

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, October 16, 1981 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

### PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members, a number of people from the Environment Council of Alberta. They are part of a co-ordinating committee known as the Public Advisory Committee to the Environment Council of Alberta. Dr. Kostuch is the chairman of the group. As members may know, the Environment Council of Alberta is made up of about 120 different organizations throughout the province. Their responsibility is primarily to be a watchdog on the environment, also to make recommendations to government. It's a pleasure to have them here this morning, and at this time I'd like to ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased today to introduce to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta two distinguished visitors from the United Kingdom House of Commons. Seated in your gallery are two members of the Labour Party of the United Kingdom: the hon. Mrs. Gwyneth Dunwoody, the Member for the constituency of Crewe, and Mr. David Marshall, the Member for Glasgow-Shettleston.

These distinguished visitors are touring Canada and have been received in the provinces of Quebec and Saskatchewan, and we're very fortunate they've had time now to visit us in the province of Alberta. With them is Mr. David Lowe, a member of the Labour Party executive, and Mr. John Whalley, our protocol officer. I would ask these distinguished visitors to rise and receive a very warm welcome from the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### **Bill 59 The Alberta Insurance Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Alberta Insurance Amendment Act, 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I have circulated a news release which outlines the salient amendments to The Alberta Insurance Act, and would like to bring to members' attention the provision which would eliminate the statutory condition dealing with impaired driving. In referring to this particular aspect, I should emphasize that the standard automobile insurance policy will continue to penalize the impaired driver by not permitting him to claim for his own losses under his insurance policy. However, the insurer will no longer be able to recover from the impaired driver

moneys that have been paid to innocent third parties. This should speed up settlements and payments to innocent third parties and, at the same time, eliminate the devastating effects the current provisions have on the insured and his immediate family.

[Leave granted; Bill 59 read a first time]

##### **Bill 69**

##### **The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, before introducing this Bill, I wish to table, pursuant to Section 5(3) of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act, the required letter of designation from the president of the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I request leave at this time to introduce Bill No. 69, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill provides for setting aside, as the long-term saving for Albertans, a portion of the capital assets derived by way of income from the sale of our depleting oil and gas resources. The government is proposing to the Legislature that 30 per cent of our non-renewable resource revenues be transferred to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 1982-83 fiscal year.

[Leave granted; Bill 69 read a first time]

##### **Bill 61**

##### **The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1981.

This Bill provides for legislative increases in pensions to the permanently disabled workers in the province and their dependants; also some required amendments to the Bill passed this spring, Bill 37, the new Workers' Compensation Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 61 read a first time]

##### **Bill 62**

##### **The Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 62, The Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1981. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, there are two principles in the Bill. One, it clarifies the authority of the Department of Government Services to provide operating maintenance services to organizations that get some or all their funds from the provincial government. Secondly, it provides for an increase in the department's revolving fund from \$60 million to \$75 million.

[Leave granted; Bill 62 read a first time]

**Bill 235****The Code of Ethics and Conduct Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 235, The Code of Ethics and Conduct Act.

Briefly, the Bill has several principles that will set out a code of ethics for elected members of the Legislature, requiring disclosure of assets as well as the rules with respect to lobbying after a person has left this Legislature.

[Leave granted; Bill 235 read a first time]

**Bill 63****The Land Agents Licensing Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Land Agents Licensing Amendment Act, 1981.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to amend the legislation to allow for setting up more than one type of land agent licensing. Under the present legislation, this is not now permitted.

[Leave granted; Bill 63 read a first time]

**Bill 64****The Environment Statutes Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 64, The Environment Statutes Amendment Act, 1981.

Simply put, the purpose of this Bill is to allow the Alberta Environmental Research Trust to fund projects with a development as well as a research component.

[Leave granted; Bill 64 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before moving to Tabling Returns and Reports, I'd move that Bills Nos. 63 and 64 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 228****The Alberta Family Institute Act**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 228, The Alberta Family Institute Act.

This Bill is designed to support and strengthen the Alberta family through establishing an institute which will: (a) advise the Alberta government and municipalities as to the effect of legislation and programs on the family, and (b) make available the most up-to-date information on family programs to church, volunteer, private enterprise, and government programs associated with the family. This Bill is similar in intent to one introduced by the same name in 1979, but is significantly amended as a result of input from various organizations and individuals both in and out of this Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 228 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table two annual reports: the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation annual report for 1980, and the Glenbow-Alberta Institute 15th annual report, 1981.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, it's my distinct pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of the Legislative Assembly the Law 30 class from M.E. LaZerte high school, strategically located in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. I would like to say that this class had done a fair amount of homework in preparation for visiting us this morning. Basically, they requested and did research in the function of the provincial legislature, and I congratulate them for it. Also with them this morning is their teacher Mr. Rentre. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would now ask them to rise and receive the very cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 55 members from Victoria Composite high school in the constituency of Edmonton Centre. They are here with their teacher Don Mock and Shirley Armstrong. I would ask that they rise and receive the very warm welcome of the Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Piggy Bank**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, before asking my first question — and I will only ask one question today — I've noticed a lot of interest in the object I have on my desk. The object is what I describe as the Heritage Savings Trust Fund piggy bank of the government.

In terms of Albertans, Mr. Speaker, the features of the piggy bank are that there isn't any place to put money in the top and no place to get it out of the bottom. Albertans sometimes ask the question: what is it benefiting me? I would like to have tabled a number of these for the Assembly, but I found it a little difficult to meet the requirements of tabling by duplicating the Heritage Savings Trust Fund symbol for everybody. So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to raise that as a point of interest at this time.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out it's certainly the best looking of all the opposition members. [laughter] As well, I would observe that it faithfully reflects the average physique of the members on that side.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly see that our symbol has the object of attention.

MR. NOTLEY: It's still the opposition's best asset.

MR. R. SPEAKER: It's our best asset. [laughter]  
Over the next two weeks, Mr. Speaker, Albertans will be viewing the bank in television ads being supported by

the opposition, requesting Albertans' ideas with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

#### AOC Loans

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the acting Minister of Tourism and Small Business. It's with regard to the objectives of the Alberta Opportunity Company. We note at the present time, in looking at statistics, there is a decrease in the number of loans from the year 1980-81. As well, the interest rates of the loans are increasing significantly on each one as well. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister the reasons for that and whether there will be an adjustment in that Alberta Opportunity Company policy.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, as second acting Minister of Tourism and Small Business, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the acting, acting minister. As well, could the minister review whether an inventory as to the bankruptcies in the province at the present time is being taken by AOC? The indications are that bankruptcies are up 37 per cent. Would the minister take that under advisement and find out that information?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll do that.

#### Rental Accommodations

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It concerns the most recent statistics from the city of Calgary with respect to condominium conversion applications for some 9,138 units from January 1, 1981, to the present time, and the approval of 2,280 of those units. With the vacancy rate at less than 1 per cent, what specific steps is the department taking to monitor condominium conversions in the two major cities, but in particular the city of Calgary?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I note from news reports that the hon. member would recommend that a freeze be put on conversion of apartment units to condominium dwellings. Hon. members will recall that when The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act was adopted by this Legislature, one of the conditions incorporated in that Act was exactly such a freeze, subject to the removal, by order in council, of those conversions deemed appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, that concept was included in the Act at that time because we wanted to maintain the fidelity of the rent control measures. As the hon. member is aware, rent controls expired some time ago in this province, and to then impose a freeze on conversions would not be useful. In retrospect, if one looked at what took place as a result of our move in 1975, a number of tenants today would be home-owners were those conversions permitted, and would have been home-owners at a very reasonable price. I don't feel it would be appropriate for this Legislature to remove from Albertans in this province that opportunity to become home-owners.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. As a result of the freeze, there are also a lot of tenants who had a place to stay during those years as well.

My question very directly to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is with respect to the incredible number of applications, especially in the city of Calgary — and these are from figures supplied by the city planning department — and the shortfall expected between the units needed to maintain the existing 0.7 per cent vacancy rate. What specific steps, if any, does the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs plan to develop to protect renters who may well find that with the shortfall, in the first place, plus massive condominiumization applications, they simply are not going to be able to find a place to stay?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member is confused. Condominiumization does not result in a change of use. The premises are still occupied by people who need accommodation. The only change is in ownership. I think we should all support the opportunities for Albertans to become masters in their own homes and to own their own dwellings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The hon. minister well knows that while obviously people are going to occupy condominiums, they may well not be the people who are occupying the apartments, particularly with respect to older people. What specific steps does this government propose to take to protect those Albertans who may well lose their residences as a result of the condominium conversion of massive scale, especially in the city of Calgary, particularly as it relates to senior citizens? What special programs, if any, does this government have?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member raises programs with respect to senior citizens, the litany can go on and on. Forty-two per cent of all senior citizens in this province who rent today are in senior citizen accommodations at subsidized rents. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have attended the official openings of two beautiful senior citizens' residences in my own constituency. I know that my colleague the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works is busily working at providing senior citizens' accommodations right across the province. That, together with the increase announced last year from \$500 to \$1,000 for the renters assistance for senior citizens, the increase in the assured income of senior citizens: the list goes on and on.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The issue is not a litany of other programs. The question is: what steps, if any, does this government propose to take to assist those renters in the two major cities where we already face a shortfall in the number of accommodations made available? Now that situation will be made even worse as a consequence of very substantial condominium conversions. What provision, what steps is the government considering? The minister has ruled out a freeze as recommended some years ago by his former colleague the Member for Calgary Buffalo. What steps can the renter expect to see this government take to protect them in a market place which is going to be tight and almost impossible to manage?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the only way conversion from rental to condominium to ownership could affect the vacancy rate or the opportunity for people to seek and find accommodation within the city of Calgary or elsewhere, is if that accommodation were taken out of the

market in terms of occupancy, if it were converted to commercial use or to hotel space. But if it is converted for residential use, it doesn't change the market one iota; it doesn't change the supply one iota.

In terms of what this government has been doing, the \$1.7 billion in investments under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund combined with the moneys voted through the '81-82 budget, which exceeds by 70 per cent the total budget of this province just the short 10 years ago when we first took office, is a sure indication of what this government is doing for tenants in this province. If it were not for the substantial investment of funds in these programs — the core housing incentive program, the Alberta family home purchase program — I'm positive that rents in this province would be substantially higher, as much as \$100 to \$200 a month higher than they are now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. No one is arguing we're going to be taking units out, but the affordability of the units, as every member knows, will be impacted by condominium conversion. My question to the minister: has this government any proposal at all, or is the government seeking from other groups in society proposals to aid low-income people who will be impacted by condominium conversion?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, our core housing incentive program requires that the developer who uses that program for the development of apartments in this province provide and set aside half of the units for those tenants who require controlled low rents. This is a rifling program that makes sure that controlled rents are available for those tenants who need controlled rents and not for those who do not.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what specific steps the government will be taking over the next few weeks, certainly before the next budgetary year, with respect to CHIP? Will there be a massive infusion of additional funds to get programs under way in Edmonton and Calgary through CHIP?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think members are aware of the extra \$200 million allocated to the programs for this year. Perhaps it wouldn't hurt to emphasize the numbers for the benefit of members. With regard to home ownership, we're adding another 1,850 units, which will bring the total number of units to 10,050 for the year. Under rental, we've added 350 to the core housing incentive program, which actually is to accommodate non-profit groups who had applied after the date and we felt were most worthy applicants for non-profit senior citizen accommodation. In addition, we've added 1,000 units to the modest apartment program, bringing the total rental accommodation units for the year to 9,275. So the total number of units for the year financed by the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation is now 19,325. That raises the capital budget of the Home Mortgage Corporation — which, as members know, is obtained through debenture borrowing from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — from \$985,500 to \$1,185,500,000. That's just the capital alone added for the financing of 19,325 units.

The modest apartment program, the 1,000 units I mentioned: it's intended that a significant number of those,

perhaps in the order of 600 or 700, depending on the demand and the requirement, will be allocated to the city of Calgary to alleviate the rental situation there. The modest apartment program carries a subsidy over three years, which should help the affordability, the ability of developers to create these units for the market.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated that under the \$200 million additional amount, as I understand, 1,000 units were allocated to MAP and 350 for CHIP. My question to the minister, particularly as it relates to Calgary, with the applications for condominium conversion at 9,138 and the shortfall in the first place: what assessment is now being given by the Department of Housing and Public Works to a substantial infusion in CHIP beyond the amount necessary to fund the 350 units the minister referred to in his answer a moment ago?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, we're assessing CHIP in terms of budget for the next fiscal year. But again, we've gone through our evaluation, and we feel the additional \$200 million we've added will be sufficient to meet the demand, requirements, and construction feasibility for the balance of this fiscal year.

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

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister then telling the Legislature that as a result of the \$200 million more being made available, the government has statistics, has reviewed those statistics, and is of the view that there will not be unreasonable increases in rent in either of the major metropolitan centres or, for that matter, some of the smaller centres in the province, such as Red Deer? Is that the government's position?

MR. CHAMBERS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs answered all these questions earlier in a very lucid and frank way. I could go on about any number of the programs we have: the construction for senior citizens in Calgary; I've outlined the modest apartment program, the increase of \$200 million. I feel I've adequately explained what we're doing for the balance of this year.

#### **Pork Producers' Insurance Plan**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate what response there has been to the new pork producers' insurance plan?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I have no recent, current data. It's my understanding that on the announcement of the program on behalf of the Pork Producers' Marketing Board, the program was well received. I'll check with the board, get a percentage of producers who have made application for the program to date, and provide the hon. member with that information.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intent of the hog marketing board to continue the plan for 45 months, as was suggested?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is there would be no change in the original plan of providing support for the hog industry, other than some variations to the Alberta plan to fit in a federal stabilization plan for hogs, when it's presented by the federal government, to fit in each program as it exists across Canada. To my knowledge, that would be the only variance in the Alberta plan that would take place in the future.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider extending the program for our Conservative blue pig here?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's already covered.

### Municipal Financing

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'd like to know if the minister has had any recent discussions with members of the AUMA as to the revenue-sharing program the AUMA has been advocating.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the program the hon. member refers to. With respect to the executive of the AUMA, I've had a number of discussions with them, the last, I guess, being in Calgary a couple of weeks ago.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate if the government has made any change in its direction as to tying a percentage of revenue income to direct grants to municipalities?

MR. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it should be made clear that the current executive of the AUMA, or the one previous to this one, did not make a direct request to the government for sharing revenue in a direct way as the hon. member describes. Those comments have been made by various members of the AUMA but have not, at least from my information, been the official position of the AUMA over the last couple of years.

What the AUMA did ask for was the establishment of a fiscal relations committee, involving members of my staff and appointees of their organizations, that might consider a variety of ways to improve the municipal financing base. That's part of the exercise that's been going on the last several months. So I'm sort of at a loss as to know exactly what the hon. member is getting at, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister indicate at this time what discussions he's had with municipal officials as to what other avenues of income and taxation the municipalities will have available to them to raise much-needed revenues to run their municipalities.

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities are receiving a lot of transfers from various government departments for a variety of programs now. I don't think I have to name them. They are discussed in this Legislature during budget estimates from time to time. There are the unconditional grants from the Department of Municipal Affairs, a very extensive interest subsidy program

from the Department of Municipal Affairs, transportation grants that are extensive for all municipalities, water and sewer, et cetera. I could spend a lot of time going through those transfers.

Very recently, after some review by the Provincial Treasurer, I was advised that the actual direct and indirect transfers to the two major metropolitan areas of this province come close to \$2 billion a year. In short, there is a very significant sharing of revenue that the province of Alberta receives with its municipalities, generous to an extent not seen anywhere else in any other province in Canada.

At the recent AUMA annual meeting, I was asked if we would do away with all our cost-sharing programs and simply transfer to the municipalities 8 per cent of the supposed \$64 billion in revenue that we might receive as a result of the new energy agreement. At that time, I said I would be pleased to recommend that to our cabinet if that's what municipalities wanted, but that the situation they were presently in was far more generous than 8 per cent. After that meeting had concluded, a number of people approached me and said they believed the present situation was far preferable to the demands for 8 per cent of the resource revenue.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I heard that exact speech before the government was changed in 1971.

I'd like to know if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has had any discussions with municipalities as to a further debt reduction program, or do the municipalities have to wait till just before the next election? Has the minister had any discussion with the municipalities as to a debt reduction program, or do they just have to wait and hope?

MR. MOORE: Before the election in 1971, Mr. Speaker, the growth of this province, outside Edmonton and Calgary, was so stagnant that there wasn't much of a requirement for funds.

I've had a lot of discussions with municipal governments about the kinds of needs they have with respect to financing needs for their citizens. Quite frankly, we've responded. My hon. colleague the Minister of Environment was criticized last year and again this year because the growth of rural Alberta, in particular, has been so large that we've had to come in with extra special warrants to help with water and sewer programs. For the second year in a row, my colleague the Minister of Transportation has brought in extra assistance in transportation matters. We continue to look at every avenue there is to help and assist municipal governments and will continue to do that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the hon. minister. The municipalities are tired of coming and bowing before you, sir. They would like to know what revenue they're going to get. I'd like to know from the hon. minister if the government is looking at going to more unconditional grants rather than to the strings-are-tied conditional grants they have at this time.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I object very strongly to the hon. member's comment that any municipality has had to bow before me or any other minister.

DR. BUCK: Well, they do.

MR. MOORE: I think we've been able to meet effectively the requirements of municipalities by sitting down and having discussions with them. It hasn't been a case of bowing to anybody.

The second thing I'd like to say is that the conditional grants that are offered to municipalities in a variety of ways are there, to a large extent, because of requests by municipal governments and their citizens. If the hon. member will take the time to go out and talk individually with municipalities across this province, he'll find that for the most part they like the water and sewer programs the hon. Minister of Environment has in place. They don't want that replaced with a straight dollar transfer.

DR. BUCK: They'll take anything they can get, Marvin.

MR. MOORE: The needs of one municipality are often substantially different from another. For example, I believe the cities would like us to continue looking at grants for urban transportation in a different way than we might look at grants for other transportation needs in rural areas, because their needs are different. The government has responded by discussing — almost every minister in this government is in discussions from time to time, in some form or another, with municipal governments about how we help them fund and realize their responsibilities. We'll continue to do that, and we won't do that by simply doing away with all the cost-sharing programs that exist in this government and replacing that with some kind of magic revenue-sharing formula. If that's the Social Credit way, so be it; it's not our way.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, now that the gas tax proposal of the minister's advisory committee was shot down at the AUMA convention — the minister indicated the other day that it's now a dead issue — what is the mandate of the minister's advisory committee at this stage, in terms of developing provincial/municipal financial proposals, particularly with respect to the upcoming convention of the rural municipalities? It is my understanding that originally the concept of a gas tax that went before the AUMA in Calgary was to be discussed there, then that concept was going to be forwarded to the rural municipalities and counties.

My specific question to the minister is: what is the mandate of the minister's advisory committee, and what package of proposals, if any, will be presented to the Alberta association of rural counties and municipalities at their upcoming convention?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the advisory committee that has been established has made the one recommendation with respect to a municipal gasoline tax. I forwarded copies of that report to the executive of both the AMD and C and the AUMA, asking if they would provide that to their delegates for information. I did not ask that they have a vote on the matter, as the AUMA did. I expect that the Association of MDs and Counties will provide that information to their delegates, as information.

In the interim, I do not expect to have another interim report of any kind from the advisory committee. Indeed, over the next year and a half they will be working on a number of matters relating to provincial/municipal fiscal relationships. I expect a final report within that time frame, but I do not expect to receive anything further prior to the November 17 meeting of the AMD and C.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary from the hon. member, followed by a postfinal supplementary by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, has any directive been issued by the minister to the advisory committee, subsequent to the decision of the AUMA to turn down the proposal of a municipal gas tax, in terms of the mandate that committee has as far as developing suggestions for provincial/municipal revenue sharing is concerned?

MR. MOORE: No there has not, Mr. Speaker. There was no reason for me to take any different approach than we had agreed upon prior to that discussion at the AUMA.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary for clarification. The minister mentioned that the municipality or the people at the local level knew better what their needs were than we at the higher level did. Did the minister say that the government is not looking at going to more unconditional grants rather than conditional grants? Is that what the minister meant? They are going to stay the way they are now, and not let the people at the local level decide what they want to do with the funding?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, what I was really saying is that I didn't believe that the hon. Member for Clover Bar knew exactly what the citizens wanted and that he might spend some time talking with the 350-odd municipalities across this province to know what their needs are.

#### ECA Public Advisory Committees

MR. R. CLARK: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment and ask if it is his intention to introduce any legislation at this fall session regarding strengthening the Environment Council of Alberta.

MR. COOKSON: No it isn't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, what formal mechanism has the minister arranged with the public advisory committees so that in fact the minister gets the recommendations from the public advisory committees before he makes important decisions on environment matters, such as the legislation on hazardous materials the Premier indicated is coming in?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite clear on the question of the Member for Olds-Didsbury. If it's a matter of consultation before legislation comes in, there is a period of time when we proceed to consult those bodies, organizations, or municipalities that are interested in legislation. But once the feedback is obtained, we go into a period of time when there would be no further consultation until after first reading in the House. Then it becomes a public document, open to the public for dialogue.

MR. R. CLARK: More precisely, my supplementary question to the minister deals with the formalized arrangements between the minister and the minister's advisory committee in the ECA, which the minister introduced in the Assembly today. What is the formal mechanism that the minister uses to get the advice of the public advisory committees of the ECA prior to taking action on important issues in the Department of Envi-

ronment? I simply use the hazardous materials legislation as an example.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any formal arrangement. From time to time, we meet with the public advisory committees of the Environment Council. We exchange ideas and thoughts about legislation and ways of improving the environment. At any time, I'm happy to receive recommendations from the organization and will take them under advisement when they come forward. Certainly, their recommendations are advisory, then we have to assess within the government as to their practicability. Once that's done, we advise accordingly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary, dealing with the advice the minister receives from the public advisory committees. Has the minister established a practice of replying to the public advisory committee of the ECA, once the minister has received its advice on a particular issue? Does the minister then formally get back to the public advisory group and in fact indicate whether the advice is to be agreed upon? Does the government take that advice; does the government not agree with the advice in that area, like the dam in southern Alberta? What kind of formal mechanism has the minister so that the people on the ECA committees know that their advice is at least seriously considered?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I am in fairly regular contact with the chief executive officer of the Environment Council of Alberta. When it comes to a major hearing in which a report is put together, I think we have improved the dialogue between Environment and the Environment Council, insofar as we have — for example, on the most recent hearing on the problem of hazardous materials, we are meeting occasionally with, first of all, the panel that was structured to sit in and conduct the hearing. The chief executive officer is acting chairman of that committee. There's no problem if at any time the public advisory committee wishes to sit in on that.

The other procedure is for me to meet, either jointly with the panel or on a one-to-one basis with the chief executive officer there, and dialogue with him as to the way we may or may not be going so far as the recommendations are concerned. You have to remember that following these public hearings there are a large number of recommendations. Some we're going to accept, of course, and some, in our judgment, we'll have to reject. So it's simply a judgment on our part, and we dialogue as closely as possible with the internal operations of the ECA on those issues.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to consider seriously the suggestion of replying to the public advisory committee's recommendations in a written manner so that the advisory committee itself knows which recommendations are accepted, which rejected, and the reasons for rejecting them? Is the minister prepared to consider that proposition?

MR. COOKSON: Well, we are doing that, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it's not laid out in any formal manner, but as soon as we have reviewed the reports, we do advise the Environment Council of Alberta through my department. I'm sure I'm correct on that. We do respond in written form as the decisions are made. Perhaps we can improve on that. But if there is a concern in that regard, I don't

mind accepting it as a concern, and we'll try to improve on it.

#### Cable TV Services

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Telephones and results from a number of complaints I've received from citizens concerned that cable television broadcasters, although committed to provide community service and local and public interest programming as a condition of licence, are now, it appears — at least in Edmonton Mill Woods — doing it at considerable cost, with the requirement for a converter. Is the hon. minister planning any steps to make sure that the cable companies fulfil their commitment of licence?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, both the cable television companies in Edmonton and Calgary have more services they can provide than are available in the low-band range from channels 2 to 13. As the hon. member has said, some of them have switched over into the mid-band range some of the programs that were in that range. They have done so with the blessing of the CRTC in Ottawa.

I have suggested to one of the operators that they tape and delay some of the programs, such as the Alberta Legislature, if they had a problem of simultaneous transmission. The response was that it was a costly process, and they weren't able to do that. So, I think the only recourse concerned citizens have would be to put pressure on the cable companies to switch it back to the low-band range or get in touch with the CRTC.

MR. PAHL: A supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of a stick, if you will, is the hon. minister considering providing a carrot to the public service broadcasting?

DR. WEBBER: No, Mr. Speaker. The cable TV operators certainly have the prerogative of carrying these programs on the channel they wish, provided they have the blessing of the CRTC, and they have that. So that's where it stands.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister considering exercising the potential constitutional authority of this province to regulate cable television and accomplish through Alberta legislation what he is finding difficult to accomplish through negotiation with the federal government?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to legislation passed last spring in this Legislature, Bill 40, where we can have the Public Utilities Board license telecommunications undertakings. However, regulations are required before we can do that, and we are in the process of developing those regulations now.

MR. COOK: A final question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister working with the industry to develop regulations, and would those regulations reflect the concerns of the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we certainly have been in contact with the industries that would be affected, namely the broadcasters of Alberta and the cable TV people of Alberta. The broadcasters have concerns, such as content and advertising, and the cable television people have different kinds of concerns. It's going to be very difficult to

resolve the situation to have regulations that are going to satisfy all the different groups, but we're certainly trying.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

11. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that the Assembly approve in general the operations of the government since the adjournment of the spring sitting.

[Adjourned debate October 15: Mr. R. Speaker]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the Premier's marathon remarks, which went on for some time, I'd like to say that I describe the presentation made to us as members of this Legislature as a person suffering from 'helicopteritis'. It isn't only the Premier of this government who suffers from that kind of disease, but the ministers of this government. That's what I want to talk about today.

In this Legislature the Premier can present to us a glowing picture, make global observations, put growth statistics before us, tell us about the economic vitality of Alberta, talk about high growth rate, many more jobs, low unemployment, and on and on. And I agree as well that that is in Alberta at the present time. But when you talk in global terms, when you suffer from 'helicopteritis', one of the things you miss is the real concerns and the needs of individual Albertans, families in this province, and that's where a good administration is able to fulfill its obligation to the people of Alberta.

It is easy to look at the big things. When I took on the responsibility of a cabinet minister in this province, one of first things I was told was: the big problems are going to be easier to solve, but the little ones that come day to day, the problems of people in their daily lives, are going to be the most difficult, but are the most important and should be followed and observed very carefully. That was the advice given to me by Mr. Manning, a former premier of this province, and I've always remembered those words as good advice in my responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe — and it can be observed through question period — that this government has missed the needs of Albertans at the present time. There are a lot of problems of concern to the man on the street, economic problems in his daily life. We're at a time when many Albertans are concerned that they can't meet their obligation to pay for their food, clothing, and shelter. We're living in a time of riches, but at the same time many people are under economic stress in their personal and family lives. In this Legislature some people smile when I mention that kind of observation. It is nice when you're on government income, income subsidized by other types of committee work, and we can be shielded from that demand and stress out in our communities today.

Mr. Speaker, it's obligatory upon this government to do something about it. Why do we say, what is the heritage fund doing for Albertans? Under economic stress, Albertans are asking that question. Today over 85 per cent of Albertans are saying, not much, even after the government has spent \$0.25 million attempting to tell Albertans that it's a great program, you have great benefits, and it is doing a lot for you. People in Alberta are

saying, what's it doing for me? I'd have to say, not much, when you're in the conditions of many Albertans today.

Let me look at a few of these people and talk about them: people who call my office, who contact my colleagues here in the Legislature, because they feel there is a deaf ear by government to their personal problems. They don't know where to turn. The lending institutions say, this is the interest rate; if you can't pay it, then quit the business. If the farmer can't make payments, you'd better get out of farming. Or the mortgaged person says, I can't meet the mortgage payment if you double it. They say, then we can't do anything for you. Those are the kinds of problems out there on the street.

We all know the history of interest rates in the last short period of time. In January 1979, just a short time ago, it was 12 per cent. In July 1981 it was 21 per cent. Yesterday the prime rate established in Canada was 20 per cent. What is the effect of that in terms of small business? My hon. colleague from Olds-Didsbury is out on the phone at the present time talking to a constituent who is closing his business today and needs some urgent help. AOC is turning a deaf ear. My hon. colleague from Bow Valley — last week two businesses, responsible people, had to close their doors. In my own constituency people are phoning and saying the pressure is too great because of the interest rates. Nobody is listening. In statistics from January to August 1981, bankruptcies in Alberta are up 37 per cent. Sure, maybe there are a lot more, but 37 per cent is a significant figure, something to be concerned about and to listen to; not to stand back and say everything's great out there. Those are individuals and families who are investing their time and money trying to be responsible in the province of Alberta.

Who's at fault? Is it the small business man who's going out of business? Is he at fault? When you examine most of these businesses, they got into business when interest rates were low. Interest rates have gone to the levels I've indicated. The difference in interest rates has taken away any reinvestment money, any money in terms of profit and, in many cases, has turned the business from being in the black to being in the red. That's the situation across the province of Alberta. I think we must recognize the problem here in this Legislature, not turn a deaf ear, and know something about it.

When I asked the question today with regard to what the AOC was doing about this — if that were a concern of government, that would have been a prime topic of discussion in cabinet, and every cabinet minister would have been able to respond. This government isn't even aware of what is happening out there to small business at the present time; not even aware there is a crisis. If there is, well, maybe they can fall by the wayside. We're still okay; we've got our income. But the characteristic of a good government is being able to go out and listen to people's problems and be concerned about individuals. Because with the same philosophy the Premier uses about 10 good provinces making a good Canada, good individuals in a sound business make a good Alberta. It's no different. The principle is exactly the same. Mr. Speaker, I think this government must pay attention to that need. At the end of my remarks I'm going to suggest a program I feel this government should put in place to meet the emergent need of small business across this province at the present time.

The second area is agriculture. My colleagues have brought examples to me where farmers are in difficulty, specifically the feedlot operators, the persons who deal with the beef industry of the province of Alberta. In my

own constituency — also, prior to coming to this Legislature, a presentation was made to the cabinet committee when they were in the Vauxhall area. Twenty-two farmers set up a feedlot a few years ago when interest rates were very reasonable. They were able to build up a one-third equity in the business. Last year their losses were so bad that the one-third equity disappeared. They're at a point where they have to close the business. But that's not the only loss. These farmers are irrigation farmers and have wheat and beet crops that can carry their livelihood. But a facet of the agricultural industry goes down the drain. What does it always affect? In the town of Vauxhall we have a feed-mill industry, very important to the economic viability of that town. Fifty per cent of the feed from that mill goes to this feedlot. You can just realize what happens to the feed mill when they go out of business. It's very obvious in that type of thing.

What's going to be done about it? Government continues to listen, wait and see, take statistics. Well, the only statistic that will really make the government move is when the 43 per cent of our cattle production is down to 20 per cent. Then it's too late, too late to recover and bring it back. Today is the time to act and do something about it. There are other examples. The hon. Member for Bow Valley raises questions with the feeders in his constituency facing the same problem and knowing there's no way out. They're saying, what can government really do?

At the same time, we have the Premier on this cabinet tour in southern Alberta — and I used the word 'helicoptering' a few moments ago, meaning that the Premier looks at things from a global aspect and forgets there are people out there. He also did that in my constituency: 'helicoptered' out to a corporate farm, talked about the problems of the feedlot operator. But there were small farmers down the road who never got a visit. Just down the road, a father and three sons — the sons want to get into farming. We've been working for over a year trying to get an ADC loan to help them, but to no avail.

Four or five miles down the road is a young farmer I helped get into business a year ago. His dad divided a quarter of land so he could have 80 acres. They set up what they thought was an economic unit and set up hog production. First, he had to borrow money from the bank at a high interest rate to get into business, and that hurt his cash flow. Then he had a disease in the hogs, which wasn't his fault. We tried to deal with ADC on that one. We're still dealing with ADC, and it still isn't resolved. The poor young fellow is in real difficulty. The other thing he had to do was wait for the subsidy on hogs, but by the time the government got it down he had paid a terrific amount of interest. This is the kind of thing that happens with this government, in terms of the real problem out there.

We think, and recommend to this Legislature, that it is time to act on the problem. We must keep that farm group, the beef industry, in place. If we allow it to deteriorate, we're going to suffer the consequences down the road. Sure, at this point in time, as my colleague points out to me, a lot of the calf purchases have not occurred, but they are going to — and maybe they won't, because the cash is not in place. Yesterday my hon. colleague from Bow Valley, with the support of the rest of us, recommended that a program of financial assistance to the cow-calf and the feedlot operators in the province of Alberta should be put in place. I'd just like to touch on that program that we feel will be able to keep our businessmen producing beef on the farm in the business. We've recommended that the program that should

be in place be retroactive to January 1980; that there should be a payment to the producers of \$40 per head for all fat cattle, grades A, B, and C, sold in 1980. This program would cost in the vicinity of \$35 million to \$40 million dollars.

Secondly, we recommended that the assistance program should support the backgrounding sector with payments of \$20 per head, in an effort to help producers supplying stocker cattle. This program would cost in the vicinity of \$5 million to \$10 million dollars.

We also feel that because of the difference in freight rates between Alberta and Ontario, there should be some compensation for the producer in the formula. We feel that eligible cattle must be owned and fed in Alberta for 60 days minimum and sold in the 1980 calendar year. Mr. Speaker, that would put some money in the hands of the cattlemen of this province to carry on and be able to hold the business in place while, hopefully, this Canadian economy straightens itself out. That's the type of thing we would recommend government should do.

The problem out there is real. When you have meetings of 400, of 1,000 farmers across the province, and other meetings that project the same kind of attendance, there must be a concern. Usually one of the greatest concerns farmers have is when you touch their pocketbook or their income. At this point in time I think that is a real concern.

I think it's time for the government to stop saying, we'll monitor the market and wait. It's time to do something. In principle a lot of us don't agree with subsidy, but there's so much precedent I think it's difficult to argue that at this point in time: the hog producers, other provinces. It's unfortunate that both those programs got into place and caused the situation we're in.

That's agriculture. And as farmers, the same feeling applies out there. Nobody's really listening; where do I turn. They don't know where to go to find an answer to the problems they have.

What about shelter and homes? Today we had a discussion in the Legislature about accommodation. The minister has indicated the government is putting in place some 19,325 housing units in their debenture borrowing program. And that's good. I think that's very, very good. I think it's an excellent attempt to meet that accommodation need. But where does the crisis lie out there at the present time? That's the question I want to talk about today. Many individual persons, families, across this province have been put under budgetary strain because of high mortgage rates.

The young newsman in Lethbridge that I saw last week had just renewed his mortgage. It went from \$500 to just over \$1,000. He said to me: you know, I think I'm able to meet that, but what it means is that my wife and I stay home. We don't take a trip and we readjust our standard of living, because we now have no other way out. That was the money to do something else in our life. He has been working for 7, 8, 9 years at this responsibility, and his wages are not too bad.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret interrupting the hon. leader, but there appears to be some hopefully temporary difficulty with the sound system. Perhaps he would like to raise his voice a little.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that . . . I won't say what I was going to say. I was going to blame it on the government, Mr. Speaker, and now that it's on, I feel that would be unfair.

MR. R. CLARK: That would be too quick a reaction.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Too quick a reaction. It just doesn't symbolize the action of government.

I've had other responses as well. When I was in my office last week, I had a call from a young lady in Red Deer. She and her husband have been married for two to three years. She said: we decided not to have children, so we earned the 10 per cent, spent two years, we have that today. I went down to the office. When we first wanted to build a home, the interest rates were 12 per cent. Today — that's after October 1 — they're 19.3 per cent. But she said, the other clause the government has added is that I must now have a child, and we don't qualify. She said, that's unfair; I have tried to be a responsible individual in this province and take my responsibility, but the government isn't prepared to meet that need.

The government's going to build those 19,325 units. But here is a responsible Albertan who is being left out because they have not met certain criteria. How can the government do that type of thing?

In question period the other day my hon. colleague raised an instance where, when the persons applied for a loan, it went in when the rate was 15 per cent. By the time the application was processed it was 19 per cent, and they couldn't afford to pay that rate of interest under their budget.

Mr. Speaker, across this province there are thousands and thousands of examples where mortgage renewals have taken place where people want low-interest money. As I've indicated, in many cases mortgages have been increased over 100 per cent. For example, a three-year closed mortgage in one of our banking institutions in June 1979 was 11 per cent; in October 1980, 14.75 per cent; in October 1981, 20 per cent.

The question I raise, Mr. Speaker, is what action will the government take with regard to those mortgages? Does the government even recognize the needs of those people out there? Does the government know how many people have to leave their homes because they can't meet the new mortgage rates?

In the papers today there's an indication that the federal government may do something, that there may be a new 16 per cent rate of interest. Hopefully that is a true statement. We don't always know. But it isn't all that good a deal: 25 to 30 years fixed interest, a long period of time. I'm sure that will still put a strain on many family and individual budgets in this province.

But the point I want to make today in this presentation is that this Conservative government must be more responsive to the needs of those individuals when they're in a crisis situation. There is not an agency of government to which these people can turn when their mortgage rates have doubled. Even in circumstances where they can't afford it, there is no agency in the private sector or in government where that person can turn and say, help me out of this situation. I want to stay in my home; I can't afford it. My earning power is only that much; I can't earn any more. My boss won't pay me any more wages, the food costs this much, the clothing costs this much, schooling for my kids is that amount. There's nowhere these people can turn, nobody who will assess that problem. This government has not even tried to set up that kind of facility — there is not one agency. They can try to quit their job and get social allowance, but that's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about a person staying in his home, staying in his job, and possibly getting some kind of relief. Mr. Speaker, we think there is a way

this government could and should help in those areas. Again, I am going to make a recommendation at the end of my remarks with regard to that circumstance.

What about Albertans and the energy agreement? The Premier has told us that it was a good agreement that really did some great things. But when you clear away all the discussion, the rhetoric, only two groups really benefited from that agreement. One was the government of Alberta; and secondly, the government of Canada. The other two groups, the oil companies and the consumers of Alberta, have not benefited. I'd like to talk about that for just a moment.

The best information I can secure at this point in time is that the oil and gas netback to the oil companies, resulting from this new agreement, is going to be less than what they could have obtained under the national energy program. Well, Mr. Speaker, everybody was upset with the national energy program. If they were upset with that, we know quite well from our side of the House, in listening to some of these people who have to work towards energy self-sufficiency for us, that their netback is even less and they are in a worse situation. We expect growth in the next few years, and the Premier has said this. Well, if the netback to the oil companies is less for investment, for production, then how can we expect a greater amount of growth in our economy? Mr. Speaker, I think somebody should explain that, and somebody should have been listening prior to the signing of that agreement. The indications are that in the United States, as it was under the national energy program, the oil companies could have received much more in terms of netback. If I recall the statistics correctly, for every \$1 that could be received in netback in Canada, \$8 could be received in the United States. I think that's significant. It's also going to determine the direction our expertise, our oil companies, will turn in producing and bringing about oil for North America. It certainly won't be here in Alberta. I think we have a problem with regard to that, and the government should be paying more attention. But listening to the Premier's remarks, that wasn't a problem.

The independent oil companies of this province are headed up by individuals, groups who support families, have a cause, and have tried to work and be responsible in this province of Alberta. In turn, I think we as legislators and this government have a responsibility to attempt to meet their needs as much as possible, because we as Albertans and Canadians want energy self-sufficiency and they are the tool through which we will reach that specific goal.

So they weren't winners. What about the consumers in Alberta? Every Albertan will pay their share of the agreement. It's going to be costly for Albertans. On the farms, for example, our fuel costs will go up significantly. Fuel costs for people in the cities who must drive to work will go up significantly. But on the other side, specifically when we look at our agricultural industry, have we any guarantee that our prices for production will go up at the same level? Mr. Speaker, I don't think that guarantee is there, or ever has been. So our consumers in Alberta are paying the brunt.

I'd like to relate a small story I heard the day after the agreement in my own home town. A group of us met and had a discussion after morning church. The young fellows there who were farmers said, we heard about the agreement; we're pleased there was a settlement. They said, it's good to get the argument over with, but we've been thinking about it. Do you know who will pay? We will. That's all we get; we have to pay more for our fuel, but

we don't know what the benefits are. We don't see any direct returns back to us as farmers. That's the same question they ask about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The royalty revenue from resources, which the government is so happy about, will go in the heritage trust fund bank. That's where it goes. Then what happens to it? Do Albertans really benefit from that Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Well, Albertans on the farm who have to meet their needs in terms of agricultural responsibility don't think so. Mr. Speaker, in terms of that resource revenue, we in this Legislature, the Conservative government, have a responsibility to try to enhance that part of the agricultural industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I understand you would like to make an introduction, and I can pause here.

#### head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

*(reversion)*

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for pausing in his remarks so that I may introduce some distinguished parliamentarians from the United Kingdom, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery: Baroness David of the House of Lords; Dr. Edmund Marshall, Member of Parliament for Goole; Mr. Michael Martin, Member of Parliament for Glasgow Springburn; Mr. John MacKay, Member of Parliament for Argyll; and Mr. John Ward, the Member of Parliament for Poole. They're accompanied by Miss Charlene Blaney, the Chief Administrative Officer of administration of the Legislative Assembly, and our parliamentary counsel Mr. Clegg. I would ask them to stand so they might receive your welcome.

#### head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

*(continued)*

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to add to my observations on the energy agreement, as consumers we've lost and have to face the brunt. Oil companies have lost. At the same time, in the Premier's remarks we have heard no observation of the loss of those two important parties that constitute the population of Alberta.

I talked about the royalty that was going to come to Alberta, and the benefits. Well, Mr. Speaker, we as legislators must bring a responsibility to individuals if we want to keep this economy and the social life of Alberta as viable as possible.

The other topic I'd like to touch on, in line with my theme of looking at the problems of the man on the street, is with regard to the social fabric of Alberta. The Premier listed a number of social programs the government is initiating or is going to initiate. But one of the things I get concerned about in this government is that the programs seem to be initiated but are really not always responsive to some needs out in the communities. For example, if we look at the crime rate in Alberta, I feel it is often directly related to the demand and the stress on the budget and the economic pressures on many people here in Alberta today. In the first half of 1981, the crime rate has increased 12 per cent over the first half of 1980. We find that violent juvenile crimes in Edmonton have had an eightfold increase from 1978, a significant increase, but we don't hear this government saying, the problem is out there and we're going to do something about it; we are going to put a program in place and

attempt to deal with it. Divorce rates are higher than any place in Canada, up 45 per cent in the last ten years. Now, I can't blame that all on the Conservative government, but it's part of the problem that is out there and must be observed and recognized by this government. They must make every attempt to do something to help individuals and families stay together. But I don't hear that.

Hospitals, health care. We've heard it for the last 10 years: slow, poorly developed allocation of money, but never getting in place. I think the fighting and scrapping that goes on for hospitals in different districts of this province is embarrassing. People at the local level should have more say about their hospitals so decisions can be made and the facility can be put in place. But the delay and red tape of this government doesn't allow for that. The government really doesn't trust individuals who volunteer to do the job at the local level.

There really isn't a social emphasis to this Conservative government, nor is there real observation of some of the economic problems that face individuals, families, or the man on the street in Alberta. I think that's what we as legislators must be concerned about. Some of those concerns and problems must be answered in this Legislature: the cattle producer, the mortgage rates, and the interest rates. This government will say, and in more than one case in the last two days have said, that the interest rate question is a federal one and it's unfortunate that the Canadian interest rate tracks that of the U.S. That's all the answer we get. But in terms of concern about the effect of these interest rates, there really isn't any.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude my remarks with that in mind. I feel it is time this government put in place a fund to help those who are facing personal, business, or farm financial failure because of no fault of their own but a fault of the system, the high interest rates, the high mortgage rates. How could it be worked? I think there are enough government agencies in place. In the last 10 years they have doubled from 17,000 to over 40,000, so I think the agencies are in place.

We could look at the treasury branches, ADC, AOC, Alberta Housing and Public Works, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, or even Social Services and Community Health for these agencies to be available to the people in Alberta who have a concern, so when a person has a problem, we as MLAs can say, look, here is an agency of government that is attempting to hear and meet that need and that crisis you personally are in. At present, that group does not exist.

I don't think this government is aware of the crisis of problems, so that's most likely why it's not in place. But I recommend that this government have that type of coordinated facility so Albertans who are in a financially difficult situation have somewhere to turn and it looks as if we're giving them every chance to solve their personal economic crises.

I'm sure that can be worked without a lot of cost in terms of administration. In terms of dollars that may be required to subsidize interest rates in some situations, to support mortgage rates in some situations, to look at the need of the cattle operator, it may be \$100 million or so. But in terms of keeping Albertans in their homes, in their businesses, and on the farm, the investment from the heritage fund or from general revenue would be a good investment in this province. If we can keep people taking their responsibilities and off the welfare rolls, that's a lot more positive than allowing the welfare rolls to grow, as they will if this government doesn't take some kind of

emergent financial action in terms of a program at this point in time.

What else could be done? I observed this cabinet in the last two days, where one cabinet minister wasn't aware of what the other was doing in terms of this economic crisis out there. I think a special cabinet committee could: one, assess the current situation to a greater degree; secondly, be the group that would allocate and manage the special allotment of funds that would be necessary to deal with these personal problems across the province; and thirdly, monitor, keep an eye on, and keep an ear to the ground for this special problem that is in our environment in Alberta at present. That's not so tough. But that would meet the needs of many Albertans and relieve them of stresses in situations where they have nowhere to turn at present. I recommend that to government as a positive step and something that is highly practical and possible within the framework of the general budget or the heritage fund of this province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, today I said that my remarks would not be those of a marathon runner but those of a sprinter. I wanted to make one point: there is an economic crisis out there for individuals and families, and this government must recognize that fact and, in turn, put in place some programs, initiatives, and efforts so those needs can be met.

Thank you.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to respond to the Premier's motion, also in some sense to the Leader of the Opposition. I have been listening with a good deal of interest to the previous speaker. I must admit to some sympathy for his position, because it must be very difficult to find areas of criticism in a province like Alberta and in the speech of the Premier made in the last two days.

I found some amusement in his term 'helicopteritis'. I've heard of a helicopter as being an egg beater which oftentimes is used for scrambling, and I have a sense of there being a scrambling attempt to get ideas that would be effective.

MR. COOK: Scrambled ideas.

MR. OMAN: I don't question the sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition in his attempts or in his concern for our society. But it seems to me there is a false premise here that government can solve all the moral, physical, and business problems and protect us all from risk. I find it very strange that an opposition which professes to be extreme, in the sense of the extreme right of political philosophy, now comes forth with the idea that we should get into every part of life and take the responsibility of personal decision-making onto the government's shoulder. I find that rather strange.

In fact, I should like to remind the Leader of the Opposition of his speech in the throne speech debate last spring, in which he says:

Well, what has been this government's performance in the last decade with regard to those basic tenets?

He had previously mentioned expanding the civil service. He said:

The lid is higher, and we have 40,000-plus civil servants in the province of Alberta. It has over-doubled in one decade, one decade in 20 per cent of the history of this province.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, when I examine old programs that have been phased out, I can't recall one

program of any significance in the last 10 years that was phased out. It's been a total, complete, expansionary approach to adding programs and adding to the budget.

Now, I don't find the hon. gentleman's speech today to be particularly consistent with those words of last spring.

It's easy for Albertans as well as the opposition, because of the highlights and headlines of the energy and constitutional debates that have gone on in Canada, to overlook what I think has been the basic thrust of this government over the last two years since I, at least, have been in office. That is, we have been concerned with people needs. I don't need to run over all of them again, because they have been done. But we have forgotten about perhaps the hundreds of millions of dollars going into subsidies for housing for low-income Albertans; for the 30 per cent increase in the social services budget over this past year; for the multitude of programs for our senior citizens, including rental assistance, home repair, medicare, and assured income plan; for the first-time farmers in agriculture. I could go on and on and indicate that this government has been centering its energies and basic thrust — it hasn't been headlined as often as the energy and constitutional talks — on people-oriented needs.

The other question I have to ask, quite frankly in response to the speech from the Leader of the Opposition, is: why should we as a government of Alberta be called upon to cover up and solve the problems created by fiscal economic mismanagement at the federal level. I just don't see how we are responsible to give an account and solve all the problems that basically have been federally created.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ronald Reagan.

MR. OMAN: Yes, my hon. colleague from Edmonton. It seems to me the Leader of the Opposition did, at one time or another, give some praise to the present President of the United States of America and his economic programs, which I don't think are too socially oriented.

AN HON. MEMBER: They should have kept Jimmy Carter.

MR. OMAN: Well, perhaps it's a matter of out of the frying pan and into the fire.

I think the simple fact of life is that even here in Alberta government cannot or should not shield its citizens from all the risks of life. There have been failures. There are strains in our society. We don't deny that. I think our government has gone the second mile in trying to meet some of those strains, and we're still wrestling with them. At the same time, we cannot take away from our citizens the responsibility of individual decision-making. If you go into business, if you take out loans, you recognize there is a risk involved. As someone has said, nothing is promised in this life except death and taxes.

Having said that somewhat in response to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, I also would not throw out very quickly his final suggestion that we look at this matter of perhaps a fund or some means where, because of the strains, those under economic hardships can be helped. I think we're ready to do that and will do it. I'm sure we're ready to look at his suggestion. If it has merit, why wouldn't we put it into operation?

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment and spend

my basic allotted time on a matter which one might think primarily affects the city of Calgary. Because I'm a member representing that city and chairman of the caucus, I have some interest in that regard. But I go back to the Premier's speech on the state of the economy in Alberta. I can't add to that. It's like trying to guild the lily. It was done so well, forcefully, and persuasively. It was amazing, the areas that were covered and what's being done in Alberta.

As I said before, I feel some sympathy for anyone who has to feel they must somehow criticize what has been done and what has happened over the last year in Alberta. The strokes that have fallen our way and the battles that have been won are just terribly significant for today, for tomorrow, for the next week, year, and, indeed, centuries. I think we ought to be thankful for a Premier and back-up team that has done so well to secure the rights of Albertans in Confederation and, at the same time, remain loyal to the great Canadian concept.

In his remarks, our Premier made brief mention of his involvement and attendance at the Calgary effort to secure the Winter Olympics, in Baden-Baden, Germany, two weeks ago. I might just comment on that, because I think it has significance for this Legislature. I want to point out the provincial involvement — past, present, and future — in this whole process. First, those provincial representatives who went to Germany to help Calgary with its bids included, along with the Premier, the Hon. Peter Trynchy, the Hon. Horst Schmid, me, and Lee Richardson from the Premier's office. It was a privilege for me, personally, to be there, an exciting time.

However, in this situation I don't think the politicians — those from Calgary or the province — can primarily take the glory for what happened. Certainly we aided. But I must take my hat off to the organizers from the volunteer sector, particularly Frank King, Bob Niven, and all their associates who did a magnificent job. The battle was not won in Baden-Baden in that week. It was won because of the foundation and work that had been done over a period of two and three years. They laid the foundation well. When they came under fire, because others recognized that Calgary had done its work and were trying to undermine that, they stuck to their game plan. They remained cool under fire. I simply have to say the whole procedure was in the hands of competent people. Because that is true as far as the past is concerned, I feel rather confident as far as the future is concerned in planning the many events which will lead up to the Olympics in Calgary in 1988, because of the IOC giving the decision that Calgary should have it over the other two competitors, Falun, Sweden, and Cortina, Italy.

However, because I don't think it's widely recognized, I'd like to mention that quite frankly provincial initiatives have been even greater than those of the city of Calgary, from a political point of view. First of all, I think our Premier was behind the whole movement for this particular bid right from the beginning, when it was initiated a couple of years ago. Of course, I think it's well known that our Premier was at the forefront for Calgary's bid for the Winter Olympics in the mid-60s and has been a great promoter of this ever since.

I should also point out that the first Olympic facility, the coliseum, is now under construction in Calgary. The initiative for that building took place with this province. The Calgary caucus of MLAs presented a plan to the general caucus of the government, who then offered a plan to the city of Calgary, whereby they could have a

coliseum that would, I think, turn out to be second to none in the world. The financing for that plan was that we would provide one-third of the funding, the city of Calgary one-third, and the federal government one-third. With the securing of the Olympics, it looks like that funding formula will really work out. In fact, most of the city's contribution will be by way of land, because it's found now, by way of evaluation, that the city's land is probably in the area of about \$22 million or \$23 million. So the actual cash they'll put into it is very little.

But I point out that the province took the initiative in getting that thing off the ground. It's now under construction. It looks like we're going to come in on budget. We hope we'll be able to complete it in just a little more than a year for use at that time.

I should also point out that most of the venues that will be used in the Olympics will not be in the city of Calgary themselves, but are going to be built on provincial property in its forest reserve and Kananaskis Country. The Nordic events will be west of the Bragg Creek area, and of course the downhill events will probably be in the Spray Lakes area. Therefore, most of the construction will be the responsibility of the province. The province is going to have very real input into the whole matter of Olympic construction. I just want to point out that we are very much involved. We are taking the initiative in many areas.

One might ask: why the Olympics at all? After all, it's a very, very expensive procedure. The budget that has been drawn up by the Calgary Olympic Development Association totals approximately \$415 million. That's approaching \$0.5 billion, a lot of dollars. I'll say a bit about the funding of that a little later. But when you look at it, I think you have to say this. For all of Alberta, particularly southern Alberta, you're going to have a legacy of sports facilities that will be envied throughout the world and in fact will draw people from the world not just for the Olympics but in order to prepare for them, and afterward in the practising that will go on — such things as skating ovals, luges — and cross-country as well as downhill facilities. Southern Alberta, as well as all of Alberta, desperately needs more downhill facilities. Our people are going to places in the United States and other areas. So it's a matter of giving facilities to this part of the province that is rapidly expanding and growing. It's like an explosion in the population boom. Therefore, it very, very neatly ties in with the need to provide recreational facilities for the city of Calgary, southern Alberta, and all of Alberta.

The other thing is the kind of inspiration our young people will have. I'm quite sure that people from all across Alberta will be flooding into the area because they will want to see the once in a lifetime privilege of world-class athletes coming to our province. Our young people will be able to see this first hand and get inspiration from the world class, and then a kind of goal toward which to strive.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. COOK: Come to Edmonton in '83.

MR. OMAN: Yes, I'm sure Edmonton in '83 will set the stage, as my hon. colleague indicates.

The other thing I want to mention, and it has already happened in effect — not that Alberta isn't already on the map worldwide, yet many people do not understand either the kinds of things that are happening here in an exciting way, by way of economic energy developments.

population developments, some of the research going on, or some of the most beautiful scenery in all the world. This of course is going to be promulgated over the whole of our globe, and we'll be able to share with the rest of the world some of the God-given, innate talents and endowments that have been given to our province. So, unquestionably, there will be a boost as far as tourism is concerned, and recognition of what is happening here in our great province.

By way of budgets — and I think this is one of the exciting things, too. When I mentioned the budget of \$415 million, it's kind of frightening. On the other hand, we expect the federal government to be the main contributor. I think there is some argument as to how they'd do this, but we hope the federal government, through fund raising of one sort or another, will be bringing in almost half that budget, perhaps some \$200 million. Obviously the provincial government, by way of roads and facilities that I have mentioned, is going to be kicking in a fair amount of money — I don't think I want to mention a figure here — and part of it will depend on whether we can get private developers to take over the ski areas. Of course, that's what we want and that's the ideal thing. Obviously, if we have to build them ourselves, it will cost more.

I think the interesting thing is that for the city of Calgary, if the budgets are handled correctly, there will be perhaps not more than \$25 million, of which most will be their contribution to the coliseum, by way of a land donation. So, interestingly enough, the actual dollars expended by the city of Calgary are going to be, and should be, minimal. I point that out because of the way things have been planned. Certainly because of the generation of our government and others, there should be very little increase in the property tax in the city of Calgary as a result of what has happened.

Of course I didn't mention the income that will be realized, primarily through television rights — fantastic, unimaginable sums. It has become a worldwide event, and the selling of those rights — which still has to be negotiated — brings in many hundreds of millions of dollars, which we hope will help balance.

The other exciting thing about this is that the Calgary Olympic Development Association is setting aside a fund of some \$30 million-plus, the interest of which will go to help operate those facilities into the indefinite future so that the burden of operating those facilities will not fall upon the city or the province. I think it's an excellent plan to secure those facilities cost free, in a sense, for an interminable period of time for our young people and for worldwide use.

Mr. Speaker, there may be other questions on the Olympics, but I think I'll leave that now. I wanted to bring you up to date on some of the excitement that has gone on in the city and some of the provincial involvement in all that. Before I close, I might mention one thing with regard to the whole Olympic aspect which kind of excites me also: the fact that the organization involved here has been very carefully planning, right from the beginning until now, to involve everyone. I think they have done their best to try to take in various levels of government. I think there has been involvement by many people within the Legislature, from the ministers down to people in the various constituencies who have had and will continue to have input in the whole Olympic bid and plan in the future. The other thing is that I think there is a great concern to make sure we do the developments in an environmentally acceptable way, which will not dis-

turb the viabilities of communities such as Bragg Creek and other areas to the west of the city of Calgary, as well as the city itself.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a couple of concluding remarks with regard to the whole area of the needs of our municipalities. I was really dumbfounded, and I think I expressed that in some of my questions the other day, when the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association was persuaded, without a proper look, by a few people who I think wanted to embarrass the government and ended up with egg on their own faces — nevertheless, persuaded that assembly in the last week to turn down the suggestion of its own committee, in effect, that the government look at a gasoline tax in order to bolster the provincial coffers, particularly as regards transportation. I'm amazed that that happened. I know that many people in the AUMA are embarrassed and wish that that vote could be recalled. I think it was a kind of tragedy when that opportunity existed. In spite of that, I suppose there would be the temptation on behalf of the province to say, well, you've cut off your nose to spite your face. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the needs of our municipalities and major metropolitan areas which are mushrooming as a result of the energy needs and developments in the province. I believe the building permits in Calgary this year are now approaching the \$2 billion mark. I understand that right now more office space is under construction in the city of Calgary than any other city in North America. That points to a great increase in population, transportation needs. We cannot get away from this.

I want to commend the Minister of Transportation for setting up that study group on urban transportation and for putting on it representatives from the cities and business communities. I think the report of that committee is going to be very meaningful, and I'm looking forward to it with a great deal of expectation. Hopefully, it will form the basis whereby we can work co-operatively with the cities and municipalities of Alberta to give them some permanent relief for their exploding needs, particularly in the area of public transportation. It's something we in Alberta have to deal with, and we have the opportunity to deal with it. With our cities growing so rapidly, now is the time to move and plan, rather than to always be in a catch-up situation, when the planning and direction of our cities have already taken place and you have to go in and bust up communities and push new roads and routes here and there. Now is the time to plan and to act. I really believe this study will give us the basis on which we can do that.

Our municipalities are financially hard-pressed; however, I must remind them, not as hard as some other areas of the country. I certainly would do a disservice if we didn't remind ourselves that the city of Calgary alone this year will receive from our provincial government approximately \$800 million in benefits, either directly or indirectly. That's a fair chunk of money by anybody's measurement — almost \$1 billion. I think we ought not to forget that, and it ought to be out in the forefront that the government is not doing nothing; it is doing a very significant matter by way of helping our municipalities to solve their problems. Nevertheless, they are also looking for other areas. Such things as lotteries and amusement taxes have been mentioned. I would hate to see where we would begin to finance governments, in Alberta or any others, by means of lotteries. I think it would be an unhealthy situation. Therefore, we have to provide our municipalities with some flexibility so they can plan ahead and be able to raise the expenditures they need. I

say that from the viewpoint that I spent six years on the city of Calgary council, three of those as chairman of the finance committee, and therefore know some of the problems they are facing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a plea again for a world-wide concern. The energy settlements we have seen here in Alberta are unquestionably of great benefit to our province, and they are now benefitting every Albertan to the tune of thousands of dollars per year. We've got to highlight that more and more, so that we recognize . . . I don't see very many people moving out of Alberta to other provinces or other countries. I think the more we move abroad or in this country, the more we see how good it is here.

But I have some concerns, because other areas of the world are facing real hardships where they do not have enough to eat and their budgets are such that they simply can't survive. I noticed the other day the head of Shell Canada made a speech — and I was encouraged by it — in which he said that we in the west, particularly in Canada, must do something to help third world countries particularly to develop their energy resources because they simply cannot survive as viable countries in today's world. As a province in a relatively rich country of the world, all things considered, I hope we would be able, out of our almost endless riches by comparison, to see if we cannot reach out a hand to help others help themselves. Not give away — but if we can be concerned not only about the development of energy resources within our country but also some of those countries which so desperately need it just for survival's sake. I put a new plea upon us, to say that as a rich, developed, well-endowed country we have responsibilities not just to our own people but to people all over the world.

It's a great privilege to be an Albertan today, Mr. Speaker. I consider it one of the great opportunities of life to be here today and to be a part of a government that is trying to work out the problems — good problems by and large — to steer a ship that is moving and not stagnant. I think we face a great challenge. I am proud to be part of this government.

Thank you, sir.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, speaking to Motion 11, I would like to make a variety of comments. After listening to the mover of the motion, I thought I would make certain comments. However, after hearing comments by the leader of the official opposition this morning, I have to respond in some small way in the form of what obviously will be interpreted as rebuttal, and I guess it's intended that way.

Mr. Speaker, I kept hearing that the government wasn't doing enough. As a member of this Assembly, I have to put my mind around to the point, what is government and what is its role? On becoming a member of this government, as I understand it the role of government was essentially to help those people who could not help themselves; not those who would not, but those who could not. More and more in this Assembly I'm seeing — and I heard it this morning — that government is supposed to be everything to everybody.

Just a moment ago the Member for Calgary North Hill very clearly made the point about the role of government in his view. I tend to agree with it, although I do take exception to some of his comments later about the euphoria attached to the Olympics. For those of us who haven't learned that never in the history of the Olympics — and I suppose they've gone on from 4 BC in Greece —

have they operated without a deficit, maybe we're going to see a precedent. I'll have more to say about that in a few moments.

First of all, I would like to comment with regard to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in three areas. He mentioned the beef industry and why we as a government should do certain things in the industry. Well, I agree with him, subject to several conditions.

I don't know much about agriculture, believe me, and I don't pretend to. The extent of my knowledge is what I eat. However, I had the opportunity of spending an hour with a former member of this Assembly from Hanna, Mr. Jack Butler, who has been in the business all his life. In discussing it with him, I indicated there had been various approaches, like two or three pounds of mail a week, for government to do something. He said, John, if there's anything you want to move cautiously on it's this, because in my view, if government is going to become involved in my business government is going to have a right to say what goes on in my business. He said, please, don't move forward at this time. Now I have a lot of respect for Mr. Butler.

The Leader of the Opposition has spelled out in great detail why we should retroactively pay people X dollars for a management decision they made a year ago. Now if the thrust of his argument is the future of the industry, that's something else. But as the Member for Lethbridge West, I have to say that to my knowledge all the programs this government participates in, in form of subsidy — there may be other names for them. I would mention a couple. Nobody gets a loan from the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation without providing a copy of the income tax return. No one moves into our senior citizen accommodation without providing a copy of his income tax return. So on the surface I would say, if people in this province, including cattle feeders and cow-calf people, want assistance and my support, the first thing I'll want is their income tax return. I think that's only being consistent. Having said that, perhaps I won't hear any more about the subject.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to talk about crime, and he used figures that frankly surprised me a great deal. He talked about an increase in crime of 12 per cent. I think he used the second capital of this province, Calgary. I quote from something members received yesterday from the Solicitor General, tabled in this House, on current crime trends in Alberta. The crime rate in the province of Alberta actually decreased, while the rate for Canada as a whole increased. Alberta decreased 0.3 per cent; Canada as a whole increased 10 per cent. However, "historically, the province of Alberta has a consistently higher crime rate than that of Canada." Historically. We're not talking historically.

"Over the same five year period" — this is a 1979-80 study — from 1974 to '79 "the percent increase of violent crimes in Canada [increased by] 17 per cent, . . . almost three times that of [its] population growth," while in the province of Alberta, the same time span, the population jumped 16 per cent, while its violent crime rate increased only by a similar percentage of 16 per cent.

So I'm a little confused by the comments of the Leader of the Official Opposition. He made specific reference to young people or juveniles. Again I'll quote from page 15 of the report, current crime trends in the province of Alberta:

With reference to type of offender, the percent of people charged with criminal code offences who were juveniles dropped in both Calgary and Edmonton

... The percent of juveniles charged with violent offences for Edmonton changed slightly [from 4.5 per cent down to 3 per cent.]

If one likes to use percentages, that's a drop of 50 per cent. So although I'm generally sympathetic to the views of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to social conditions in Alberta, I take exception to that because I don't think it's factual. If he wishes, I'll send him that copy.

He went on to talk about energy and the cost to the consumer. Well, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am somewhat confused, because I thought it was the official position of the Social Credit Party that we go to world prices, not three-quarters of world prices — not three-quarters of international prices, but world prices. If that was true, if that's their recommendation, and if this government had followed that lead, surely his concern for the consumer would be self-inflicted. Surely, if we're looking at 80 cent per litre gas in five years, at the rate we're going it would be \$1 or \$1.10. So I have great difficulty in understanding his empathy for the consumer when the official stance of his party was to increase prices by 33.333 per cent. When you go from 75 per cent to 100 per cent, it's not an increase of 25; it's an increase of 33.333.

He also made reference to some other areas that I wouldn't comment on, other than to say my knowledge of economics, like agriculture, is somewhat limited, but from being a father of five, being 49 years of age, and having raised a family, I do know that when your outgo exceeds your income in this world, your upkeep becomes your downfall. Surely there has to be a moral lesson there for all of us. Somehow, whether we're members of this Assembly or citizens in the street, we, have to exercise some degree of responsibility in attempting to live within our means.

I'm well aware that people have said, I spent my lifetime learning how to make ends meet, and when I retire someone moves the ends farther apart. I'm well aware of that. When I look across the aisle I see people facing that, imminently facing that.

Having left that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to a comment or two regarding the mover of the motion, the hon. Premier. I think the Premier covered in an excellent way, from the government point of view, the events of this province from June 2 or so. I'm sure that everyone in this Assembly would agree that the talk by the Premier last night on the constitutional issue not only has clarified in a very lucid way the Supreme Court decision but has probably been the finest explanation anybody in this country has heard since that decision was made on September 28.

With regard to interest rates, I frankly found it very interesting when the hon. Premier said we didn't have to track U.S. rates. Well, maybe we don't have to track anything. But I guess the difficulty I have is simply this: as long as we in Canada wish to either attract or retain U.S. investment, surely, like water seeking its own level, interest rates must be sufficient to attract that capital. I understand that. Secondly, if we do anything to lower that rate, funds will leave this country. They will seek their own level, the highest rate possible. I understand that as well. Thirdly, if that happens, the Canadian dollar has to sink. It has to fall. There has to be pressure on that Canadian dollar. Therefore, the pressure for the government of Canada has to be to buy its 440,000 barrels a day at U.S. prices — very severe. I understand that too. I would think the Canadian government is in quite a

dilemma. Do they increase the federal deficit by allowing the dollar to fall? Members of the Assembly, the argument of the increased attractiveness by U.S. buyers for our productive capacity really doesn't hold water in eastern Canada, because Ontario industry is now manufacturing at its capacity. However, I find extremely exciting the Premier's comments that if we were to look at those resources we export to America, by increasing those through a change in federal policy, we could increase the balance of trade to Canada in such a manner that the dollar would be strengthened. With the implementation of the energy agreement reached with Ottawa, undoubtedly the federal revenue, the Treasury of the federal government, is going to increase at a rapid enough rate that it would ease that pressure as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to spend a moment or two on what I deem to be growing pains of this province. There was an extremely interesting discussion yesterday on the motion by the Member from Edmonton Glengarry on Bill 220 on conservation. As I gathered, listening to him, his solution to the problem of conservation wasn't seeking ways to cut out the waste. It was seeking ways of building buildings that would become airtight and, as such, you wouldn't use as much energy. I would just point out that there are a variety of ways. My view is that we should look at ways of eliminating waste. I recall Dr. Horner several years ago, I think 1976, saying that Alberta imported about 7 million TV dinners a year into this province, even though we produce 40 to 45 per cent of the nation's cattle. Heaven knows, we have some irrigated land that produces vegetables. None the less, TV dinners are frozen. TV dinners are in aluminum trays. It says in *The Globe and Mail* — maybe it's a good paper — that if we would eliminate the aluminum TV trays of just one day a month in this country, we would save about 300,000 barrels of oil a year.

I find that extremely interesting. If for one day a month we eliminate the use of TV dinners in aluminum trays, we would save 300,000 barrels of oil a year. That's one day's supply imported into Canada. Something else was interesting. Beef eaters — and naturally we're all close to beef — are the biggest energy eaters. It takes the equivalent of two gallons of gasoline to produce a pound of beef. Measured by the nutritional value of beef, we need to invest 10 gallons of gas to produce one pound of protein.

It goes on to say — and I won't dwell on this, other than to say that microwave ovens, which apparently are pretty popular, use 40 per cent less energy than conventional electric ovens; however, 30 per cent more than top of the stove cooking. Now how many of us, and I am amongst them, have been induced to buy a microwave oven to save energy? Most microwave ovens are about 650 watts; some of the fancier ones go to 800. Incidentally that's about 25 per cent greater than your block-heater in your car. But using the top of a stove is still 30 per cent more efficient than using a microwave oven. Now the advertisers have obviously done an excellent job, because they convinced me to convince my wife not to use the top of the stove but to buy a microwave oven.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier made reference to the Crow rate. I'd like to comment in general terms. I have always had great difficulty understanding how the Americans always seem to out-dicker us on world markets in terms of a deal. I understand most of the wheat in America is grown in the midwest. There are no ships in the midwest, so presumably it goes to Seattle. It goes somewhere to get on the ship. They don't have a Crow rate. As you're all

familiar with the CPR propaganda that was put on your desk yesterday, the Crow rate works out to half a cent to move a ton one mile, or about 15 cents a bushel assuming you have 1,000 miles to go to the coast. I'm told the normal amount is eight times that. How is it that America — and give the consumer some credit for not paying more than he has to pay, so assume he gets a good deal in Russia, China, or wherever — continually out-dickers us, yet they don't have a thing such as a Crow rate?

I don't pretend to know the solution, but when I read the literature here it says the agreement was made in 1897, put into statute in 1925, again in 1930, and perhaps in 1997 we'll resolve it. But I would simply point out, for those people who are so gung ho over eliminating the Crow rate, that the National Harbours Board of Canada, which operates all our port facilities — only 30 per cent of the total cost of those is paid for by the user; the other 70 per cent by the taxpayer of Canada. So before we go off half-cocked trying to make dramatic alterations to a system, I suggest we have to look at comparisons of other parts of the transportation system. Again, I've expended my knowledge with regard to transportation.

Mr. Speaker, a Bill on the family institute was introduced in the House this morning by the Member for Calgary Currie, which interests me because I have very strong feelings about responsibilities of both the family and the community. I think it's long been proven in the history of Alberta that the strength of Alberta has been in two sectors. One is taking up responsibility within a community — and that's why we have such diverse communities and attitudes around Alberta — and the other is the role of the volunteer.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

If we just look for a moment where we're going. We were all given a copy of the Foster Research report. It's interesting to note that with our population growth, by '95, which is really not that far away, we're going to hit 3,020,000 people, of which at least 600,000 will be accounted for as coming from other parts of Canada. Surely that presents to us, as Albertans and as legislators, some very, very significant problems. With the traditions built in Alberta and dealt with in a community over a long period of time, in my view it's not very difficult for municipalities to establish programs applicable to those particular citizens. But we're receiving this tremendous influx of other Canadians into Alberta — I see by this it's about 60,000 a year, and I think that's great — with some different social attitudes. I think this presents some very, very interesting and challenging problems to us, one being the strong belief in Alberta that the family is the basic unit of society.

I would say that amongst all our problems, one of the very real and important ones is the preservation of our family way of life. You know, in olden times — however old that is — it was always felt that groups or communities were necessary to resolve problems. Today we've seen a new wave come in and we're into the expression of individuals, their egos, their self-centredness, and a variety of things. I think this is reflected in many of our statistics, not only with crime, not only with social problems, but indeed in our health care institutions. So I am pleased to see that the Member for Calgary Currie has introduced this Bill — and I haven't read it so I really don't know — because it's going to provide a forum for debate in this House about what, if anything, this government should

do with regard to seriously looking at the family unit.

And who knows, perhaps we'll change our ways. I see a sign in a Calgary window: We Hire Out Wedding Rings. That's an indication of how rapidly marriages turn over in this province. Now about three out of five marriages end up in the divorce courts: an inbred facility for ensuring a guaranteed income to any lawyer who graduates in this province.

I would point out something I found extremely interesting as well, before there's too much criticism. In a recent report published by the Institute of Law Research and Reform, the average length of a marriage that ended up in the divorce court in Alberta was 10.5 years — not 6 months, one year, or 2 years. There are many pressures on our people, on our family units, whereby those who have been married 15 and 20 years are seeking divorce. That's all part of our social fabric.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to the constituency I represent and to some of the exciting things that have happened. Because again I want to take issue with the Leader of the Opposition about the role of government. We have had in my community, and this is evidenced by a change in the regulation of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, such a strong use of funds for housing that the till virtually ran dry. They had to change the regulation.

Lethbridge, although it doesn't have a rapid growth rate — it's 2.8 per cent a year — is a very viable community at 55,000. When I look across at the front benches of this government, I have great difficulty seeing a minister in this House who has not been in Lethbridge in the past year. That's something else about this government; it's a very mobile and interested government. They're concerned about all parts of the province. So many of the comments I'm going to make, although directed at members of the front bench — they are probably well aware of them.

First of all, we had a very exciting year with the Alberta summer games and the involvement, almost on a one for one basis, by volunteers. That's got to be encouraging to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I think it's extremely exciting and exhilarating to members of government to know that the volunteer sector is alive and well in this province. And as we saw with the Commonwealth Games, and undoubtedly the Olympics are going to be a similar activity, the involvement of the volunteer is unique to Alberta.

It's not without problems. We have found that a volunteer group such as Meals on Wheels, which has operated in Lethbridge for a long period of time and in other communities, is for a variety of reasons finally faced with problems that are difficult to cope with. The problems are: most of the people who handle Meals on Wheels are elderly people, 55 to 65 to 70. They drive their automobiles and deliver these meals. Well, the price of gasoline obviously is a factor; their health obviously is a factor. Somehow we must find a way of attracting more younger people into the volunteer sector of our province.

Mr. Speaker, on September 10 and 11 the University of Lethbridge, Alberta's third largest university — a very exciting liberal arts university — opened phase two at a cost of \$22 million. It was opened by the Premier of Alberta. I think it points out the commitment on behalf of government, particularly the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, to sustaining a very real educational opportunity outside the major cities of Alberta. The Department of Culture, represented by the hon. minister, was there because phase two was really the fine

arts or the performing arts sector. And after all is said and done, there's more to life than working; there's more to education than mathematics and English. I think culture has become an essential part of our life style in this province, and maybe other parts of Canada.

However, looking to the future, we find in Lethbridge that because of enrollment the university has to go out and rent facilities, the major facility being a swimming pool. Now who heard of a university not having a swimming pool? Well, the U of L does not have one. The Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower would love to see that we have one, but he's indicated in some ways that unless certain things can happen they're not going to have one.

So I'd like to put the point to members of this Assembly that although the U of L has an excellent athletic program, it doesn't qualify within a certain sphere of universities because it does not have that facility. Now here I am, the constant critic, saying, why do we put out so much money to municipalities at that low interest rate and turn right around and ask for support for a thing like a swimming pool? Because I'm concerned about the physical fitness and well-being of our community. That's why I'm asking. It is to ensure that Lethbridge can host other universities coming into the community and putting on a solid athletic program.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, with one final comment regarding the university. I've been encouraged to hear from the Associate Minister of Telephones that consideration is being given to the Canadian very long baseline array, or VLBA, project for Alberta, particularly southern Alberta. This is an area where they would use radio telescopes, about 4,800 kilometres coast to coast, and geographically Lethbridge is the ideal area. I couldn't think of a better ancillary institution — worth \$25 million or \$50 million, not of our money but of federal money — to go into the area of the Lethbridge University. I'm very pleased and encouraged by the attitude of the Associate Minister of Telephones and others. He feels that with the role AGT is assuming today in telecommunications and other areas of electronics, indeed it would be exciting.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with just the following comment. I think Albertans by and large are feeling the pressures other Canadians are feeling. Obviously the strength of Canada and Alberta lies in the pulling together by many citizens. I think economic pressures are being felt. I cannot think, and do not know, of a government in Canada that's been more supportive of the family unit, more strongly supportive of those areas indicated in the hierarchy of needs such as transportation and housing, and social areas where we've launched perhaps the largest hospitals building budget in our history. Obviously we're going to face operating costs down the road.

Indeed I think it is a great time to be an Albertan. Looking to the future, I see nothing but exciting days ahead. I know that by government and opposition pulling together in this Legislature, the citizen of Alberta will be the winner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to speak in support of Motion 11 on behalf of the Albertans living in Edmonton Mill Woods. Some of my colleagues have given me a reputation for taking notes, and I have some 12 pages of notes on Motion 11 by the mover. If time permits today I will go through those notes, but perhaps before I do I'll indicate that in the Premier's accounting to the Legislature, and through the

Legislature to the people of Alberta, a wide range of items was of direct interest to the constituents of Edmonton Mill Woods. I should like to touch on a few of them in the context of the events of this summer.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier first highlighted people programs. If there's one thing about Edmonton Mill Woods that's outstanding it's people, twenty-five per cent plus more people than were first forecast for Edmonton Mill Woods by the city of Edmonton just four short years ago. The population of Edmonton Mill Woods is estimated at about 45,000 people, compared to the projection of the city of Edmonton of 31,000 people to be living in Edmonton Mill Woods by 1981.

What has this population increase meant in terms of governmental responsibilities? For me it's meant that I've had the opportunity and privilege of participating in the opening of a lot of neighborhood schools, a junior high school, and a health clinic, among others.

But there are other openings of buildings, other responses to growth by the people of Edmonton Mill Woods, that government has had either no role or a relatively minor role in initiating. I'd like to report on several of those to this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, the reason I want to emphasize that is that I think these community-based responses to growth are important, and it is worth emphasizing that voluntarism and community spirit are not dead, *passee*, or old-fashioned in Alberta's urban or city centres. Last month, inside of the space of two weeks, I participated in the official opening of the Mill Woods Moravian community church, a groundbreaking ceremony for the Mill Woods Pentecostal assembly nursing home, and the official opening of St. Theresa's Catholic Church. By the way, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my Edmonton area colleagues, I would like to make them all aware of the fact the Edmonton Mill Woods now has the largest Catholic church in Edmonton.

Also, in response to the need of new residents of Edmonton Mill Woods for a source of information on community activities and services available to them, an organization called the Mill Woods information and referral service has been initiated. This service evolved from a number of individual ladies who perceived the need and worked and organized to initiate this very worth-while service.

Mr. Speaker, through these and other volunteer, community-based initiatives, the citizens of Mill Woods are building the strengths and quality of life that will continue to attract people to our fine cities and to the province as a whole. I was pleased to hear in the Premier's comments yesterday his reference to the opening of the Alberta children's hospital in Calgary, mentioning the technological advances that are available for the diagnostic and medical treatment of children.

On the subject of volunteerism, we have in the Edmonton area an organization called the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation. As a group of reputable citizens, they have felt there is a need for further child care facilities in Edmonton. Our government has very responsibly responded to that assessment by both citizens and professionals by commissioning two studies in that regard. Those studies will be available to us as legislators and to the people who have made that volunteer effort to help assess the need. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, this organization has taken the initiative to not leave everything to government in terms of the research in this area and funding this sort of work. They have committed themselves, in co-operation with the University of Alber-

ta, to a pediatric research and diagnostic centre, and are in the process of raising funds for that centre.

Not only do individuals and professionals participate in this, but a number of corporations have shown their good citizenship and commitment to our community and surrounding area by assisting in this cause. One notable contribution I would like to make members of the Assembly aware of is the fact that Nu-West construction has contributed an \$80,000 house — located in Edmonton Mill Woods, by the way — and I'd invite you all to go out and see it and purchase a ticket on it.

These are the sorts of initiatives taking place within the urban area that we normally don't associate with the larger centres. So I think that the emphasis on people programs was most appropriate in the review of stewardship for the last months since the Legislature adjourned.

The Premier also made mention of initiatives taken for the Year of the Disabled. As a member of the Legislative committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I had the privilege of visiting Kananaskis Country in a helicopter. I'm pleased to see the Leader of the Opposition in his place, because he was part of that tour. I can see that the helicopter in that instance certainly improved his vision, because he was very supportive of the work done in Kananaskis Country, and supportive also of the recommendation in the committee that similar facilities be made available to urban and in fact all populations in the northern or north-central part of Alberta. But I want to mention, in the context of the tour of Kananaskis Country, that I had an opportunity to take a look through the William Watson lodge. This very impressive facility, to enable disabled people in general, people in wheelchairs, to spend a night in the beautiful setting of Kananaskis Country with their family, at very, very reasonable rates of \$3 per person — it depends on how many are in the family. [interjections] Yes, but it's still \$3 a person per night. The point is that this facility is a marvellous response. In addition to the William Watson lodge, a number of trails with suitable grades and access to fishing areas have been designed for people in wheelchairs. I'm certainly going to try to do my part to take up the Premier's challenge of making sure disabled Albertans are aware of that facility and will make sufficient use of it — that a similar investment could be considered in future periods by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

With regard to shelter for disabled people, I'm proud to report to the Assembly that the co-operative housing action program, CHAP, has also responded to the needs of disabled people. Duplexes have been built by disabled people through the co-operative housing action program within the community of Edmonton Mill Woods. So the accommodation has been not only in terms of the institutions that are government-funded but also into private residences. Certainly the availability of the William Watson lodge will further provide meaningful opportunities for our handicapped citizens to enjoy some of the activities that people who are not handicapped at the moment enjoy as a matter of course.

I also noted the additional support for shelter to the order of \$200 million by the Minister of Housing and Public Works. I was somewhat mystified by the concern of the Leader of the Opposition that because of a great need to put some ordering of priorities, the benefits of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation program are limited to those people who have dependent children. I guess the question I leave with the hon. leader is that if you have to place a priority, I would hope his commitment would be to the existing family unit rather than the

prospective or empty nest. I don't think anyone would take pleasure in that restriction, but I wonder how else you could apply that.

I think it's also worth while mentioning that the area of housing — and it's an area the hon. Leader of the Opposition touched on — with respect to the problems and the very serious tragedy we see coming upon us with respect to mortgage renewals and the like is a very good example of what the Premier was talking about in terms of federal and provincial programs being at cross-purposes and perhaps cancelling out one another. I think this is an excellent example of how Alberta's program to provide affordable housing to all Albertans through the use of mortgage subsidies, the construction of core-incentive housing, and the like — we're really placed in a situation where our efforts, as was quite properly pointed out, are very nearly putting people into new houses at one end of the block and, at the other end of the block, because of the federal government's inaction or irresponsibility, I would even say, with respect to interest rates, particularly directed at mortgage renewals, we're seeing people threatened with the very real prospect of being out of their homes.

As others have, I think the hon. member has identified the problem. But with great respect, I think vision requires that you also identify who's to blame for the problem and where the solution lies.

With regard to economic matters that were touched on in Motion 11, I'm sure Albertans in Edmonton Mill Woods breathed a sigh of collective relief on September 1, 1981, with the signing of the energy agreement. Because, as members may be aware, a very substantial portion of the province's oil field services and supply industry is centred in Edmonton Mill Woods. As an aside, a very, very significant proportion of oil well, drilling rig, and service rig manufacturing capability is also developing in Edmonton Mill Woods. Again, I guess it reinforces the point the Premier made with respect to policies being at cross-purposes. In the case of the oil well and service rig manufacturing industry, one man's poison was another man's meat, because the great differential in demand and pressure put on the Canadian dollar by the national energy program created a substantial offshore market for this manufacturing industry. I know it will continue to grow and respond to the realities of Alberta being a trading province in a trading nation.

But certainly we must recognize that hardships have been created, particularly [for] the small and new businesses that have supported the actions of this Legislature with respect to the negotiations on energy with the federal government. Not only was the reduction in the oil industry a problem for them. We have the federal government's double-whammy of a postal strike and exorbitant interest rates. So this problem is developing, and it's recognized. I think the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill responded as well.

I must refer to the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I compliment him for trying to engage in constructive criticism, but I somehow feel that maybe his problem is related to metric conversion. His criticism goes on for miles and miles, but when he tries to get constructive he hardly gets a metre. What do we see? We see a response — and I must admit, it was quite entertaining to see a rigged pig brought into the Assembly. But in order to respond to the problem, rather than having the vision to see who's responsible for it and the direction of the solution, if you will, it appears the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his party would like to break the bank.

I've always thought you used to rob the kid's piggy bank if you were a little short of grocery money or something. But here we see quite literally a Sacred policy that we're going to rob our children and their children's piggy bank to solve a short-term problem that is probably not within our capacity to solve. The rather vaguely worded fund for failure of the hon. Leader of the Opposition — I'm not sure if it was crisis management or management by crisis. We would attempt to somehow subsidize interest rates, and this would all be accomplished by a special cabinet committee that would "keep their ear to the ground". I appreciate, as I'm sure members in our cabinet appreciate, constructive criticism, but really.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch upon the energy agreement in another way, because the Premier quite properly pointed out that there's a need for our goals to be set, our objectives to be clear, our strategy understood, and for a climate that would be consistent, stable, and enable investors within the province, the country, and without to have some confidence in the direction this government is going. I would simply refer hon. members when looking at the energy agreement to consider it in the context of the 1973 position articulated by this government with respect to energy policies. Those were outlined in November 1973, eight years ago. At that time the Premier indicated that first and foremost in Alberta's energy policy was the need for security of supply for Canadians; second, a fair return for Alberta's resources; and third, a fair price for petroleum products for all Canadian consumers. I think that quite obviously includes the agricultural community of this province. It is well known that the agricultural producers of this province literally have a permanent long-term advantage with respect to input costs to help their competitive position across the country or, in fact, across the world.

Again, I must indicate that being able to see the problem of input costs also requires that you have the vision to see where the problem can be solved. It can be solved with our responsible efforts, but also in taking the initiative to see that the federal government responds with respect to its responsibilities for the transportation of agricultural products.

Fourth in that 1973 position is the maintenance of the provincial responsibility for resource ownership and the rights and responsibilities that flow from that resource ownership. Certainly, that's the very important principle that's been established. The idea of unilateral management of somebody else's resources will not occur subsequent to this, and should not occur in the future. Fifth in this policy that was articulated in 1973: investment opportunities for Canadians in the oil and gas industry. That doesn't mean nationalization; that means participation in a very important industry. So if you just refer to the energy agreement, with respect, carefully review the energy agreement within the context of the elements of those policies established eight years ago. I think you'll see there is a benefit for all Albertans and all Canadians.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Premier also outlined the tragic consequences for all Canada if the Prime Minister ignores the full import of the Supreme Court judgment, as well as ignores the majority of Canadians' wishes by proceeding without a mandate to do in the United Kingdom what he cannot, or should not, do in Canada. On behalf of the citizens of Edmonton Mill Woods, I join the Premier in his appeal to the Prime Minister to revert to the Canadian way in meeting Canada's constitutional wishes and needs.

Finally, I would like to conclude by urging all members

to support Motion 11, endorsing the stewardship of our government over the last few months.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in participating in the debate on Motion 11. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Premier on his excellent review of the important events that have occurred in this province since the House adjourned four and a half months ago.

The events he outlined have had an important impact in the lives of most Albertans. Some of them, particularly the energy agreement, have had an extra special impact on members of my constituency of Bonnyville. Later in my remarks I would like to return to this subject, to share with the Assembly some comments on the impact that energy agreement has had at the local level.

In the hon. Premier's speech people programs and improvements therein were stressed, and well they should be. This is a people-oriented government and a government I'm proud to be a member of. Like the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, I had my attention triggered by the use of the word 'helicopteritis' by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I started listening to his speech and tried to think of one word to describe it. When I heard him describe the bleak environment we live in, full of nothing but problems, I couldn't relate that to the environment I or my constituents live in. So at the end of the hon. leader's ramblings, the only word I could conclude was 'moleitis'. As you're aware, the life style of a mole is that it spends its daylight hours underground, it comes up at night only when no other activity is going on, and it doesn't have a clue what is going on around it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does it have a piggy bank?

MR. ISLEY: It doesn't show it if it does have.

I was also amazed by the hon. leader's criticism of the energy agreement and his suggestion that it was a good deal only for the two governments. I have a hard time separating what is good for government not being good for people.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Check how many businesses . . .

MR. ISLEY: I'll talk about my constituency later on, sir.

I was also amazed at his cries of sympathy to the oil companies. Surely a gentleman who has been around as long as the Leader of the Opposition should realize what is going on. I submit that what is going on is that the oil companies are simply going through the negotiating process to get as good a deal for themselves as possible. I think the future will probably prove that the remarks of the hon. Premier are correct, that it was a good oil deal for Alberta, for Canada, for energy self-sufficiency and, I'm sure, for the people of the province and the country.

I was also amazed at his implication that we were so hung up on resource revenues that we just took all this money and dropped it into this piggy bank without a top or a bottom. Surely as a member of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, he realizes that we're talking about only 30 per cent of non-renewable natural resource revenues.

What I'd like to do now, Mr. Speaker, is discuss briefly what impact the people programs of this province have had on the Bonnyville constituency over the past summer, touching first of all on hospitals. The 10-bed prototype hospital in the community of Glendon is well under way. If you want residents of this province who are very

supportive of this government's hospital policy in not closing the small hospitals and throwing another blow to the identity of small communities, all you have to do is visit the village of Glendon. The planning for the new Bonnyville and Cold Lake hospitals is at the architectural stage and moving very smoothly. Again, I fail to understand the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the frustrations local boards are going through in planning hospitals. I have three local boards I would like to introduce him to that are very happy with the process they are going through.

Senior citizen self-contained units, which I think is an excellent program carried out by Alberta Housing and Public Works: a new 12-unit set of self-contained units will open shortly in the community of Grand Centre. Twenty units are under construction in the community of Cold Lake, and additional units are planned for the community of Bonnyville.

In the people service of advanced education, I'm sure the announcement of the Hon. James Horsman last week in Vermilion was greatly appreciated by all the constituencies in the northeast, although the \$1 million commitment for planning and improving facilities on the Vermilion campus is not in my constituency; it is part of the Lakeland College, which serves the northeast. I think my constituents will be much better served in the future by the programs developed through Lakeland College. I hope the Vermilion campus rebuilds its agricultural identity in the colleges in this province which, I'm afraid to say, it has lost somewhat in the last couple of years.

The people services of parks: I've seen substantial improvements to the Cold Lake Provincial Park, satisfactory progress on the ski hill that I invite my Calgary counterparts up to share next winter since they don't have enough downhill runs in the southern part of the province. That's the project we were doing in co-operation with Canadian Forces Base, Medley.

In the field of native affairs, I'm sure there was strong appreciation from the Bonnyville Native Friendship Centre when our government stepped in to replace the funding for Native Outreach, which the federal government stepped away from. The increase in recreational facilities proposed by AADAC and carried out by Alberta Housing and Public Works at the Bonnyville Indian and Metis rehab centre at Moose Lake is another greatly appreciated people program in the area.

Mr. Speaker, the next section I would like to deal with is labelled economic conditions. Here I'll probably touch on some of the comments the hon. Leader of the Opposition was trying to stir me up on earlier. In view of the time and the length of this subject, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Bonnyville, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Government House Leader, I would like to indicate that it is proposed that on Monday afternoon the House continue debate on Motion No. 11. It is not proposed that the House sit Monday evening.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to call it 1 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:57 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

