

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

[Leave granted; Bill 226 read a first time]

Title: Wednesday, April 15, 1981 2:30 p.m.

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID: *Assalamu Aleikum*. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor to introduce to you and to hon. members of the Assembly His Excellency Altaf Ahmad Shaikh, Ambassador for Pakistan in Canada. His Excellency has served in Ankara, Stockholm, Calcutta, Bad Godesberg, Meshed, and Paris, and in the countries of Syria, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Austria, and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, Pakistan is one of the most promising countries for petroleum equipment and technology from Alberta, since 80 per cent of its area is a sedimentary basin. Several Alberta companies have already concluded contracts, one alone in the amount of \$2.5 million, and the president personally, as well as ministers of the government of Pakistan, have expressed their keen interest in our expertise.

I would like to thank His Excellency the Ambassador for his outstanding help and co-operation, and ask hon. members to welcome him, as well as Mrs. Shaikh and their daughter, to this Assembly and the province of Alberta.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 29

## The Water Resources Amendment Act, 1981

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 29, The Water Resources Amendment Act, 1981. The purpose of this Bill is to clarify that The Water Resources Act covers the few surface waters in Alberta, as well as changes of an administrative nature.

[Leave granted; Bill 29 read a first time]

## Bill 226

## An Act to Establish the Independence of the Human Rights Commissioner

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 226, An Act to Establish the Independence of the Human Rights Commissioner.

The purpose of the Bill is to establish an officer of the Legislature responsible for protecting individual rights. The independence of the commissioner is guaranteed through this Act, with provisions similar to those which keep the Ombudsman from partisan political control.

Mr. Speaker, following the request by Your Honour, the title of this Bill has been changed slightly to avoid confusion with Bill 224.

## Bill 27

## The Pipeline Amendment Act, 1981

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce The Pipeline Amendment Act, 1981.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend The Pipeline Act of 1975, in order to improve public safety and convenience with respect to operations of pipelines. The major portion of the amendments embodied in the Bill are a result of the findings of the Energy Resources Conservation Board pipeline failure inquiry regarding the March 1979 pipeline failure in the Mill Woods area of Edmonton. The main features of the Bill are protection of pipelines from other construction activities and provisions for upgrading the operational safety of pipelines.

[Leave granted; Bill 27 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 27 and Bill No. 29 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

## head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the Legislature Sessional Paper No. 82, required under The Blind Persons Act, and Sessional Paper No. 83, required under The Disabled Persons Act.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a class of 31 grades 7 and 8 students from St. Vincent de Paul school in the constituency of Calgary North West. The students are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Brian Ogrady, and by one of the teachers' aides. I would like them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of this Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, Mr. Al Hiebert, I take pleasure in presenting a class of grades 5 and 6 students from St. Bede school in the Edmonton Catholic school district. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. MacKenzie and Jos Vicente, and by parents Mrs. Miller, Mrs. Schultz, Mr. Gatzke, and Mrs. Sicotte. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 25 grade 6 students from the Lauderdale school in Edmonton Glen-garry. Accompanied by two parents, Mrs. Wagner and Mrs. Hartell, as well as their teacher Mr. Scott, they are in the members gallery. Would they please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly and, a little later this afternoon, enjoy the proceedings of the House.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to the members of this Legislative Assembly 20 students from the Victoria Composite high

school in the constituency of Edmonton Centre. This group of high school and young adult students represents China, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Chile, Japan, India, Portugal, and Indonesia. They are accompanied by their leader, Mr. Scragg, and are seated in the public gallery. As the students rise, I would ask hon. members to join with me and give them a warm welcome.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Hospital Construction

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question this afternoon is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It relates first of all to some of the glowing reports and platitudes we heard last night from the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, and to the Canmore hospital. It's indicated that there are inadequate facilities at the Canmore hospital, and the performance of a number of surgical and medical procedures has been condemned as unbecoming conduct for the doctors if they do perform these medical procedures. I wonder if the minister could indicate what type of renovations are being contemplated, or when a new hospital will be ready for Canmore.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the new hospital building was approved as a new building project in the fall of 1979. We're expecting construction to start sometime later this year. The programming, planning, and preparation of contract drawings should be done by then.

I must say the move by the College of Physicians and Surgeons with respect to telling some of their members not to carry out surgical procedures in the building came at a bad time. Nonetheless, I've been assured by officials that health facilities and services that should be provided to the citizens will be provided by using what is available at Canmore and using the nearby Banff hospital.

There had been a request from the Banff hospital board that, commencing immediately, an interim hospital be built in the meantime, and that it could possibly be open by the end of the year, then be converted to a nurses' residence when the new approved hospital came on stream. I think people can readily see the impracticality of that suggestion.

Nonetheless, to finish the points raised, funds have been approved for immediate temporary repair work, on a high priority basis, to some aspects of the hospital. I don't have that list at my fingertips, but I can take this question as notice and get it for the hon. member. So that's the way we're proceeding: we're urging the board to proceed as expeditiously as possible with the new hospital and in the meantime to carry out only the very necessary renovations needed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. From my examination of the project, some of the doctors find themselves in a very uneasy position. Is the minister taking any steps within the department to place this project on a higher priority? Due to the pressure that's going to come on the hospital this summer because a mobile tourist population places a special pressure on Canmore, will all steps be taken to move this project and the construction date ahead? Are there some possibilities of the minister doing that?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think there are. First I should mention that the Canmore hospital was

one of the eight hospitals released for approval in the fall of '79 because of a high priority that had been identified. Members will recall that the major building program was announced in March 1980, so Canmore is one of those eight high priority items released for approval some six months earlier than the rest.

It's involved in the development of what's called a prototypical or modular hospital capable of expansion and building in other parts of the province to serve other communities at a later date. I think once the drawings are done, the project will go ahead very rapidly. Of course all this has happened in a time of very rapid growth, in an area of high tourism, and in relationship to a very, very, old building that has probably been there too long. I think that combination of factors does two things. It underlines the urgency for all parties involved to get on with the project as quickly as possible. I think it points out, too, the importance of getting a good long-term building in there as quickly as possible.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. One of the concerns I have with regard to putting a hospital in place is this time span. This particular hospital was promised prior to the 1979 election. In July 1980, the College of Physicians put together an *ad hoc* committee. They recommended that all haste be taken. We are two years down the road at this time, and it looks like close to three years before the hospital can be used. Is the minister looking at some new procedures by which hospital facilities, not only a new facility but renovations, can be put in place faster than they are at the present time?

MR. RUSSELL: I'm glad the hon. leader brought up that point, because that's one of the very frustrating things I've found in the office for the short time I've had it. I've got the approval of the Legislature to commit this incredible building program and, by my nature, I'm anxious to get on with it. It's not that easy dealing with a variety of autonomous boards throughout the province, all of whom are very anxious to reinvent the wheel for every new hospital built around the province. So the programming and planning is taking longer than I would like. I think we're taking all reasonable moves we can to try to standardize hospital design, to try to speed up the process, and still respect the local autonomy of the boards.

##### University Faculty Salary Negotiations

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and ask the hon. minister what review the department has undertaken of the concerns of the Confederation of Alberta Faculty Associations with respect to remuneration for salaries — concerns that with the consumer price index increasing 121 per cent in the last nine years, their remuneration has only gone up 91 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question, question.

MR. NOTLEY: Just a minute. My question is: what review has been undertaken by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower on this assertion?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the budget put before this Assembly last evening indicates the response of the

department and the government to the needs of postsecondary education in this province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. In view of the lowered expectations of the professors over the last nine years as a result of this government policy, is the minister telling the House that the budget last night will in fact allow the universities of this province sufficient leeway to pay catch-up salaries, in view of the figures that the Confederation of Alberta Faculty Associations have presented? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect, I would have to doubt whether it was in the area of responsibility of the minister to do a certain amount of arithmetic of that kind and express an opinion on a subject, certainly a subject on which you would think the hon. member asking the question would be able to do the same thing for himself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase the question and ask the minister if, in drafting its budget proposals, the government specifically took into account the concerns of the professional faculties in this province with respect to remuneration, and that sufficient funds would be available for catch-up settlements?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of the government to deal with boards of governors in the area of universities and colleges and not to deal directly with, or become involved in, the negotiations between the boards and their faculty associations. I've indicated quite clearly to the confederation that it is not my position, nor is it the government's intention, to become involved directly in the negotiating process.

The budget contains a number of features, which I hope to touch upon in the debate on the budget later today perhaps, in which I will outline measures that have been taken to recognize areas of growth and, in particular, to recognize areas of concern with regard to professional faculty enhancement at the institutions. But it is not the intention of this government to direct the funding to specific faculties. Those decisions are properly made within the university and college communities.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What consideration was given by the government in the global commitment? One realizes that negotiations have to take place between the boards of governors and the respective faculty associations. But in terms of global budgeting, some provision has to be made. What specific assessment has the government made of the concerns of the faculty associations, in view of the fact that this information was given to him some time ago and I believe has been discussed with him for some time now?

MR. HORSMAN: The subject of the level of payment received by members of faculties at universities is a matter that has been negotiated between the boards of governors and the faculty associations. In each case there are contracts between the board and the faculty. It's the contract entered into between those two bodies which determines the method of setting salaries. I might add that it includes in each case a method of dealing with impasse resolution. It is certainly the appropriate method of dealing with the subject of levels of salary within

institutions, and it is not the government's intention to become involved in that negotiating process.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the government's answer, what assessment has the government made of the need to retain competent staff by paying competitive salaries, even though the negotiations must be done between the faculty association and respective boards of governors? In particular, has any study been made of the assertion of the faculty associations that the low salaries seriously imperil the graduate student program at our universities in the province?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to review the budget of my department at some length in the budget debate and again in estimates. Many of the questions posed this afternoon relate directly to those issues.

With regard to the level of salaries paid at universities, colleges, and technical institutions in this province — at the board-governed institutions — I wish to repeat that it is very clearly the responsibility of the board of governors to enter into those negotiations and agreements.

I may say that the normal measure is a comparison of other universities in Canada. In that respect I have noted Statistics Canada figures which indicate that the average salary for professors at the University of Alberta is the second highest in Canada, and the University of Calgary is the fourth highest of all universities in this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary by the hon. member, followed by a further supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Is the minister in a position to tell the House whether the government has had an opportunity to review the assertion of the president of the Confederation of Alberta Faculty Associations that in fact there has been a shifting of funds and that under the established programs financing Act, Alberta has not been matching federal funds on a fifty-fifty basis? Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly precisely what is the government's review on this particular matter?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Those assertions are obviously based on some allegations of fact I'm not aware of, because in fact the level of cash payments from the federal government under the established programs financing agreement entered into in 1977 for postsecondary education, has remained constant at approximately 21 per cent of the total expenditure. There has been no decline in the level of provincial involvement in those postsecondary programs.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I can understand hiding behind the board of governors and the negotiations. [interjections] My question to the minister is very straightforward. We all recognize that the boards of governors have only two sources of funds: the provincial government and student fees. Under those circumstances, where quality education will come about by remuneration which is fair and equitable with other faculties — and there is a requirement by the boards of governors for greater funds — is the minister recommending only one alternative at this time, an increase in student fees?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are many more than two sources of funding for universities: the grants provided by this government, tuition fees, moneys available from investments by universities, and we are encouraging the private sector to become involved through the 1980s advanced education endowment fund. I think it's entirely appropriate that the institutions in this province not be solely dependent on government for their entire funding. [interjections]

Now the hon. members in their little corner over there can mumble away all they want, the fact of the matter is that it is wrong to have universities and colleges become more and more dependent solely on government for their income. That may suit the socialists, because that's what they like. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to put himself in that camp, fine and dandy. But the fact of the matter is that we as a government believe the private sector should be encouraged to participate in funding postsecondary educational institutions.

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

MR. R. SPEAKER: The minister well realizes that those funds from the private sector are directed and channelled into certain faculties, and they're not overall available in negotiations to the faculty associations and the boards of governors. My question to the hon. minister is whether the boards of governors have access to the minister for a greater amount of funds — because when we look at the budget, it looks like maybe 12 per cent is available to the boards of governors — to meet the needs of the faculty associations to bring about this quality education.

MR. HORSMAN: The mathematics of the hon. Leader of the Opposition aren't any better than his preparation for his speech last night. [interjections] The fact of the matter is that the global funding increase for universities and colleges is 18.2 per cent.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. minister better do some math. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

#### Television Services

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Telephones. It arises from a decision taken yesterday by the Canadian radio and television commission which permits TV broadcasting services to be beamed via satellite to northern and remote communities. Is the minister in a position to inform the Assembly how this undertaking by the consortium known as CANCOM will impact on the communications industry in Alberta, and specifically northern Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly I'm misapprising the purport of the question, but unless there were some substantial provincial involvement or involvement by the minister's department, it would seem that this question would be outside the terms of reference. In any event it's an outright invitation to express an opinion.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that there will be some involvement and impact on television communications in the province, and I would just like to have that clarified by the minister.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there has been involvement on the part of provincial ministers in this particular decision. I'd like to make the comment that we welcome this particular decision of the CRTC in Alberta. For the first time it provides an opportunity for an Alberta broadcaster to be allowed to get up on the satellite and provide television programming to northern Alberta and the Northwest Territories. The decision allows the consortium made up of four broadcasters — BCTV, ITV in Edmonton, CHCH in Hamilton, I believe, and a Quebec broadcaster — to be licensed to provide programming on the satellite.

As I say, we welcome that particular decision. It is a follow-up of representations by provincial ministers, also a recommendation a year ago by a committee of federal, provincial, and territorial members. A former colleague of ours, the hon. Dr. Warrack, was a member of that committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister in a position to advise when transmission of the kind indicated in the CRTC decision will be implemented in Alberta?

DR. WEBBER: I'm not sure exactly when it will be implemented, Mr. Speaker, but it's my hope that services will begin before September.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Associate Minister of Telephones, arising from that of the Member for Barrhead. If and when this service becomes available, could the minister advise the House if a fee for receiving these programs will be levied on residents of northern Alberta?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, if in fact the signal is going to be scrambled, there would be a requirement for people who are going to receive this signal to pay a levy. However, if the signal is not going to be scrambled, it's available to anyone that wants to pick it up, whether it be northern or southern Alberta.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, because I don't know how it's going to be scrambled. If a fee is going to be levied on consumers of this free airspace, as it were, could the Attorney General advise the House if they must go through the Public Utilities Board to set that fee?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the question is heavy with implications that it might require a legal opinion.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that any telecommunications group comes under the same category as a utility. If that is so, I would again pose the question to the Attorney General. But recognizing the legal opinion I've got, perhaps I can communicate with him in written form and perhaps get a professional opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: If the question relates to the present law, of course it's seeking a legal opinion . . . which as you can see would be very difficult to give. But if it relates to the arrangement which was made, it's a question of fact.

MR. CRAWFORD: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that your observations sounded hypothetical to me. [laughter]

#### **Municipal Taxation for Hospitals**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could the minister indicate whether the government is considering allowing hospital boards to collect a share of municipal taxes?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that's a suggestion we've put to the last two annual conventions of the Alberta Hospital Association. My colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs has also suggested it at the last AUMA convention. Following that, I met with the AUMA executive and told them that a position paper they were working on would be very helpful to us, and that perhaps it would be a good idea to develop one along with the AHA and give it to us. Yes, it is a matter that's under consideration.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister met with municipal officials in Alberta and discussed collecting a portion of the municipal tax by hospital boards?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thought I'd said that I met with the executive of the AUMA not too long ago, and we discussed their possible position paper. We had a good discussion about why such a move would probably be necessary, without debating the merits of the move.

#### **Meat Industry**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister advise the Assembly how the study on Alberta's meat industry is progressing?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the study is ongoing and within the time frame that was established. It's my understanding that Dr. Horner was spending this last week in the Peace River block, tied with the basic study itself.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether there has been or will be an interim report? When can we expect the final report?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, an interim report was filed about two weeks ago. It's my understanding that the final report could be expected late in October.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In light of the possible hog stabilization program, could the minister further advise whether he will be waiting for the meat industry report before proceeding on a price assurance program for hogs?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in light of the lack of any federal program for support for the hog industry across Canada, provinces have established, in varying degrees, support to the industry. It's on that basis that we in the province of Alberta are considering some form of support

or assurance to the industry. It would not be our intention to have to wait until the final report before any decisions were made.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister suggested "considering". Would the minister then advise whether consultations have occurred between cattle producers and hog producers regarding this stabilization program, and whether he'll wait for the outcome of such consultations or considerations before he makes the final decision on the assurance program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the hog marketing board discussed a form of support with the membership at the annual meetings that have just closed throughout the province. I'm also aware that the cattle industry is aware of the ongoing discussions and have shown some concern in regard to any approach of support to the livestock industry. It's my understanding that they have requested a meeting with the hog producers to have an exchange of views between the two areas of production in both the beef and hog industries.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister advise the House if it is intended to be an assurance program, in the sense of government-funded, or an insurance type of program, where in fact the industry pays part of the premium and insures itself against very significant price fluctuations?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, no decisions have been made as to the exact program itself, other than to say that the programs of our neighboring provinces lend themselves more to an assurance program that is more insurance in nature and ends up with a shared premium, by choice.

#### **Postsecondary Institutions — Funding**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It really flows from the discussions I had with some of the individuals who were on the front steps of the Legislature today — a group, might I add, one doesn't often find there, and I commend the academic community in Alberta for that.

Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly the status of discussions or negotiations between the provinces and the federal government regarding the established program funding Act, primarily that portion that deals with advanced education? I ask the question in light of the federal government comments that they are going to place a lid on that area and that, through the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the federal government has said there'll be no cutbacks in that area, leading to the concern of a lot of people that in fact postsecondary education will be the area of federal cutbacks.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the negotiation of the new agreement, which I expect will take place soon, between my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, the federal Minister of Finance, and other provincial counterparts, will relate to the entire program.

At this time, I can advise the Assembly that the Hon. Francis Fox, Secretary of State of Canada, responsible for this area of the federal government's liaison with the ministers of education, attended the last meeting of the Council of Ministers of Education and assured us that no

decision had been made at the federal level with respect to their participation in the established programs financing area. It is of course a matter of concern to the government, and along with my other colleagues I will be discussing this matter with the Provincial Treasurer, who will have that responsibility in the coming months.

MR. R. CLARK: A further supplementary question arising from the same group. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly what types of problems the faculties of business, engineering, and computer science are having in being able to retain top quality people in our postsecondary educational institutions, because of the difficulty in competing with the private sector?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is aware, as are all members, of the fact that in last year's budget, for the first time a professional faculties enhancement amount of \$810,000 was made available to the University of Alberta. In this year's budget that has been extended to include the universities of Calgary and Lethbridge. The particulars of that will be more available, but without going into details, I would indicate that almost \$2 million has been provided to those three institutions so they can make their internal allocations without our specifically directing particular funding to any faculty. I'm sure no one in this Assembly would want us to start that business. The requests were made to government by the boards of governors with respect to the faculties mentioned by the hon. member.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister's department, or some other government agency the minister is involved with, done an in-depth look at the success Alberta universities are having in being able to retain members of the academic community on a long-term basis? I raise the question because when someone leaves, it is certainly possible to hire someone at a far lower level and continue that kind of process. The end result is that we don't have the quality there that is desirable. Has the minister's department been involved in that kind of assessment?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have been advised by universities of the turnover rate generally, with respect to their faculty. I understand that at the University of Alberta it has been in the neighborhood of 3 per cent, which is extremely low. I have not had such information from the universities of Calgary or Lethbridge, but I can perhaps obtain that information and advise the hon. member.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly if a rough breakdown in the estimates presented to the Assembly last night would be something like 5 to 6 per cent for new programs and enhancement to certain programs, and something in the vicinity of 12 to 13 per cent for the broad, general area of salary increases across the board?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am prepared to go into some detail on that in the budget debate and in my estimates. But there is a 13.1 per cent across-the-board increase to provide for cost increases for all institutions. Then of course there are professional faculty enhancement grants, operating costs for new facilities, provisions for general growth, conditional grants for pro-

grams that had previously been approved and are still in their conditional stage of approval, and then for new program initiatives. So a number of elements are built into it. But the base grant increase is 13.1 per cent.

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

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary to the minister. The base increase then would be 13.1 per cent, as compared to the government's 22.5 per cent base increase in its budget?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is obviously going from an unwarranted assumption to a foregone conclusion. I think the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury should spend some more time on the estimates before he comes up with figures like that.

#### **Acidic Soil Program**

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Last night I was pleased to see the announcement of the acidic soil program. I was wondering if the minister could advise the Assembly when more details of this program will be announced.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member would wait until the estimates, and then we would have an opportunity to air the program fully.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the program be in place so the farmers can take advantage of it by this fall?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's our intention to put the program into force this summer, of course recognizing that the success of the program will be tied directly to the source and the availability of supply. At present it would appear that there are sources that lie fairly well along the Eastern Slopes within the province. The problem is to make those available to each agricultural community at a reasonable price.

#### **Bankruptcy Investigation**

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if he could advise if his department is investigating or reviewing the bankruptcy of the Dial Mortgage Corporation.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the responsibility we have with respect to Dial Mortgage is under the mortgage brokers Act. Earlier this year, as a result of a review of some of the financial statements, the Superintendent of Real Estate was concerned enough to issue a stop order on certain of the bank accounts of Dial Mortgage. Subsequently one of the banks, I believe the Canadian Commercial and Industrial Bank, under a debenture, moved to appoint a receiver. That was done. Thereafter I believe that the receiver appointed under the debenture concluded that there might be a conflict in the receiver's acting under the debenture as well as on behalf of investors or clients of Dial.

There have been successive court appearances at which representatives of the department have been present, with the next one taking place tomorrow, I believe, in the

Court of Queen's Bench in Edmonton. The issue is the appointment of someone to act on behalf of the interests of Dial's investor clients. That may be in terms of an actual appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy, or it may be in terms of the appointment of a receiver separate from the Thorne Riddell receiver appointed under the debenture, though I understand that it more likely will be under the bankruptcy proceedings.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. A constituent of mine I guess would be considered one of those client investors. What he's concerned about is that it was his understanding that an insurance fund protected people like him, and it appears to him that he's not being protected, but the bank is. From the minister's remarks, can I assume he will have this protection under this Act, or is this a federal Act? I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I think he in fact is seeking legal advice, which perhaps could be sought elsewhere.

MR. KOZIAK: My answer may have caused the hon. member to reach an incorrect conclusion. He said something about the banks' being protected. When the superintendent moved earlier this year with a stop order on Dial's accounts at the banks, that was for the benefit of the investor clients rather than the bank. If I left that impression, that wasn't the case.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My concern is that my constituent, who was registered on the property, is not receiving any more money because of the actions that have taken place in the bankruptcy, and he wants to know what protection he has.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it does seem that the hon. member or his constituent would have to consult legal advice.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question. Can the minister advise if his department is able in any way to protect this individual?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the method of protection would have been in terms of our early movement with the stop order, although there is some dispute as to the ownership of the funds it involved, to save for the benefit of these people those funds they were able to catch with the stop order and any ultimate claim on a bond.

Admittedly, investors who invest in this nature of investment must appreciate that this is not a bank, trust company, or credit union, which is supported by such things as the Stabilization Corporation in the case of a credit union, or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of deposits with banks or trust companies. Investors who invest in this particular field, invest because of the higher rate of return. They should be aware that a higher rate of return brings with it a higher degree of risk.

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

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether he has had any communications with the Alberta Mortgage Brokers Association in respect of the situation of certain investors

who advanced funds to Dial Mortgage in the expectation of receiving a mortgage security, but who have not received same and may now find themselves in the status of unsecured creditors? If the minister has had such communications, has he given consideration to possible legislation to protect such investors and ensure continued confidence by the investment community in real estate properties in the province of Alberta?

MR. KOZIAK: Though I'd like to, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to be able to say definitively that such contact has or has not been made with officials of the department who work with this particular area on a day to day basis. Perhaps it would be useful for me to make those inquiries and report to the hon. member.

#### **Alberta Opportunity Company Loans**

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business, regarding the Alberta Opportunity Company. In view of the high, fluctuating interest rate, I wonder if the minister would inform the House whether he has changed the AOC rate, or whether the rate is lower than that high 18, 19, or 20 per cent interest rate, with high collateral, required at the market rate?

MR. SPEAKER: I have some concern. Unless this is information which the minister has which has not yet become public, then of course the question would be in order. But if it's asking for public knowledge, of course this is not the place.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking whether that rate has changed recently as a policy directive, because the interest rates have gone up.

MR. SPEAKER: As I say, if there's a rate change which is not publicly known yet, the question is in order. If the rate change is publicly known, question period is not the place to confirm it.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, there is no rate change from last fall.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the policy of the Alberta Opportunity Company regarding loan approval changed during the past few months, especially with regard to rural and urban approval AOC loans?

MR. ADAIR: No, Mr. Speaker. There has been no change in the process of applications. They've been speeded up in the last 18 months. Rate changes are still based on the base rate of 12 per cent, to a high of 15 per cent and a low of 10 per cent.

DR. PAPROSKI: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have any information whether any other financial institution in the province of Alberta has offered to provide such high-risk loans for small business, recognizing AOC is doing it?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the opportunity may be welcome to the minister, but it would seem that the question period is not intended for that kind of information. It's true that quite often there are questions asking whether ministers have certain information in the

course of their public duties, and quite often they have that information which isn't generally available. But this would seem to be a fairly accessible type of research project that might be pursued outside the House.

DR. PAPROSKI: Then with respect, Mr. Speaker, I'll reframe the question. Maybe the Speaker, in his wisdom, will allow it to go through. If not, I'll abide by the ruling. I'm really asking whether the minister has received an indication or information from a financial institution that they're willing to step in to do the job AOC is doing. I think it's very relevant that we as legislators know that information.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it would seem that this whole topic, at least in the direction it's going, is not really suited for the question period. Access to these financial institutions to find out on what basis they'll make loans is undoubtedly open to all members of the public as well as of the House.

#### **Rental Accommodation**

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. With an almost zero vacancy rate in Calgary, a number of apartment blocks are being 'condominiumized' or converted to other uses. As a result, a number of senior citizens are being forced to find alternative accommodation. Has the minister received any complaints with respect to owners not carrying out proper notification to tenants?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall receiving any complaints to this end. With respect to a change of use, under The Landlord and Tenant Act the notice provisions would be the normal three months, and 180 days in the case of a conversion of the entire apartment to condominiums. That would be the sort of requirements imposed on the owner of the premises. However, we haven't received complaints to this effect, at least in my office. I don't know whether officials in the department have; I could search that out.

The hon. member mentioned senior citizens, and I'm sure he's pleased with the announcement last night in the budget speech which indicated that Alberta Housing Corporation would be constructing 2,600 units for senior citizens in this fiscal year, which would assist in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Associate Minister of Telephones would like to deal further with a previous question period topic.

#### **Telephone Directories**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to a couple of questions raised yesterday, and I took them as notice. One was a question from the Member for Athabasca. He asked about the reasons for rearranging areas which were included in some rural telephone directories.

Some changes are being made in the part of Alberta covered by the northern district directory. It includes listings of the communities from Grande Cache and Jasper, over to Bonnyville, Paradise Valley, and other parts of eastern Alberta. It has common white pages throughout. After conducting surveys, AGT concluded that the book was larger than necessary and that the majority of subscribers don't need or use listings of residences and businesses in communities that are far away from them.

Consequently, in order to cut costs, AGT decided to discontinue the northern directory and is producing three new directories. They'll begin this July and will provide information or listings for communities within the same general area. Notices have gone out to subscribers in those areas. However, if subscribers are not satisfied in receiving just one directory, they can receive free directories for those areas for which they need them.

The second question was raised by the Member for Stony Plain, in which he referred to Edmonton directories that had black pages being received in outlying areas around Edmonton. However, they were black-marked. The reason they were omitted this year — the previous year they received them; this year they were cut out — was simply that those listings are currently in the AGT home directories for those areas. However, as a result of some unforeseen problems, it's going to be my recommendation for 1982 that those black markings go back into the Edmonton directory for those areas.

Finally, the Member for St. Albert raised a concern yesterday about a possible shortage of Edmonton directory yellow pages in regions around Edmonton. Those directories are available free from AGT at the current time. However, AGT also provides its own yellow pages for those areas, and there have been some concerns from local businessmen that they don't want the Edmonton yellow pages coming into their area because of competition.

#### **Dickson Dam**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, while we're clarifying responses, perhaps I could clarify one in the question period yesterday when the Member for Olds-Didsbury asked with regard to the cost of the Dickson dam. I think I left the impression that the cost increases were primarily due to inflation, and I guess I indicated there were no design changes. In responding to that, while there were no major design changes, some changes were made in design. I'd just like to put them on record.

The tunnelling was moved from the south to the north bank to avoid proximity to service spillway. The result was a longer tunnel and a shift in axis of main dam, with resulting increased quantities. There was also a flattening of earth-fill slopes as a result of detailed testing. A two-lane highway crossing on the dam was included after the original cost estimate, as a result of dialogue with the county of Red Deer.

In addition, as a result of some other submissions, we made some provision in the dam that would facilitate development of hydropower. Aerial contours were inaccurate, requiring some lengthening of the dike system. The dikes were rerouted to improve configuration of residual farmland. A ground water control program, in the form of drainage ditches and pumping system, was included after a 1978 seepage investigation. Finally, an agreement was made with the county of Red Deer to pay for road maintenance in addition to normal. Primarily, these were the design changes.

MR. R. CLARK: Might I ask the hon. minister a question?

MR. SPEAKER: For detailed costs?

MR. R. CLARK: You're a mind reader, Mr. Speaker. Not a detailed cost, just the overall cost of these changes nobody seemed to know about.



MR. COOKSON: I could provide that information. I don't have the cost breakdown here.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully draw the attention of the House to the position of a television camera to my right, which is there for the purpose of giving hon. members an opportunity of assessing whether it will obstruct passage unduly. It is something which has been worked out with the members of the press gallery in order to try to deal with an observation made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I would respectfully invite hon. members to observe this position and to see whether they think it may be feasible to continue the positioning of a camera in that situation until such time as we're able to make better long-term arrangements with regard to televising in the Chamber.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the point you've just raised, I was just going to say that all hon. members will welcome the report. I believe it's the custom in any parliament that the presence of anyone other than a member in the Assembly goes unseen. In the case of Miss Leahey, that's particularly difficult, Mr. Speaker. [interjection]

MR. CRAWFORD: I missed that.

MR. R. CLARK: That's one of your better observations.

MR. CRAWFORD: It's nice to be seconded in these things, Mr. Speaker.

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

4. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that when the House rises at 5:30 p.m. on April 16, 1981, it shall be adjourned until 2:30 p.m. on April 22, 1981.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 4 was before the Assembly, of course, on Friday. As I recall, I had already moved it and in effect had adjourned debate. There was then some discussion outside the Assembly in regard to whether or not the government would wish to present the motion in a slightly different form. I won't say the result of that was that the hon. member who raised it was satisfied with the response, but in any event we concluded that the preference would still be to put it forward in the form that it appears.

Because of the fact that at the time we discussed previous precedents in regard to the Easter break, I would just note that admittedly this precedent has only a one-year precedent — last year's. Nevertheless it is the same way it was dealt with last year, and that would be the reason for suggesting that it go ahead on the same basis this year.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as it's necessary in rising now to move the matter again, I would do so.

[Motion carried]

6. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government.

[Adjourned debate April 14: Mr. Stevens]

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks today, I would like to acknowledge the questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition this afternoon regarding the Canmore hospital. Those questions are, of course, as late as everything else that's been contributed, but I'm glad the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care was able to bring him up to date on the area.

The 1981 budget, so well presented last night by the Provincial Treasurer, is a \$6.7 billion plan that is a measured response to Albertans' needs, and indeed to those of Canadians elsewhere. It reflects the misguided and discriminatory Ottawa energy policy, because it includes the reduction in our revenue from our depleting natural resources, and that's a shame for Albertans and indeed all Canada. But it provides new initiatives and expanded programs in health care, for children, for handicapped Albertans, for housing, and in so many ways for our senior citizens: in housing and benefits. When we were able to participate in the delivery of the 75th Anniversary gold medallions last year, all of us enjoyed so much the wonderful occasions with our pioneers and their families.

This budget continues the precedent of this government: this decade of good, sound financial management. But it does act as a pause. It provides a rest for a moment, if you like, on the hand on the lever. And with that Alberta square-shooter look, it says: as a challenge to us all to consider our individual priorities as citizens and our demands for increased services, we do face some difficult choices ahead. We can have increased services, but we are going to have to have increased taxes or reduce our savings.

I want to dwell on that for just a few minutes as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by noting in the Budget Address, particularly page 60, that the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimated income and capital contributions are shown as \$2.3 billion in 1981-82, hopefully to be added to the estimated assets, now \$8.5 billion. Think about this just for a moment: in our last quarterly report from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the Provincial Treasurer's report as of December, and looking at our 1981 Budget Address, page 60, our capital projects investments, we have approximately \$1 billion. Last night we heard that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is not benefiting Albertans. Just for a moment let me quote some of the projects in the heritage savings capital projects investment division. They're so numerous that I think citizens across Alberta should have the opportunity to reflect for a moment on what this fund is doing in this division alone: the Southern Alberta Children's Hospital, the Alberta Health Sciences Centre, the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre, and all the other programs including the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, which is off and running.

We can look at irrigation rehabilitation and expansion; stabilization plans; Alberta Oil Sands Technology and the conventional oil enhanced program; all the parks projects throughout Alberta, including Kananaskis Country, the Capital and Fish Creek parks; our airport terminal program; our hopper cars now being seen throughout western Canada. We've seen the Alberta heritage learning project. I know that many of us here today were able to

participate in the delivery of those books to schools throughout our constituencies. I know that I, and I'm sure each of us here, received many compliments for that program for our children. That's just some of the examples in the capital projects division.

We have a Canada investment division, \$1.5 billion involving six provinces across Canada: Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec. That is recycling petrodollars throughout Canada. We have the Alberta investment division. When we talk about the Alberta investment division, let's see how \$4.5 billion are working their way through our society in Alberta: the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, the Alberta Government Telephones Commission, the Alberta . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret interrupting the hon. minister, but it would appear that he has very nearly, if not actually, exhausted his time.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In concluding, I would indicate that it does reflect a full range of services across Alberta. I look forward to the debate and the participation of my colleagues, who share with me pride in Alberta, our ability to act as the prime mover in Canada, if only the Ottawa government will open eyes that are blind and unseeing to the opportunities we have here, in Canada, to help all Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Rising to take part in the budget debate this afternoon, I'd like to make a few introductory comments. I notice that the hon. Provincial Treasurer was quoted as saying that the Alberta rainbow is fading. Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly the ideas of this government, in terms of dealing with the problems right here in our own backyard, are inadequate. If that's an illustration of a fading rainbow, there's no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that shows a government essentially satisfied with the way things are, a government that in my view has lost all vision of the way things might be. Incessantly through the budget speech we have one phrase after another of Ottawa-bashing. There are differences between the federal government and the province of Alberta, differences shared in part by all Albertans and in part by some Albertans, depending on the issue. But it is not adequate, in my view, to evade responsibility for some of the real problems that exist in this province by continually and incessantly blaming Ottawa for everything. Indeed, when one considers the fading rainbow, it's almost got to the point where the Tories are blaming the weather on the federal government. Mr. Speaker, we have an administration in this province which is hiding behind siege mentality and continual confrontation for a record of performance in Alberta which, in my view, is not very good at all.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health has entered the Chamber. Because while the rainbow is fading for some, it's not fading for everyone. We have the announcement of the appointment of the minister's former ministerial assistant to an assistant deputy ministership in the Department of Social Services and Community Health. Now, quite frankly, I say to the government that I think it is a very dangerous precedent indeed to appoint executive assistants to cabinet ministers to senior positions in the civil service. If you're going to maintain morale in the public service of this province, the worst possible move is

this business of slotting ministerial assistants into senior civil service positions. I suggest that this particular move is going to come back to haunt the government in terms of its overall performance.

The minister smiles, but the minister is going to have to deal with the political ramifications of that decision, and the government will have to face it over the next period of time. I frankly say that in my judgment, at any rate, it is not appropriate for that kind of appointment to take place.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at the budget I'd like to review this perhaps from the standpoint of assessing various programs on the basis of dependency versus self-reliance. We hear so much from Tories about the need to create self-reliance. After all, this is a so-called free-enterprise government. But you know, when one reviews the budget in some depth, it seems to me that underlying almost every phrase, every action, is a government that is committing us to more dependency and less self-reliance: in the area of social services — I'm going to come to that in a moment; in the area of diversification and developing a broad-based economy in this province; and, without doubt, more dependency and less self-reliance in the area of the ownership of our economy.

First of all, let's deal with the question of social services, because there is a much publicized increase in the budget for the Department of Social Services and Community Health, and the commitment of the government to engage additional staff. To the extent that additional staff members are necessary — and I think they are — I commend the government for this step. But I say to the members of the House that probably a young couple in Peace River who triggered this whole debate in Alberta — and, I think, raised an issue that caused many of us to take a second look at the performance of our social service agencies in Alberta — probably deserve a greater debt of gratitude for any move on this score than any member of the Legislature, government or opposition, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, while we're making more money available for Social Services and Community Health, as I review the budget document I think it should be worth noting that, essentially, these programs have all been announced before. What we have today is the putting of a formal price tag on programs that have been publicly announced over the last several months. Within the thrust of the budget, there is that tendency to retain the approach of custodial treatment and dependency on social services, rather than creating a thrust towards self-reliance.

One has to look at where this government has been over the last 10 years. In the area of foster care, for example, we have the Ombudsman's report, clearly a searing indictment, not so much of the public service, because I know social workers have had to deal with a very difficult situation and child care workers have had anything but a picnic, but if anything an indictment of 10 years of neglect by this Tory government, 10 years of absolutely inexcusable neglect, when one considers that in 1972 we had the report of Judge Catonio.

I look over the recommendations, Mr. Speaker, and rather than reading them all into the record, the fact is that they are remarkably similar to the recommendations of the Ombudsman in 1981. The only difference is that nine years have passed in the intervening period, nine years of neglect in the area of social services. Now we have headlines about all the things we're doing to catch up. But most members know that as we try to catch up.

the last-minute efforts to patch together years of neglect in a crisis management way are not going to lead to the sort of performance that long-term planning would create.

I say to the members of this government: why was there no action on the Catonio report in 1972? Why did it take the horror stories in the newspapers and public media last spring and summer, and the Ombudsman's report, before this government finally decided to move? I think that question should be answered during the course of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

I look over the budget, and I see we are still taking this approach of carrying on dependency. The Catonio report makes the very valid observation that the whole thrust, the whole philosophy of social services, should be to maintain the family unit. Sometimes the family unit isn't the happy, North American model. We have tens of thousands of single-parent families, and one of the ways you maintain that family unit is the kind of support services that are needed, including after-school programs, after-school care. Even government members have admitted that our subsidized after-school care program in Alberta is totally inadequate. You can't say to a young mother, get out and work in the workplace, if you don't have an after-school care program for her children.

I look at the question of home care. Yes, more money for home care, and I applaud that, but a home care program in this province still medically oriented rather than providing the kind of aids to senior citizens to stay in their homes and remain self-reliant and independent instead of being institutionalized.

We have the question of senior citizens, Mr. Speaker. We have more money for nursing homes, but not the emphasis we get from almost every group concerned with senior citizens. For example, the Council on Aging is saying we need a much greater emphasis on programs that keep senior citizens in their own homes for as long as possible. Day care for seniors: last year we spent the grand total of \$14,500 on a day care program for seniors. Well, Mr. Speaker, simply putting people into nursing homes, even if we improved the nursing homes — and God knows we need to improve the nursing homes of this province, when you consider that 38 of the 41 private nursing homes don't meet the national standards. But even setting that aside, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis should clearly be upon self-reliance and keeping people in their own homes as long as possible.

Then I look at this increase of \$10 a month in the Alberta assured income. Mr. Speaker, with the wealth we have, the best we can do in this province is \$10 a month for people on the assured income. To get the assured income, you have to be in receipt of the old age pension and the guaranteed assistance program: you have to be able to demonstrate need.

On television the other day the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry was talking about the increase in utility rates and the impact the increase is going to have on senior citizens in this province. And he's right. Last year in the city of Grande Prairie, we had an increase of 64 per cent, almost \$200 in the average utility rate in that city. The best we can do, sitting on our heritage trust fund and our buoyant revenues, notwithstanding the poor-mouthing we had from the Provincial Treasurer the other day, is a measly \$10 a month increase.

ANHON. MEMBER: That's 100 per cent.

MR. NOTLEY: Oh, talk about percentages — the concern of the senior citizens about percentages. Keep in mind that these are the senior citizens who don't have any other form of income and have to rely on this kind of assistance. Talk about percentages to these senior citizens, and they'll tell you the impact of higher energy costs and higher utility bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that while more money is being spent, what we've done in the area of social services is to a large extent catch-up, due to a decade of neglect. We still tend to be institution oriented, and emphasis is not placed on creating self-reliance among our people, where it should be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there to deal with the question of diversification. One important observation needs to be made; I notice the Leader of the Opposition made it last night. There is an actual cut in the budget of the Department of Agriculture. I find that interesting, and I would welcome the contribution of rural members who will tell us why it's necessary to increase drilling incentives to oil companies by \$105 million, while we have a \$14 million cutback in Department of Agriculture spending.

But one thing was rather shocking in this document: there was no commitment to any program to shelter or even partially shelter Alberta farmers, beyond the existing sheltering that's in place. The government says, we've got the best there is, and that's good enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, as Unifarm pointed out last year in their annual submission to the caucus committee — it should have been to the Cabinet but the Cabinet doesn't meet the people any more in Alberta; it shuffles them off on caucus committees. Page 3 of the Unifarm brief makes the observation:

For every dollar the price of energy goes up directly to farmers, costs of other inputs such as fertilizer and machinery go up about \$2.00. An increase of only \$4/bbl would increase direct fuel costs by 25%, or about \$25 million directly and \$50 million indirectly, for an average of \$1,500 per farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any party in Alberta that isn't strongly committed to getting a fair commodity price for oil in the international market. But if we're moving to that objective — and the objective of this government is three-quarters of the Chicago composite price, and the world prices are going up — we have to come up with some better form of shielding than we have in place at the moment. Otherwise, you're going to have a lot of farmers facing very serious trouble. One would have thought that in this particular budget, if this government is concerned about protecting farmers, we would have had some program announced. Unfortunately, all we have is resting on our laurels, unless of course this might be a pre-election budget as one of the hon. members of the opposition suggested. I suspect we won't have any move to help the farmers until just before the election, the old business of three years of lean and one year of fat just before the election.

Mr. Speaker, I notice we also have a cutback in the Department of Economic Development. When one considers the need to diversify the economy of this province, that's strange indeed. A cutback in the estimates of the northern development council. Where is John Diefenbaker's vision of the north? If ever there was a faded rainbow, it's the vision of the north as far as this government is concerned. We've got an awful lot more to do in northern Alberta.

I'm glad to see additional commitment for roads. Last

year, members of the opposition argued that there should be an increase in road construction. Government members may recall, because they voted against the position we put forward. Rural members in particular will know that this is the time to expand our road program. With the slowdown in the oil industry, we've got available men and equipment that could be put into active service. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the expansion contained in the budget is not going to take up the slack caused by the oil slowdown, nor is it going to meet the potential that could exist if this government were to push ahead even more quickly in the area of road construction.

We've got many miles of roads to build, especially in northern Alberta, and many miles of pavement. We have \$35 million listed here for the pavement rehabilitation program. We had the minister himself come before the heritage trust fund in the fall of 1979 and tell us that we needed \$2 billion just to bring up to snuff the paved roads we already have in this province. So when it comes to the road construction program, let's not be too content with the provisions of this budget.

Let's look at urban transit. While we are moving modestly in the area of rural transportation, the increase of about 17 per cent in urban transit of about 17 per cent is not even going to keep pace with the actual inflation rate, when one has to consider the costs of expropriation, the added costs of arterial roadways, or the light rapid transit in our two major cities. We have the city of Calgary telling this government that between now and 1987, in order to complete their light rapid transit, they need almost \$0.75 billion more than is being projected. We want to get away from dependency and move towards self-reliance while we still have energy prices that are reasonable. We've got to make the investment in light rapid transit in our major urban centres, so that we can haul people quickly and efficiently. Now's the time to do it, not just pass the buck to the local level of government and say, all right we'll give you a 16 per cent increase and then you deal with the problems. As hon. members of the government should know, if they don't, the city fathers of both Edmonton and Calgary are more than somewhat concerned about the inadequate funding of urban transportation.

While the price of oil is \$19 a barrel and not \$30, \$40, or "whatever it's going to go up to in the next decade — and who's to say what it will rise to — the fact of the matter is that the investments we make in energy-efficient transportation in the next four or five years will pay dividends to this entire province, if we're really concerned about a strong and vibrant economy in the latter part of the 1980s. When one looks at the question of diversification, there are all sorts of indicators. But one important indicator: secondary manufacturing grew by only 7 per cent last year, less than the inflation rate.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there to deal with the third major area I want to comment on in my budget remarks, and that is the question of Canadianization. One of the glaring omissions in this budget is any real commitment to the concept of Canadianization, particularly of our energy industry. I know that members of the government pay lip-service to it, but it is only lip-service. One would think there would be some highlighting of the need to Canadianize the energy industry. We have all kinds of attacks on Ottawa: the bogeyman of Petro-Canada and Pierre Trudeau trying to steal our oil. But where were the programs we're outlining in our budget to facilitate Canadianization of the energy industry either through the private sector, the co-operative sector, or the

public sector? One can read a long way, and there is almost no emphasis other than continual Ottawa-bashing.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I want to raise this now is because if all parties in this House are committed to increasing the price of oil, the time to move on significant Canadianization is now. If we increase the price of oil, there will be a substantial increase in the ultimate cost of Canadianization. If one just examines the in-place oil of only the five major oil companies — Imperial Oil, Texaco, Shell, Amoco, and Gulf — and looks at the value of their reserves, also the foreign share of those major companies, and the natural gas in place and the value of that natural gas, and we take an increase of \$1 a barrel with an 85 per cent energy equivalent for natural gas — which is still the policy although the government offered to reduce that to 65 per cent in the July 25 negotiations — but using the policy that is in place, for every \$1 a barrel increase, the foreign share of reserves that are in place will increase by \$3.6 billion.

Because all parties in this House, and to my knowledge all members in this House, are committed to higher energy prices, the fact of the matter is that now is the time to significantly move on Canadianization. If we wait until the price of oil is \$30 a barrel, \$35 a barrel, or whatever it may be, the cost of Canadianization is going to be infinitely greater, and perhaps beyond our capacity to achieve. It's fine to say, yes, Canadianization is a good idea, but later. That's the John A. Macdonald approach: tomorrow, tomorrow. Mr. Tomorrow. We've got a Mr. Tomorrow kind of government when it comes to Canadianization.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the members of this House that there's no point continually crying in our beer about the nasty Ottawa government attempting to thrust Canadianization upon us, because every survey I've seen indicates that the vast majority of Canadians and Albertans support Canadianization. What I think we need from this government is some clear indication as to what we're going to do in the area of Canadianization, and not simply forever crying about Ottawa's initiatives. As I've watched the last few months, one of the really appalling things is that one obvious area where we could expand Canadian ownership is in the co-ops getting into the energy business. I would expect a free-enterprise government to be interested in that.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we've had a co-op refinery in our neighboring province of Saskatchewan, which members of Alberta co-ops, who keep track of what's going on in the co-op field, know very well has been an unparalleled success story. You have interest shown by the co-ops in getting into the oil business in a very significant way. But who are they meeting? Are they meeting the provincial government? No. Are they sitting down with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, the Provincial Treasurer, and the Minister of Economic Development? No they aren't. They're meeting Pierre Trudeau and the federal officials. What in heaven's name are we letting that happen for? Why are we not prepared to sit down with the co-operative movement? We've got over 3 million members of the co-operative movement in western Canada, a membership which is probably, more widely distributed than any other organization in the west. An organization that to a large extent had its beginnings in the west — in the case of Federated Co-ops for sure. Certainly the co-operative movement has roots that run as deep as the history of this province.

Here is interest shown by the credit unions and the co-op movement in getting into the energy business, ac-

quiring one of the foreign-controlled oil companies, and significantly moving toward the objective of Canadianization. We have a government here that frankly seems to be asleep at the switch. Instead of getting together with the co-ops and saying, all right, this sounds like a good idea to us, we're prepared to look at it, and we're prepared to see this as one option. We don't want to get into the area of public ownership, because we don't believe in public ownership, but let's look at co-ops moving ahead.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly will know the changes made in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the fall of 1979. We can now buy debt instruments. The comment of the Provincial Treasurer at the time was that only firms wanting \$1 million or more need apply. Why are we not looking at that? Why are we not sitting down with the co-op movement and saying, all right, we've got investment funds in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and we want to put this to use. We're concerned about Canadianization, but we think that Canadianization based on the co-operative movement could also be westernization. They're not talking about taking over all the oil industry. But the interest of the co-ops in expanding or possibly even acquiring one of the smaller foreign oil companies, is something I strongly believe we should consider.

In the comments of the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration last night, I noticed that he welcomed constructive ideas from opposition members. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that opportunity has come, because I think no more positive idea could be put forward than an amendment to this budget debate, asking this government to take a serious look at the question of Canadianization through the expansion of the co-op movement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion No. 6 on today's Order Paper be amended by adding at the end:

but that this Assembly urges the government to provide assistance by way of loan, to enable Federated Co-operatives Limited to purchase one or more foreign-controlled energy companies.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies of the proposed amendment for all members of the Assembly.

I conclude my remarks on this particular debate, Mr. Speaker, by saying to members of the House that if we are really concerned about fading rainbows, perhaps we might want to show a little initiative in an area where, frankly, we could be constructive and positive, an area that is not committed to any kind of ideological bent, but where there's interest, action, and support among hundreds of thousands of western Canadians. For that reason, I would welcome the members of the government rising to support this amendment and urge that we get on with the job of doing our part in the important job of Canadianizing our energy industry.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak to the amendment for a minute, rather than to the original motion. I'm not quite as enthusiastic about the co-op movement as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. We've bought machinery through the co-op implement association for — well, until we learned better, I guess you would say. Every couple of years they exchange machines, bring in new machines. There's no consistency in the co-op movement, Mr. Speaker. There's no organization. They just aren't good, efficient businessmen. It isn't a well-run business because it's a co-op movement, not an individual business process.

The member speaks about Canadianization of the oil

industry. Let me tell him that the oil industry in Drayton Valley is Canadian. My constituents in Drayton Valley are suffering from a national energy program that is taking away their very livelihood, and each and every one of those businesses is Canadian. It's the Canadian businessman who's being hurt by the national energy program.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise to speak to the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. For the hon. member to propose that Federated Co-ops receive funding for the purchase of a multinational oil company is opportunism, because he's inviting members to condemn the Federated Co-ops, which hon. members would of course not want to do. They're performing very well in the province, and performing a badly needed function in a lot of parts of the province. I don't think rejection of the amendment should be interpreted by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — as I'm sure he will, though — as a rejection of the concept of helping Federated Co-ops. That certainly should not be read into the government's attitude toward this amendment.

It is important to point out that under the rules of debate on the budget speech, Mr. Speaker, any amendment accepted is in effect a motion of non-confidence. Were the Assembly to accept this, under the normal procedures the Provincial Treasurer would be asked to resign and the government might even be asked to tender its resignation. So it's important to point out that the real purpose of this motion is to embarrass the government.

If members of the Assembly choose to reject this, it should not be thought of as a slap in the face of Federated Co-ops. I'm a member of the Alberta co-operative movement. I enjoy shopping at the co-op store. They do a wonderful job. I think the government has recognized the importance of the institution by introducing important legislation this session, Mr. Speaker, under the name of the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

I encourage the member to consider the real intent of his motion. It's interesting too that the motion is fairly vague, in that he simply suggests they could buy "one or more foreign-controlled energy companies". He doesn't mention the size or importance of the companies, what kinds of activities those companies might be involved in, whether it's primarily exploration, refining, or marketing. I think the motion is clearly opportunistic, purposely vague, and designed for some short-term political appeal. The motion should be rejected by the House.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking. From there on, if we have to arrange it, the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud and then the hon. Member for Calgary North West.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe my ears when the hon. Member for Drayton Valley stood in her place and indicated to this Legislature — it seems that the government's position is that they think the co-operatives in this province are not operating efficiently.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order or privilege, whatever it is. I didn't indicate that the govern-

ment thought that. I indicated that I as a farmer have not always been happy with the co-operative movement.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is speaking as a member of this Assembly. We do not speak as farmers or dentists; we speak as elected people. Mr. Speaker, there are many co-operatives in this province and this country: the livestock co-op, United Grain Growers, Alberta Wheat Pool, seed growers' co-op, cattle feeders' co-op, the Wheat Pool, the UFA. I couldn't believe what the hon. member was trying to tell us in this Assembly. I'm sure that when the hon. member goes back and reads *Hansard*, she will be dying for the opportunity to retract what she said. If the hon. member is giving impromptu speeches, somebody had better start writing some material for the hon. member. [interjections]

MRS. CRIPPS: I always write my own speeches.

DR. BUCK: That's one the hon. member should have written and not given. Mr. Speaker, to say that these co-operatives do not know how they're operating, that they're operating inefficiently — I just cannot sit in my place and accept that. I really think the hon. member should have a look at what she said in her speech, and then I'm sure she will want to make a correction to this Assembly.

MR. HORSMAN: Might I ask the hon. member a question?

DR. BUCK: Certainly, hon. third-in-line House leader.

MR. HORSMAN: Would the hon. member indicate to the Assembly then, in his recent remarks, whether he feels it incumbent upon each member to follow the government's line absolutely on everything? Is that what he's indicating he would like to see happen? [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Oh, James. Mr. Speaker, that is an indication of one time when the strings should have been pulled.

I hope that now that . . . [interjection] No, I'm answering the question of the hon. Member for Medicine Hat. There are instances, Mr. Speaker, when government backbenchers should be told what to say.

MR. COOK: Where's Rod?

MR. COOKSON: May I ask the hon. member another question?

DR. BUCK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I'd be glad to answer a question from the hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. COOKSON: Could the Member for Clover Bar indicate whether he ever disagrees with co-ops, in terms of philosophy and policy?

DR. BUCK: Do I disagree with co-ops as a philosophy? Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. The co-operative movement serves people; it's a movement initiated by people. It's not a movement that is told philosophically by a government you should or should not get into. It is a movement that is of benefit to the people who participate. Therefore the question about the philosophy — as a matter of fact, many people don't know that the co-

operative movement is one of the strongest free-enterprise systems going.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would entertain another question. Does he ever disagree with the real leader, Rod Sykes, on matters of policy; for example, energy cutbacks or cutbacks on government spending?

MR. SPEAKER: I have some difficulty finding anything in the *Standing Orders* that relates the length or nature of a question period of this kind. Perhaps we could have one more question and then recognize the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. BUCK: To the hon. Member for Edmonton Glen-garry. I would like to stand in my place and indicate that it's always the sign of a worried government when they start picking. I'm very pleased to say that the leader of my party is Mr. Rodney Sykes, and I'm sure that hon. members of this Assembly will know within a year or two who the Leader of the Opposition is.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, he didn't answer the question, which was: does he ever disagree with his leader, Sir Rodney?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have to be responsible one way or the other for any debate outside this House.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against this amendment. It's clearly out of order; it's clearly not necessary. We have three agencies in this province that loan money to businesses and to co-operatives — and I consider co-operatives businesses. I've never had the displeasure of buying machinery from a co-operative, but I've certainly been satisfied with other things.

I believe that if Federated Co-operatives were to be almost directed to buy a foreign oil company, as this amendment suggests, that would clearly be out of range of this Legislature. I'm very surprised that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would be so mistaken to expect us to direct anyone to buy an oil company, one way or the other. With the Alberta Opportunity Company being as aggressive as it is in its loaning policy, and the new arrangement for large loans through the heritage trust fund, I think there is clearly no need for this resolution. Furthermore, I'm certain that if Federated Co-operatives, or anyone else, were to ask for assistance in purchasing an oil company or whatever, they would be given a fair, reasonable hearing and not directed, one individual company directed by this Legislature to do that.

MR. COOK: Question.

MR. KNAAK: No, I'm speaking, Rollie.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this amendment really demonstrates a difference in philosophy between the socialists and this government. I just want to spend a few minutes talking about that. I think the line is fairly clear. It's part of the socialist philosophy of the federal NDP and the Liberals, who are not much different from the NDP. Basically what this is suggesting is to take a very sizable amount of money and lend it to a group of people, however capable they may be in distributing machinery, hardware, or anything else — and I've had

good relationships with the co-op I deal with. We're really suggesting to them, here's some money that we're lending to you — at subsidized rates, I suppose, although it doesn't say so. If they didn't need subsidized rates, they could go to any bank to borrow the money. So I think subsidized rates are embodied in this, which means a subsidy from other citizens of Alberta to enable the members of the co-op to buy a well-running — I presume — foreign-controlled operation.

But the real point is that the co-ops aren't qualified, nor do they have the experience in the oil and gas industry, to do the job required now in Canada. If they did, they could borrow the money anywhere and take over an oil company as others are doing in Canada. But the most significant point, and where the difference in philosophy comes, is that if I had \$3 billion, I wouldn't take over something that already exists. I would use the \$3 billion to create a new company, create new jobs, and find more oil.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my brief comments and urge the Assembly to vote against this amendment. I certainly agree with the comments by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry when he said this is no reflection on the co-ops.

Possibly the Member for Clover Bar might say that I am reacting quite quickly, but I would like to take exception to the phrase "foreign-controlled energy companies" or what I read into that. As has already been mentioned, we know that changes are certainly occurring today, when more and more companies are being owned by Canadians. I'm not against that policy, but I am really very strongly opposed to the insinuation I read into this amendment, that there is something wrong with what the foreign-controlled energy companies have done in this country.

Frankly, I have many constituents in Calgary North West who have worked for foreign-controlled energy companies. If it weren't for the money brought into this country by those companies, we would not have had the development in our oil industry at the time and in the place that we had. So on that point alone, I urge members to vote against this amendment.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm a very proud member of a co-op. In fact, many of my Saturday mornings are spent with my wife and children purchasing our weekly family needs at a co-op.

It's unfortunate that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has brought forward this amendment. Not to be redundant, I think many of the arguments put forward by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry — he has developed a remarkable ability to understand parliamentary tradition with respect to amendments and the question of budget speeches, and I think they should not be forgotten. I intend to vote against this particular amendment simply because of the reason and manner in which it has been presented.

I simply want to reiterate that I am an extremely proud member of a co-operative. I think co-ops provide an excellent service to the people in Alberta, and I'm sure that feeling is shared by a great majority of the members in this Assembly.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I'd get up on this particular amendment, but I'm here and I'm going to make my comments.

I too would like to speak against this amendment. The

prime purpose and central theme I would like to develop is that the hon. member opposite, representing the NDP, has spoken for a portion of his debate on dependency, then he says co-ops should get a loan, making them dependent. Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty with that kind of philosophy. He's saying they should be independent, and they are. The co-ops have done a good job, and they don't require the guidance or direction of government. They know very well that loans are available, and that if they apply, an appropriate hearing will be provided for any group, including the co-ops. So I have difficulty with his philosophy. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I just don't see the rationale and, on that basis, it should be rejected.

In addition, when he comments about purchasing a foreign company of that dimension, Mr. Speaker, the question whether the co-op would be willing, able, and capable arises very quickly. If there was a willing buyer and seller, I'm sure a deal could be struck. But that's up to the willing buyer and seller.

So frankly, Mr. Speaker, the co-ops are doing a good job. They have flaws, as governments, parties, and individuals have flaws. But by and large they're doing a good job, and I see no reason to interfere or guide the co-ops. They can make up their own minds.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the eloquent delivery of the budget speech last night; it was a pleasure to listen to.

I was interested in the comments by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Working with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is like playing kick the can. He kicks it and runs, and he's run again.

DR. BUCK: He's gone to see where the Premier is.

MRS. CRIPPS: Do you know where the Premier is?

DR. BUCK: No, I don't know where . . . [inaudible]

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you pay attention?

MRS. CRIPPS: He talked of self-reliance. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview has a pat answer for every social problem: spend more money. Every time it's spend more money, hire more people. He downgraded the home care program — as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that's a motherhood program — and the senior citizens' program. I'm fairly familiar with the senior citizen's position in rural communities, but I wasn't quite so confident about the urban senior citizen. So I made a point of visiting the Strathcona senior citizens' group. This group was a mix of citizens: single, married, on pensions with old-age security, on old-age security alone with the guaranteed income supplement; living in their own homes, in apartments, or in government subsidized apartments. A whole mix of senior citizens was at that meeting. In every case they felt they were well treated. They said that in most cases the increase in renter assistance had made up for the recent rent increases. In fact he comment from those senior citizens was that they're a pampered generation.

Mr. Notley talks of agriculture as if he has a real . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. As hon. members know — and I know this has been occurring with increasing

frequency — an hon. member's name is used in the Assembly only under the most serious circumstances. None of us is here as a named individual. We are here as elected members for constituencies. May I respectfully draw that to the attention of the House.

MRS. CRIPPS: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. It is a serious situation, though.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview talks of agriculture as if he has a real interest in it. Well, I'm afraid my interest is grass roots, and the real problems in agriculture, stability of markets and transportation of the products, elude him. I'm afraid I don't know any more about rapid transit and urban transportation than he does, so I won't remark on it.

I couldn't believe it, though, when the Member for Clover Bar rose in his place to speak on the amendment and spent his whole time berating me and my personal opinion.

DR. BUCK: On behalf of the co-operatives.

MRS. CRIPPS: The member never once mentioned the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I understood that's what we were talking about. I noticed last year that the member has a tendency to attack the ladies. [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: We'll give you "A" for effort, Walt.

MRS. CRIPPS: Last week it was the Member for Three Hills: I would hate to think the member is a male — what do they call it? Anyway, we're not easy prey, but keep trying.

Mr. Speaker, as Albertans we have a stake in the efficient operation of this province. We are fortunate that along with the agriculture and natural resource base of this province, we have a responsible government which practises sound fiscal policies. Alberta is in the position of having a savings account, rather than paying 17 cents of every tax dollar in interest as the federal government does. Like the Member for Banff-Cochrane, I often get queries about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It seems odd to me that people understand their own savings account, but cannot understand the need for a province to have a savings account. The use to which the funds are put is often misunderstood. The concept of government saving for the future is unique.

Mr. Speaker, my constituency is indicative of the economic climate of this province. It depends on a viable agricultural sector and a vibrant oil industry. Drayton Valley constituency was vibrant, busy, optimistic, and enthusiastic. On page 5 of the budget the statement is made:

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.

The Alberta budget emphasizes a predictable climate for investment. But another budget affected Drayton Valley, Mr. Speaker, the Ottawa budget of October 28, truly black Tuesday for communities such as Drayton Valley.

Let me take a few minutes to describe what has transpired in the conventional oil fields of Alberta since October 28. In Drayton Valley, for instance, businesses associated directly or indirectly have suffered a slowdown of activity. Where 38 to 43 service rigs were normally

kept fully employed, now only 14 or 15 rigs are operating. While whole crews have not been laid off, hours have been drastically reduced. Trucking companies, normally booked months in advance, have yards full of trucks, with only occasional calls for work. Construction equipment sits idle. Welding shops have had to reduce employees.

The Alberta energy association has done a fact sheet on the average 6,000-foot exploratory well. Thirty-one independent contracts involving 536.55 man-days are negotiated at a total contract price of \$470,450 for each hole. Each rig that leaves the province reduces job opportunities in Alberta by 536 man-days. Between October 28 and February 20, 78 rigs left Canada for the U.S. Each hole drilled would have meant 41,850 man-days of work in this province. Another 53 rigs are committed to go by April 30. That's another 28,337 man-days of lost employment in this province because of the national energy program. Add to this the 24 service rigs that have already left and the 81 which have been considered for U.S. employment, and the end result is a drain of Canadian expertise and talent, besides the thousands of jobs lost. The oil companies have reduced servicing of low-production wells in the Drayton Valley area. Some companies are not servicing wells under 16 barrels; others under 12. Under the new energy program they are uneconomical, even though the Alberta government has reduced or foregone royalties for years on these good production practice wells.

Let me be more specific, Mr. Speaker. In Drayton Valley, the energy association did a survey of businesses for the period January 1 to February 15, making a comparison between 1980 and 1981, taking into account and adjusting for any volume increases. The first 100 responses: 47 from service industries, 47 from commercial businesses, and six from professionals. The 106 companies represented 1,089 employees. One hundred and fourteen, 10.5 per cent, were already laid off before the survey period. A further 170 layoffs, 26 per cent of the total, are expected in 1981 if there is no change in the national energy program. That's only one community. Seventeen thousand man-hours were lost in the oil service industry for that period. Nine and a half million dollars of expansion plans have been delayed, with \$6.6 million worth of orders and materials cancelled. The gross income lost is 15 to 50 per cent, representing \$2.1 million less than the same period for 1980.

On page 8 of the recent Nisku report, they say their 1981 pre-budget sales volume was \$277,710,000; now it is forecast at \$174,850,000, a drop of \$102 million. "Proposed expenditures on drilling rigs have dropped 56% and actual number[s] of rigs have dropped 52%." We're talking, Mr. Speaker, about Canadian companies, not foreign companies. On page 25 of the Nisku report, the lost sales in central Canada will be over \$50 million from the few companies that were surveyed in the Nisku area.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Some results of the Whitecourt economic survey, done at the end of January:

1. Have your sales, production forecasts, work orders, or contracts fallen off noticeably over the last 3 months?  
Yes 72% No 24%
2. Have you been required to lay off staff or personnel?



Yes 30% No 61%  
If yes, how many?

- 151 people  
9. Have companies you are in contact with reduced or stopped exploration work?  
Yes 72% n.a. 21%

The Member for Grande Prairie gave similar results in this House on April 7, from a survey done in that area. I venture to claim, Mr. Speaker, that the same slowdown has resulted in Swan Hills, Fox Creek, Valleyview, Rainbow Lake, Rocky Mountain House, and Brooks, to mention only a few. These Alberta communities, these Canadian companies are suffering economic chaos because of an inept federal government which is preoccupied with becoming a unitary state intent on pillaging Alberta's natural resources, determined to nationalize the oil industry, and unconcerned about the economic recession it is causing.

Business decisions are made using available information and calculating the risks involved. In making decisions two years ago, the highest possible calculation of interest was 14 per cent, not near the 20 per cent of today. Certainly continued employment, considering the need for the product and the exploration projections, was certain. No one could possibly have foreseen a federal government intervention policy which would cause such havoc in the industry. Businesses are crumbling because of high interest rates and lack of cash. If I can quote from the budget:

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.

Mr. Speaker, the survey examples from Drayton Valley, Nisku, Whitecourt, Grande Prairie, and Red Deer reinforce this statement. Also from the same page:

The [drastic] 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.

It is impossible for the Alberta government to implement budgetary measures which will totally alleviate the problems created in these communities by Ottawa's lack of a national energy program. Measures can be taken, such as the \$30 million program to employ small contractors, but the specialized well servicing and supply area equipment cannot be channelled into other uses. I am encouraged that the government has taken the position:

Contingency plans will be further developed over the coming months, so that selective stimulative measures can be implemented quickly if the need develops.

The responsibility of negotiating an agreement which will bring stability, optimism, and investment back to the oil industry is an onerous task.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at length on the oil industry, so I'll have to be brief in my other discussions. Agriculture as our renewable resource is the key building block for Alberta. The estimate for the budget this year is 19.6 per cent from the estimated budget last year. This of course does not take into consideration the \$25 million special warrant for the stop-loss program for the hog

industry. I also welcome the 1,000 hopper cars and the initiation of agricultural processing.

The biggest investment for Alberta's agricultural future, the Alberta commitment to the Prince Rupert terminals, is not shown in the budget. Over the next few years, Alberta has committed \$150 million. This commitment makes the project viable. The biggest problem in Alberta's agriculture today is the transportation bottleneck. Agricultural production must be moved at fair and equitable rates. We can no longer be penalized by a system of preferential rates which put western agriculture at a disadvantage. Mr. Speaker, if there is one decision I would urge this government to concentrate on, I believe it would be the transportation of Alberta's agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, the Drayton Valley hospital will commence construction this year. The residents of Drayton Valley welcome this as, seeing is believing. The construction will help alleviate the unemployment situation that presently exists in Drayton Valley. I'm pleased, too, to have the planning of Buck Lake park at Calhoun Bay proceed on schedule.

In my constituency the main concern is still transportation. The resource road program has been especially beneficial, with the Cynthia road almost completed. Highway 22 remains contentious, especially since someone in their wisdom eliminated the nine a couple of years ago, and so Highway 22 is no longer in the 900 series but has become a primary highway. I appreciate that construction is being done this year. I hope the special construction program can be used to alleviate some of the local problem situations. The 30 per cent increase in the transportation budget is most welcome to most rural residents.

One criticism I hear all the time is that we have a pipeline leading from Drayton Valley and a thread coming back. I expect this is true of all resource communities. I do have trouble responding to that, as I never know quite how to justify it, and I do have empathy for their frustration. Extra expenses are incurred because of resource development: extra wear and tear on roads, extra sewer and water pipelines to be put in. This is one reason the resource road program was implemented. It's too bad the Leader of the Opposition isn't here because I have . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He never is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MRS. CRIPPS: Why? Because he's always talking about planning. It costs the town of Drayton Valley 12 to 18 per cent extra for every capital project they do because of lack of planning which, by the way, those local residents begged the government to do back in the 1950s. They begged the government to plan pipeline corridors, to plan for future residents. I hope this government can respond to that need. I feel that the government has some responsibility to compensate for bad government decisions in the past, and I recognize it wasn't this government that made those decisions.

The improved senior citizens' benefits are most welcome. I am especially pleased that the benefit is extended to spouses from the age of 60 to 64. The extension of the benefits of the pioneer repair program, senior citizens' renter assistance, and senior citizens' tax rebate to spouses, is a response by this government which acknowledges the precarious position many of our senior citizens

found themselves in.

In education I would just like to commend the ministers for the direction they're taking. On page 15 of the budget:

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.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the last statement, I have concerns in education I'd like to address. One is the role of teacher aides in the primary grades. I believe that specific funding should be earmarked for aides in these grades. In order to provide equal educational opportunity for children in the lower grades, individualized attention is absolutely essential. This could be done with teacher aide assistance, and I'm pleased that the program direction is taking this line. My second concern is for the brilliant student. I've always maintained that we lose the slow learner from grades 1 to 4, and we lose the brilliant students from grades 5 to 9. We must challenge these students, keep them interested, and develop their potential.

Last but not least is the assistance for the handicapped. The response I had from handicapped people has been totally positive. I have seven constituents on home dialysis machines. They appreciate the real meaning of being alive and well and able to function normally. It's really true that the best things in life are free. Recently I attended a 4-H regional speak-off. Four of the topics related to the year of the handicapped. In every case, you and I were cited as the main obstacle a handicapped person has to overcome: our attitudes, our insensitivity, or our inability to adjust to them. Governments cannot legislate conduct, but maybe we can create an awareness, an attitude of respect for the person despite the handicap. Let's not be the problem the handicapped have to overcome.

Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly difficult year for resource communities. It is essential that stable investment and business climate be re-established. The budget presented yesterday shows leadership and a determination to stabilize the Alberta economy with enough flexibility to implement selective stimulative measures if necessary. Mr. Speaker, I am confident in Alberta's future.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity to speak on Motion No. 6, to "approve in general the fiscal policies of the government". I listened with keen interest last night to the hon. Provincial Treasurer as he presented the Budget Address. Then afterwards and again this morning I had an opportunity to study some of the provisions of the budget in detail and some of the other related documents. As I did so, I certainly continued to develop an ever-increasing sense of admiration for the dedicated effort our hon. Provincial Treasurer has displayed in achieving such an outstanding result.

As I examine the budget, I am very confident as I am sure all government members are, that the message clearly comes across: although it is an outstanding budget and we can look forward with confidence to the future, there has to be a certain amount of sombre concern. At this time I also congratulate the Member for Banff-Cochrane, who spoke so well and so eloquently last night, and the Member for Drayton Valley, who has covered very well a number of topics I had on my notes here today. I can't say the same thing for the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, because I haven't

yet figured out what they were trying to say.

In question period a few days ago, the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources indicated to the Assembly that some progress may have been made towards solving the energy resources difficulties. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members sincerely hope this feeling will continue to grow and be more positive after the next round of discussions are held between the provincial Minister of Energy and his federal counterpart.

But as the budget suggests to us in the theme that goes all the way through, we cannot take anything for granted. We cannot assume in any way that things are going to change in the foreseeable future, and the only option we do have is to make our plans accordingly. This is what the budget does. With the national energy policy so clearly affecting the economic climate of our nation, and particularly our province, we have to make plans in this matter. Mr. Speaker, even taking these facts into careful consideration, in the Budget Address and the supporting documents we do have a remarkable blueprint for the future of this province.

Members of the opposition talk so frequently about plans and that we don't have any long range plans. It seems to me that they haven't caught up on their reading. If they look at this budget and previous budgets, they'll see that they all reflect planning for the future. The plan indicated in this budget is for steady, balanced growth, although there are probably some restraints compared to the budgets back in '73 and '79. But it does have a plan that will foster and generate diversification and permit continued normal growth of the economy in our province.

We have to have that concern expressed in the budget address, Mr. Speaker, that relates to the growth and expanded services in this province. We do have to seriously consider the options or alternatives that the hon. Provincial Treasurer placed before us. Do we increase taxes? Do we start to use our savings? Or do we reduce the demands for various services that keep escalating? Perhaps these thoughts are not palatable to certain non-government members of this Assembly. But with the situation in our nation as it is today, we certainly better be considering these things. We just can't sweep them under the rug; they just won't go away. We can't depend on that. So we better take a careful look at it all.

However, Mr. Speaker, even with these thoughts I've expressed, we have before us a budget that we do find very exciting. Hon. members who have already spoken have underlined some of the programs that are particularly interesting to them. I'm sure all hon. government members would like to underline all the programs in the budget in such a manner, because they're all so very highly commendable.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to underline some of the programs I find particularly exciting myself. The first of these is the recently announced \$30 million program which will help small construction contractors in this province, the dirt-moving people, who have been working in the oil fields and perhaps, because of a slowdown there, will find themselves looking for other employment this year. This money will be put into a program to build much needed roads and highways within the province, and provide work for these approximately 400 smaller contractors. This averages out to about \$75,000 per contractor, which I'm sure will be a very welcome input to that industry. Of course this doesn't mean that each of these contractors is going to receive \$75,000. It has to be worked out. The work will be there.

If it should work out to an average, that's what the amount will be. But of course some will do more work, and some will find jobs somewhere else. In all it will be a tremendous input to that industry.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was somewhat critical of the Transportation budget. However, when we see such items as 43.9 per cent increase for improvement of local, rural district roads, and when we see that the total budget increase is about 26 per cent, one can clearly say that this budget certainly recognizes the priority that our primary and secondary roads, as well as district roads, do have as an essential and integral part of the planning for the future in our province.

I really appreciate that program for the small contractors very much. I speak of that again, because in my constituency I have a number of these people. I'm sure that many of those in the north-central and northern parts of the province have as well. This is going to be a great asset to them over the coming year. Also, that tremendous increase in the general Transportation budget will be a benefit to all the constituencies as well.

Mr. Speaker, although residential housing starts in Alberta have far outstripped those in the rest of the nation, it is unfortunate that a general downturn in residential housing starts does exist elsewhere in Canada, in the United States, and beyond the borders of our nation. I say this because it has brought about a very severe shortfall in markets for the Alberta lumber industry. It's only because of the substantial program support the Alberta Progressive Conservative government has developed in promoting housing starts that our Alberta production has been able to maintain itself and to survive in this period of depressed state of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, once again we have to think about the national energy policy. We have to do this so often, and will have to continue to do this until the situation is resolved. With the outflow of all those billions of dollars every year to cover our nation's balance of payments deficit, and the efforts of the federal government to continue to tie Canadian interest rates to those of the U.S. government, we are going to have interest rates that are high and will remain high. This is going to continue to cause difficulty in the housing market. It's going to cause difficulty for timber operators as well. However, our people in the lumber industry are optimistic. Their optimism remains high, and they continue to operate and survive. I'm sure we're all grateful for that.

Notes are made in the budget of the new sawmill that will be coming on stream at Grande Cache this year. I'm sure the hon. Member for Edson will be referring to that, as he has already in one speech. Interest is high in the industry, and inquiries continue to come to our government from people outside the province regarding possible future forest resources that may become available for development. As far as the industry is concerned, I think this is a reason for optimism as well.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was also critical of the Agriculture budget. He suggested there was an overall percentage decrease in the budget. However, perhaps because of his undue haste to trigger off the budget debate, or maybe he didn't examine it closely enough to find out, he neglected to remember that the budget estimates include a substantial amount for irrigation, which will be reflected in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division estimates this year. So that's not shown in our budget this year. Also, we had a substantial amount, something like \$25 million I think, for the hog stop-loss program that has recently expired in

the animal products portion of the food production budget. That is reflected in the Agriculture budget as well. If you remove those two particular items and start to do your percentages once again, you'll find quite a remarkable increase in the Agriculture budget. That's commendable as well.

Also, if you examine that Agriculture budget a little more carefully, you find an 89.9 per cent increase in Agricultural Development Corporation lending assistance. Most of this is reflected in loans to beginning farmers. During the fiscal year just ended, we had hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of additional young farmers who benefited by this program, especially when the loan limits were raised and the additional subsidy was placed on the program. Of course, if you look at Agriculture you have to go back to the Transportation budget as well and think about the extra assistance being given to rural, local roads. That is another item that is going to assist people engaged in agriculture. So that is something useful as well. And if you're looking at Agriculture, you have to look at Public Lands, because there's an increase of 38.5 per cent in Public Lands and much of this goes into land dispositions which will be made available for agriculture. As well under Public Lands you're going to have an allocation every year in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital budget which will increase the grazing and range improvement programs. That is a benefit to Agriculture as well. So there are many things in this budget besides what is shown in the Agriculture budget that are going to benefit the agricultural community.

The opposition has commented on the fact — the Member for Spirit River-Fairview did this. Mr. Speaker, I realize it is contrary to the rules of the Assembly to mention that somebody is absent from his seat, so I won't say that.

DR. BUCK: Do you mean the Premier?

MR. APPLEBY: Anyway, he said something about caucus committees — people not being able to meet with cabinet, but being able to meet with caucus committees. This type of operation that our government has — caucus committees who aid the ministers, do in-depth studies, meet with people, research, and make recommendations to assist in formulating policy, do a tremendous amount of work. People not involved in this — and no other government in the nation is involved in this type of thing — will realize how beneficial it is to a government to have this sort of activity going on.

I want to assure the opposition that as this budget debate goes on, they will be hearing from people who are actively involved in the various caucus committees: education, health, social services, and others. They'll be hearing from them. They'll find out that their knowledge is much greater and their grasp of the situation here in this province much more extensive than that of the members of the opposition. That's because they've had the benefit of all this work that has been going on as far as the caucus committees are concerned. I'm sure they'll all get straightened out as this debate develops.

Mr. Speaker, just a reference to my own constituency of Athabasca. We are certainly pleased that planning is going ahead very capably for the new Athabasca University, to be located in the town of Athabasca. We are pleased that we have new senior citizens' housing projects being developed in Westlock, Athabasca, and Newbrook. We are pleased about the extraordinary assistance for realigning Highway 18 through the town of Westlock. We

are pleased that the Department of Recreation and Parks is putting in improvements to Cross Lake Provincial Park and Calling Lake Provincial Park. We have one other provincial park at Long Lake, but it's pretty well developed.

A lot of planning has gone into this particular budget, Mr. Speaker, and it's certainly reflected in all the estimates. I think everybody here will be looking forward with a great deal of interest to getting into committee stage and getting much more detailed and fuller explanations of all the things that are included.

In this, the international year of the disabled — and this has been referred to by the two previous government members — we all have to be grateful that we have a Provincial Treasurer who has the insight and sensitivity to produce the budget we have before us, which has such an evident concern for all the people of Alberta. The hon. Member for Drayton Valley very well outlined many of the groups whose special needs are being assisted by this budget. They're being recognized and provided for within this budget. I'm sure we're all pleased at this.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Many benefits are going to continue to accrue to our citizens from the very careful financial planning outlined before us. We have some concerns, Mr. Speaker, and I think all Albertans should be made aware of these concerns. I don't think it hurts for us to make them aware of them. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, this budget also reflects an approach we should give to all Albertans: that they can continue to have a feeling of confidence that all 2 million-plus of us will continue to live in a very exciting and very rewarding atmosphere here in our province.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes left in the afternoon, I would like to take this opportunity to address some remarks to the situation with respect to universities in this province. We are indeed very fortunate in Alberta to have four universities and the Banff Centre for Continuing Education, which is included with the universities for budgetary purposes, and appropriately so, since it provides a particular type of postsecondary service to the people of this province, akin to that provided in the university sector.

We are indeed very fortunate to have dedicated and conscientious private citizens who are prepared to give of their time and effort on behalf of all Albertans, in particular the academic community and students, by way of service on boards on boards of governors. As the minister, I am very grateful for that, and I'm sure all members of the Assembly share that gratitude.

One of the things so important to academic life in this province and indeed in our western way of life — and I mean that in the broadest sense of the term — is to have universities that operate free from government control and direction; in other words, universities that have autonomy. Therefore it is the boards of governors, the public representatives, the representatives from within the institutions — that is to say, the academic staff and administration as well as representatives from student organizations. These boards of governors are charged with the responsibility to deal with such matters as collective bargaining with their faculties and contracts with their faculty members.

In each case, over the history of this province, there has been a good working relationship between the boards of governors and the faculty associations and individual

faculty members. They have entered into contracts, agreements whereby they determine the method of bargaining or establishing contract relationships between individual members and faculty associations. All those contracts provide for a method of resolving impasses which come about as a result of bargaining, and that is usually in the form of binding arbitration, binding on both sides. Granted, whenever one gets to the bargaining table there are going to be difficulties in arriving at settlements. But in each case over the last several years, the agreements have either been resolved by agreement or by an arbitration process.

Mr. Speaker, there is no place in that process for me, as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, or my department or government, other than as a facilitating agent, if called upon by the parties to do so. That is the position I take, and that is the position of this government. We will preserve and maintain the autonomy of those board-governed institutions. Of course we have a very real role to play with respect to funding postsecondary education in the province, and it has rightly been pointed out. I want to touch on what this year's budget is doing with respect to postsecondary education.

The universities have at least three sources of funds: government grants, tuition fees paid by students in attendance at the institutions, and other. "Other" includes interest or income earned on investments, and donations by the private sector to the universities, by way of direct grants, endowments, or any number of ways. I want to point out that when I refer to the private sector, I am talking about the widest possible participation. That includes the alumni, the students themselves, business, labor, service and fraternal organizations, individuals, philanthropists, estates: everything in the private sector. As a government we are trying to encourage the greatest possible participation by the private sector in funding universities, colleges, and technical institutions. I believe it is wrong for us to continue a system whereby universities become more and more dependent on government as the sole source of funds. When that happens, Mr. Speaker, the temptation becomes greater to start interfering in the autonomy and to start directing the universities and their activities. So I want to see a broader base for university and college funding.

That's why we introduced last year the 1980s advanced education endowment fund. It is true that the three universities — namely Alberta, Calgary, and Lethbridge — have been able to share in what was called the 3AU fund for capital purposes only. But with the 1980s advanced education endowment fund, Mr. Speaker, it is now possible for the private sector to donate and endow the universities and have the funds matched unconditionally by the government. Through that mechanism, we hope to encourage the citizens of this province — in the broadest sense of the term, the private sector — to participate more in the funding of postsecondary education, and thereby materially assist and preserve the autonomy of those institutions.

Right now I want to deal with what we as a government are prepared to do at this stage for the universities in particular. The budget provides an increase of 18.2 per cent in real terms for operating purposes. Along with the province of British Columbia, that figure is the highest percentage increase for the current fiscal year of any province in this country. I want to advise members of the Assembly what the other provinces are providing: Saskatchewan, 12.5 per cent; Manitoba, 13.8 per cent; Ontario, 10.1 per cent; the maritime provinces, 11.6 per cent.

Newfoundland and Quebec have not yet finalized or announced their percentage increases. So there is no question that on a system which already funds universities to the highest level — if not the highest level, right at the very top — we are adding the largest percentage increase in real terms. I consider that to be significant.

I want to deal with the various elements which comprise that increase. We start with last year's adjusted operating grants. I say "adjusted" because they were adjusted upward during the course of the year as new programs were added and new funding provided by various initiatives taken through my department by way of new program initiatives and others. We start with that base and to that we add an across-the-board increase of 13.1 per cent to provide for cost increases. Last year for the first time, we added to the funding a new element, that was paid to the University of Alberta in the sum of \$810,000 to be directed by them to the professional faculties which they felt required enhancement for growth and new program development. That was an experiment which worked. In fact, as a result of that initiative, the University of Alberta was able to increase its quotas in the faculties of nursing, engineering, and business and commerce.

This year the same principle is being applied and extended to the universities of Calgary and Lethbridge. This year the University of Alberta will receive an additional grant of \$670,000, the University of Calgary will receive \$1,159,000, and the University of Lethbridge will receive \$130,000, for a total of \$1,959 million extra to assist professional faculties to expand their programming and permit more young Albertans to attend the universities in their chosen courses. But no strings are attached by government, except that we ask the universities to direct those funds to the professional faculties which they themselves have identified to us as being in need of enhancement. The third element is that we provide operating costs for new facilities going on stream: the University of Alberta, \$215,000; Calgary, \$318,000; Lethbridge, \$198,000; a total of an additional \$731,000.

To deal with the subject of general growth. As you know, enrolments have not been increasing at the Univer-

sity of Alberta. They have remained relatively static, in fact declined substantially for a three-year period, and just last year recovered modestly. On the other hand, at the University of Calgary there has been some significant growth. By way of new growth funds we are allocating \$1 million to the University of Calgary, \$650,000 to the University of Lethbridge, \$1,790,000 to Athabasca University, for a total of \$3,440,000, and an additional \$1.63 million to Banff Centre to assist in their transition to year-round status. So in fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a very real increase, to each of the institutions, over and above the basic 13.1 per cent increase.

Added to that we have conditional grants. I won't go into all these details, Mr. Speaker, because I can supply them during the study of estimates. Each institution, except the Banff Centre, is in the process of instituting new programming. Those programs have been approved conditionally and, when they prove successful, the funds will fall into their base and be added to their base for future years. This provides an additional \$3.4 million in that area. Added to that are new program initiatives of almost \$3 million. So the total funding increase over and above last year's adjusted regular grants comes to 18.2 per cent overall — the most significant increase in university funding in Canada today, Mr. Speaker.

I want to take some time to deal with the matter of the colleges system and the technical institutions system, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the time I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Assembly agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:28 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

