattle facility does serve the north-west United States and western Canada at the moment.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

One of the items mentioned was cartilage. Again it's my understanding that the techniques for this are not that well established at the moment. Presently some work is being undertaken, but in terms of North America the location for this research is Boston, Massachusetts.

The examples cited with respect to kidney transplants are of great interest to numbers of us in the Assembly.

Some of us have known persons who require kidney dialysis. There is the possibility that with respect to some of my own family this may well be lurking on the horizon. It's my understanding that with regard to kidney transplants this facility has now been computerized and, as mentioned by Dr. Reid, the transport of kidneys from place to place has been greatly facilitated by the whole operation being computerized. Therefore we are in a continental framework, not simply a national framework, of moving the donor kidney, in terms of matching, anywhere within North America.

With respect to the use of transplants, obviously the cornea example is quite familiar to most Albertans. One of the members of my family should have a cornea transplant, but because of the nature of the disease the body immediately starts to reject. For me this is another item that comes fairly close to home. By the same token, many of us should really be carrying in our wallets those little cards whereby we are able to donate and especially able to give the very special gift of sight, which is obviously of tremendous importance and a gift we'll keep on giving.

The other example that is very familiar and was exemplified within the walls of the Legislature a week ago is the whole matter of giving blood. I know that last week in the building, together with staff and members of the Legislature, something in excess of 65 pints of blood was given with respect to this kind of giving gift.

The previous speakers mentioned that a pamphlet is published by both the Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health and the Solicitor General whereby a donor card is presented. That pamphlet is readily available. Hopefully, because of the debate here in the Assembly this afternoon, other members of this Assembly, together with a considerable number of other residents in the province, will take advantage of the donor cards and not only obtain them but fill them out and carry them around with them. I know that a number of members of the Assembly such as me have a donor card in their wallets. Hopefully those cards will be acted upon, especially if our bodies are in shape to be used after the moment of death. [interjection] I realize hon. members are complaining about the shape of my body. Perhaps they might take a look in the mirror with respect to their own.

Nevertheless there is that aspect which is embraced within the whole motion this afternoon: that we should also think in terms of donating our bodies to the university, whether it be the University of Alberta or the University of Calgary, so medical research can be furthered and medical students of the generation after Dr. Anderson, Dr. Reid, or Dr. Paproski are able to be even better physicians when they come into the field of medical practice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is entirely appropriate that this motion is before the Assembly this week. If I might make a comment for a moment that relates to the religious background of a tremendous number of Albertans, this week is Holy Week within the Christian year. This week we remind ourselves of the image presented to us by the life style of Jesus the Christ, in the sense that here was a person who was prepared to live his life for others. One of the elements of his life style was that one should live for others. So I believe that in this Holy Week, when he himself went to his death on behalf of other persons, it is entirely appropriate that Motion 202 is before the Assembly. We might think in terms of living our lives for others even beyond the moment of death; that there is

that capability for us to give the gift of sight, as previously mentioned; that we can give other portions of our bodies so that in a sense we might live on in the lives of others; but more importantly, whether it be from a humanitarian or a Christian point of view, that we really are prepared to give to other persons and able to give of that most precious gift of ours, our bodily organs and tissue.

So I entirely support the intent of Motion 202, Mr. Speaker. It seems fairly obvious that there is indeed a need to establish a task force within one of the government departments, a task force that would be widely representative of a number of disciplines, so that one might examine the moral issues as well as the physical and fiscal issues. In all likelihood, given the level of expertise at the moment, a five- to 10-year lead time is required to establish some of these facilities. So I speak in favor of the motion, hopefully so that further work might be accomplished with respect to sorting out the logistics, the expertise, the cost elements, and the siting of such facilities.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. Member for Calgary McCall for bringing Motion 202 to this Assembly. I suppose what I'm about to say may be gross in the modern definition. Nevertheless I must say it. We all assume there is no pain after death. At least I haven't heard anybody complain about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: I should rise on a point of personal privilege.

MR. KUSHNER: Excuse me. I just received a note from an hon. member, asking if I'd donate my nose. But they couldn't find anybody 8 feet tall to accept it. Seeing that that's the case, Mr. Speaker, I think I'll get back to Motion 202, if you don't mind.

Upon death, in a religious sense I suppose, the soul leaves the body. What's left? In my case, I guess not much. But in other instances, Mr. Speaker, to some blind person, to someone on a kidney machine, someone who's deaf, a person with serious heart, liver, or arthritic problems — and this goes on — to those people and the medical and scientific professions, that corpse is as valuable as life itself, because in some cases that corpse could in fact save a life.

As a government, we have a responsibility to the people of this province with regard to Motion 202 which is twofold: first, to those Albertans totally unaware of the fact that they have the ability, after their deaths, to assist another individual in living a full life, by providing a healthy organ for that individual. Our responsibility there, Mr. Speaker, is to make people aware that by their generosity they are able to assist other human beings. Our second responsibility is to the people requiring the donations. The shortages of various organs is, to say the least, not optimistic for anyone requiring a transplant. Some of those people are suffering terrible agonies because of non-functioning or malfunctioning parts of their bodies.

In a lot of cases the expenses incurred as a result of medication and treatments are horrendous. Take the example of someone with a kidney disorder. The cost to that patient to go in for kidney dialysis could be as high as \$22,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, \$22,000 is more than a lot of us Albertans take home after a year's work. And these costs recur. The irony is that the actual kidney donated is more valuable than any dollar value beyond our wildest dreams, but the cost of a kidney transplant is

a mere \$8,000, as opposed to \$22,000 year after year after year.

I also understand that 36 per cent of the eligible population of Canada have no intention of donating any portion of their bodies, no matter what. Fair enough. It's their body, and they have the right to make that decision. But what about the other 64 per cent? Where are they? I think the only way we'll ever know is to set in motion this task force that the hon. Member for Calgary McCall is recommending to this Assembly and capture that 64 per cent of the population.

In 1980 we had 155 people waiting for various types of transplants. If 64 per cent or even 50 per cent of the eligible people in this province had been made aware of what a valuable contribution they would be making to their fellow man, I really don't think we would have the serious shortage of organs we are experiencing today. The saying that money can't buy everything has never meant so much, when referring to human tissue donors. Sure, this government could build excellent facilities throughout this whole province, but what good would that do without the vital organs required? We already have very excellent facilities located in Calgary and Edmonton. But I also said that last year 155 people were awaiting transplants. We have to rectify this very serious situation as quickly as possible.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I urge hon. members to please support Motion 202. Thank you.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, in considering Motion 202:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government of Alberta to consider the establishment of a task force to study the need for human tissue for therapeutic purposes, medical education, and scientific research, and to recommend appropriate ways of meeting any such need.

Mr. Speaker, although according to my blood donor card I am A-negative, I am, like the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, positive on this motion. In standing in my place to speak to the motion, I must admit that I am somewhat intimidated by the ease with which my colleague for Edson and my learned colleague for Calgary Millican managed a diversity of medical terminology, when it took me some time to pronounce pituitary gland properly in sponsoring The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act, 1979, which I must admit first made me aware of the very great need for awareness of organ transplants, the encouragement of donors, and of course alleviating the anxiety and suffering of those people waiting for transplants, as the moving Member for Calgary McCall referred to. Certainly the history outlined by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall and the hon. Member for Edson shows what a quantum jump there has been in technology and the gains and progress in the process of human tissue transplants.

In my sponsorship of The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act of 1979, I was made aware of the fact that not only is there a need for pituitary glands to provide a growth hormone; there's a need for this particular extract in order for research to go on to have the effect in the few short years of being able to provide a lesser amount of extract to achieve the same ends through measured doses. Although it is certainly a gift of normal growth that is received, this extract has to be taken by injection. Any improvements in providing oral dosages, et cetera, would provide a further step.

The history of legislation in our province, starting with the 1967 Human Tissue Act and improvements in 1973,

followed by the first Fatality Inquiries Act in 1976, which led the way to facilitating what was amended in 1979 through The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act, shows there is considerable progress within the province in the area the motion is addressing.

In my involvement in legislation with respect to the pituitary gland, I also found that the organ donor work done by volunteers, such as Mrs. Mae Cox of the Human Parts Bank of Canada here in Edmonton, shows there is a growing level of awareness among our citizenry that will facilitate the encouragement of donors and meet the very great need that exists in our community.

I was impressed by hon. members speaking before me with respect to the level of success that is now enjoyed with kidney transplants. It would appear to me to be almost routine, and certainly public awareness of the success of this and of corneal transplants is becoming broader. I was somewhat distressed to learn from the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary McCall of the problems with respect to a central registry for donors and the cross-typing, the technical problems outlined so well by the Member for Edson. On that point, it would seem to me — I almost feel like my body is now on loan. I have a blood donor card, a driver's licence that has me providing any needed organs, tissues, or parts — after death, I note. The important point I want to make is that the Human Parts Bank of Canada provided an organ donor sticker. I think the problem the hon. Member for Calgary McCall referred to with respect to the knowledge of people being donors is overcome, at least in the case of people entering hospitals. Have you ever tried to get into hospital without your Alberta Hospitals and Medical Care insurance plan card? I think this little sticker would go a long way to solving the problem. Perhaps that's one of the things a task force could look at. I realize the problem with respect to cadavers would be more difficult, but I feel that is a matter that could be appropriately placed before the task force to study.

With respect to the question of awareness, and to encourage donors, the prose of Patricia Jane Finn of Calgary with respect to her Bed of Life leads me to observe that it's a shame not more of the press gallery were here to share that. Unfortunately attendance in the gallery sometimes has a proportionate effect on the purpose that was to be achieved here. I certainly hope some members of the gallery will take that thoughtful and moving prose, and with permission — that has already been granted, I assume — it will be more widely available.

I was also impressed with the description of the hon. Member for Edson of the window of the eye, the cornea. I'm sure that sort of description, in understandable terms, will help the level of awareness. I was also very much impressed by the numbers he presented. He said 140 people in Edmonton suffer or are in line for a two- to three-year wait to receive a cornea and, therefore, the gift of sight. In more direct terms, Mr. Speaker, that would be a 12- to 18-month wait for sight for about the number of members sitting in this Assembly. Putting it in terms of 60 people in Edmonton suffering a five-year wait for kidneys, if we were all suffering from kidney deficiency we would be faced with more than a five-year wait to receive the required attention. Those sorts of numbers have to bring it home, I think.

Not only the numbers in the remarks of the hon. Member for Edson impressed me, but the fact that even with the impressive gains we have made in medical research and procedure, a great deal of problems and tribu-

lation are associated with such things as being on kidney dialysis which, without thinking about it, or perhaps without knowledge of the problem, one tends to assume is a routine and easy thing.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in supporting the motion — not only supporting the intent of a task force, which I think would address some of these problems of awareness of the need and registration of donors — is to also perhaps address the idea of putting more information on the Red Cross blood donor card. They have computerized registries already, and I suppose with the appropriate legislative permission and support it may be possible to address some of the advance typing problems the hon. Member for Edson outlined to us. Those are embodied within the motion, and I support them.

In rising I also had the purpose of trying to speak to the second purpose the hon. Member for Calgary McCall outlined, and that's to encourage donors to make the commitment to pass on a gift of life to others. I guess I feel I'm investing in the blood bank when I donate blood, but I would say that it feels good to feel that you may be able to contribute to the needs of others in such a vital area. This motivation in our, if you will, more enlightened times could be enhanced by the fact that, as outlined in the pamphlet presented by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall — produced, by the way, by the Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health and the Solicitor General — the traumatic times of death, funeral services, and burial are not in any way compromised by the giving of tissue. That sort of awareness perhaps will encourage more people to consider more positively the idea of donating parts of their body after death.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the motion has been well presented, in the sense that there is a need for awareness, a need to encourage donors, and a very real need to alleviate the suffering of people who could ... There's a both way winning in effect. The hon. Member for Edmonton Glen-garry would appreciate the conserve-our-society element of this, recycling and the opportunity for others to gain after one has enjoyed the full life of the body.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge all hon. members to seriously consider support of the motion, which would set up a task force to study the need for human tissue for therapeutic purposes, medical education, and scientific research, which I think would go forward in helping enhance the commitment this government made to medical research in the province.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the opportunity to take part briefly in the debate this afternoon. I would like to compliment the hon. member for bringing the issue before the Legislature. I basically support all comments made this afternoon. I will try to give the government the benefit of some of my constructive criticism at the end of my speech. The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, Mr. Little, focussed very clearly for us that there certainly is a need and a need for education of the public on some of the problems we have. I do not wish to rethrash old straw and won't touch on some of the information given to us this afternoon.

I want to indicate to the members some background on some of the advances we have made and review the present legislation we have. The Human Tissue Gift Act of 1973 allowed the living and post-mortem transplants where the donor is given permission to use some of those. Then we had The Fatality Inquiries Act of 1976, which

allows an unidentified body to be donated to a university if a demand is made by the university and allows for removal of the pituitary gland if no objection by the deceased is known.

Mr. Speaker, in the present program, as was indicated, we have donor's cards. I would like to say at this time that I really think that program should be publicized. I don't know how you would publicize it any more than we have. When we look at the number of driver's licences in the province and the number of people who made a commitment for donations, I'm sure that program is not nearly as widely used as it could be. That is one area where I think we should look at an ongoing publicity program and indicate the need to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services and Community Health has taken some action in the area of the human organ procurement and exchange program. In 1979 we had two nurses posted to the program. The main purpose is to educate medical staff and the public about the need for organ donations. As the man on the moon said, that's a small step. But at least it is a step.

The blood transfusion service — I was quite appalled when we thought we may be regressing to the point where we have to pay people to donate blood, as they used to do many, many years ago; this will certainly be a retrogressive step. I hope the people of this province will continue, as they have in the past, to be voluntary blood donors. Mr. Speaker, I think it's just a small donation we can make to our fellow man, as indicated by the hon. member on the opposite side of the House when he said that we make this type of donation that means so much to the recipient but really takes very little effort on the part of the donor.

I'd also like to indicate to the Assembly that we have private groups doing some of the work. What I'm leading up to is that it's really time the government got off its backside and did more than just talk and debate in this Assembly, hon. Member for Calgary McCall. We have private groups now: the CNIB, with their eye bank; the Kidney Foundation of Canada; and the Human Parts Bank of Canada.

I think one area that wasn't touched on — or maybe it was — would be of information to hon. members. When we think of parts we basically think of the heart transplant, the kidney transplant, the corneal transplant, and the pituitary secretions, but many, many other parts are being used. Now we're even looking at joint transplants, middle ear transplants, larynx, eardrums, and the dura mater. We're also looking at experimental usage of muscles and nerves. The touching letter the hon. Member for Calgary McCall read really indicates to us that there is no limit in the amount of tissue we can use for transplants.

Mr. Speaker, one area of concern we as legislators will have to face in the future is the area of embryo transplants. We know this is being done in animals and commercially with high-grade and pedigreed cattle. The medical profession are now doing experimental transplants of human embryos. There is even a move that we may be quick freezing them and using them some years down the road as human implants. We can see there will be medical, legal, and moral problems. I hope no one is so backward as to suggest that we use sperm from members of elected assemblies and pass that on. I think that would be a retrogressive step. [interjections] I'm sure there are people who would like to preserve future generations more than elected people. But seriously, hon. members of the Assembly, it will become a moral issue

years down the road.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to bring to members' attention, especially government members, is: where has the government been all this time? Last fall we had an announcement of the \$10 million blood bank program. At that time, people involved in the spare parts or organ transplant business met the \$10 million report of the government with enthusiasm. Then the minister indicated, no, that's just for the blood program. So I'd like to say to hon. government members who are so enthusiastic about the program of looking at parts banks that, as well as making hearts and flowers speeches in the Assembly, they get to work in caucus and get the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care moving on the program. I say to the hon. member who moved the resolution that that's what we want; we don't need speeches. We need speeches of course, but we need action more.

Mr. Speaker, if this resolution doesn't receive any more enthusiasm than the resolution of 1974, passed by this Assembly, that we were going to look at setting up a province-wide ambulance service, many people in this province are going to be dead waiting for this program to take place. So I'm saying to the government that if this resolution is passed — and I hope it is passed — this government will take more expeditious movement than they did on the ambulance service. I say with all sincerity that this resolution should be passed. But after the resolution is passed, we want some government action and we want that action quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to a motion at this point in time reminds one a little bit of the bachelor who married the widow with 11 children. There's very little left to say and very little else left to be done. But because I think this is a very important subject, I want to enter the debate this afternoon.

First, I would like to commend the hon. Member for Calgary McCall for bringing forward this motion today. I also agree with the Member for Calgary Millican, who wondered about the outcome of the patient who received the transfusion of lion's blood. In his summary, at whatever point that comes, I hope he would have the outcome of that patient's experimental treatment. Just before speaking, I received a note from the Member for Edson that suggested that perhaps both he and the Member for Calgary McCall could arrange mutual transplants. I am wondering if the Member for Clover Bar would like to join that trio.

If I could comment briefly without overlapping too greatly on what's been said, I want to mention three different areas: first, the cost factors; secondly, the law; and thirdly, public education. I think the Member for Calgary Mountain View mentioned there are substantial savings. If we're looking at priorities, as the Member for Clover Bar has suggested we should be doing, I think that's probably true. In the long run we're going to have to look at types of spending priorities. This is one where a savings in dollars and cents can definitely take place, if we can find donors who are willing to give and a successful transplant takes place. As the Member for Calgary Mountain View demonstrated, there is a very significant saving in dollars and cents, in addition of course to the tremendous savings in personal and human suffering.

Obviously the second area of concern is the law. The law requires that surgeons must obtain either permission from the donor or consent from the next of kin before the organs are removed from the cadaver. A prime issue is

the question of definition of death. I think this was covered very well by the Member for Calgary McCall, who set out the definitions and the accepted times that organs can be removed. It's very obvious that there has to be protection for the person dying, ensuring that death has taken place, from anyone who perhaps at some inconceivable time would be more anxious to remove the organs for the recipient than wait until the proper time. But of course in Alberta this will not happen, because death must be pronounced in a hospital by at least two physicians who have no relationship with the transplantations.

Perhaps the one concern I have with the motion itself would relate to the wording. I wonder if the mover would consider a change to the use of "medical education". My concern in this area — unless I am not interpreting the wording correctly — would be that it's not the medical aspect we hope to educate, but the public; the 64 per cent who would agree that transplants and donating parts of their bodies are an acceptable part of their values. It's to this large group of people we would like to address concerns through the subject of this motion.

I guess the greatest challenge in public education is to try to convince people to make this decision — not at the time of bereavement or at a time when many difficult decisions have to be made relating to a death of one's next of kin, but to have this discussion take place within a family, when they can properly evaluate their own values and their feelings towards this subject. It's very important, in my mind, that this take place well in advance of any tragic situation. If families can give full consideration to this, I think it should be handled similarly to making a will or buying insurance. It's often too late to consider a will at the time of death, at the time when a person is no longer capable of signing his name, or whatever situation may arise. I believe this decision should be treated as the same type of consequential decision, that can have such great positive results, effects, and benefits for people suffering from the multitude of conditions and diseases that have been enunciated this afternoon.

Of course donations can be made at the time of death with very little disfigurement to the body. This should not be a concern to the family: that they would still not be able to go through the same type of last rites normally acceptable within their family.

I hope that in the passage of this motion a task force will consider a lot of different options that have been set out this afternoon. I think the central registry is an excellent idea, something that could provide information without having to have that card signed immediately. I know that perhaps there may be some problems with the confidential nature of it and ensuring that it is not mistreated, but I do believe it can be workable, and certainly it's an option I would like to see fully explored.

I'd like to congratulate the Member for Calgary Millican again for bringing forward his concern. I think he did it in a very caring way. I appreciate the deep amount of research he's done on this motion. I would like to assure him that he has my support with Motion 202.

Thank you.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to rise to speak today. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the Member for Calgary McCall for taking the initiative in presenting this very important motion. The motion calls for the establishment of a task force to study the need for human tissue for therapeutic purposes, medical

education, and medical and scientific research.

Mr. Speaker, it would be ungrateful of me not to rise in my place and speak today. I owe much to the person who dedicated and donated his body so that I could have an opportunity to enter med. school and use his body, so that I could learn my profession and treat and help others in the future. We owe much to those who have donated their bodies to medical research and to the institutions we have within our country. We owe much to the developments within medical science that have taken place.

I remember going into the anatomy lab the first morning — to have the cadaver opened that we might stand in front of it and treat the person with respect and dignity, to learn the profession I practise today. I also remember the first opportunity I had as a fourth-year medical student at the University hospital to participate in one of the kidney transplants by Dr. Lakey and Dr. McLeod. Since that time Dr. McLeod has left the university and gone to the Foothills hospital in Calgary to set up a very important kidney transplant unit in that area.

The Member for Clover Bar states, where has the government been? I think it's appropriate to consider this motion today in relation to the establishment of the Walter C. McKenzie Health Science Centre, which is going to make Edmonton one of the most important research centres in Canada. I think it's important to consider it on the basis of the Alberta heritage medical research trust fund, established to improve research through the province and the world and giving renewed hope to those suffering people throughout the country.

However, transplants and tissue banks present problems with moral and religious conflicts. We'll have to face those problems, as the Member for Clover Bar stated previously. However, as we say in our burial ceremonies, earth to earth and ashes to ashes and dust to dust, it really doesn't matter where our tissue goes. Because a person has had a disease and has lost a part or a member of his body, does that make him any less, and will our superior creator look on that person any differently than one of us who hasn't lost any part of our body? I believe the spirit will be reunited with the body and made perfect. We don't have to worry whether we've donated to somebody else. I believe that as citizens we need to do everything in our power to help ourselves live. First we must use the initiatives available in medical science to keep our bodies going, and then we depend on a superior force to give us life and death.

Prior to 1972 in the United States, committees used to decide who would be treated and who would not, giving the death penalty to some people and not to others because of the financial burdens that were in place. I'm proud to say that in Alberta finances are not the main priority in transplant situations. At the present time in Norway, legislation stipulates that the person has to sign a document to opt out of donating body parts rather than opting in. I think that creates problems within society, because somebody may have overlooked the signing and not have willingly wanted to have his body or a tissue given.

At the present time in Canada we have an opportunity for a signed donor card giving authorization for the donation. Even though that authorization is given, doctors still give the nearest relative the opportunity to refuse that and to live with the requests of the family. We have a universal donor card that takes up less than a quarter of the annual renewal form for our driver's licence. If we went around the Legislature and took a count, I wonder what percentage of that would be filled out.

Mr. Speaker, the human tissue donation is of major importance to our society. We have many tissues being donated, and that was elaborated on by many members within the Assembly today. Over the time of my practice, I've had the opportunity to see many conditions being treated with transplants. Middle ear disease and loss of hearing have been cured with the transplant of the middle ear bones into people who have had audiosclerosis. Eardrums have been used to create a new eardrum for people who have lost their eardrums through rampant otitis media infections.

Livers have been used to keep and give life to those people who have had chronic liver failure. Bone and cartilage, and now bone marrow, are being used to improve the quality of life of those people disabled by illness, injury, or tumor. Corneal transplants are being used to give renewed vision to those less fortunate than us. The pituitary gland extract has made it possible for those of us who do not have the capability to grow to be away from the problem of dwarfism and its effects, the cruelty in our school-age children, and later in adults, as we look at them as being different. Kidney transplants are being used to give new life and new initiative to people in society.

Blood is being used to extend the lives of those who have been involved in accidents. In some countries throughout the world, even cadaver blood is being used. We don't use it in Canada or the United States, but there are places that do. After the death occurs and the heart and the lungs stop functioning, the blood clots. But as it clots, the enzymes within the blood dissolve the congealed blood and it becomes liquid again. At that time they withdraw the blood from the body, purify the components, and use the components for other needy victims.

I'd like to reassure the Assembly that the removal of tissue is done with dignity and care. The transplant surgeon, as he is operating on the cadaver, does so with the same type of care and dignity as he does on a live patient. There is care to preserve the external appearance of the donor. If bone is removed, an artificial prosthesis is put in to preserve the appearance and substitute it. There is care to make sure there's no delay in the funeral arrangements for the relatives.

Mr. Speaker, transplantation gives some problems in trying to interpret death. With the new life support mechanisms available today which keep the heart and lungs pumping, it's often difficult to determine when a patient is dead. However mechanisms have been set up to ensure that the transplant tissue is brought from a truly deceased patient. In order to have authority to remove tissue, two physicians must sign a declaration that the patient is dead. Those physicians must not be associated in any way with the transplant team. There must not be any indication, that there was any expectation of that tissue being used prior to the death of the patient; in other words, a preconceived use of the tissue before the patient had died.

Mr. Speaker, there are many psychological and social problems associated with transplant tissue going to patients. Many patients have difficulty knowing the information. They actually deny that they are seriously ill and often refuse information about their condition and the need for transplantation. It's very important that the recipient have a proper attitude if the transplant is to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, the kidney is the blood's sewage treatment plant. It looks after the removal and concentration of blood chemical wastes in the urine. Chronic renal

failure, or the failure of the kidney, is treated in two ways: either through hemodialysis or through transplantation. Hemodialysis for the permanent renal failure case is expensive, and it's very restrictive to the patient. The patient must follow a strict diet. He's under a considerable time restraint, due to four or five hours per day on the machine approximately three times a week for the rest of his life. His capability of travelling is restricted by access to a machine, and there's a marked loss of independence because of the dependence on the machine. This often leads to social problems, with a high incidence of marriage break-up and family breakdown. However, some people do very well on dialysis and can live within the restrictions placed on them.

Mr. Speaker, transplantation is a treatment and not a cure. There's a high incidence of rejection. There are drugs available to counteract this at the present time, but they often complicate the whole picture. They reduce the body's natural resistance to disease and often present other unwanted side effects such as the puffy face, the moon face, or the buffalo hump from the cortisone and immuno-suppressants. They often produce cataracts and sometimes joint deterioration. However, the ones that are successful are very useful.

I had a patient who was on renal dialysis and was very restricted in what he could do. He waited for a number of years until finally he was able to get into the hospital and have his transplantation. There was a remarkable change in that individual's vitality, strength, and endurance. He lived a normal life for a number of years until he was again faced with the difficulties of dialysis because of rejection. However, I think the costs and the technology that went into providing him with a normal life and opportunities during that time were very worth while.

Mr. Speaker, we have been successful in Alberta with a transplant program that has been in effect since World War II. That field was in the corneal transplant, which involves the replacement of the outer shield of the eye. This is done by a very careful microsurgical technique, which replaces the damaged cornea and restores serviceable vision. However, there is a waiting list that is up to a two-year period. We have difficulty with not only waiting for the corneal transplants to be available, but waiting for hospital time and opportunity. This may be corrected by using some outpatient time and new facilities throughout the province.

Joint transplants are something new. They are preserving the knees of many patients. It's found that human tissue is much more endurable than the steel prosthetic joints we have available on the market.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that with better diagnosis of disease, better genetic matching, and much more finely tuned drugs being available on the market, the transplant field of medicine is only beginning and is becoming a more and more important aspect of our medical practice.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Motion 202, the first observation I would like to make is that I am constantly both surprised and literally amazed at the participation of members in this Assembly on behalf of the people they represent, not only for the empathy they have in their fellow Albertans but their very, very deep knowledge. As all of us know, the Member for Calgary McCall, who spent most of his life on the police force and has seen the terrible ravages of crime on the body, is sponsoring a motion that I think is so very important to all of us. We heard from the professionals, the Member for Edson

and the Member for St. Paul, with very detailed knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's been a very dramatic debate. I'm sure we all know of the very exciting aids to daily living program that this government's had for some years, and how much easier it has made it for ostomy patients or those on dialysis in Alberta. That doesn't mean to say that there's not much more to do. Indeed there is. I do think, though, that we as legislators must bear in mind that when we urge the government to create legislation that does various things, we remain very cognizant of the fact that there are those who insist — indeed I think it's a right — on having some control over their own bodies. I would just briefly mention the fact that we have those religious groups. I think Jehovah's Witnesses are one such group who have religious feelings about what should and should not happen. As long as they're not minor children, I think we must respect their wishes.

There's much I'd like to say with regard to this motion, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Calgary McCall, in reciting the prose from one Patricia Finn — I think it will give those of us who review it in *Hansard* great food for thought.

In view of the hour, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, all members are aware that we will reassemble this evening at 8 to hear the budget speech.

[The House adjourned at 5:27 p.m.]

[The House met at 8 p.m.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ended March 31, 1981, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1982, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of the 1981-82 estimates of expenditure.

I move that the messages of His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, the Estimates, and all matters connected therewith be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government.

head: **BUDGET ADDRESS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, in last year's Budget Address I offered a prediction:

An exciting 75 years ahead for Alberta is possible, provided our historic resource ownership rights are respected and provided we are fairly dealt with as an equal partner within Confederation.

Our historic ownership rights have not been respected by Ottawa. Instead of equal treatment, we have been subject to discriminatory federal taxation.

In last year's Budget Address, we spoke of the pride of Albertans in celebrating 75 years of remarkable achievement, and of our optimism in the decades ahead. Unfortunately, misguided Ottawa policies have shaken our steady pattern of growth and blurred that view of the future. Nevertheless we shall consolidate and stabilize the Alberta economy and move ahead with the pioneering resilience and rugged determination that carried this province through other difficult times.

In the Budget Address of a year ago, we emphasized building on strengths. With good prospects for agricultural processing, for the increased harvesting of our barely tapped forests, for more mining of our vast coal reserves, for tourism, for surging petrochemical development, and for pure and applied research, we can succeed by building on a diversified Alberta economy.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this milestone budget, in the 10th year since this government undertook the responsibilities of office, is not as optimistic as those since March 1972. However, the remarkable growth in jobs and economic performance of the past 10 years will provide the stability to enable us to weather the storm.

A unique success story unfolded over those 10 years. At the heart of the story is the hard work, creativity, and enterprise of individual Albertans. Their government has provided a known, predictable climate for investment, maintained by sound budgetary and fiscal policies.

There is an underlying strength in the Alberta economy today. Economic activity in Alberta has grown significantly in each and every year of the decade. The average annual rate of expansion in Alberta's real gross domestic product has been a remarkable 7.3 per cent, with high points in 1973 and 1979 of over 9 per cent. Alberta's economy today, in real terms, is almost twice the size it was in 1971. The primary driving force behind this growth has been new capital investment, which has increased on average at the phenomenal rate of over 23 per cent a year. Acquiring new private capital investment requires a climate of government stability and consistency, and an attitude which respects and encourages the risk investor.

The hard work of individual Albertans has been rewarded by a 200 per cent increase in per capita personal income. The average annual increase in per capita personal income since 1971 has been close to 14 per cent. After allowing for the doubling of consumer prices during the decade, annual per capita growth in income has averaged 4.5 per cent, an impressive figure. But even after that long period of sustained growth, Albertans are just now catching up to residents of Ontario and British

Columbia, who were well ahead for so many years.

Alberta's population has expanded by 450,000 since 1971, reaching 2 million in mid-1980. This rate of increase is the equivalent to the addition of a new city the size of Red Deer each year. Employment has surged at an even faster pace, passing the 1 million mark in 1980. Nearly 400,000 new jobs were created for long-time Albertans and newcomers in the '70s. To accommodate this growth, 310,000 new housing units were built, an average of more than 2,500 homes each month for 10 years.

That surging record of growth will be hard to match over the next 10 years. But despite setbacks from Ottawa, the deep-seated strengths that will make for continued prosperity in a stable economic climate are there. Albertans will rise to meet the challenge.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, I truly regret what I have to say about the national economy.

Largely as a result of missed opportunities, the Canadian economy has been weak and sluggish over the past year. Regretfully, Ottawa's economic policies have condemned too many Canadians to a dull, gray economic future. The realizing of Canada's potential could generate jobs and activity in every region of the country.

Canada is one of the few industrialized nations of the world which could have been self-sufficient in oil within the decade, but Ottawa energy policies have caused that significant opportunity to be lost. In spite of its great potential for international competitive advantage, Canada is now dependent for more than a quarter of its crude oil on supplies from politically unstable areas of the world, and that dependency is growing.

More than \$7 billion a year will flow out of Canada to pay for imported oil, and there will be a further loss in national output due to the multiplier effect. World leaders and a growing number of thoughtful Canadians are amazed to see a bizarre federal policy which forces Canadian taxpayers today to pay over \$45 a barrel for low-quality foreign oil while refusing to buy secure higher quality oil available from Alberta at approximately \$20 a barrel. The federal policy of "Buy Canadian" apparently applies to all commodities except Alberta oil.

In the face of an increasing number of objective studies showing that the Canadian economy can surge ahead if petroleum prices moved upwards at a reasonable pace, the federal energy policy sets the price that Albertans are to receive for their depleting crude oil reserves at less than half their fair value for the foreseeable future.

Canada's real economic growth has been sputtering since 1977. There was no real growth in the country in 1980. Nineteen eighty-one is expected to be another year of unrealized potential for most of Canada due to a blurred economic strategy; a low priority for research and development; an undirected foreign trade policy; a balance of payments deficit that is, on a per capita basis, one of the largest in the world, and interest rates too closely tied to those in the United States.

Unemployment remains high in many parts of the country. In the Atlantic provinces, the unemployment rate averaged 11 per cent in 1980. A rate of close to 10 per cent was registered in Quebec, and in Ontario the figure was almost 7 per cent. The strength in employment growth in western Canada is expected to weaken as a result of Ottawa's economic policies.

To protect a Canadian dollar made unnecessarily weak, in part by the federal government natural gas export

pricing policies, the Bank of Canada has caused a rise in interest rates in Canada. These higher interest rates will clearly dampen new investment and lead to lower economic growth in the future.

The Ottawa energy proposals have taken the edge off the economy of western Canada. The rainbow has faded. Slower growth in the west has a detrimental effect on the entire country. Fewer new jobs will be created everywhere. Contracts for businesses in central Canada to supply materials and engineering will not develop.

Investor confidence in Canada, a vitally important ingredient for economic success, has been seriously shaken by Ottawa's punitive resource tax regime and the clear trend towards federal control of the petroleum industry. The investment dollars, equipment, know-how, and entrepreneurship which are quickly leaving Canada will be very difficult to bring back. The dramatic cutbacks in planned 1981 exploration budgets, announced by company after company in response to substantially reduced cash flow and poor future returns, will impact especially hard on the smaller Canadian-owned drilling and oil well servicing companies.

Following a record high level of activity in 1980, oil and gas well drilling is expected to suffer a decline in 1981 of about 25 per cent, compared to plans made prior to the Ottawa energy proposals. In 1978, 5,500 wells were drilled in Alberta. In 1979, the figure reached 5,600, followed in 1980 by about 7,000 well completions. Before the Ottawa energy proposals were announced, it was anticipated that about 8,000 wells would have been drilled in Alberta during 1981. That figure is expected to be cut by one-quarter to about 6,000 wells, 1,000 below the number drilled last year.

As of October 28, 1980, there was a fleet of 600 drilling rigs located in Canada. By early April 1981, 114 of those rigs plus 49 service rigs had crossed the border. Another 75 drilling rigs and 58 service rigs are scheduled to move to the United States by the end of August this year.

ALBERTA ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

I turn now to the Alberta economic outlook, Mr. Speaker.

Prior to the Ottawa energy proposals, Alberta could look ahead to another year of exceptionally strong economic growth. Activity on virtually every front was proceeding at a fast pace. Although prospects in the conventional oil and gas industry are now dulled, the maturing Alberta economy has other strengths. In a positive climate for private enterprise, we can continue to grow and expand. There is justified confidence in the Alberta economy in 1981; there are opportunities for bold plans and successful investment.

The economic outlook in Alberta remains favorable when compared to the outlook in other parts of the country. Real growth in Alberta's gross domestic product in 1981 is forecast to be around 3 per cent, still one of the best in Canada and well above the predicted Canadian real growth rate.

Although investment activity in the conventional oil and gas industry is expected to decline, continued strength in other sectors of the economy likely will maintain the real level of investment at its current high level. New investment will continue to be the driving force behind Alberta's economic growth over the next several years.

The unemployment rate in Alberta is expected to rise somewhat to 4.3 per cent in 1981, still a relatively low

rate compared to expectations in other regions.

The growing demand for skilled labor in Alberta in recent years has meant plentiful job opportunities for Albertans and other Canadians. With growth in employment expected to slow to about 4 per cent in 1981, job opportunities will not be quite as favorable as they have been. It may be necessary to advise those intending to come to Alberta that employment prospects have been reduced and that jobs for unemployed Albertans will be a priority of this government.

The rate of inflation in Alberta, as measured by the increase in the consumer price index, has moved upwards over the past two years from 8.8 per cent in 1979 to 10.2 per cent in 1980. For 1981, price increases are not expected to moderate.

The outlook for agriculture in Alberta is encouraging. The majority of Alberta farmers enjoyed another good year in 1980, the third buoyant year in a row. Farm cash receipts increased by 8 per cent to just over \$3 billion in 1980, primarily because of stronger grain prices and improved grain marketing. Realized net farm income was almost \$0.66 billion in 1980.

With the exception of canola, farm cash receipts from crops were up dramatically in 1980: 24 per cent for barley, 45 per cent for wheat, and 60 per cent for oats. Other bright spots were rye and sugar beets. Increased North American hog supplies held down both hog and cattle prices during 1980. Dairy products did well in 1980, registering a 17 per cent increase in farm cash receipts over 1979. With an increase of 8 per cent in production and 10 per cent in price, receipts from eggs rose by over 18 per cent.

As farmers know, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is a difficult sector to forecast. In 1981, supplies of chicken, pork, and beef are expected to increase only slightly, which should lead to higher prices for the farmer. Prices for most grains are also anticipated to be higher. With the addition of 1,000 distinctive blue and gold heritage fund hopper cars, grain movement has improved. Farm cash receipts, therefore, are expected to rise to over \$3.5 billion in 1981, while expenses are estimated to be about \$2.8 billion. This implies a healthy increase in realized net farm income for 1981 and solid returns for the family farm.

The growing area of agricultural processing has great potential for 1981 and for the entire decade. As a key step in the diversification of Alberta, a food processing development centre to cost more than \$7 million is under way near Leduc. Funded by the capital projects division of the heritage fund, the centre will assist the industry to develop new products, improve and expand product lines, develop better packaging techniques, and apply new technology.

In 1981, major new coal developments are planned, following upon significant expansions in the past decade. Metallurgical export coal developments for 1981 include the new Gregg River mine and the expansion of the Cardinal River development. Construction of the Sheerness, Keephills, and Genesee coal-fired plants for provincial power generation is under way. A large, new thermal coal project near Hinton has been approved. Construction will commence this summer on a coal research facility in Devon, which will conduct research programs to expand the uses of coal, including coal liquefaction.

Forestry is another key element of Alberta's diversifying economic base. The pace of forestry development is accelerating. The first sawmill in the new Berland-Fox Creek project is scheduled to commence operations by the end of the year. Expanded heritage fund initiatives in forest management include major reforestation projects and the Pine Ridge Forest Nursery to produce seedlings. Initiatives regarding future commercial utilization of Alberta's sizable poplar resource will continue. Proposals for development of major forests in areas of the province not harvested previously will be considered.

Alberta's impressive gains in manufacturing and processing continued in 1980. Following an increase of 21 per cent in 1979, shipments increased by another 18 per cent in 1980. The areas showing most strength were primary metals industries, refining, and chemicals. In 1980, Alberta accounted for about 6.4 per cent of the nation's total manufacturing and processing shipments. Nineteen eighty-one growth is expected to continue at roughly the 1980 rate. The outlook is promising in Alberta, in part because of very low corporate taxes and the prospect of helpful new incentives under the Alberta business tax and tax incentives program.

One of the brightest spots in the continuing diversification of the Alberta economy is petrochemicals. Six major projects, with a total cost exceeding \$1 billion, are under way; and a dozen others, involving over \$5 billion of new investment over the next five years, are in the planning stages. These new developments are being located in Alberta because of our plentiful supplies of natural gas and favorable climate for investment. Much of the natural gas feedstock for these job-producing plants has been found over the past several years, one of the few success stories in Canada. The new jobs and other benefits to be derived from this industry are promising. Necessary government approvals are being accelerated to assist in sustaining Alberta's economic growth and diversification.

Construction is expected to be another area of major strength in 1981. After falling in 1980, housing starts are expected to pick up in 1981 to about 35,000 new units. Non-residential construction is anticipated to continue at record levels. In addition to the major petrochemical developments, stimulus is expected from the construction of the eastern leg of the Alaska pipeline prebuild, and the addition of more office, commercial, and warehouse space in major centres throughout the province.

FISCAL POLICY MEASURES

I'd now like to review fiscal policy measures, Mr. Speaker.

Especially since the Ottawa energy proposals of October 28, 1980, the government has been closely monitoring the prospects for the Alberta economy in 1981. Although a significant slowdown is anticipated in the conventional oil and natural gas industry, the resilient Alberta economy is expected to perform well in comparison to other regions in Canada. Strength and stability will come from agriculture, petrochemicals, construction, tourism, housing, forestry, coal, and other areas of emerging opportunity. As evidence of increasing diversification, those sectors will be able to take advantage of the availability of skilled labor released by the oil and gas industry downturn.

A pause has other advantages. Albertans will be able to regroup to meet new challenges. The breathing space will allow those economic sectors, so vital to Alberta's future, to develop further. A more measured pace of growth will also help to ease some of the social problems which have accompanied the accelerated growth of recent years. The government will also use this pause to consolidate and overcome the shortage of skilled personnel available for our public service.

After carefully reviewing the available information, the government has come to the conclusion that there is not now a need for stimulative fiscal policies of a general nature. Even with the oil and gas industry slowdown, the economy should expand sufficiently to increase employment by a healthy 4 per cent. This budget will provide mild stimulation to the economy, with a capital budget for roads, hospitals, schools, universities, and other public works which is roughly 20 per cent greater in terms of its economic impact than the amount invested last fiscal year. Together with private-sector investment plans started or ready to go this year, these capital projects should assist in sustaining a satisfactory level of economic activity in Alberta.

Accordingly, while most of the provincial capital projects reflect current and anticipated needs in program areas, there are some projects which will specifically help those regions which will be hardest hit by the federal energy policies. The special \$30 million program for construction this year of rural and local roads will employ small oil field contractors in municipal districts, counties, and improvement districts.

The capital budgets of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation and Alberta Housing Corporation together will provide financing for more than 20,000 new housing starts in the province, generating jobs and giving a major boost to the residential construction industry. Generous subsidy programs will be maintained to bridge the affordability gap for low- and middle-income Albertans.

The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation will again make available hundreds of millions of dollars at very favorable interest rates to finance a large part of municipal government capital expenditures. Municipal investment in transportation, assisted by the province in a major way, will provide a further boost to the economy in 1981.

The performance of the provincial economy, and especially the availability of job opportunities for Albertans, will continue to be monitored closely in the months ahead. Contingency plans will be further developed over the coming months, so that selective stimulative measures can be implemented quickly if the need develops.

BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE 1981-82

I'd now like to outline this government's budgetary expenditure plans for 1981-82.

The 1981-82 expenditure plan provides funding to enrich a wide variety of existing quality programs and to introduce selective new programs. Special emphasis has been placed on programs in the areas of social services, child care, senior citizens, housing, and health care. As well, the 1981-82 estimates sustain a high level of capital construction for hospitals, roads, schools, universities, colleges, mass transit, and other public works. The expenditure plan strikes a balance between the goals of providing first-rate services for Albertans today and building for continued economic prosperity and jobs in the future.

The rate of increase in operating expenditure is a key indicator of government budgetary policy. In 1981-82, operating expenditure will be 16.9 per cent over last year's revised budget, or 17.8 per cent over last year's comparable estimates. Roughly three-quarters of total expenditure is for the operating cost of ongoing programs for Albertans, mainly in health services, education at all levels, and a host of social services. Of the 17.8 per cent increase in this year's budget, 11.7 per cent or approximately \$500 million is to cover last year's negotiated wage and salary increases and the additional manpower resources in hospitals, health services, basic and advanced education, social services, and the public service.

Capital expenditure will increase by 48.2 per cent over the comparable 1980-81 estimates or 18.6 per cent over the revised plan. The capital budget provides the building blocks for social and economic progress, and is an investment for our future.

The budget translates into an expenditure in excess of \$3,100 for every Albertan. Total budgetary expenditure for 1981-82 is estimated to be \$6,703 million — \$6,656 million in voted appropriations and \$47 million in statutory appropriations — an increase of 16.3 per cent over the revised budget of last year or 22.5 per cent over the comparable 1980-81 estimates.

The government's policy has been to hold the average increase in the public service to the rate of growth in the province's population. Underlying this policy was the premise that the government's manpower requirements should be held at a level roughly equal to the growth of the labor force. With growth in the labor force averaging about 50 per cent higher than increases in the population over the past several years, an adjustment was necessary last year.

During 1980-81, 700 temporary positions, originally approved on an interim basis to deal with peak program periods, were converted to permanent status. They represented approximately 2.2 per cent of the public service. In responding to pressing needs in the social program field and a continuing high in-migration rate, there was no choice but to add 1,145 new positions. Adjusting to take account of these special circumstances, the growth in permanent positions for 1981-82 is 4 per cent over the comparable level last year, the same rate of increase as is expected for employment generally in Alberta.

Over the past five years, the number of permanent public service positions has grown at the same rate on average as the province's labor force. This illustrates that growth in the public service has been balanced in relation to the manpower available to the Alberta economy.

The government's 1981-82 operating budget provides top quality services for Albertans.

The 1981-82 operating budget allows for a 17.8 per cent increase over the comparable 1980-81 estimates or 16.9 per cent over the 1980-81 revised plan. This compares to just over a 17 per cent increase in the 1980-81 estimates over the actual expenditure in 1979-80.

One of the government's key budgetary policies has been to hold the growth in operating expenditure at or below the rate of expansion in the economy generally. This policy ensures that growth in the public sector does not come at the expense of the private sector.

Social services are a continuing priority, Mr. Speaker. Following major enrichments over the years to social

programs, the 1981-82 estimates for Alberta Social Services and Community Health reaffirm the government's priority in this important program area. This department's budget has been increased this year by close to 30 per cent over the comparable 1980-81 estimates. To complement the major funding increase, 1,145 new permanent positions have been approved.

Priority attention has been directed to child welfare services, reflected in a more than 55 per cent boost in funding and an increase of more than 300 new staff. There is a generous increase in the provincial funding of child welfare programs. The budget includes greater financial assistance to community residences which provide child care services under contract. For the foster parent program, training sessions will be improved and maintenance rates will be increased. Close to \$3 million is budgeted to provide compulsory care services for severely delinquent children.

Nineteen million dollars is budgeted to mount the new day care operating allowance program to improve staff/child ratios, expand space standards, and meet our commitment to shelter parents from the associated cost increases. Over 15,000 day care spaces are now available in the province of Alberta.

The budget includes \$19.7 million to enrich the new family and community support services program, up from approximately \$10 million in 1980-81.

Maximum benefits to senior citizens under the Alberta assured income plan will be increased from \$75 to \$85 per month, bringing the total cost of this program to almost \$65 million.

In this, the International Year of the Disabled, Alberta leads other provinces with several new and enriched programs. Provincial expenditure for the benefit of handicapped Albertans has increased very significantly over the years.

The aids to daily living program will reach 14,000 Albertans, providing \$7.7 million for wheel chairs, respiratory equipment, and other aids to those with chronic or long-term health disorders. Nine thousand three hundred handicapped individuals aged 18 to 65 will receive close to \$58 million in benefits under the assured income for the severely handicapped program. A staff increase of over 230 will improve the staff/patient ratio in a major way at the Michener Centre in Red Deer. An additional \$8.5 million is budgeted to expand the number of available spaces for vocational training of handicapped Albertans.

In the education field, there is an increase in expenditure of more than \$2 million for the sensory multihandicapped and for equipment and supplies for handicapped children; \$1.4 million is budgeted to further increase the number of special education teaching positions. The elementary and early childhood services programs contain a \$2.3 million increase in grants for the dependent handicapped. The limit for the learning disabilities fund for large school boards will be raised from \$135,000 to \$250,000.

Moving to the important area of housing, in April 1980 the government announced a package of housing initiatives designed to increase the supply of housing and its affordability. The package was successful in helping to hold down rents and housing prices. With demand for housing expected to remain strong, and given today's

high interest rates, the government will continue to actively encourage the construction of new housing and maintain imaginative programs to bridge the affordability gap.

The budget provides over \$17 million in direct subsidies to home-owners under the Alberta family home purchase program and over \$11 million in indirect subsidies to renters under the core housing incentive program.

The minimum benefit provided to senior citizen home-owners under the generous Alberta property tax reduction plan will increase by 50 per cent from \$400 to \$600 for 1981-82. This major expansion will materially assist senior citizens to remain in their homes. Total cost of benefits under this significant program will be \$9.1 million.

In 1981-82, residents of senior citizen self-contained housing units and community housing units will continue to benefit from an equitable policy which has rent payable equal to 25 per cent of income.

Widows and widowers aged 60 to 64 whose spouse would have been 65 years or older if still alive will now be eligible for grants under the pioneer repair program. The senior citizen renters assistance program and the senior citizen property owner tax rebate program will continue to be available to widows and widowers aged 60 to 64 whose spouse was eligible for those programs at death. These initiatives respond to many representations by senior citizens and their children.

A continuing high priority is to provide and expand a first-rate health care system for Albertans. Grants to active care and auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes will rise to over \$920 million this year, an increase of more than 25 per cent over last year's estimates. A major part of this increase is due to large salary increases negotiated last year. This year's budget provides funding for the operation of 10 new or expanded health care facilities coming on stream throughout the province. To improve diagnosis and treatment of patients, \$6.6 million has been allocated to purchase high-technology equipment. Service to patients will be improved by the installation of upgraded electronic data processing equipment at a cost of over \$5 million.

Physiotherapy services provided by private clinics will become an insured service under the Alberta health care insurance plan, and physiotherapy services will be provided to eight more rural hospitals.

Nursing home beds in Edmonton, Lacombe, and Brooks will be upgraded to auxiliary bed status with \$3.8 million in funding. Nursing homes throughout Alberta will receive over \$67 million in funding for 1981-82.

I'd now like to outline our commitment to basic and advanced education, Mr. Speaker. The \$870 million budget for primary education this year represents an increase of almost 18 per cent over last year's comparable estimates. Continuing emphasis has been placed on special education programs for the handicapped, greater fiscal equalization to provide fairer educational opportunity, program improvement, and evaluation of pupil learning. There will be new support for native children in urban areas, student exchanges, early childhood education, and second language program transportation.

Operating grants to universities, colleges, and technical institutions will rise by more than 18 per cent over last year's estimates to \$350 million.

There will be continued regional expansion in postsec-

ondary education and manpower training programs. Emphasis will be placed on meeting the skilled manpower needs of the province and providing community and personal service programs through additional funding for new courses. A more significant role in manpower training will be played by public colleges.

Direct financial aid to students will increase by \$6.6 million this year to over \$18 million. In addition, Albertans will be further encouraged to train as vocational teachers.

Assistance to municipalities: in 1981-82, Alberta municipalities will receive unconditional grants totalling \$78.9 million, a \$6.5 million increase over last year.

The municipal debenture interest rebate program will provide additional benefits of \$43 million in subsidized interest costs on eligible municipal borrowing, an increase which will more than double last year's benefits. As recently announced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the program will be continued at a rate of 11 per cent on eligible borrowing. The program will shield costs by about 3 per cent, given present market interest rates, thus saving property tax payers in Alberta millions of dollars over the years ahead.

Provincial support to municipalities for policing costs is increased by over \$5 million compared to the 1980-81 level of \$22.5 million. A further \$31.5 million has been budgeted to purchase the services of the RCMP.

Successful crime prevention programs like neighborhood watch, operation identification, and block parent will continue.

Funding this year for the court system will be over \$34 million, an increase of \$8.5 million including 100 new positions. The increases reflect the growing demands being placed on the courts.

The Alberta Gaming Commission will be in full operation this year. With the provision of \$457,000 and seven positions, volunteer, charitable, and religious organizations will be assisted by the equitable regulation of games of chance for fund raising.

As for our recreation and culture plans, funding for the operation of provincial parks will increase by over 24 per cent to \$28.4 million in 1981-82, to reflect higher patronage and new services and facilities resulting from recent capital development activities. Per capita assistance grants for the operation of local cultural and recreation facilities will triple.

Such popular Alberta Culture programs as library services and performing arts will receive increased funding. Work on the exciting Canadian encyclopedia project continues, and museum expansion moves ahead.

Albertans continue to benefit from natural gas price protection. Following a comprehensive review last year, the Alberta natural gas price protection plan was amended effective October 1, 1980. The new rebate plan reduces the price of natural gas for Alberta consumers to 65 per cent of the Alberta border price on a maximum annual consumption of 1 billion cubic feet per consumer. The plan was also enriched with the introduction of the remote area heating allowance. Consumers can now apply for rebates on propane and fuel oil used for home

heating in areas where natural gas is not available. Under the new, expanded plan, rebates are financed directly through a separate regulated fund.

Agriculture and agribusiness: in 1981, Albertans are realizing more than ever that our productive lands are a valuable renewable resource. As hardworking, productive businessmen, our farmers are among the most efficient in North America.

Loans to beginning farmers will be the most active area of lending by the Agricultural Development Corporation this year, with almost \$100 million expected to be loaned to young people starting an agricultural career.

Investments to upgrade grain handling and transportation will continue. Financing for the Prince Rupert grain terminal is expected to move ahead. The three inland grain terminals financed by the province will be upgraded and will play a major role in a more efficient delivery system.

Numerous irrigation and drainage programs will continue to assist farmers in many parts of the province. Progressive policies assist farmers and ranchers involved in livestock production.

A new program to assist farmers in acidic soil regions of the province will commence.

Grant assistance to international missions and livestock shows will increase by 32 per cent.

Support for agricultural service boards will go up by \$400,000 to a total of \$3.5 million in 1981-82.

The Alberta economy continues to expand through diversification. Building on our agricultural, forestry, petrochemical, coal, energy, and other strengths, the government acts as a catalyst to overcome our economic disadvantages and encourage the development of more dimensions to our economy:

- Processing and manufacturing industries are stimulated through heritage fund support to the Alberta Opportunity Company.
- The Alberta Research Council continues its Canadian leadership and is a focus for the brainpower industries developing here.
- Another tract of unharvested forest land may be offered for responsible development this year.
- A \$2 million increase in the trade and development programs will expand export markets for agricultural products, engineering services, and manufacturing.
- Support for our important tourism industry will increase.
- In co-operation with the private sector, a new entity to provide business assistance for native corporations has been established.
- The business incentive tax system, brought home to Alberta as of January 1, 1981, will be used to expand opportunities for smaller Alberta businesses.
- Consumer and corporate services will expand to meet the needs of our growing diversification.

Mr. Speaker, this government's capital budget will provide lasting projects for all Albertans.

Because of Alberta's rapid growth in recent years and prospects for continued growth in the future, the province's capital budget has increased fourfold since 1977-78.

Hospitals, roads, schools, universities, and other public works have been built to provide top-quality services to Albertans and to facilitate the province's economic boom.

The government has employed the capital budget successfully to take advantage of lulls between major private-sector projects, expediting public-sector projects so that demands for skilled labor, engineering expertise, and materials complement rather than conflict with the needs of the private sector.

The 1981-82 capital budget provides for total expenditure of \$1.6 billion, an increase of more than 48 per cent over last year's estimates or 18.6 per cent over the revised plan. Allowing for those capital estimates which have little direct economic impact — for example, utility corridor land purchases — the 1981-82 budget translates into an increase of roughly 20 per cent over the revised plan for last year. This year's capital budget will have a stimulative effect and a stabilizing influence on the provincial economy for 1981. It will help to offset the adverse economic impact of the Ottawa energy proposals.

Alberta's health care facilities continue to improve. A capital construction program of nearly \$1.5 billion to build new hospitals and expand and renovate existing hospitals is under way. In 1981-82, \$177.3 million has been budgeted, an increase of 40 per cent over last year's program.

Construction of new hospitals and major renovations are currently under way in 23 communities, including Grande Prairie, High River, Innisfail, and Medicine Hat. Construction will start this year in 29 centres, including Drayton Valley, Barrhead, Lac La Biche, Ponoka, and Lacombe. Planning will continue for another 31 projects, including new facilities in Bonnyville, Leduc, Cold Lake, and St. Albert. Planning and design continues for two major projects in Calgary and another two major projects in Edmonton.

In the housing area, the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation will continue to finance significant numbers of new housing starts in 1981-82. Under the Alberta family home purchase program, 8,000 homes will be built. Another 6,000 units will be financed under the core housing incentive program. The Alberta Housing Corporation will also construct 4,000 units, including 2,600 for senior citizens and more than 1,100 for low-income families. Together, these two Crown corporations will be involved in roughly one-half of the total housing starts expected in the province this year.

Through the revolving trunk servicing program, \$50 million will be committed to developers and municipalities this year to help keep down the cost of land for residential housing. The land banking and development budget for the Alberta Housing Corporation has nearly tripled to \$120 million for 1981-82 compared to expenditure last year, thus assisting in providing lower land costs for future Alberta home-owners.

The government's spending on capital projects at universities, colleges, and technical institutions will increase by over 41 per cent to exceed \$148 million this year. The total commitment to postsecondary education projects is in excess of \$250 million.

Funds will be provided for a major capital facility at the University of Alberta. A new program of student

housing at the University of Calgary will commence. Phase two of the capital building program at the University of Lethbridge will be completed, and a new theatre will be built at Red Deer College. The decentralization of trade and technology institutes will require \$41 million this year for the construction of new facilities.

The 1980s advanced education endowment fund sets aside \$80 million for grants to match private contributions over the next 10 years. The University of Calgary is the first major beneficiary of this program. In response to an \$8 million commitment from the Ralph Scurfield family and Nu-West Group Limited, the government will provide \$8 million in matching funds, enabling the university to construct a building to house its faculty of management.

School construction, renovation, and expansion throughout Alberta will continue at high levels this year. The provincially supported portion of the capital construction will exceed \$100 million. The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation will provide the financing for the construction program.

Alberta Environment will provide \$75 million this year for the very successful municipal water supply and sewage treatment assistance program. The original \$22 million budget last year was supplemented by more than \$46 million during 1980-81. The government's commitment to the northern supplementary fund will be expanded by \$3.5 million for water and sewer programs. Funding to encourage local governments to implement lasting solutions to water management problems, including control of flooding, erosion, and drainage, will be more than doubled to \$6 million. The province will raise its contribution toward the cost of these efforts from 50 per cent to 75 per cent.

This year will be the peak construction year for the \$113 million Dickson dam southwest of Red Deer. Expenditure will be over \$54 million in 1981-82. The dam is expected to be completed in time to regulate the 1983 spring run-off.

Under the solid waste management program, \$2.7 million will be provided in grants to municipalities, an increase of more than 50 per cent. A new phosphorus removal program, to make our rivers cleaner, is established this year with a budget of \$5 million.

To better meet the needs of all Albertans, the transportation budget is increased by 33.7 per cent over last year's comparable estimates, to over \$750 million.

This year a major thrust in the transportation field will be the improvement of primary highways in the province. The 1981-82 budget is increased by 36 per cent, or over \$50 million, to \$191.3 million.

The pavement rehabilitation program, which protects our investment in roads, will be increased by close to \$13 million in 1981-82 to bring the total funding level to \$34.8 million, a 58 per cent increase over last year.

The resource roads program will be increased by nearly 60 per cent to \$35.9 million next year. This additional expenditure recognizes the demand placed on rural roads by resource development.

The budget contains \$144 million to improve rural and local highways, an increase of over \$44 million or 44.5 per cent over the comparable estimates of last year. I have already referred to the special \$30 million program to employ small, local contractors in the construction of

rural and local highways. This program will specifically help to alleviate the adverse impact of the Ottawa energy proposals on small contractors who normally work on wellsites and other aspects of oil and natural gas development.

In 1981-82 the original six-year, \$0.75 billion urban transportation financial assistance program will provide over \$155 million in operating and capital support to Alberta's growing cities, an increase of 26 per cent over last year. With built-in annual increments and adjustments in funding every two years, the program is increased substantially this year. The level of support for the coming fiscal year is equal to about 81 per cent of the primary highway construction budget of the province. Over the life of this unique program, Calgary and Edmonton will receive a total of approximately \$580 million. With this initiative, Alberta leads the nation in terms of per capita support for urban transportation.

Reviewing resource management, to protect our valuable forest resources an additional \$4.8 million has been allotted to ensure greater success in suppressing forest fires at the initial stage.

The range improvement program will be more than doubled to \$3.6 million in 1981-82, for improvement projects on Crown lands used for agriculture.

The government will continue its support of programs to increase production from our vast reserves of oil sands and heavy oil and from conventional fields using enhanced recovery schemes. The government's commitment of nearly \$320 million over the next five years, through the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, is being matched by contributions from industry.

Highlighting our culture and recreation plans, the \$60 million Calgary centre for the performing arts, a joint project with the city of Calgary and its citizens, will get under way this year.

Work on the unique Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village, near Elk Island Park, will continue.

The dinosaur research institute will be located in Midland's provincial park near Drumheller. The \$25 million project, which will include a major museum displaying remains of dinosaurs and other prehistoric animals, will be constructed over the next three years, and will enhance the tourist and economic viability of the Drumheller area.

Development of a major new provincial park in the Whitney-Ross-Laurier lakes area, near Elk Point, will commence in 1981. Further development of the very popular Cypress Hills Provincial Park, near Elkwater, will continue this year. Construction of the parks workshop at Rimbey will begin this summer. Planning for new provincial parks near Drayton Valley and Edson will commence, and work at Cold Lake Provincial Park will be accelerated.

Estimates of expenditure for this year's public works construction program will total more than \$252 million, an increase of almost 23 per cent over last year's comparable estimates.

Under the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, a new recreation centre in Bonnyville will be built, as well as a lodge and training school near St. Albert, a detoxification centre in Edmonton, and upgraded facilities at Claresholm.

A modern, consolidated facility for the Alberta Research Council will move ahead.

Two historic sites in the Crowsnest area will be developed. A major oil sands tourist centre in Fort McMurray will be started.

New courthouses are planned for Drumheller, St. Paul, Sherwood Park, Vegreville, Lacombe, and Wetaskiwin. A \$60 million new facility will be constructed to replace the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution. Planning has started for a new remand centre in Calgary.

Construction of a new \$6.3 million medical examiner's facility for Calgary, to provide toxicology and related services to southern Alberta, will get under way this year.

REVENUE AND TAXATION

I now wish to outline our revenue and taxation position, Mr. Speaker. With the large but short-term non-renewable resource revenue available today, Albertans enjoy the lowest overall provincial tax rates in Canada. The personal income tax rate in Alberta is 38.5 per cent of federal basic tax, compared to 44 per cent in British Columbia and Ontario and 51 per cent in Saskatchewan. While Alberta has no sales tax, the retail sales tax ranges from 5 per cent to 11 per cent in other provinces. Alberta property taxes are, on average, among the lowest in Canada. Natural gas costs for home heating are probably the lowest in North America.

One of the government's key fiscal policies has been to set aside, through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, a portion of resource revenue so that future taxpayers are not saddled with unfairly heavy taxation. Even with this allocation, today Albertans pay directly by taxation only one-half the cost of provincial services.

Particularly over the last few years, demands and expectations for provincial services have increased dramatically. This budget reflects that demand. The growth in the cost of expanded services is beginning to outstrip the growth in revenue needed to finance them. Thus we are approaching a very important decision point. Do we increase taxes? Do we reduce our savings for the future? Or do we lower our demands for expanded services?

Last month the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources announced that the exploratory drilling and geophysical incentive programs for petroleum explorers would likely be extended, with increased credits to mitigate the effects of inflation since the program was last reviewed.

These highly successful programs reflect the government's policy of maintaining a favorable investment climate for the private sector and encouraging exploration and development of Alberta's resources.

As already announced by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, health care premiums will be increased 9.8 per cent effective July 1, 1981. The new rates will be \$9.50 per month for single persons and \$19 for families. Subsidized premiums for those with moderate income will be increased commensurately. All senior citizens and low-income Albertans will continue to be exempt from premiums.

The modestly higher premiums reflect the government's long-standing view that Albertans should pay directly a portion of the cost of the medicare program. The premiums will cover only 28 per cent of the cost of the

program this year, compared to close to 50 per cent 10 years ago. Premiums provide a direct and visible indication to taxpayers of the cost of the health care system, thereby controlling the demands put on public services.

The transition to a self-administered corporate income tax system is proceeding smoothly. Many corporations began to work with the province in January 1981. The remainder will make the transition as they begin their 1982 taxation year.

The government continues to assess a variety of tax incentive measures. The report of the caucus committee on business tax and tax incentives will reflect suggestions put forward by the Alberta business community. Decisions on tax incentives will be made selectively, especially in the current fiscal climate. Our objective is to target incentives to those economic sectors where true gains can be made to provide, in part, a tax base for the future.

Albertans are aware of their personal stake in our non-renewable resource revenue picture, Mr. Speaker. Alberta's revenues will be affected significantly by the Ottawa energy proposals which purport to

- fix prices for oil and natural gas at less than one-half their fair value.
- inflict an export tax on natural gas, a wellhead tax on domestic gas, and a federal royalty on both oil and gas. Each of these taxes represents an infringement on the resource ownership rights of Albertans. The export tax on Crown-owned production has been held by a unanimous decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal to be beyond the powers of the federal government.
- move towards nationalization of the petroleum industry at a time when there are other viable ways of increasing Canadian ownership.
- shift exploration activity to federal lands at the expense of activity on provincial lands.

These moves, Mr. Speaker, will be very negative to the Alberta revenue picture in the future.

Alberta will further reduce conventional crude oil production in the face of the unilateral federal move to set unfair wellhead prices. The reduction underlines provincial ownership jurisdiction to control the rate of production and ensures retention of a portion of a rapidly depleting resource in the ground for the future benefit of Albertans. Foregone royalty revenues are not lost to Albertans; they are simply postponed, and when the withheld oil is eventually produced it will command the higher price. The production reduction will have no measurable effect on the number of jobs in the industry in Alberta.

The 1980 conventional crude oil production declined by almost 8 per cent, primarily because of declining reserves and productive capacity coupled with relatively weak demand in eastern Canada. With the phased-in reduction in light and medium crude oil production, conventional production is expected to decline by a further 12.5 per cent in 1981.

Crude oil royalty revenue for this year is projected to be \$1.8 billion, 7.5 per cent below revenue last year. The decline is largely due to the phased-in reduction in production, which will result in deferred royalties of \$475 million for the year, revenue which will be recouped in the future when the oil is subsequently sold at higher prices.

Provincial royalties on conventional crude oil will be short-lived; productive capacity from existing reserves by the end of this decade will be cut by 65 per cent, compared to the 1980 production level.

Natural gas production declined by 7 per cent last year, due mainly to sharply reduced export demand resulting from buyer resistance to increased prices established by the federal government, the availability of substitute products in the United States, and a weak United States economy. Last year's natural gas exports authorized by the National Energy Board were not reached. Only 669 billion cubic feet of the about 1 trillion cubic feet authorized by the National Energy Board were sold in the United States last year. Domestic Canadian gas consumption volumes for 1980-81, predicted at just over 1.7 trillion cubic feet, were slightly lower at 1.6 trillion cubic feet. Reduced export volumes resulted in a significant drop in natural gas revenues in 1980-81.

Provincial royalties on natural gas and by-products will generate \$2.2 billion this year, an increase of over 20 per cent compared to last year. This growth results largely from higher production levels, because under the Ottawa proposals, the domestic price of natural gas at the well-head is effectively frozen for 1981.

Proceeds from the sale of Crown petroleum leases for 1981-82 are anticipated to be little more than half of receipts last year. This dramatic reduction reflects the downturn in exploration activity which will result from the punitive taxation of the petroleum industry and the discouragement of activity on provincial lands under the Ottawa energy proposals.

After the 30 per cent deduction this year for the heritage fund, non-renewable resource revenue is expected to decline by 4.4 per cent compared to last year, yielding \$3.1 billion in 1981-82. That amount represents slightly less than one-half of total budgetary revenue.

As for other budgetary revenue, growth in net personal income tax revenue is expected to be 17 per cent for 1981-82. Net corporate income tax revenue, on the other hand, is expected to decline slightly from last year's level, in part because of the cost of the new Alberta rental investment tax credit for multiple unit housing projects by the private sector.

Remittances from the Alberta Liquor Control Board are expected to be lower this year, due to the construction of a major new warehouse and office facility financed by the retention of part of the board's profits.

The establishment of the new Pension Fund for provincially administered pension plans has two implications for Alberta's budgetary revenue. Firstly, the transfer of \$1.1 billion in assets to partially fund the plans will reduce interest income. Second, under the new pension financing arrangement, employee contributions to the plans will no longer be included as part of the province's budgetary revenue.

Our overall revenue outlook is therefore not as optimistic as in past years. Significantly, total budgetary revenue this year will be lower than it was in 1980-81. So, contrary to federal claims, the Ottawa energy proposals do have a significant impact on Alberta's non-renewable resource revenue. The impact is not confined to this fiscal year. Over the next few years, budgetary revenue is expected to grow by less than 10 per cent a year.

Even when the new Pension Fund and the oil produc-

tion reduction are taken into account, and the figures adjusted, budgetary revenue this year would increase less than 10 per cent. That revenue increase is less than the predicted rate of inflation and less than half the 22.5 per cent increase in estimated total government expenditure for this fiscal year.

1981-82 FINANCIAL PLAN

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the 1981-82 financial plan. For this fiscal year, I estimate a budgetary deficit of \$336 million, the first planned budgetary deficit since 1976-77, not counting the two years just past in which special, one-time financial management initiatives led to budgetary deficits. This year's deficit compares to a \$1 billion budgetary surplus in 1979-80 and a forecast surplus of \$682 million for 1980-81 before extraordinary expenditures. As with last year's forecast \$747 million budgetary deficit after all expenditure items, this year's deficit will be covered by the shrinking accumulated surplus. To cover just the deficits of 1980-81 and '81-82, those surplus reserves will drop by 40 per cent.

This sudden reversal in our budgetary position results from significantly lower growth in budgetary revenue, coupled with a continuous high demand for expanded provincial services. Budgetary revenue for this year is expected to be less than revenue last year, and only 12 per cent higher than income in 1979-80. In real terms, there has been a significant drop in the level of revenue available to finance provincial services. While that revenue has been sliding, demands for new and improved programs and for higher salaries and wages have continued to grow. The government is concerned that expectations are running too high, based on false perceptions that Alberta's financial resources are unlimited. This 1981-82 financial plan that I present tonight makes it clear that the province has a reduced capacity to meet requests for funding.

I estimate that the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund will increase in value by \$2.3 billion during 1981-82. About 60 per cent of the increase will come from the transfer of non-renewable resource revenue and the remainder from income on the fund's investments. Under these projections, total assets of the heritage fund would be about \$10.9 billion at March 31, 1982. To many Albertans, that will probably sound like a large amount of money. But with revenues declining, and with two budgetary deficits in a row and another deficit expected this year, the clear need for a transition, savings trust fund is even more apparent.

Suggestions for financing from the heritage fund for this year are far in excess of the resources available. In the housing field alone, the capital budgets of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation and the Alberta Housing Corporation will take up nearly half the new money going to the heritage fund and available for investment. Another one-quarter is planned to be used to finance the capital requirements of municipal governments through the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation. The government will have to be increasingly selective in the allocation of the limited heritage fund resources among the competing investment opportunities.

Sound financial and economic management is fundamentally important to every family, to every community, and to every government. Tonight I have underlined the very different budgetary position which Alberta faces for the year ahead. It is time for Albertans to lower expectations and reflect upon the reality of the provincial res-

venue and budgetary position. The economic and financial prospects and options over the next several years are being carefully assessed. We will continue to pursue measured and responsible budgetary and fiscal policies for the benefit of all Albertans.

SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, this budget assists in stabilizing the Alberta economy for continued solid growth in the years ahead and maintains a climate for enterprise, risk taking, and individual initiative.

As well it involves a slight decrease in budgetary revenue for 1981-82, with an estimated 22.5 per cent increase in total expenditure.

It provides new initiatives and expansion to existing programs for all Albertans — particularly the handicapped, children, and those in need — through quality services in health care, housing, social welfare, and education. Over 1,400 new positions and more than \$3.4 billion in total operating funding are proposed for these programs.

It increases minimum benefits to senior citizen homeowners by 50 per cent, from \$400 to \$600, and makes available the benefits of three program initiatives to eligible widows and widowers aged 60 to 64.

The budget boosts expenditure on construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation of highways and roads by 38 per cent over last year's comparable estimates. Additionally, a 26 per cent increase in urban transportation assistance will have \$155 million going to Alberta cities in '81-82.

The budget supports agriculture as our top priority renewable resource through the programs of three departments and the heritage fund by providing incentives for beginning farmers, lower farm input costs, improved grain handling and transportation, and support for agribusiness and processing.

The budget reinforces financing policies which provide over 20,000 shelter units, or over \$1 billion of affordable new homes, apartments, lodges, and other housing for Albertans and maintains a home building performance record unprecedented in Canada.

It includes a 25.4 per cent increase in grants, to \$922 million for active and auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes, and a 40 per cent increase in capital expansion funding for 60 communities in 1981-82.

It proposes the investment of a total of more than \$1.6 billion in capital projects to provide needed services and facilities for Albertans, to benefit the Alberta economy and to sustain job creation momentum.

And this budget stresses, again, prudent financial management and a responsible Heritage Savings Trust Fund to help economic diversification and carry Alberta taxpayers through the transition years in the future.

Although our steady growth pattern of the '70s has been partly slowed, the resilient, stabilized, and increasingly diversified Alberta economy can weather the storm, and we will move ahead to new opportunities balanced with realistic expectations in the '80s. [applause]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three points with regard to this Tory budget this evening. First, the timing: I think it's an affront to the legislative process, an affront to the rights and responsibilities of us in this Legislature. Tonight we are two weeks into the fiscal year. By the time the estimates are passed by this Legislature, we will be another four weeks into the fiscal

year. A month and a half has gone by before this budget of 1981-82 is in place.

Mr. Speaker, during that time, this government is operating on a special warrant of over \$2 billion that has not been passed by this Legislative Assembly and honored by the members of this Legislature. To me that is an affront to us as elected members, an affront to us who represent the people of Alberta. I felt that should be raised at this point in time in the debate on this budget, because it's significant.

We will most likely pass this budget in this Legislature. [interjections] That really is true. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we may be a few in the opposition, but we intend to make our voice heard. We intend to make clear that we represent a segment of Alberta people and that those Alberta people want us to speak and be part of the democratic process. They want us to approve the expenditures of government before the expenditures are made. That is only responsible government, and that's what we want to be part of.

On June 10 of this year, I will have had the opportunity of representing my constituency for 18 years. I hope that during those years I have been able to partake in decisions before they take place or are imposed on the people of Alberta or benefit the people of Alberta in any way. Mr. Speaker, presenting this budget here this evening is an affront to that very basic principle of the democratic process. I think this government should reassess how it treats this Legislature and the legislative responsibility we have here in this Assembly.

I asked the government over the past few months, what have they done in January? Where were they? That would be a very interesting question to ask some of the people. Where were they in February and March? There were no negotiations on energy. There were no negotiations on the constitution. There was really no active administration going on in the province of Alberta. There was no reason we as legislators could not have been together to have put the budget in place so that this budget could have been in place at the beginning of the fiscal year, honored by the Legislature and certainly passed through the democratic process, as it should have been. Certainly as Socreds on this side of the House, we hope that if it is ever our responsibility to administer and place a budget in this House, it is passed before the fiscal year begins. If there is a good reason it is not, we have a responsibility to explain that. In this budget, Mr. Speaker, there was no explanation why there was an affront to the Legislature, an affront to the supremacy of the Legislature. That's my first point this evening, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to make a second one as well, about the credibility of this budget presented to us here this evening. Over the last week and a half or so since the session started, one of the questions I have been raising continually is with regard to the government's responsibility for financial planning and budgeting in this province. The financial plan presented to this province by the hon. Provincial Treasurer in the last week of March indicated the type of planning that goes on by this government. For example, in 1980-81 we had \$593 million in special warrants. Twenty-three out of 26 cabinet portfolios, 90 per cent of them, came back to the Treasurer for special warrants. The budget was increased or overspent by 11 per cent by special warrants. If you add that to the actual increase in expenditure over 1979-80, we had a 24 per cent increase in last year's budget; we in this Legislature approved an increase of 14.4 per cent. I raise the question again in this Legislature: is there any credibility to the

presentation made to us tonight? Can we really believe that that is the financial plan for 1981-82? Mr. Speaker, I have some doubts about that plan.

When was the financial plan for the 1980-81 budget really made by the Conservative government? The financial plan of this government was presented to us on March 26, 1981, as the real financial plan. That's when we saw that plan. During the year we were not sure what the expenditures of government were, but all of a sudden in the last week of the fiscal year, the financial plan of the Conservative government was revealed. Mr. Speaker, we do not want that to happen again this year. That's why at this point in my remarks I say, what is the credibility of this budget? Is it real in terms of the revenue predictions? I look at the predictions made last November with regard to the influence of the October 28 budget. They're not quite the same as the ones we see here this evening. I look with regard to expenditure and raise questions as to whether that is all the expenditures. I'm not sure.

In that light I'd like to make just one more point here this evening. What about this financial plan of the Conservative government? Is it based on some very basic principles? Are those programs outlined to us this evening based on principles of any kind? Were each one of the programs priced out in a realistic fashion?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to look at that in terms of one principle established by this government in the 1980-81 expenditures by the now Provincial Treasurer. The minister said at that time, this government bases its expenditure on the following principle, and it's on page 12 of the 1980 Budget Address. Just for information, the increase in operating expenditures last year was 14.4 per cent over the 1979-80 budget. The Provincial Treasurer said:

This maintains our policy of restricting increases in operating expenditure to the growth rate in Alberta's gross domestic product — expected to be about 15 per cent this year.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard this evening about the turndown in revenue potential, the turndown in Alberta's economy. Well, the gross provincial domestic product may be 15 per cent again, or even less. But look at the increase in expenditures: operational expenditures up some 16.9 per cent, capital expenditures up over 48 per cent. There is a violation of the basic principle of this government: keeping within the gross provincial product.

I'd like to raise one other item with regard to where this government is going with its expenditures. On page 20 of this budget debate, the Provincial Treasurer raises some interesting questions. He says, the "budget reflects that demand", and goes on to say:

Thus we are approaching a very important decision point. Do we increase taxes? Do we reduce our savings for the future? Or do we lower our demands for expanded services?

Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of government to answer those questions and to place before us a financial plan that follows out those objectives.

What do we see on page 24? It says this about the general direction of this government. This budget provides new initiatives and expansion to existing programs for all Albertans . . .

Mr. Speaker, that's very true. Before adjourning the debate I'd like to conclude with that statement. It's very obvious that this government knows how to spend, but they have not convinced us this evening that they really know how to manage.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: There's been a motion by the Leader of the Opposition to adjourn the debate. Would those in favor of the motion please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is lost.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'll leave it up to the House Leader as to when we quit this evening.

I'd like to look at this budget in a variety of different terms, Mr. Speaker, and see what direction this government is really going. I'd like to look at some of the programs raised. I start where I left off with regard to the principles this government has used. One of the principles they've talked about for the last few weeks is lowering expectations, and I wonder whether this government has really talked about lowering expectations. Where in this budget do they really lower expectations? Do you know where it is? In agriculture, one of the most important areas and backbones of this province, the government has asked them to lower expectations, a decrease in the budget by 9.7 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A decrease in the budget: that's lowering expectations.

MR. NOTLEY: Where are all those backbenchers? What are they doing?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Why do not the people on this side of the government stand up for agriculture.

We want to diversify this economy. Are we diversifying it? We talk nicely in the budget about diversification, that diversification comes from our oil and gas resource. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed in this Legislature how this Assembly knows that too much of our revenue and the support of this government is based on oil and gas revenue. The Premier admitted that in 1971 and in 1974. Again, in 1979, the Premier attempted to say, maybe we can't reach that objective. In the throne speech, that was reiterated to us.

We know that in order to diversify this economy, we must look after agriculture, but what is this government doing in times when we need to do something? Reducing the budget of agriculture, Mr. Speaker. What little was mentioned about agriculture? Agricultural Development Corporation — \$100 million. That is not very much money to put out to young farmers to get them started and on their feet when \$20 million is spent on Government House South in Calgary. We think that that one house, that old building in Calgary — five of those buildings are worth thousands of young farmers across this province. That's the most disgusting affront to agriculture I have ever seen, and I hope the farmers of this province realize that this government does not care about agriculture.

Let's look at another subject in this budget: municipal governments. In the 1980 budget, it talks in glowing terms about the municipalities of this province getting

interest money at 9 per cent; 9 per cent is what it says here. We have a commitment to help our municipalities. We give them low-interest money. What do we do with them this year? Increase the interest by 2 per cent so their budgets go up? But when I very quickly assess the budget going to municipalities — and my colleagues tell me that the budget to municipalities is less than 10 per cent; grants go up by 9 per cent. When this government knows that salaries at the local level are going to go up, that road construction is going to go up significantly, that it's going to cost municipalities more money, and they have increased it by only 9 per cent, and at the same time increased the interest, what an affront to our municipalities. Isn't this a great budget? What a great budget, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Look at page 49.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Those are two areas down and neglected here this evening. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what happens to our local taxpayers in this province. I haven't had the opportunity of figuring out the increase for the school boards, but I know that significant salary increases are going on across this province. What's going to come out of this budget is that school taxes, property taxes, will most likely increase to pick up what this government is not paying; a government that made a promise in 1971 that the property tax for education would be maintained at a 15 per cent level, or even lowered or eliminated, when now it's up to over 30 per cent. According to the ATA and school trustees, it may be closer to 40 per cent that the property tax is picking up for education. I think that's unbelievable.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that's what's going to happen. Municipalities in this province will again have to pick up this lower expectation being carried on. That's the second area that is certainly of concern.

Let's have a look at some of the other areas in this great financial plan for Albertans. When we look at transportation, Mr. Speaker, I read the news release of the hon. Minister of Transportation, who raised the fact that he was going to put in place this fine program to try to boost the construction industry of this province and help everybody out, and indicated that they'd put 32 per cent more money into the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the Premier has to go home at this time, but this is his government, not my government. It's unfortunate that the government wants us to go on and on. If the government wants me to adjourn, I'm open to adjournment and to continue later. But if we're going to sit here, fine. [interjections] It doesn't bother me one bit, Mr. Speaker, because if the government wants to hear it, they should. If they want to go to their champagne parties and gloat over a bad budget, fine; they can leave as well. [interjections] But the hour is early, and I certainly can be here for a long, long time yet.

I want to talk about these roads, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that this government is really doing a great thing at this point in time in putting 33.7 per cent more money into the budget. You know, we're 10 years behind. I noticed somewhere else in this budget they've got what they call a pavement rehabilitation program. For all the highways this government has allowed to deteriorate over the last 10 years, we need a lot of money in a rehabilitation program. If they want to really help and support the construction industry, why can't this government come up with a five-year program; increase this year's budget by 33 per cent, but continue the increase on a longer

period of time so the construction industry can build so it can meet the needs of Albertans, so we have rural roads that can act as transportation centres between one community and another, so we can really build regional industries, so people can travel from one place to another.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. leader. I've been somewhat concerned about this debate continuing. It's my understanding that when a member moves adjournment of the debate and that motion is lost, the member has finished speaking in that debate. It would be my understanding that the hon. leader would be able to continue only with unanimous leave of the House.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if my hearing was correct, I believe the hon. House leader said "continue" to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite. But that was not put in the form of a motion, nor was it voted on. It was simply one of those asides that sometimes cross the floor.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect might I suggest that you, sir, as Speaker, ask if the hon. Leader of the Opposition does have the unanimous consent to continue. If he has not, then the responsibility rests clearly where it should, on the government's shoulders.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could just address a remark or so to that. The point raised by Your Honour — and I think all hon. members appreciate very, very much that Your Honour is as careful of the rules of the Assembly as you are — was clearly not in the mind of the hon. leader as he continued and was certainly not in my mind either. In addressing myself to the point you've now raised, Mr. Speaker, I note that it is a unique point in the sense of recent experience in the Assembly, because the custom has been to adjourn debate immediately after the budget speech. However, the hon. leader wanted to put on a show, has done so . . . [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has the right under the rules. Mr. Speaker, you know that, and he knows that. He can withdraw that. As a learned man of the law, he knows better, and should withdraw that, Crawford. [interjections]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was only addressing myself to the point of the circumstances being somewhat different from previous occasions, when other hon. members in the official opposition were looking after the duties over there. No one downplays the important duties performed by the Leader of the Opposition tonight or on any other occasion. But, Mr. Speaker, I was just observing that the hon. leader wished to put on a show. He is doing so. He may just as well continue and, speaking for myself, we would be willing to agree to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: There's just one difficulty in the Chair's mind. As you know, the question of whether an expression is parliamentary or not parliamentary is a matter of some difficulty. It depends on the circumstances. There isn't a great deal of unanimity. Although the situation is borderline, I hesitate to say that the expression is unpar-

liamentary. Possibly the hon. Government House Leader would give consideration to dealing a little further with that remark about putting on a show.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I might add that maybe I could do so in light of the fact that I wasn't too impressed anyway. But before I sit down I would like to say that at all times, certainly, accept even so much as a suggestion from Your Honour that something might be withdrawn, that it should be. I gladly do so.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, the hon. Government House Leader has made a personal suggestion. Am I to take that as a motion, or am I to deal with it further?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think if Your Honour would do it by way of motion, that would be agreeable. I made the suggestion and heard no dissent.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that the hon. Leader of the Opposition may continue the debate on this motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any dissent? It is so ordered.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly I know that the government doesn't want to hear the other side of the story. [interjections] They certainly do not want to hear it on the evening when they wish to rush off to various cocktail parties. I know the ice is melting. I know they want to pat themselves on the back. I know they want to say to Albertans: we've done a great job. But, Mr. Speaker, this financial plan is not a great job. Millions of billions of dollars that this government has had, and here we end up at a point in time when we have a deficit of \$336 million. We have some 2 million people, over \$6.7 billion to spend, and we have a deficit of \$336 million. Mr. Speaker, this government really hasn't got any priorities. Back in 1968 to '71, that was one of the greatest words of the Premier of this province: we must have priorities. And if we're going to introduce a new program, we're going to eliminate one of the old programs. Well, that's never happened in this government. All that has happened is expansion, add on. Add on friends, add on civil servants. It's going great in good old Alberta. It's going to carry on on its own, and it'll all work out.

I was on transportation, Mr. Speaker. I'd really recommend to the hon. Minister of Transportation that he look at the possibility of a significant increase in his budget next year, because we're \$1.8 billion behind in highway construction in this province. We're at least 10 years behind bringing the provincial highway system up to number one standard. I think that government has a lot of accounting to do for that. We talked about roads to resources, the road up to Fort McMurray. This government was going to complete that a number of years ago. I haven't been up there for a while, but my understanding is that that's still on schedule. People tell me we've got the worst Trans-Canada Highway of any province in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I think there's a lot of work to be done.

One of the other areas we should look at in this budget is with regard to the handicapped. This is the International Year of Disabled Persons. Mr. Speaker, it's nice to see there is \$7.7 million for the aids to daily living program. I think that's a good idea. But the question I

raise with regard to this program is: what about all the volunteer groups and the groups across the province that really want to get involved in some of these programs? I don't see any real honorable mention about the \$250,000 being made available to various groups to carry out programs. I don't see a highlight of that in this budget. Maybe it was just too modest and too humble, and the government really didn't want to mention it. It's nicer to spend \$20 million on Government House South. It's nice to spend money on a house over in London. It's nicer to spend money on Kananaskis Park that really hadn't been budgeted for. But the year of the disabled persons — is it really highlighted in the budget? Mr. Speaker, it is not. It's not; there isn't a change of emphasis.

I looked at the throne speech. Eight out of the nine last throne speeches mentioned that the handicapped would get great emphasis. I examined the programs. It never did, Mr. Speaker. This government put it into words, but never followed through. Here we are again in the year of the disabled. Has it really happened? It hasn't.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at one other area in this budget, with regard to the national economy and the economic situation we're in today. It's very nice to say, you know, it's bad old Ottawa, and we're going to bash Ottawa tonight, tell them they're bad guys and they're taking all the revenue away. Well, it always takes two to make a bad deal. Ten years, nine years, this government has had the opportunity of negotiating with Ottawa, of settling some of the energy questions, of working on the constitutional question. But as I said in my throne speech, and I say it again, this government has taken the approach of war, of confrontation, of making someone else, the poor people of Alberta, bleed for our problems.

Mr. Speaker, that's part of the root of the problem in this budget. It isn't just all Ottawa that's at fault. I don't support Ottawa, nor do I support the Prime Minister in his attitude. But I know that it takes two to cause a problem. I don't think the Alberta government, this Tory Conservative government, can escape from the responsibilities they have with regard to the economic position we are in today.

Why did they break the principle of 100 per cent ownership of the natural resource of oil? Why did they say they'd settle for 75 per cent? Why did they back off to that position?

MR. COOK: We're Canadians.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Why didn't they look at 100 per cent and say, that is a sacred principle and we don't break that principle, that we're willing to share and negotiate on revenue? Mr. Speaker, that was the corner they got themselves backed into. There was nothing else they could do but sacrifice a very basic principle. We as Albertans have to suffer with that, not only today but in the years ahead in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't really touched on many of the other points in this budget. [interjections] Health care premiums: one of the questions raised with me the other day was health care premiums. Someone said, is this government really that hard up that they have to increase the health care premiums? I said, well, I guess they are; they're starting to run out of money; they've spent so quickly that the revenue can't keep up with them, and I guess they have to come back to the poor taxpayer and put some more on your backs. So they increased the health care premiums. That's what happened, Mr. Speaker. The little bit of money that comes in from health care

premiums is not much to government, but it's an awful lot to Albertans. They want to ride out their difficult situation on the backs of Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be very interested in this budget when I examine the percentages of money being made available to the elementary and secondary schools of this province. I hope the inflation rate is even taken into consideration. Normally it's not, and I hope it is.

Mr. Speaker, in due respect to some of the members of the public who are in the gallery who may want to do other things, I just conclude this way. One, the timing of this budget tonight was an affront to this legislative process. Two, this government should certainly respect the fact that legislators should approve budgets, and that it is our responsibility to do just that. It is hard for me to believe that it is a credible budget, as the precedent that's been established by this Provincial Treasurer doesn't indicate that what we pass in this budget will be as it is one year from today.

Most likely in March 1982, a financial plan with a whole bunch of special warrants will be presented to us a few days before the end of the fiscal year. In that light I think this government should consider putting a ceiling on special warrants. I hope they'll recognize and look seriously at the resolution we have on the Order Paper that will limit special warrants to 8 per cent. We think that's important. If it's more than that, they should come back to this Legislature and have the Legislature decide whether this government can be allowed to spend over that 8 per cent level in special warrants. Or the government should come to us in the fall sitting and say, look, as a Legislature we would like you to approve more expenditures; would you do it? If it's a good, responsible reason, then the Legislature, in the democratic process, can carry out that responsibility. I think this government should consider the responsibilities of this Legislature in their action. The arrogance displayed by ignoring the discussion in this open Assembly is really an affront not only to us as legislators but Albertans.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I conclude again on my other statement. This government indicates it knows how to spend. It's an expansionary budget. It hasn't really said, we are going to moderate our expectations. We are not going to lower our expectations, but they're saying to Albertans, municipalities, and farmers, lower yours because you're not going to get so much from us. Mr. Speaker, I think it's time this government takes the responsibility it was elected to take.

Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Banff-Cochrane this is my third opportunity to hear a Budget Address as a member of the Legislature. I just want to say that perhaps it is a unique experience, as our House leader said tonight, for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to make his statements like this. But it does give me a chance, with my colleagues perhaps, to respond tonight. I've been thinking about this. I was going to go home tonight and study this report and be prepared to contribute to the debate in the afternoon. But I am also very proud to be here now, to be able to say I am proud to be one of this Assembly, to be a member of this Progressive Conservative government, and to hear and be present when a budget of this kind is presented by our Treasurer.

I'm going to have to learn a lot about rules. I've been thinking about what I would say to respond to what I consider to be a statement, I suppose, but if only the words of the Leader of the Opposition had substance.

Instead, in my opinion, what we've heard tonight from the leader is claptrap. Now claptrap, in Oxford terms — I hope it's parliamentary — is simply the use of language to endeavor to raise applause. Therefore I think it's very parliamentary to say we've heard nothing but claptrap.

The response of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to this address reminded me of the old musketeer, armed with a single trusty musket, scattering a single shot in all directions. I also thought of some of the cartoons our children watch sometimes. I immediately thought of the Bugs Bunny character, the Tasmanian devil, that whirling, spinning, wolf-like marsupial who dashes hither and yon, carrying in his pouch something else, the prompter. I gather that at the same time, outside this House, there was the other, gathering about and saying other things. I gather they aren't saying the same things; one in the House and one out of the House.

Did the members actually hear any responsible alternatives? Did we hear anything new? We've heard the same tired out, obsolete musket shot. Municipal resource sharing: remember the throne speech debate? It wasn't the throne speech of the Leader of the Opposition, it was his response to it: the old plea to share resource revenue with municipalities, at a time when Alberta and eight other provinces are fighting the Ottawa government's blatant efforts to grab our resources.

We heard the same tired call for autonomy in health care, with very little reference to the budget tonight. As Alberta citizens we enjoy the best services in Canada. We have a program of construction and research which is the envy of North America, and the member talks about autonomy in health care. I can speak for the two hospital boards in my own constituency. Both are actively engaged in the planning process, as are many boards throughout Alberta, in attempting to build the best hospitals for the future of our citizens, for the next 30 years. We wouldn't be needing to be spending this effort now if any proper efforts had been done in the decade before the '70s.

The member talked for a while about many services to people, and questioned whether we had services to people. For example, I can think of home care, the success story of preventive social services in Alberta, and the new Bill for family community support services that has been introduced and is to be debated. In my own constituency, as one example of our '79, we have the community, individuals, and volunteers all working hard. We see a budget tonight of \$19 million to expand that program.

Economic development: since the session began my good colleague the Minister of Economic Development has been answering questions in this House about what we are doing to help diversify our economy. But without the development of our natural gas, oil, coal, forestry, hydro, and mineral resources, we wouldn't have the opportunities to continue to see Alberta lead Canada, to have 46,000 new jobs coming this year, as our Provincial Treasurer indicated, to go with the 60,000 last year. Without building on those strengths we wouldn't have that opportunity to be the jewel in Canada.

He talks a little bit about — and it frightens me — ownership of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund as though it wasn't owned by the people of Alberta. God help us if his party actually gets hold on that fund. They'd spend it like they did the sidewalks in the '50s. Remember the municipalities that got sidewalks? Some got them on half the roads, and some got them on the other half. Or they'd develop the tax action program which they announced in the '79 provincial election, if you remember

that funny little envelope that came around, called tax action. Maybe they would really talk about making loans across the kitchen table. God help us. Through all this, the hon. leader just indicated that he wants 100 per cent value for oil and gas, from a federal government that recognizes the people's ownership only until they can constitutionalize it away.

We've listened carefully. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure some critical assessments, some constructive suggestions, could be made. That's the role of the opposition. I've been going around, as all of us have, to schools. I'm asked, what do members do? What do ministers do? What does the Leader of the Opposition do? What do the opposition members do? I've tried to explain. I tell you, in the last three years it's been hard for me to explain that part, from the examples we have here. The citizens of Alberta won't get any constructive suggestions from the remarks we've just heard from the Member for Little Bow, or the others in that row:

Oh that row, that row
Hop, skip, and fudge it.
Six men in a bunch
Sat through the budget
Quite out to lunch.
We've listened to one
And five more to go.
When all's said and done
It's a sad little row.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the Provincial Treasurer gave one of the most important budget addresses ever presented in this Assembly. It is a budget which Albertans, and perhaps all Canadians, should review very carefully. But first let us remind ourselves of the 1980 Budget Address, and that brief quotation at the beginning:

An exciting seventy-five years ahead for Alberta [said the Treasurer last year] provided our historic ... ownership rights are respected and provided we are fairly dealt with as an equal partner within Confederation.

What's happened since April 1980? We have seen an Ottawa government attempt to impose an energy policy that has as its object a nationalized pipeline, rather than a full pipeline. We have felt first-hand in this province — and because it's in this province, it's therefore throughout Canada — the impact of a discriminatory federal budget that directly and indirectly attacks Albertans' ownership of resources. It reduced cash flow to our major industry of this province. It has imposed an export tax on the resources of 2 million Canadians who live in Alberta; an act, as the Provincial Treasurer has indicated, that the court of this province has ruled is unlawful. By a resulting steady stream from Drayton Valley, Banff-Cochrane, and all across this province, we've seen a Canadian industry and Canadian employees flowing southward.

So what have we got tonight for all of us to look at very carefully? A 10 per cent revenue drop in our non-renewable resource revenue. The Treasurer did announce this on March 26. I think it was a shock to all of us to see how those kinds of policies by one government could so hurt Canada by hurting Alberta. This budget has at its heart a year to move ahead, a year to stabilize. We're shaken by Ottawa's policies, but we have a determined plan here to build on strengths: agricultural processing, increased harvesting of our forests, increased mining of our coal, further recreation and tourism development throughout this province, petrochemical development, international trade, and pure and applied research. We have a voice that can be heard throughout the world. It's

a plan tonight to maintain consistency and stability, to continue with an attitude which encourages private enterprise, encourages and holds public support, and encourages initiative. But it is a timely reminder to us all, throughout Alberta, that the demands and expectations we as citizens all have, that we've developed as we have enjoyed this historic boom, are continuing to escalate.

I know that each of us receives letters and calls, thinking that perhaps we have an inexhaustible horn of plenty and that we can continue to throw money out in dribs and drabs to individuals who have their special needs. That's why this budget tonight reminds us that it's time for all of us to look at that and to understand that the costs of increased government services are starting to outstrip, to go far beyond, the growth and revenues needed to pay for them. This year, a major increase in capital construction of 48.2 per cent, to \$1.6 billion — and I'm sure that as the estimates are examined, our learned friends on the opposition seats will be going over each of those estimates with each minister — to help offset the impact of what Ottawa has done and is doing to us. We see an increase in our operating budget of 17.8 per cent to \$5 billion. And for the first time in this decade there is a forecast deficit of \$0.33 billion. Now we're not going to do deficit financing without thinking about how we will pay for that. So the Treasurer has unveiled in the budget the need for us to draw down on the reserves that fiscal management and good planning have built up in this province. We're going to tap those this year because Ottawa's policies attack our resource revenues.

So we're at a crossroads in Alberta. Do we increase taxes? We are the most fortunate people in North America. The litany, the story, of our tax situation is one of the reasons we have 60,000 people a year flocking here and why we're saying there are going to have to be jobs here. Be very careful about leaving your home elsewhere in Canada and coming here, when it's only a tax advantage.

Do we have to reduce our savings for the future? I'm very concerned about our children and our grandchildren. I have a letter from a citizen who says, what does the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund do for me? I could have written a book about what it is doing. In 1975 an awful lot of people voted this government to establish that fund and, in 1979, an awful lot more people said, keep that fund. I hope a lot of people — as reflected in the polls — say, take care of that bank for the future.

How can I as a citizen respond? I'm asked, what can I as a citizen do? The third question in the Budget Address tonight: do we lower our demands for expanded services? It's a question each of us can ask. It's a question we can discuss with our constituents. It is a budget for us all to reflect upon reality.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out how the 1981 Alberta budget responds to the needs of Albertans, to the needs of Canada, and to the opportunity our province continues to enjoy to do more than our share for Canada as a whole, and review what impact our budget will have upon the provision of services by government through the public service, for whom I have the privilege of reporting. I'd like to reflect upon the budget's promise for one constituency, Banff-Cochrane, which is as unique as each of our 79 constituencies but as reflective as any of Alberta herself.

I opened my remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, by reflecting upon the lack of substance, in my opinion, in the opposition leader's response to the budget presented by the Treasurer. Perhaps my views will help illustrate that this is a budget of substance, of challenge, of opportunity.

and of choice; for we do have a choice.

In his first remarks the leader mentioned roads and commented on certain figures, which I tried to follow but I could not find them in the address the Provincial Treasurer delivered to us all tonight. For example, the pavement rehabilitation program, which protects our investment in roads, will be increased by \$12.8 million in 1981-82, a 58 per cent increase over last year. I don't find that to be a decrease. I find that to be reflective of the needs of Albertans to move goods and people, and the minister is responding to that.

Education: I know my good friend and colleague the Minister of Education and my other good friend and colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower will enjoy being able to respond to these comments. But if we turn to page 18 and just briefly review schools, universities, colleges, and technical institutions: a 41.6 per cent increase to exceed \$148 million, a commitment to postsecondary education in excess of \$0.25 billion. And on and on.

I turn to a chart — and I must compliment the Treasurer and the budget bureau for presenting an excellent document for all of us to read and share with our constituents. It's understandable. The graphs are very clear. A graph here shows the expenditures on education and health: nearly half this government's expenditures on behalf of all Albertans.

Disabled persons: I couldn't believe the comments we all heard tonight about our government's intentions regarding disabled Albertans. On behalf of all of us, I had the privilege of meeting two very fine Albertans at a recent dinner meeting. It was the 74th annual meeting of the Edmonton YWCA. These Albertans had the disadvantage of being physically handicapped. I spoke to one of them, a young lady, and asked her what her disability was. By the way, she had no legs. She said she had no disabilities now and had the best employment opportunities in this province of any province.

I spoke to a gentleman who was the guest speaker that night. He speaks funny, walks funny, and talks funny. That's what he told us. But then he told us that we should be inside his eyes and see how we look. This man has cerebral palsy. He is one of 32 North American citizens who have the privilege of being able to drive. Right now he is engaged in a project throughout Alberta, under the Minister of Education, of actually talking to children at schools. This man shows children what it's like to be handicapped. That explains to children what it's like and how it is to be and feel handicapped. He's a marvelous Albertan. That night he told that audience from all over the city and other parts of Alberta that there isn't a better place to be than in this province if one is unfortunate enough to be physically or mentally handicapped. Members of the Legislative Assembly: I listen to those people, and this government listens to the disabled.

The leader also briefly discussed municipalities. I have the privilege of having some unique municipalities to represent. One of the largest municipalities in Alberta by area — shared by my colleagues the Member for Three Hills, the Member for Drumheller, and the Member for Olds-Didsbury — is the municipality of Rocky View. I have an ID to represent, ID No. 8, whose Minister of Municipal Affairs has been very helpful to that advisory committee of the municipal planning commission and to

me in representing that ID. I also have two Indian reserves to represent, the people of the Sarcee and the people of the Stoney. Those people working with me and my colleague the Minister responsible for Native Affairs are seeing economic development occur, and they are being helped by this government. They have come to this government because they know it is an approachable government.

I also have the privilege of representing two of the fastest growing of the top 25 municipalities in this province, the town of Cochrane and the town of Canmore. Through this budget and the past budget, both municipalities receive a much higher rate of grants from the province because of our approach, developed by the hon. minister, to provide for recognition of fast growth. They're very pleased to receive services from the Minister of Housing and Public Works through the Alberta Housing Corporation, through the announcements of an increase in the amount of money and assistance being provided in the revolving fund in housing for the elderly, and so on.

Lastly, but not by any means least, the national parks townsites are working very closely right now with the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, his staff, and the federal government to determine if there is potential for establishing local government by their decision. This government has been recognized as offering that opportunity and working with the communities there. It's unusual to hear one figure and then to read another figure immediately. In the municipal budget portion of the Provincial Treasurer's address, just to give one example: Assistance to Municipalities. I've mentioned those in my own constituency that will enjoy this assistance this year.

In 1981-82 ... unconditional grants [will total] \$78.9 million, a \$6.5 million increase...

The municipal debenture interest rebate program will provide additional benefits of \$43 million in subsidized interest costs on eligible municipal borrowing...

There is a further explanation, on page 34, Assistance to Local Government. I just find it hard to understand how a member can say that these do not reflect the increasing demands and needs. The increases are provided also to improve the level of assessment services.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker. I could take each page, or I could go department by department, minister by minister, and show how each minister has developed in his department's estimates, now presented by the Treasurer, programs that will affect each Albertan. Not one department, one minister, one agency isn't actively providing assistance and being recognized for that assistance in the constituency of Banff-Cochrane.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say. I know the time is probably drawing close. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:11 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

