

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, December 8, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Heritage Savings Trust Fund Auditing**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question this afternoon is to the Premier, with regard to the letter tabled in the Legislature yesterday. I wonder if the Premier has had an opportunity to review that letter and has made a decision to forward it to the Auditor General, giving the tabled letter from Mr. Sindlinger and the other members of the opposition the same status as the letter forwarded to the Auditor General by the Premier?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to consider that matter over the night and to refer to the questions I was asked December 3, as well as the question I was asked yesterday. What I said December 3 was that I saw no reason

why any member of this Assembly could not communicate directly to the Auditor General, in writing, any observations he has with regard to these terms of reference and the request for the special report.

The question yesterday was quite different, after examining the Blues. It had to do with suggesting that we give some official status to the communication by an hon. member. Of course, that would be contrary to Section 17(2) of The Auditor General Act, which reads: "The Auditor General shall perform such special duties as may be specified by the Executive Council". So it would not be our intention to change the terms of reference or to so specify. But again, if communications want to proceed to the Auditor General from any member of the Legislature or, for that matter, from any member of the public, obviously he can give it the weight he believes it deserves if he wishes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate the reasons for not accepting that letter as the chairman of Executive Council and forwarding the matter to the Auditor General for his review, particularly in light of the concern of Albertans for the realized loss . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think we've been through some of that. This is the question period. The question is complete. I find it is quite complete. It can stand on its own feet and doesn't need any buttressing after it has been asked.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'm just giving him some help.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made my answer very clear in my rather detailed response to the first question. Section 17(2) of the Act clearly states: "The

Auditor General shall perform such special duties as many be specified by the Executive Council". Those duties have been specified and communicated, to give a full and complete review of the matter by the Auditor General. If members of the opposition believe other matters should be considered they, together with any other member of the public, may communicate directly to the Auditor General. If he wishes, he can give the communication the weight he believes such communication deserves.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the answer, will the Premier consider an amendment to The Auditor General Act which would give status to members of this Legislature in terms of communication with the Auditor General — formal status, as the status of the Executive Council, as the status of this Legislative Assembly as a whole?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. Leader of the Opposition is having some difficulty reading these Acts. Section 17(1) reads: "The Auditor General shall perform such special duties as may be specified by the Assembly." If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wished a special report to be made, he could have presented that to the Legislative Assembly by way of a special report. He may or may not have received the endorsement of the Legislature, but that is the route he should go. The Legislature can determine such special duties for the Auditor General, pursuant to Section 17(1). In addition to that, the Auditor General can respond to a request by the Executive Council, under Section 17(2). Of course, the important matter is that the communication I provided to the Provincial Auditor on December 3 is such that, in my view and I believe the view of any objective person, it clearly covers all matters that might be raised and are at issue.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. The matter we're raising in the letter that is going to the Auditor General, and in the Premier's letter as well, was raised last February. Two questions to the Premier: one, was the Premier involved in discussions at that time, and were any discussions held with the Auditor General with regard to the realized loss of \$60 million; secondly, why at that point . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly these sort of buckshot questions . . . As the hon. member knows, buckshot is for the birds. Perhaps he could shoot one bee-bee at a time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: what discussions with the Auditor General were held on previous occasions with regard to the matter in the letter tabled in the Legislature, and specifically with regard to the realized loss of \$60 million?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there haven't been any discussions that I've been involved in. I first of all saw the item in the annual report. As I mentioned in public, as well as here, I would have been very surprised if I had not seen a provision for net realized losses. In fact, I would have been critical of the investment policies of any investment trading group that doesn't recognize that it is appropriate, as a trading organization, to accept realized losses and move to better investments. I have a blind trustee for my own investments these days, so I don't

really know what he's doing in particular. But if he's not doing that and doesn't have net realized losses, he's not appropriately performing the trading function.

I anticipate that in this year and as long as the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is involved in a similar process, there will continue to be net realized losses. As a result of that, there was nothing of any surprise or even concern to me. When it was raised in the House in the fall that in the view of some members of the opposition the answers, which I thought were fully given by the Provincial Treasurer when he appeared before the legislative select committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, were inadequate and suggestions were made they were incomplete, we thought it only fair and proper that the Auditor General be given an opportunity to clear the air completely on this matter. I'm sure that's precisely what he will do in due course.

Marijuana Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Premier as well. It's with regard to the Solicitor General. Could the Premier indicate whether the Solicitor General is attending a meeting out of the province at the present time, and what the items of discussion in that respective meeting might be?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take notice of that question and report back to the House tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Could the Premier determine whether the Solicitor General is meeting with the solicitors general of the other nine provinces of Canada? Is one item on the agenda the legalization of marijuana? A supplementary question to the Premier with regard to that. Could the Premier indicate the present position of the Alberta government with regard to that matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: The present position of the Alberta government has been the position it's had all along. First of all, it's a federal matter. From our point of view, it's certainly not our view that we intend to see any move in the direction of legalization of marijuana. If that's the position of the Leader of the Opposition and his party, we and the public will be very interested to hear it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the Premier can make all the comments he wants, but the government is responsible for programs in this province. The minister is going to a meeting to represent this government. What position is the minister taking? That's what I'm interested in.

MR. NOTLEY: Is he going to say no firmly?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Is the minister going to excuse himself when this matter is on the agenda for discussion at the meetings?

MR. LOUGHEED: I haven't any doubt about our Solicitor General. He won't be excusing himself from anything, and he'll be taking some strong positions. [interjections] If the Leader of the Opposition wants to take the other point of view, I'll enjoy seeing that on the campaign trail.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the Premier check this matter and report to the House as to what position the minister is taking and what

actions, in a respective meeting with regard to the discussion of marijuana, so we know where the government stands?

MR. LOUGHEED: There's no difficulty about where the government stands on this issue. Now there's no difficulty about where the Leader of the Opposition stands.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In question period, the Premier has always sat in this House like a saint, saying . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have just had a marvellous example of what happens when we have debating questions and debating answers and . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: He started it; I didn't. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: . . . once that starts, there has to be some equity on both sides.

Treasury Branch Mortgage Loans

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It is a question exclusively with provincial jurisdiction, so I'm sure we'll have no difficulty with him saying it's Ottawa's responsibility.

Is the Provincial Treasurer able to advise the Assembly why the upper ceiling for mortgages through the treasury branches in Edmonton and Calgary is \$60,000, as compared to \$75,000 in other parts of the province?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'll check on the details, Mr. Speaker. I think hon. members will recall that since the very inception of the treasury branches — and this perhaps reflects the Alberta Opportunity Company as well — there has been an emphasis to fill in gaps where traditional financial institutions were not providing services to Albertans, and they've done that very well indeed. I would think this policy is probably a reflection of that general policy which has been followed since the late 30s, which most Albertans have found very effective.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Bearing the hon. Treasurer's answer in mind, what is the reason for the maximum ceiling of \$60,000 and \$75,000, urban/rural, compared to the maximum ceilings allowed by the chartered banks, which have been moved up — in the case of the Toronto-Dominion to \$100,000, the Bank of Montreal to \$150,000, and the Bank of Nova Scotia to \$150,000? Why is the treasury branch still employing a ceiling for both rural and urban which is significantly under the costs of acquiring a new home, whether it's in a rural or an urban area?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons is that the treasury branches do not have access, as do other financial institutions, to longer term funds. It's only recently that R R S P s , for example, which provide long-term funds to an institution, were available for the treasury branches. Therefore, being essentially an institution that relies on shorter term obligations which have to be paid out on demand, they have not been in a similar position with similar flexibility as the larger, more traditional financial institutions to offer the same longer term loaning, such as mortgages.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Keeping in mind the legal definition of the treasury branches as such — they can't be considered chartered banks — does the Provincial Treasurer or officials of the Treasury Department, either the deputy minister or senior officials, have any role at all in determining the maximums allowed in the form of mortgages, both rural and urban?

MR. HYNDMAN: No direct role, Mr. Speaker. As I've indicated in the House before, the general mandate of the treasury branches, which of course have expanded remarkably in the last decade, is to provide a service which to the greatest extent possible is competitive — realizing they're not a chartered bank — with other financial institutions, to emphasize filling in gaps where other financial institutions do not provide them in the province of Alberta, and to run on a successful businesslike basis of making a reasonable profit, half of which is returned to the province of Alberta. There's no day-to-day second-guessing of the policy decisions of the treasury branch, which I think would be an improper procedure to follow, if that's what the hon. member is suggesting his party would like to do.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who of course is enticing debate. I'm sure he wouldn't want to do that. In view of the funding of the treasury branches, has the government given any consideration to allotting Heritage Savings Trust Fund money to the treasury branches in the form of money which could then be made available through the treasury branch system for mortgages, so mortgage ceilings by the branches could be increased?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the only way to do that would be to take moneys away from the Alberta family home mortgage program, from the various housing programs funded by the government. I think those have been extremely successful in providing subsidized rates to many thousands of Albertans. So at the moment, even though there may have to be trade-offs there because, as I indicated, the moneys flowing into the heritage fund are far less than those being requested by the Crown corporations, I don't think that is a choice we'd make at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the minister has in his possession at this time any statistics on the impact of the treasury branches on the mortgage market now, both rural and urban, compared to five years ago? Is the treasury branch system maintaining its share, or has it in fact declined as a mortgager?

MR. HYNDMAN: I could secure information on that point for the member and for the House, Mr. Speaker.

Marigold Regional Library

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture and has to do with the Marigold library system. Is this fully operational now?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It now has its headquarters in Strathcona. Its director and some of its staff are on hand. The programs operating within the library are very limited at this time, though.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How many people and libraries are involved with this system now?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, that would look like an ideal question for the Order Paper.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I'll bypass that one and do as you suggest. Is the Marigold system economically viable without the participation of all people?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, when you set up a library, there is an \$8 per capita start-up grant. In the budget year '82-83 there will be an operating budget in excess of \$150,000. Hopefully that will be sufficient to see the library well on its feet.

MR. BORSTAD: Is any consideration being given to the formation of co-op libraries in northern Alberta?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a Peace River steering committee in place in the Peace River area. They're coming along very well. Hopefully within the next six months to a year, we will have a regional library or a co-operative library, as my hon. colleague said.

Lamb Processing Plant

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the government still offering the lamb plant at Innisfail for sale?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, over the period of the last two years, I believe, we have discussed Lambco. As the government has been operating Lambco as a plant, recognizing the role it plays in western Canada in the slaughter and marketing of lambs, I was hoping the hon. member would ask the question. I'm pleased to announce that over the period of the last two months Lambco has made an excellent profit by increasing the throughput through the plant itself. Hopefully, for this year the plant will operate in the black. It was the intent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. My recollection of the question — and I really didn't detect any debating undertones in it — was whether the plant was still for sale.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I know the interest the hon. member has. In looking at Lambco, I just couldn't miss the opportunity to announce its success. Over the years, the government has stated that once Lambco got on its feet, consideration may be given to passing the kill-and-chill plant to the private sector. If conditions continue in Lambco, perhaps that's one of the decisions that will have to be made in the future.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for answering my second question. The other question I want to ask the minister: have they imported any lamb from outside Alberta to slaughter at the lamb plant in Innisfail?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the movement of lamb from western Canada into Lambco perhaps has been the secret of the success. At the present time in Alberta,

Lambco is the main slaughter and market for all the lambs raised in western Canada from Winnipeg west. Because of that volume and an increase in the markets the new manager has been able to achieve in both Toronto and Vancouver, the markets have sort of drawn a number of lambs from out of province. Yes, it is the key for all western Canada.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question. The minister indicated the lamb plant has been operating in the black this year. I wonder if the minister has given any consideration to diversifying the plant to boxing beef in the plant at Innisfail?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, there is a certain amount of diversity in the plant at present, other than lambs, which is its key role. White veal and some of the specialty cuts in the boxing of reindeer from the north are handled through the plant. The plant has that capability of expanding to boxed beef, if necessary, just for the cutting and the boxing.

Guidelines for Annual Reports

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, with regard to guidelines on literature, booklets, or reports of the government. I have in my hand the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation annual report, March 31, 1981, that came into my possession yesterday. I note that 12 of the 33 pages — pages which look very expensive — have pictures and sayings, such as this one: "Every bird likes his own nest best." That was written in 1611 by Randle Cotgrave.

My question is: what guidelines are established with regard to reports such as this? I ask the question in light of the fact that the target group isn't necessarily the families of this province but other kinds of groups. Not all families receive this report. I see that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're clearly getting into the area of debate again.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I was going to explain the question.

MR. SPEAKER: It's out there now. Having let it go, that puts some constraints on me for the remainder of the series on that question.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, of course I would be delighted to respond, because I found considerable joy reading comments from Aristotle in 38 B.C. I really think we are criticized from time to time by members of the opposition for not communicating the heart and the soul as well as the mind and the pocketbook. In the development of a corporation which has had such an outstanding success story, I think it's important that it not just be a matter of figures and dollars but that there really be an effort to communicate that there is a deep personal feeling about the programs of this corporation and that it is not such a material thing. So I'm delighted that they have come forth with a document that says: "Men come together in cities in order to live. They remain together in order to live the good life." Aristotle, 38 B.C.

MR. NOTLEY: Sounds just like Alberta.

MR. LOUGHEED: It sounds a lot like Alberta. Then they went on and in 1785 said: "God made the country

and man made the town." I know you won't let me go much further, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that Winston Churchill is quoted here, and I think that's great. In our guidelines, we do allow the quoting of Winston Churchill: "We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us."

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I also feel there are sayings in there applicable to Alberta. I'd like to read one: "You are a king by your own fireside as much as any monarch in his throne", Mr. Premier. [laughter]

My question with regard to this document targeted to families in Alberta: is it the intention of the government to direct these reports to the various families across the province that have Alberta Home Mortgage loans or other loans from the housing corporation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, infrequently but at times, the Leader of the Opposition does make some good suggestions. Perhaps we should give some consideration to improving our communication of our housing programs so more and more citizens are aware of what we're doing, how the Heritage Savings Trust Fund makes such an important contribution to housing, and how incomparable our programs are, so much better than the rest of the country. Yes, we'll take those suggestions under consideration and improve our communication.

University Library Systems

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I assume the acting minister is the Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister of Education would advise the Assembly what the government proposes to do with the crisis now facing university library systems as a result of the government's decision not to carry on with the heritage program for university libraries, where the choice at the university library is either cancellation of the periodicals or . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I heard a moment ago that the hon. member was not going to incite any minister to debate. He started off a while ago telling us what the chartered banks were doing and how much more poorly the treasury branches were doing by comparison, and why it was so bad. Well, that's debate, and we're in debate again. So if the hon. member gets a debating answer, there is nothing I can do about it.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that if the hon. member undertook not to excite me, he succeeded. I take issue only with his use of the word "crisis". I too manage to read the newspaper from time to time, and I don't think that was what was alluded to. However, I will take his question as notice and have the hon. minister reply.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly when we can anticipate the return of the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, so that we may have some indication as to when a specific reply to the concerns of the general faculty council on libraries will be addressed?

MR. KING: There has been an illness in the hon. minister's family. We expect him to return to the Assembly on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Minister of Agriculture wishes to deal further with a previous question period topic, and the hon. Minister of Culture wishes to deal further with a topic raised today.

Water Management — TV Production

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I accepted a question as notice from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview on a documentary entitled *On The Water Front*. I've had the opportunity to review both the documentary and the material that sparked the documentary. It's one of four the Department of Agriculture will be showing this year. It's basically a program that deals directly with irrigation as it pertains to the \$300 million invested by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to be spent over the next five years, and the impact that expenditure will have on the irrigation industry in southern Alberta. In no way does it challenge any changes in government policy, and it deals directly with those policies that exist in both the departments of Environment and Agriculture as they deal with irrigation.

The program has been on study since the announcement of the basic program. *On The Water Front* is the culmination of two years of research and a shooting that started early this year and finished in the latter part of the summer. It was the intention to show *On The Water Front* to all those producers and all Albertans. The schedule for showing was released.

Over the past 12 years, the Department of Agriculture has had a working arrangement with the CBC for the presentation of documentation which is produced both in-house and out. Under that agreement over the period of years, CBC has the opportunity to pass comment on the material submitted and to accept or reject. Recognizing the publicity that water management has received very recently, it was their suggestion that perhaps the showing date should be changed. It was on that advice that we withdrew the showing of *On The Water Front* and rescheduled it for closer to Agricultural Week, which will be in February 1982.

The documentary itself was produced in-house. It cost \$25,000 and deals directly with agriculture. It's just one of four that will be shown to Albertans this year. The opportunity of seeing it will come in early February.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. As I recall, the minister's answer was that the film was basically on existing policies. Does that answer imply the water management policy that is made specific reference to by the assistant deputy minister of Environment in his memo to the hon. Minister of Transportation, where existing water management policy does not negate the location of dams in such a way that they fit the eventual question of water transfer?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, water transfer in the particular documentation and documentary is not mentioned. It deals directly with on-stream/off-stream storage on the rivers that is now available and provides water to all irrigation districts. It spends its total time on that discussion as to the early loss of water because of spring run-off before it's needed, from an agricultural point of view, and the need for better controls so we can meet both the demands of producers in this province and our commitment beyond. It's tied to those water basins that now exist under the irrigation districts at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the assessment of water management, is the program designed in any way, shape, or form to "create a demand"?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the only reply I could give is that it's designed to better utilize the water that is already there and, through that better utilization, to increase production.

Computer Technology in Schools

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Education is with regard to the computers the minister has purchased or is purchasing for various school boards, and with regard to the basic hardware package and the machines themselves. I understand the actual computers purchased by the minister were at a higher price than those that could be purchased on the open market or at a retail price at other outlets in the city of Edmonton. I wonder if the minister could comment on that matter and give the special reasons why the Bell & Howell purchase was necessary.

MR. KING: I can comment by saying that the hon. member's assumption is incorrect.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Minister of Education confirm that on the day the hon. minister explained that his department's decision to purchase Bell & Howell hardware after consulting other Canadian and American education departments, which included the province of British Columbia and the state of Minnesota, both these jurisdictions are now purchasing Commodore hardware, and the Minnesota department is also experimenting with Atari hardware. They're not following through with the recommendation they made to the minister. Could the minister indicate any concern with regard to the decision he has made, when the authorities have changed their position?

MR. KING: I can indicate that I have no concern with my decision, which I believe was the question put to me by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is not correct that either British Columbia or the state of Minnesota have changed their position, if I'm recalling the words of the hon. leader correctly. It is correct that they have purchased into a second line of computers, but it is not as a result of any decision to stop using the computer which is in place in their system; that is, the Apple computer. The hon. member will be aware of the fact that the Bell & Howell computer is known as an OEM Apple. It is Apple technology in a black box. It's sometimes referred to as the Black Apple. To all intents and purposes, the Bell & Howell computer is an Apple. It is an Apple that is being used by JEM in British Columbia, and it is an Apple that is being used in Minnesota.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the agreement that I believe was tabled in this Legislature, Bell & Howell has agreed to provide the department with free use of only one pass until March 31, 1983. Could the minister indicate what responsibilities the province will have to assume after that agreement has terminated? Will the province accept the responsibility for a lease fee after that point in time?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we're now into an area of detail that I would not like to respond to without having information at hand. The hon. member is raising questions, the answers to which I would certainly like to communicate across the province. There has been some misunderstanding about the cost of these computers and the cost at which they will be sold to school systems throughout the province. I will undertake to return to the House tomorrow afternoon and answer the hon. leader's earlier question and this question in detail.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the scholarship award that would be established by Bell & Howell, according to the contract. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether that fund has been established or when the fund will be available to persons in Alberta?

MR. KING: Again, in order to be sure of my description, I would take that as notice and reply tomorrow.

School Division Boundaries

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. The best way of describing it would be that it deals with the trusteeship of both the Northland and High Prairie school divisions. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly whether he has had any discussions on the matter of division boundaries as it relates, (a) to High Prairie and (b) to Northland?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, on August 7 I visited High Prairie for the purpose of announcing the establishment of a trusteeship for the High Prairie School Division. At a news conference in High Prairie on that day, I was asked much the same question as has just been put to me by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. My answer at that time, and it continues to be my position, was that the government would not consider any changes to the boundary of the High Prairie School Division so long as it is administered by an official trustee.

The question of boundaries and the local electorate's control over the affairs of the jurisdiction is sufficiently important that any consideration of the question should be undertaken only in the context of a locally elected board of trustees. I might say that as recently as today I signed a letter to residents of the High Prairie School Division, advising them that I would not be prepared to consider a boundary change until there are locally elected trustees and until those trustees have been in office a sufficient length of time that they could be familiar with the operations and politics of the local community.

With respect to the Northland School Division, my position at the moment is to accept the recommendation of the committee of inquiry to the effect that there not be changes in the boundaries of the Northland School Division. I hasten to add, though, that I will always be open to representations that may come to me from local communities. If there were a situation in which one or more of the school communities developed within themselves a desire to be transferred to the jurisdiction of another school division, I would certainly consider that seriously. It would depend upon the desire being developed in the local school community. It would not be initiated by the Department of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic. We're running out of time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise the Assembly whether the official trustees in either case have been advised, then, that the matter of boundaries will not be considered? "Not be considered" would include not undertaking any studies or review prior to the selection of elected trustees.

MR. KING: They have been advised, at least formally, that that is the position. As I say, I expressed that position publicly. Letters over my signature are going out with a statement of that position. I trust that that is sufficient communication.

Hospitality Grants

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Government Services whether any distinction is made between profit and non-profit organizations when consideration is being given to providing hospitality grants on applications?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that it is the non-profit volunteer organization that qualifies, under certain circumstances, for a hospitality grant.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Government Services might indicate whether the Canadian Propane Gas Association falls under a non-profit category, and therefore would be eligible for a hospitality grant?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, if that is representation on the part of the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I will certainly consider it and advise him later.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I must state at the beginning that it is not a representation on behalf of the Canadian Propane Gas Association. The question I put to the minister is: inasmuch as the Canadian Propane Gas Association is not a non-profit organization, why was it a recipient of a \$7,700 hospitality grant for a luncheon?

MR. McCRAE: Might I take that matter as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: There really isn't time. I know we have two minutes left, but I overlooked the hon. Minister of Culture, who previously indicated that she wished to deal further with something that arose in the question period today.

Marigold Regional Library (continued)

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I said that the Marigold library was situated in Strathcona. I meant that it was situated in Strathmore.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Hospitality Grants (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the that of hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo to the Minister of Government Services. Are any ceilings placed on hospitality grants? I certainly wouldn't want the situation where we end up doing as the federal Minister of Finance did with expensive luncheons. Are any ceilings placed on the amount of grants made available to either profit or non-profit organizations?

MR. McCRAE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What is that ceiling?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that it is \$14 per plate and that a maximum number of plates are allowed. I would want to check the actual detail, because memory is not always what it might be.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order.

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1982-83 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Executive Council

Worker's Health, Safety and Compensation

1 — Occupational Health and Safety Research and Education

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want to rush through this important vote. Perhaps we can briefly review the discussion that took place when the committee last met. As I recall, that discussion centred around the issue of the farm safety program, which in my view is an extremely important one that has to be thoroughly addressed by this particular committee.

Quite frankly, one of the concerns I had as a result of the discussion of these estimates last day was not the decision to undertake research in the area — obviously I would support that — but the question of how we go about that. We had a situation last time where this particular gentleman had pretty substantial . . . I'm just trying to look through my notes here so I can recall the exact figures. I'm sure the minister will have them at his fingertips, but I wouldn't want to mislead the committee by giving figures that were not completely accurate. In any event, a substantial amount of money, my recollection is something over \$50,000, was to be allocated to this particular study which to a large extent was an attitudinal study where, as I recall the last discussion, we would look at the profiles of people who tend to have accidents. That was my recollection of the minister's response.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could begin our study by

having the minister outline to the committee specifically where he sees the study leading in the future. Obviously, if we're going to have an attitudinal study conducted by a sociologist, there must be some clear plan in mind as to what the government proposes to do with this information. I rather doubt that we'd be asked to pass the expenditure of some \$50,000 in a total vacuum unless there was a pretty clear indication that that study was going to lead to some kind of change in government policy.

As one looks back on the discussion of the estimates last time, Mr. Chairman, I suppose one option would be the option the government is following. But quite frankly, as I said last time and say again today, I would feel more comfortable if we were not spending some of this heritage trust fund research money on the sort of vague, abstract theories about accident profiles but to see that shifted to the more practical area of how we're going to encourage farmers in this province to take out compensation. We've discussed in the House that there's no private insurance plan that can match the benefits of workers' compensation, even though the rate is very high.

When we last met, the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated that perhaps one of the things the government might have to look at is some form of incentive rate to encourage farmers to participate on a voluntary basis. I think most of us would agree that it has to be done on a voluntary basis at this stage. I certainly don't think the experience in Manitoba, where it was made a compulsory program, has necessarily worked. There's no point in making something compulsory if people still are not going to enrol in it. You then get into a situation where you have an unenforceable program. So it seems to me that we do have to encourage the voluntary participation.

Mr. Chairman, I just hearken members back to when the select committee had an opportunity to visit several European countries to compare the programs there for farmers and farm employees with our rather regrettable situation. At best, it's a void at the moment. On that particular issue, I think both the hon. minister and I tend to agree that we'd be much happier if there were wider coverage of farmers and farm workers under workers' compensation. But particularly in the Federal Republic of West Germany, it's my recollection — and I'm just going from memory now, almost two years ago — that farm workers have been covered for many, many years, that now farmers themselves are enrolled, and that that's one of the costs of doing business in the Federal Republic of Germany. It seems to me that on this issue of accident prevention and training in education, a lot of practical experience exists elsewhere in the world which would be useful to Albertans in addressing the question of whether or not we should make changes and what type of changes should be made in the application of workers' compensation, particularly as it relates to farmers and farm workers in Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, while I don't know the university professor the minister has engaged to undertake this attitudinal study, and I'm am really not in a position to judge one way or the other on that particular study, the focus of the study seems to me to be the issue here. There is so much practical experience, nuts-and-bolts experience, that exists on this very issue in other jurisdictions. I would like to know from the minister what plans the department has to use any of this money we will be allocating for the forthcoming year to review existing programs in other jurisdictions.

I would also like to know specifically what plans, if

any, the department has in terms of evaluating the merits or otherwise of some of the observations by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who argued that we have a crop insurance system in place — a Crown corporation, Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance — and that we do have agents throughout the province who for some months every year are not tied up with crop insurance matters. While I don't always agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, it does seem to me that that might be the administrative basis we could practically use to make available to farmers information on the issue of practical accident protection and coverage.

I think that's really the question, Mr. Chairman. It's not just an issue of research in the abstract, because I note that we're talking about providing funds for research, training, and education. I think we have an enormous education job in rural Alberta. The way to do that education job practically is not to get the Minister of Agriculture to produce another television program that's going to cost us \$25,000 — perhaps this time it will be on workers' compensation instead of water management — then argue whether or not the CBC will put it on, or whether we have to buy time on private stations. In my view, that's not the way to educate rural people at all.

The former Deputy Premier always made the point in this House, and properly so, that if you want to talk to rural people about issues that relate to them, you do it on a practical one-to-one basis over the kitchen table. The former Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Premier, then Minister of Transportation, would always talk about the kitchen-table approach, sitting down and discussing the merits. If you're going to talk about workers' health and safety for farm workers or protection for the farmers themselves, that's where it has to be discussed — over the kitchen table — so people realize some of the implications of not having coverage.

Last time, Mr. Chairman, in a marginal way only, we began a discussion of this. But the fact of the matter is that in 1981 most farmers are eminently suable. That wasn't the situation when most of us came into this House in 1971. Especially in northern Alberta, there were enough federal Farm Credit mortgages that the net worth of some of the smaller farmers especially was relatively small. But with the huge increase in land prices, the net worth of even a quarter-section, half-section, and section farmers is now very, very considerable. Because we haven't had suits in the past is a reflection of the net worth position of Alberta Agriculture. But that has changed over the last number of years because of this enormous inflation in the value of land. I would just say to members of the House that I know that the hon. minister in particular has been one of the people concerned about this. He was concerned about it in 1973, when the matter was first discussed. He was concerned about it when the second committee during this government's tenure addressed the issue of workers' compensation. Sitting with him on the committee that reported a year ago, I know how concerned he was on the issue.

It seems to me we have to take the bull by the horns, if I can use that expression, and move much faster than we have in the past on this issue. There is some urgency now. It's always been important to do it, but in the past it's been important because of the need to protect the workers involved and because of the positive value of the program to farmers. With land prices being what they are today, we're setting up our farmers for a real fall, especially those farmers who employ others, even on a casual basis for a few weeks or months a year, unless we can

explain to them on very clear terms what the historical old trade-off is: if you have workers' compensation, you can't be sued; if you don't have it, you are suable.

Mr. Chairman, because in my judgment we have the practical experience of other jurisdictions to follow as a guide, because we have the position advanced in the last stage of this report by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to know what moves this government has up its sleeve. Well, I won't use "up its sleeve", because that implies it's going to be a hit and run approach, and I don't think that's what the minister has in mind at all. I know how the minister feels in this matter. He's very direct, so I certainly withdraw that remark. I wouldn't want to have anybody think that I even suggest that.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do is take away any innuendo in the question and to put it very directly to the minister. What follow-up is there going to be on the method suggested by the Minister of Municipal Affairs? What follow-up is there going to be of an in-depth assessment of what is going on in other jurisdictions? What specific directions will be given by the minister through his department and the department of extension for a massive Hugh Horner type of across the kitchen table, let's sit down and talk about the merits and the pluses and minuses of workers' compensation? That's really the issue that has to be addressed at this time.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a couple of points on this topic that the previous speaker related to. All of us share a deep concern for the farmer, the farm worker, and the family who work in an area of very high technology where there is extreme hazard and danger. I also travelled on the same trip that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview took to West Germany. Some of the attitudes and opinions I picked up are slightly different from the ones the member has communicated to the Assembly. In fact, I recall some of the concerns we had with officials in that country who communicated to us the deep concern and resentment on the part of the farm community for the inspectors who came on their land. In fact, some went so far as to take out weapons to chase inspectors off their land. What type of co-operation would we develop in this country in a system where we have farmers who would not want to have this program imposed upon them? This is the question. Farmers on the whole tend to be independent people, proud and competent, who do not want inspectors snooping around on their land without their agreement.

I believe we have to continue the discussion with farm organizations and farmers as individuals, and that we must communicate the type of coverage available. In the communications I've had with some of the farmers who live in the St. Albert constituency, they do not want to go to workers' compensation at this point. They prefer to retain the system they have of private insurance, and feel that they have benefits they are prepared to live with, without having to have the same type of inspections that would be necessary under a broader program.

We can stand in this Assembly and express our deep concern for this area where there has been a very high percentage of accidents. It has to be a system where we communicate and encourage the move in this direction, but not one in which we should move faster, as the previous member seemed to indicate. It seemed to me that whatever the intent of the comments he used about tricks up their sleeve was that he wished to impose this upon the farmers. I think that is wrong. It has to be a

program whereby the farming community of Alberta accepts this, and on its terms.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to get back into the discussion on this particular estimate. We made a very good beginning last time we were here. I suspect that we're not going to spend too much time on this Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation vote. There are a few other items we could cover, though, prior to voting on this matter.

One of the subject areas not completed the last time we were here was in regard to the study being undertaken by Dr. Harrell. When we adjourned, the last question posed in regard to this study was the ability of the contractor to fulfil the obligation he had undertaken. The specific questions were the expenses that would be associated with the project and whether those expenses were included in the total contract cost. As I understand it, the cost was \$8,422 for the first phase. I'm not too sure whether that has in fact been completed and expended. The cost for the second phase was \$37,862. I'm not too sure if any of that has been expended at all.

To put this thing in proper perspective, it would be helpful if the minister could indicate what the dates are or were for each of these phases, and what the target date for completion is. That would help us in that respect. That first question, the specific question, was in regard to the expenses associated with that project, and whether they were included in that total project cost of about \$46,000 or would be in addition to that \$46,000. The second question in regard to this project — I don't know if, in beginning to talk about it, I identified the project for the minister. It is the survey of factors influencing farm accidents.

The second question is the ability of the contractor to complete the project independently. I wonder if the minister could give us some indication of whether or not there are subcontracts associated with this particular contract. The reason that question was asked was that it was noted the total cost of \$46,000 for this project was within the range of a salary one might expect a professor to earn on an annual basis at a university. So if the professor had a concomitant obligation at the university, where he was expected to fulfil that obligation on an annual basis, and at the same time had this contract, which was equal, there is a question of prioritization of obligations. Do the two overlap or occur at the same time? If they do, how could the professor who has his obligation at the university also perform his obligation in regard to this contract?

Just to use an extreme illustration to make the point, it might be said that the professor had a daily eight-hour contract at the university, yet one might expect him to put in eight hours a day on this particular contract as well. It doesn't seem reasonable to expect that the professor would put in a 16-hour day divided equally between this project and his university obligations. That's why the question of some subcontracting arose.

That leads to the next question: who are the subcontractors and what would their responsibilities be? I think that was the last question put to the minister before adjournment. I have only three more questions I would ask the minister in regard to this vote. Perhaps before I go on to those, I might leave these questions to the minister to address, if I may please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to interrupt the discussion at the last committee study. When I review *Hansard* of November 30, the first day we re-

viewed this vote, we have before us an amount of money:

To provide funds for research, training and education, with the objective of preventing accidents and ill health resulting from employment and promoting the health and well-being of Albertan workers through improved working conditions.

Implementation is for the year 1982-83.

Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed listening to the debate, because what we're really doing here is reviewing what should take place in the Select Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Trust Fund Act. I find it interesting, Mr. Chairman, that we're reviewing last year's appropriation throughout this whole discussion. Nevertheless, this has happened. I'm going to make a few comments. I just want to bring to the attention of the committee that we seem to have gotten into a study of the Public Accounts. I just don't understand, but I guess each committee has its own approach.

When I reviewed my comments, I responded to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. His first comments were fairly general. I used these years' examples as the direction we may be going in this appropriation for the year '82-83, welcoming further submissions.

I agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that if there is an interest, rather than a suggestion that we use the heritage fund to buy an island someplace in the Caribbean, as I saw on one of the submissions tabled with all of us, why not get a submission from some organization in this province? I would be interested that the steering committee look at how best to implement some of these considerations to broaden the participation of farmers in the workers' compensation program we all support. The hon. member does. I do. Several colleagues, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and others, spoke on it.

Mr. Chairman, I fail to understand why we're in the Public Accounts process on this expenditure. I share this equally. Somehow we've gone off on a tangent. True, in this estimate we don't have any identified proposals as, for example, on page 16 under Environment, where it says Paddle River Basin Development. That is why this format is made. I just want to raise this, because I think we're going to be repeating this same process next summer when the select committee reviews this expenditure.

So that I'm not accused of not responding, because that was sort of the connotation last night from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — that he was interested in listening to the observations of the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Here again, a good deal of honest examination took place in the discussions and so forth. There was some sort of inference that I didn't answer the questions. Even though I think they're not appropriate for the appropriation before us, I will answer as fully as possible the questions placed.

I repeat: of the nine examples I gave, I see this study which they seem to have focussed on as the first step towards trying to communicate to the rural community where some of these accidents are and why they're happening. At the same time, the concern of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that the professor may have an eight-hour contract at the university — I don't know which professors have an eight-hour contract job at the university, but whether he is shortchanging the university wouldn't be my concern.

MR. NOTLEY: It should be.

MR. DIACHUK: No, my concern would be that the \$46,284 appropriated in my portfolio is used properly, fully, and every dollar is accounted for. However, today we're studying this appropriation, not the Advanced Education and Manpower appropriation. This seems to be the procedure the hon. members of the opposition have taken, and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, with tongue in cheek I think, was sort of asking . . . Mr. Chairman, he well knows that many professors of the university undertake all kinds of studies, even economics. I'm sure there is nothing too unusual . . .

MR. NOTLEY: We've seen some of them. That's the problem.

MR. DIACHUK: Just be patient, sir, and you will get your answers. I listened to you. You listen to me now.

I want to continue to share that I appreciated the comments of the Member for St. Albert that it's interesting how through the same experience, we had a different concept. Mind you, he stepped out when the hon. Member for St. Albert pointed out that the farmers in West Germany were no different from the farmers in Alberta. They don't like inspectors, and they chase them off with a pitchfork that may have more prongs on it than in Alberta. This is because of their attitude, and this is part of the study, to see how we can get around to review the safety programs directed at the farm community.

Again I repeat, I welcome proposals from the members of the opposition on how we could expand. The position papers were sent out this spring. I received most of the responses by September 1 or a few days later. I don't recall receiving one response from any members of the opposition with regard to greater participation by the farmers in workers' compensation coverage in this province. However, that's possibly not expected from them, nor from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, because I'm satisfied that he is doing his thing about encouraging his constituents who are farmers to participate in workers' compensation, without any subsidy, I trust. I did hear during the discussions of the select committee that he wasn't in favor of a subsidy, so he joined the rest of us Conservatives and one Sacred member, Dr. Buck, that there should be no subsidy for participation in workers' compensation benefits.

MR. NOTLEY: And one republican, Bill.

MR. DIACHUK: I appreciate the other comments made in the last two days, particularly on Tuesday, December 1, when time ran out and I didn't get a chance to respond. I think there was some good participation in what we could do in this future year, and how we could approach . . . The hon. Member for Macleod, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and even the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo looked into how could we best use this \$1 million for the year 1982-83. In the time remaining, I hope I can get some suggestions here. Also, I appreciate that we're using this opportunity to broadcast to the interested parties to come forward with submissions.

One more comment, Mr. Chairman. I heard the words, the minister has engaged a university professor. I want them corrected. I did not engage a university professor to do a study. This was a proposal. As I indicated once earlier in discussion of these estimates, a gentleman came forward, as an association, club, 4-H club, organization, or even a union would come forward, and it is then considered. This man has an interest in farm safety. He

placed his proposal before the steering committee. The recommendations came to me. I then approved them and a contract was signed. I did not engage him. However, that's semantics. My Ukrainian background would say I didn't engage him; he came forward with an offer. When I want to retain a lawyer to defend me because of whatever charge it could be — divorce; my wife isn't listening to this — I would go to a lawyer. But this was not that. Somebody around here is playing with words, Mr. Chairman.

None of these individuals or organizations is engaged to do work for me. I don't create jobs, work programs, or studies, nor do my officials. They have come forward because of the publicity we gave for this fund and because of the advertisement and the encouragement. I have done public addresses individually, and I do it again here today. However, Mr. Chairman. I think I should say I heard that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has a few more questions. I hope the questions are in the direction of what we would like to do, or even some suggestions — this isn't necessarily only question time — of how we could utilize the 1982-83 funds best.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I can't pass up an opportunity to offer some observations on how the money could best be used, as the minister has solicited. I have some suggestions on how that could be done, aside from the fact that I still have three questions. Prior to getting into those three questions, I will make a couple of suggestions, or at least one suggestion, even though I would like to get those three questions out of the way as expediently as possible so we can get on to the next estimate. I don't want to hold up the minister too long on this one particular estimate. We have spent a great deal of time on it already.

In regard to how we could best use this money — and the minister has indicated he hoped he could get some suggestions this afternoon — one thing that has concerned me about this particulate vote . . . Mr. Chairman, the approach we have taken with all votes is substantially the same. We ask two questions. If the minister is here asking us for more money, the first question has been, what did you do with the money you got last time? And we've addressed that. We haven't discussed it in detail. I might point out, because we didn't want to do that. The second question was, what do you intend to do with this money?

I have said at length at various times that all these particular projects in the estimates of proposed investments have considerable merit and value, but there is one criterion I have often put in terms of selecting investments from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It's not one I originated. It originated in the Legislative Assembly. It was first proposed by the hon. Member for Little Bow. In subsequent debates on the heritage fund. I found that the Premier picked up that same criterion as well. I note also that in introducing his estimates this year, the minister used that same criteria. It was essentially that the funds from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund should be used to do those things which the government would otherwise not do.

That has caused me a great deal of concern in some of these areas, because obviously some of these programs in here are nothing more than extensions of regular government programs in the first place. A prime example of that is the irrigation program, which, it is my understanding, is partially funded through general revenue and the estimates, and partially funded from the Heritage Savings

Trust Fund. The question has always arisen, how is the distinction made between those projects which should be funded from the heritage fund and those things which should be funded from general revenue? Obviously the distinction was not made in the irrigation case. It was just indicated that it was expedient to do so at the time.

In this particulate case, that same question arises as well. The other day when we were discussing this, the minister indicated that over the last five years the department had annually appropriated funds from its budget to stimulate research by non-government entities. In addressing that matter, I believe the minister said there was something in the order of magnitude of \$100,000 annually. What this demonstrates to me is that this type of research has been conducted on an annual basis for five years prior to it ever coming to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It raises the question: after five years when this program was funded from general revenue, why should it suddenly be shifted to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Someone not knowing too much about this might simply suggest it's a good way to supplement the department's annual budget. I wouldn't want the minister to leave that inference unanswered. Perhaps the minister could indicate what the criterion was that was used to determine that this program should now be taken from general revenue and put into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The reason I've made these observations is that the minister, in referring to the Member for Calgary Buffalo, asked if I could indicate how we can best use this money, and said: I hope I can get some suggestions this afternoon. Looking at this from a strictly financial point of view, I might be inclined to say the best way we can use this money is to invest it so we can earn a financial or accounting rate of return, as opposed to what might be classified as a social rate of return through investment in research. I might be inclined even to suggest that to the minister, but I would not do so until he addressed the question as to why this money should be here in the first place. If he can identify the criterion, the reason for taking this program from general revenue and putting it into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I think I would change my suggestion. But at this particular time, when I look back and see that this is a program funded for five years through the General Revenue Fund and suddenly was taken into the heritage fund, it just looks too convenient from a departmental budgetary point of view. That's the suggestion I might have with regard to how we can best use this money, unless the minister can otherwise persuade me from that point of view.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

I might also make another observation with regard to the minister's comments on the way this program is being undertaken, and that is indicating to the public at large that there is in fact this \$1 million pool of funds available for research. It seems to me that is addressing the supply side of the problem, if we can think in those terms. What it also is indicative of is almost an attempt to create a demand. I wonder if that demand for that particular type of research would be there if there were not the money in the first place. Again, that comes back to the first observation I made with regard to using money from the General Revenue Fund as opposed to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I guess the most basic, simple way to put the question is: after being funded for five years from general revenue,

why is this program now being funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? At this point, I'm not questioning the different research projects. I'm not saying they're good or bad, because that of course is a matter of subjective judgment. All I'm asking for is the criterion used in transferring the program from the General Revenue Fund to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If there's good justification for that, perhaps we can get on to specific recommendations as to how best to use this money. If there isn't justification for that, the only thing I could suggest in terms of how we best can use this money is simply to give it to the Provincial Treasurer and let him make his best efforts to earn the highest financial or accounting rate of return.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I think we've spent two days on this matter that was raised in the first place by the minister. Today the minister stands in his place and says, well, I don't have to answer for past expenditures, or that's passed and we should be talking about the future, and we should give them ideas as to how the \$1 million is spent. Maybe that's part of the program and our responsibility, but on different occasions for two days, November 30 and December 1, we talked about the contract with Dr. Harrell. We talked about the fact that some \$45,000 was invested from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But the minister hasn't come forward and said, here's the contract I have with Dr. Harrell; here are the guidelines for the research that's to be done; here's the stage at which the research is at the present time; here are some possible outcomes of that research. Those are four very basic questions that we can ask about a research project done under Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. I think the minister could have arranged in five minutes that that contract be in his possession so he could table it here today and we as the members of the Legislature could have access to it. It's a public contract, a contract purchased by public funds.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why all the talk is going on without any specific information being presented in this Legislature. The minister can go through an argument as to whether the man was engaged or whether there was a contract. That's of no consequence. The consequence is what the contract is: here it is, I've tabled it; two, here are the details; three, here are the terms of reference, four; here are some possible outcomes. But, Mr. Chairman, we haven't got that.

We have a minister who runs around in circles and talks all around the edge of the problem but never comes to focus on good, solid, substantial information in this Legislature. I see other expenditures, and I've listed them and hope to ask questions about them. There are six other areas that we should have specific information on. I get so tired of the ministers on that side of the House coming into this Legislature and thinking they can generalize answers to us in the opposition. It's part of the arrogance. It's part of an attitude that has been created over a 10-year period of time, where this government has come in and we in the opposition have allowed them to give any kind of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition is becoming total irrelevant regarding this particular vote. Perhaps he would confine his remarks to the vote under consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'll confine them to the minister. I was trying to be fair with the minister and indicate that my concern isn't only with him, but he does exemplify the pattern of answers that were given by other ministers in this House. That's why we have to ask questions, ferret out information that's hidden somewhere in the back rooms.

To the minister, and this should be an easy question to answer: Specifically what does this guy do? What are his terms of reference? At what stage is the research at the present time? What are some of the results that are going to be reported, and when?

Mr. Chairman, those are very straightforward questions, meaningful to the subject at hand. It's incumbent upon the minister to answer them like that. If I had the minister's responsibility, hopefully before I came into this Legislature I could predict all the basic questions. The minister outlined an agenda of topics. Following that agenda, the minister should have been prepared, as requested or on his own initiative, to present substantive information on each topic.

Now we fight, we talk. We've gone two days of generalizations, and we've wasted those two days. That's the point we're at. Can the minister produce that kind of documentation? With that kind of presentation, I'm sure we could complete this estimate very easily in half an hour. But if it doesn't happen, we just continue on with the same pattern into the third day. Mr. Chairman, I can understand how you get impatient about that. What else can we do but to go on and on, and push and try?

MR. NOTLEY: Come on, let's have the answer.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I don't think the hon. Leader of the Opposition was even listening to my comments earlier.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I did. There was nothing in them.

MR. DIACHUK: When I mentioned that we're studying the estimates for '82-83, Dr. Harrell's contract is during the appropriation of '81-82. When the select committee reviews the estimates for 1981-82 I will be prepared to answer all the questions, because at that time the full year will have been completed. Mr. Chairman, he is the first one to criticize anybody who doesn't follow the rules.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In estimate study to this point in time — I'm sure you could comment on this — the discussion has ranged from the initiation of the project to its completion. We can give examples: the Walter C. MacKenzie hospital, a very good example, where we talked about the problems in the previous year and the previous year that led to some mismanagement. The minister freely discussed it and gave us good material. I was proud of that minister. I told him so after we adjourned from the Assembly. I said that was a good experience. The precedent's there, Mr. Chairman. My point of order is that that rule should apply to the present minister.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows well there was no point of order. He just wanted to debate with me a little more and interrupt my trend of thought. I would like to continue with my presentation.

First of all, the hon. Calgary Member for Calgary Buffalo, who said he doesn't question the different proj-

ects, good or bad, because he's got the indication we should be reviewing the '82-83 appropriation. The question was, what do you intend to do with the money? I've answered this several times. As the proposals come forward before the steering committee with the recommendations to me, I will then be prepared to approve in a contract form the expenditure that is recommended on a good proposal in the area of health and safety for the workers of the province of Alberta.

Why was the program not fully funded after five years? That is part of government funding. We have continued that \$100,000 through the regular funding. It was because of a resolution that was introduced by the Member for Calgary North West, that received support from members of the opposition, to set up a program such as this that we moved into it. I sincerely say that that is not taking away from what has presently been done through the regular budgeting of the occupational health and safety division. It's a compliment to the program we have.

Again to the hon. Leader of the Opposition: he says, and I hope I'm accurate, that I stood here and said I don't have to answer for past expenditures. I really did not say that, to the best of my knowledge. I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition — he may be tired this afternoon — is a little more accurate. I did not say that. I only raised the point this afternoon because in two days of discussions I didn't get too many suggestions other than the first day, and I referred to it. On Monday, November 30, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — and I reviewed *Hansard* — was very good and generalized on the area of what programs we should be looking at, and then wanted some specific example for the past year because I had referred to the steering committee. I gave the examples.

I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition is calm and collected and contributes something to this discussion for this year's appropriation, '82-83. He is the first one who has risen in this House and criticized us for not following the rules of this Assembly as he interprets them. I would sincerely say that I haven't heard any submission from the hon. Leader of the Opposition on what would be a good way to appropriate some of the funds for the year 1982-83. It's good to know there is some support for this program, even though I detect more negativism from the three members in the opposition present. But I'm glad there is some support, and I will continue to cultivate that support for a program of research and education in health and safety in this province.

MR. NOTLEY: I hope the farmers are more successful in their cultivation techniques than the hon. minister. Otherwise, we're going to have a food shortage of a worldwide scale.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to a couple of observations before I go into some detail on a number of proposals I have. One can get into a general discussion on what can and can't be discussed during the estimates. I think there are really two things we should use as a guide. I respectfully suggest that you, Mr. Chairman, should use them as a guide as well. One is the government's main case for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, as outlined by the Premier on April 23, 1976. It was made very clear that the study of the estimates was important, not only the study of estimates for the current year but in the government's management of the fund. When members on either the government or opposition side raise questions about how money has been invested and whether an investment has been prudent or otherwise, in my judg-

ment that's totally in order. We're not in a position to satisfy ourselves that any more money should be advanced unless we are convinced the government has done a satisfactory job of investing the money already allocated. Traditionally, as I look at the estimates the whole question of control of the purse strings and the accountability angle rests on the decision of this committee to grant supply.

On what basis do we grant supply, Mr. Chairman? First of all, we grant supply on what the government proposes to do with the money, but secondly on what it has done with money granted before. As I review the precedents, supply has always been based on the proposition that if you don't like the way in which the government has done something, that is the appropriate place to demand accountability. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether we have a point of order here in terms of examining future discussion in Committee of Supply, but I suggest that that is why we have the provision in the estimates, which is a time honored tradition: if you don't like the way something is done, you move that the minister's salary be reduced to \$1. That makes the government accountable, not just for future investments and expenditures but for past expenditures. I'm not suggesting that I'm going to move that the hon. minister's salary be reduced to \$1, because basically I think he's doing quite a good job. I think we could have had a little more information on this question. I'm not entirely sure I agree with the focus, but I'm not going to call for a minister's resignation on the basis of one study. Neither am I going to stand in my place and allow any minister of the Crown to suggest that we do not have the opportunity of holding that minister totally accountable in Committee of Supply, for past investments as well as future. If we did that, Mr. Chairman, we'd be turning a thousand years of parliamentary history totally on its head. Mr. Chairman, I didn't rise primarily to get into a discussion of the point of order, but rather to go into some detail on what I think is an important area. We've talked at some length now, and properly so, about compensation for farmers. I've always made my position clear on that, and do so again.

I'd like to move from there to deal with this entire issue of the relationship of the organized trade union movement in Alberta to the research capacity of this government in the area of health, safety, education, and training. I think we should take some time to discuss it in a little detail. I'm sure the minister's had an opportunity to peruse this, but for the benefit of hon. members who don't have it, it's a document called Hazards in the Workplace. The responses and recommendations of Alberta's unionized workers. It was prepared for the Alberta Federation of Labour. Mr. Chairman, the reason I raise the question very directly relates to the executive summary. The executive summary says, and this is a program which would involve:

a variety of approaches (mix of training courses) which includes: an instructor's training program; a comprehensive health and safety representative course; a basic introductory course; and shorter, industry-specific and hazard-specific courses.

Then it goes on, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister:

It is recommended that the program be implemented over a four-year period at an approximate cost of \$1.5 million. It is further recommended that there be joint government-union funding with the objective of union self-funding by the end of the period. Over the four-year period, unions would con-

tribute \$645,000 while government's share would be \$855,000. The Alberta Federation of Labour would be responsible for administering the program.

The recommended program is based on a hazard inventory which demonstrates that although thousands of workers are faced with numerous hazards to their health and safety they are not adequately trained to protect themselves. Further, it is based on the assumption that a well-informed, properly trained workforce will help to reduce workplace injury, disease and suffering; improve productivity; and cut workers' compensation and medical costs to society as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, the minister was asking for positive suggestions on where we go from here. I would say to the minister that this particular proposal, in my view, would certainly qualify as an area where we should be working closely, using heritage trust fund money to follow through on the proposal made by the Alberta Federation of Labour.

Mr. Chairman, I'm quick to defend the work and the contribution of farmers. On the other hand, I have never been afraid to defend the role of the trade union movement. I think it's very important. I just want to underline this for other members. On page 50 and 51 of this report, it's very important to note just how much money is already being spent by unions in this province in the area of health and safety training and education. The very thing the minister is responsible for. On page 51, Mr. Sentes observes:

It is quite possible that the total amount spent by the AFL [Alberta Federation of Labour] and its affiliates during an average year is well over \$1,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, that's equal to the appropriation this Legislature is making available and is an indication that the trade union movement is in fact doing an excellent job on this issue. Too often trade unions get bad publicity, because the only time they receive any publicity is when there is a strike and people see the pickets marching around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but the hour designated for government business has now elapsed.

MR. CRAWFORD: I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

201. Moved by Mr. Batiuk:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to consider entering into negotiations with the government of Canada to withdraw Alberta from the Canadian Wheat Board designated area.

[Adjourned debate October 20: Mr. Schmidt]

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to add just a few more comments to those I had the opportunity to address the last time the motion came before the House, and to speak again to the hon. Member for Vegreville who presented Resolution 201. The presentation of the motion provides each and every one of us with an opportunity to stop and assess the system of grain handling within this province and Canada, the operation of the Wheat Board itself, and whether our end results and our own personal views are such that they fall into line with the motion as it stands; in other words, the demise of the Canadian Wheat Board as far as the province of Alberta is concerned, variations of that resolution, or the use and continuation of the Canadian Wheat Board with some recommended changes.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, in the comments I made prior to the motion, the direction I personally felt was that some changes are necessary in the system of grain handling within the province; hence some changes to the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board as they effect the province of Alberta was the basic trend of the remarks that I brought forward at that time.

It's interesting to note that just the other day, the last announcement on behalf of the Canadian Wheat Board was a year's supply of wheat to Japan, and the sale for the coming year of 13 million tonnes of wheat and 900,000 tonnes of barley — a fair sized sale, recognizing that the total goal for the shipment of grain by the Canadian Wheat Board on behalf of Canada represents some 26 million tonnes. It's an admirable target, and I wish them luck.

I think the problem perhaps may lend itself more closely to the movement of that amount rather than the actual, physical sale. I mention that part for two basic reasons. Within the province, as we come to the close of a record crop in excess of 15 million tonnes, at a time even with a very limited quota, we find ourselves with the total elevator system in the province pretty well plugged because of grain. With an indication that even though rolling stock is moving at a fairly rapid pace and there are no indications of any hindrance at the ports, we still find ourselves in a condition where it's difficult for individual producers to deliver the balances of their quotas.

It's a challenge that lies before us. Not only is the Canadian Wheat Board responsible for the sales of the products grown but also it controls the transportation tied to those sales. It's also interesting to note that as recently as last week, the week before, statements were being made by various organized groups, and in fact the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, at looking further afield at areas where perhaps a commodity such as canola would fall under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board. On one hand, we have it being considered that all those commodities not now outside should fall under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board; and

some producers looking at those now controlled by the Wheat Board, looking at opportunities to have those freedoms withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a province that's somewhat different, although we produce 35 per cent of all the grain in Canada, the production within the province of Alberta in the area of hard spring wheat, which is of course Canada's key, is perhaps to a lesser extent produced in a different way than, we will say, our sister province to the east, Saskatchewan. In other words, some of the quotas that are established with Saskatchewan farms in mind may or may not meet our needs here within the province because of the versatility of the producers and the varied numbers of commodities which we grow, especially crops that find themselves perhaps more aligned to the province of Alberta than other provinces.

I was pleased to note that the Canadian Wheat Board has of late taken an interest in soft white wheat, and has established markets. They have recognized that it is a saleable commodity, and markets do exist. As it is one of the specialties in this province, perhaps that's a direction the Board may have to extend and look at some of the specialty crops grown, whether they be entirely in the province of Alberta or in other provinces as well. If they fall under their jurisdiction, they will continue to be grown and, in some cases, expanded as new varieties come to the fore and some of the growth moves farther north out of the higher heat units that exist in the irrigated areas down in the southern part of the province.

One could pass judgment, and I'm sure the individual producers throughout the province have a number of suggestions on how the Canadian Wheat Board could better serve their individual needs. Some would like to go further, and some would like to withdraw those that exist at the present time. I suggest to all hon. members that, faced with presentation on behalf of the federal government, increased production is the key and the password for the future in agriculture, recognizing the goals that have been established this year for sales and for delivery and recognizing our own capabilities, both our ability to produce and the varieties of products we produce. The challenge that lies ahead for the Canadian Wheat Board in its present form is certainly going to be difficult to meet: the challenge of marketing and delivery, which are tied basically in our total transportation system and our package; the differences of opinion that exist in that particular route at the present time; the opportunities of bringing all those other grains, whether they be specialties or not, under the purview of the Wheat Board; or whether we withdraw those that are now totally the responsibility of the Board itself.

The other question of representation as a province: perhaps it's time that consideration be given for this province, recognizing that as a producer of 35 per cent of all the grain for Canada, it may be timely that a commissioner to represent this province be part of the Canadian Wheat Board. At present, we have advisory board members. We feel that the job ahead of them and the job they have been doing in bringing to the board itself the feelings of Alberta producers has been well done, recognizing that as a major producer, perhaps a commissioner on the board itself, plus the advisory board members, would be a goal and certainly not asking too much on behalf of Alberta producers.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the time when some change has to be made. The question is to what degree and the matter of timing. Although the motion itself suggests that perhaps the province of Alberta withdraw from the des-

ignated area — in other words, withdraw from the Wheat Board as an agency for the marketing and delivery of the grain products we grow in this province — a change of the existing system into something that would meet, perhaps to a better degree, the marketing of our Alberta grain would be a partial solution, recognizing that we are a producer of many products.

If the future, through the irrigated areas in southern Alberta, makes even more specialty crops available — and one comes to mind. If anyone thought five years ago that we would be a producer of corn as a grain, even though a fair amount of corn was grown for silage, we now have an industry in the southern part of the province growing corn for grain. There's only one way it will go, Mr. Speaker. It will grow. Again, that provides another challenge for whatever system we work under as to marketing and delivery of yet another product.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I can only sum up by saying that if I were to have a choice, I would prefer the Canadian Wheat Board to operate, first of all, in the area of a seller of Canada's number one product, the No. 1 hard spring wheats. If the board were to consider or continue in the markets of all the other grains of which it now has the authority, if at any time, those markets were abandoned by the board; in other words, if through a specialty crop, the time element did not allow for an orderly marketed system, they would voluntarily pass that opportunity back to provinces to handle the sales of those specialties and commodities. I think producers of a special commodity — I'm thinking now of canola — would have the opportunity to have a choice before the total production of canola were placed under the board. That should be a choice of the producer groups themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the motion, I agree that we're faced with some challenges, some change. I thank the hon. member for bringing forth the motion that would give us the opportunity to air not only our concerns but some of the suggestions for change for the future on behalf of producers within the province.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments with respect to Motion No. 201, brought to this Legislature by the hon. Member for Vegreville. First of all, I want to say this: I don't believe that the member's intention in bringing this motion to the floor of the Legislature was to do explicitly as the motion suggests. I recall that the timing of this had to do with the advent of the program advocated by the famous advisory board to the Canadian Wheat Board, largely controlled by the left wing in Saskatchewan, which put out a market assurance plan, MAP, for producer reaction across western Canada. They got that reaction very quickly, including the placing on our Order Paper of Motion No. 201 by the hon. Member for Vegreville, who, incidentally, is a member of the Alberta Grain Commission as well and extremely knowledgeable about these matters.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in spite of all the problems with the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board and the different policy directions they might take in a variety of areas which I will come to in my remarks, I believe the Canadian Wheat Board, on balance, is an effective way for western Canadian farmers to market grain throughout the world. I want to talk about that later.

At the outset, I want to explain how I would look at what we should do with the Canadian Wheat Board, by comparing it with the four political parties in the prov-

ince of Alberta. First I make reference to the NDP and use some comments made a few weeks ago by my hon. friend the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, when we were discussing a government program. I would say that if the Canadian Wheat Board operated with the kind of philosophical policy and management system that the socialist party in Alberta does, I would hit it on the head; in other words, we would end it, put it out of its misery, and farmers could go about the business of growing grain and marketing it.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian Wheat Board's operations were like the Alberta Liberal Party, I would let it live, because it doesn't hurt anybody. We don't hear about it very often. Every once in a while, it flies overseas for several weeks, and there's no problem. Why hit something on the head when it isn't hurting anybody? If the Canadian Wheat Board's operations were like the Alberta Progressive Conservative Party, the odd shortcoming — not very many; the odd one — operating smoothly and effectively, sometimes throughout the night and into the wee hours of the morning, I would just want to make a few touch-ups in its operations, once in a while provide it with an additional policy suggestion or two, and tell it to move forward quickly with its business of marketing grain for western Canadian farmers. If the Canadian Wheat Board operated like the Social Credit Party of Alberta, which has some major weaknesses, needs a good overhaul, makes the odd spurt in the direction of public relations and then sort of retreats from that; if it had an absentee leader, a senator who couldn't get elected in Saskatchewan who now runs that organization, similar to the leader of the Social Credit Party who I don't think has ever run for election in the provincial House — no doubt I would not want to hit it on the head, not leave it alone, but make some major changes in that operation.

Mr. Speaker, my conclusion is that the Canadian Wheat Board operations do need some major changes, and I'd like to elaborate just a bit further on those major changes in terms of where they should start. Surely it is incumbent upon any government in Canada to put in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, the most important selling agency with respect to agriculture in western Canada, someone who at least has enough confidence in the people he represents to go out and get himself elected. Frankly, I don't think that operation can survive more than another year or two of leadership by the senator who has been appointed to that position. Probably the only thing that could be worse would be if they had picked a senator from Alberta who failed to get elected.

Mr. Speaker, I want to review a number of things in connection with the Canadian Wheat Board operation, but before doing that, take a look at the market assurance plan as outlined a year ago by the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee and put forward in a paper for consideration by western Canadian grain farmers. I want to refer very briefly to the objectives of that plan that are listed by that organization, that advisory committee, as being three in number:

1. To provide a strong incentive to farmers to increase production (more seeded acres and higher yields).
2. To reinforce the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to meet market demand effectively and efficiently.
3. To eliminate "distressed" feed grain prices in Western Canada, thus helping to provide equity in the domestic livestock industry as well as

assuring supplies for an important growing market for western grains.

All very, very laudable objectives, Mr. Speaker, which need to be assessed very carefully before one would agree with such a plan. Let's start out and see what indeed is positive about the MAP objectives.

First of all, it's a positive thing indeed "to provide a strong incentive to farmers to increase production". It's a strong incentive indeed if the market assurance plan, as it was outlined, in fact will do that. It's a strong objective indeed if after having done that, the world market place, the system of transportation, and the selling of grain in western Canada will provide that farmer with a return that's reasonable, that will pay for the input costs of machinery and all the other things farmers are faced with today.

The second objective, "to reinforce the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to meet market demand", really relates to the first. In other words, what we're saying is that there may be the odd year when there are insufficient stocks of certain kinds of grain the Canadian Wheat Board doesn't have and for which there is a world market demand. So the objectives should be to grow as much as possible to fill the storage in both the country elevator system and on the farm with a variety of kinds and grades of grain so that we never run short. All very, very fine objectives, Mr. Speaker, but one must assess how we're going to meet those objectives and what the market assurance program said about that.

If one gets to the end of the objectives as outlined by the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee, you will see a little comment that says:

Related Programs:

The Federal Government and/or Provincial Governments should be responsible for carrying charges on a specified quantity of carried over grain, as required to stabilize the domestic feed grain market and to contribute to international food security.

Mr. Speaker, there in a nutshell is the entire MAP program. Quite frankly, it says farmers should be allowed and encouraged to produce to the very utmost without due regard for market demand throughout the world, and that the federal government and/or the provincial governments in the western region — and I'm not sure why provincial governments in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta should be the ones to foot the bill for Canada's contribution to international food security. It seems to me it might be useful to call on the people of Toronto to pitch in a little if we're talking about international food security. Surely that's not something that farmers from three of 10 provinces in Canada would pay for. But who should pay is another issue, and we could debate that at length.

The fact of the matter is that if there's enough money in the government treasury, both federal and provincial, to pay farmers in this province and across western Canada a fair value for whatever they produce, regardless of market demand, it's a very excellent plan and a laudable objective. Let me suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that federal and provincial dollars have been allocated in some form or another to the grains industry with respect to production, marketing, and transportation. I need only mention in Alberta the commitment that this Legislature and our government made to the purchase of 1,000 hopper cars, which are being discussed with programs this Legislature has been debating in Committee of Supply and the Heritage Savings Trust Fund over the last several weeks — very extensive dollars in that area.

Not more than a month ago, the hon. Premier, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and the hon. Minister of Economic Development announced the signing of an agreement that would provide extensive funds, from both the General Revenue Fund of this province and the Heritage Savings Trust Fund with respect to the development of a major terminal for grain handling in Prince Rupert — very extensive funds again with the objective of making sure that when we get to Prince Rupert we have a place to store grain, and that unit trains won't be held up waiting for ships to enter the terminal that exists there now. Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length in the involvement of this government alone with respect to grain handling.

Let's look briefly at the federal government. For years, that government has been involved in a variety of programs to assist in the movement of grain handling throughout Canada: the entire rail system upgrading and branch line subsidies that are in place there, and the guaranteeing from time to time of initial payments by the Canadian Wheat Board — and that has happened in past years. As well, that government does a great number of things with respect to assisting in the financing of the production, marketing, and sale of western Canadian grains. Does anyone for one moment believe that a new program of those two levels of government, of paying the cost of storing grain, for however long, for people who are growing it to meet a market that doesn't signal them, can be born without detracting from some other government expenditures? Does anyone suggest that the government of Alberta would have entered into a hopper car purchase program through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and entered into an agreement to put extensive dollars into the terminal at Prince Rupert if at the same time the government of Alberta was paying \$500 million from the General Revenue Fund every year in storage charges for grain that was being produced for a market that didn't exist?

Let's just think about the traditional grain production in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, in the Palliser triangle. It's significantly easier for 80 per cent of western Canada's farmers to grow wheat than it is anything else. Over the years, we've developed very good varieties of wheat that don't give us the kinds of problems we have with oil seeds and other specialty crops. The existing marketing system for wheat is probably better than the marketing system for barley, at least on the international market. If you did not have any signals in the market place with regard to what to produce, and if you could get the same kind of income from producing wheat under the market assurance program, in all likelihood within a few years you would see the very beneficial thing that has occurred: farmers moving into other crops, demands would be altered, and we would go back to what many of us have referred to in years past as the one-crop economy.

On the other side of the coin, the same thing could happen with respect to production of oil seeds. We've had our market demands up and down. In this province and in western Canada, canola follows quite closely the markets with respect to soya bean oil and meal, and other vegetable oils and types of meal. Indeed, there are times when we are required, because of world demands and market conditions, to cut back on our production of canola. Indeed, we would not cut back. If we're canola growers, the opportunity is there to grow it, and the market assurance plan guarantees us a price no matter what the world or domestic market conditions, we simply

wouldn't be involved. I could go on at some length about the financial and market signal problems that could, and ultimately would, exist if the market assurance program were put into place.

There are some fairly good features to this program, though, and I'd like to talk about them. As a matter of fact, one is the proposal that the market assurance program would seek to improve the equitability between prairie grain producers marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board system, by paying for our on-farm storage costs. Let's talk about storage costs for a little bit. To start with, the market assurance plan suggests that there would be some incentives for people to move their production into the primary elevator system as rapidly as possible, but then it goes on to suggest we should do something about on-farm storage.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, during the period of 1971 to '75 I was vice-chairman of the Alberta Grain Commission and at that time took quite an interest in what we could do to improve the equity that existed in Alberta vis-a-vis one producer against another, in terms of delivery. During the term that I served as Minister of Agriculture, I had the pleasure of presenting a proposal to a quota review committee that was established by the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board — at that time the Hon. Otto Lang, who has not yet made it to the Senate — that I think has a great deal more validity than MAP and would do a great deal to alleviate congestion in country elevators, to bring some fairness and equity into the delivery opportunities that would exist throughout the western Canadian grain production area, regardless of how far an individual might be from market.

I want to review that briefly, Mr. Speaker. The submission I made to the quota review committee on behalf of the government of Alberta contained an approach that would provide some incentives for carrying grain on farm storage. There is no question that the cheapest place to store grain in western Canada, aside from the ports, is on the farm. I say aside from the ports — it's more costly to store grain there but it is in position to be sold, and it's important that we have sufficient quantities in position all the time to make spot sales and to meet our long-term delivery commitment. But when you get out into the country, it really isn't very cost effective to plug your elevators with grains that are not being sold, not in demand, and to pay the kinds of storage charges we do to the country elevator system.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, in January 1970, having presented to my colleagues at a Progressive Conservative policy conference on agriculture in Red Deer a policy paper involving the marketing of barley through the Canadian Wheat Board system. I did a little research and found that some elevators in the town of Sexsmith had barley stored in them that had been there for up to eight years and had not yet been marketed. I don't have to tell you what that cost western Canadian grain producers.

The program I proposed to the Canadian Wheat Board quota review committee was an established, initial payment at the beginning of the crop year, August 1, for every grade and kind of grain, then a sliding scale of increased payments over the course of the crop year which would reflect the storage costs for farmers, which would be less than the cost that might have been incurred by the country elevator system, plus some return to the farmer for his loss of interest on the moneys that might have been gained from the sale of that commodity, plus some reasonable amount for risk and insurance. The ef-

fect would have been that if I were ready to market, say, 1,000 bushels of wheat on September 1 in the crop year 1981, I would have received, if I had taken it to the country elevator system, \$100 per tonne, we'll use as a figure. If I had deferred the delivery and sale of that wheat into the Canadian Wheat Board marketing system for 10 months, to July 1982, taking the pooled price that exists, I would have received \$116.50 per tonne.

The effect of this would have been to create an incentive for people to store grain on their farms as opposed to creating an incentive for farmers to move grain into the country elevator system. Just ask yourself as a farmer the question, what is the most effective thing to do with your grain crop the day you get it harvested? Under today's system, the best thing to do is to haul it to the country elevator system. You don't have to sell it. You can take out a storage ticket. You don't have to worry about gaining income in an income tax year. If you don't want it, you can defer that. But if you haul it into the system in September, you do a couple of things. You avoid the deep winter snow. You absolve yourself of any risk for spoilage, or fire, or all the other kinds of things that can happen to stored grain. You're able to collect at any time you want by simply making a phone call to the elevator agent and saying, put my cheque in the mail. There is no incentive to provide for any kind of orderly market.

Mr. Speaker, the final part of my proposal at that time suggested that in addition to that system, the Canadian Wheat Board should have a policy of providing some incentive payments throughout the course of the year if in any given month the Canadian Wheat Board required certain kinds and grades of grain for delivery to its customers. In other words, if the price in January for No. 1 wheat was \$107 a tonne as opposed to \$100 in August, but it was urgently required in the system to meet our market commitments, there might be a premium of \$5 per tonne on wheat delivered during the course of that month. That system would have been fair to producers wherever they resided from elevator systems.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on quickly and talk about a couple of other things with respect to the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. In my view, certainly there is room for a system that encompasses the best of two worlds. I believe it should continue to be the case that the Canadian Wheat Board would have sole responsibility for the marketing of red wheats throughout our market area. I believe, however, that it is essential that consideration be given to allowing the private grain trade in Canada to market both feed barley and malting barley in world markets in competition with the Canadian Wheat Board.

I believe the same case could be made for soft white winter wheat. I would not suggest that we make a unilateral change to say that the Canadian Wheat Board would no longer be a marketer of barley or white winter wheat. But I do believe that significant opportunities exist for the Cargills, the Bunges, and even the Alberta and Saskatchewan wheat pools and others to get involved in international marketing of feed grains, in particular malting barley.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Just think about malting barley for a little bit. From western Canada we sell malting barley around the world. We also sell it to Canada Malting in Calgary. Anyone who has farmed in this province knows that if you trot down to the elevator with your sample of malting barley, and if you live in the part of the country that I come

from, one time out of 50 your sample of malting barley is accepted; not because it is too poor for malting barley, but simply because in Alberta we grow about four times as much malting barley as Canada Malting wants. Where the balance goes, I don't know. It goes into the system as feed grain, and I guess it comes out of the system as malting barley sold by somebody. If it's the Canadian Wheat Board, some year I wish they would give the report on that. If it's a private grain trade, some year I wish they would pay us a little more. But the point is that if the private grain trade was actively involved in the export marketing of malt barley, then we'd have some people to sell to besides the single purchaser of Canada Malting in Calgary. I'm not criticizing Canada Malting Company. If you're the only one purchasing malting barley in western Canada, surely you should pick and choose, and they do.

Mr. Speaker, if I could move on very quickly to some other matters with respect to marketing grain in western Canada, I had the privilege of visiting the U.S.S.R. in 1976 with Premier Lougheed. We met with a number of important ministers, including Premier Kosygin, and Exportkleb, the U.S.S.R.'s international purchasing agency, to discuss the sales of Canadian grain to that country. As I said earlier in this Legislature, we were extremely well received and it was a useful trip. One of the things we insisted upon when we returned was that the Canadian Wheat Board and the federal government, in particular, play a leadership role in developing some long-term contracts for the U.S.S.R. While it may have been that Exportkleb, their marketing purchasing agency, preferred not to have long-term contracts and would rather buy on a yearly basis, it was evident from the discussion we had with the U.S.S.R. that they were honoring their long-term commitments to purchase from the United States, even though they said they would rather purchase Canadian grains.

Mr. Speaker, that's an exercise in having made some suggestions, I guess, and seeing some very rewarding action taken. We now have a situation where the Canadian Wheat Board, as I understand it, has signed some long-term contracts with the Soviet Union, and have others under discussion with other major trading partners which, hopefully, will be completed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with a couple of comments. On the plus side, in 1981 and into the 1980s I believe it's essential that Canada maintain a state trading agency in grains, because we do a major portion of our business today with countries like the U.S.S.R., China, and others whose way of trading is to use state trading agencies. Canada has been well served in those markets by having an organization like the Canadian Wheat Board.

The other remark I want to make in conclusion is that I have had some considerable conversations over the years with Mr. Esmond Jarvis, chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board. I would say this about his intentions and his ability: I believe he is anxious and sincere about doing the best job he possibly can under the circumstances with respect to marketing Canadian grain. However, I believe that if the hon. Don Mazankowski, Minister of Transport responsible for that organization for a short nine months, had been able to serve out a tenure of three or four years, we would have had a dramatic turn-around in the marketing, transportation, and selling of grain in this country such as we've never seen before. As well, I believe Albertans and western Canadian grain farmers are benefiting today from the

short one year plus that was spent by Dr. Hugh Horner, former Deputy Premier in this government and member of this Legislature, in his tenure in setting up and being head of the Grain Transportation Authority. During the one year Dr. Horner was in charge of that authority, there was an increase in excess of 20 per cent over the previous year in terms of movement of grain from the country elevator system to our port system. If that kind of increase can be achieved under the minister I referred to and under the leadership of Dr. Horner in operating the Grain Transportation Authority, I believe increases perhaps that dramatic could have continued year after year.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, my fear now is that the Grain Transportation Authority will not be allowed to live. It doesn't appear that the federal Liberal government has the interest at heart of letting it live. Surely the minister responsible, the unelected Senator, doesn't want to let it live. My closing comment is that if that's *a fait accompli*, if the federal government wants to do away with the Grain Transportation Authority, it owes western Canadian farmers a major shake-up in the Canadian Wheat Board system. By major shake-up, I mean starting at the top by putting an elected official into a responsible position with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board, then moving to appoint an astute and knowledgeable Albertan as a commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board — I can think of one or two who could be suggested — and moving forward with some aggressive marketing policies throughout the 1980s that will ensure that we can stand in this Legislature 10 years from now and say, yes, the Canadian Wheat Board is doing a good job and it should be kept.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move that we adjourn debate.

[Motion carried]

208. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to suspend the maximum petroleum production regulation under The Mines and Minerals Act for 30 days as an indication to all Canadians of Alberta's good will and serious intent to negotiate, in good faith, an energy pricing agreement with the federal government.

[Adjourned debate October 20: Mrs. Cripps]

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have much time to talk on this motion last time, but I was reading through my notes, the speech, and the information given in the last debate. The motion was untimely and ill-conceived at that time, and it's even more untimely and ill-conceived today.

Mr. Speaker, the petroleum marketing production regulation was established in reaction to the imposition of the national energy program on Canada in the budget of 1980. It was detrimental and devastating. It had that kind of effect on Alberta and, in fact, on all the Canadian economy. In retrospect, the province of Alberta had absolutely no choice. Anything more would have been used by the federal government to take over our natural resources. Anything less would have been totally unacceptable to Albertans.

Even at the time of this motion, the effect of the national energy program and the federal budget had become apparent in the Drayton Valley constituency. There can be no doubt left in anyone's mind of their

detrimental impact. The intent of the national energy program was to shut down the western basin and direct all oil activity to federal lands. Even today in Drayton Valley, Nisku, Swan Hills, Fox Creek, Valleyview, Rocky Mountain House, Brooks, and Whitecourt, there has not been a resurgence of activity.

The service industry is working at approximately 40 per cent capacity. There are 43 service rigs in Drayton Valley. Last week, between 10 and 14 of them were working. The plain truth is that the imposition of the PGR tax, or wellhead tax, and the incremental oil revenue tax have caused low production wells in Alberta to be uneconomical to produce or service.

Small independent oil companies are suffering too. Recently I received a letter from a resource company. We're talking about Canadian companies which have a cash flow of under \$10 million. They're small. One hundred fifty-seven of these companies have written to the federal government saying that they cannot live, operate, or exist under the national energy program forced on this province. It's crippling. Companies particularly hard hit are companies which have developed in the last four or five years and still have a huge cash deficit. The national energy program is actually throttling them.

Another fact is that the small Canadian companies cannot go into the frontier lands. They have neither the resources, the cash flow, nor the equipment. The very Canadianization the federal government says it's supporting, or purporting to enhance, is in fact being penalized extensively. Another aspect of the national energy program was to keep funds from flowing out of Canada. But money has literally flowed out of Canada since October 28; for example, Petro-Canada's questionable purchase of Petrofina at \$1.46 billion, all going to a foreign country. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about Canadianization of the oil industry, and that's what it was supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here written to the Leader of the Official Opposition in Ottawa. I'll just read one sentence:

I believe that Petro-Canada Exploration is using far more American service companies than Canadian. I have 2 examples of service given to American Co's where Canadian companies were competitive and willing to do the work.

This work they're talking about is mud supply, cementing, fracturing, and acidization. Much of that work is going to [American] companies. I've had exactly the same complaint in my own constituency, that new projects that Petro-Canada is doing are using United States service companies to do their work. In fact, they are tendering only to American companies.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is totally irrelevant. The Alberta government did negotiate an energy agreement and is still working on improving the position of the small service companies and of the Canadian companies. For this reason I urge all members to vote against Motion 208.

[Motion lost]

211. Moved by Mrs. Embury:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to consider exempting the wholesale and retail liquor store operations of the Alberta Liquor Control Board from the application of The Public Service Employee Relations Act.

[Adjourned debate October 20: Mr. D. Anderson]

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate on this important motion. I had already indicated to the House that I was in support of the concept of it. I congratulated the hon. Member for Calgary North West and the Member for Edmonton Belmont on their speeches on this issue.

Basically, as members know, the motion would allow employees of the Alberta Liquor Control Board to move into a situation they're not currently in, where they would be allowed to take strike votes. While I support that concept, I do so reluctantly, largely because I have an aversion to strikes and walkouts. It goes far deeper than just the application to this particular agency of the government of Alberta.

I'd like to deal for some time with the topic of strikes and walkouts and options we may look at besides the strike mechanism we're talking about in this motion. The topic really has to be investigated in depth and applied more generally than this motion deals with at this point in time. The fact of the matter is that last year in Alberta we lost 538,680 man-days as a result of strikes or walkouts. To apply that more generally to the country, 38 per cent of all the person-days of work in this country was spent on picket lines of one sort or another, in a walkout or strike situation. Interestingly enough, last year was not a major strike year. In 1976, 55 per cent of the time that Canadians were supposed to be spending working was indeed spent in a strike or walkout situation.

Mr. Speaker, that only speaks to the direct and obvious loss as a result of management/labor difficulties the country faced at that point in time. A lack of motivation is much more difficult to judge. A *Calgary Herald* article of a couple of weeks ago suggested that \$120 billion is lost each year in North America as a result of prolonged coffee breaks, long lunch hours, personal telephone calls, and other mechanisms to waste time that result from a worker's lack of commitment to the company he's working with. Of course, on top of that, we can't calculate at all the loss in terms of initiative, imagination, and ability that takes place in the work place in Canada. It would be fair to say that we use far less than half of our capacity in this country. That speaks to the problems of inflation and unemployment that we face, the difficulty with productivity in this country as a whole, and the fact that we have labor problems, at least in strikes and walkout situations, second only to Italy, I understand. Interestingly enough, we have two and a half times the number of days spent in strikes and walkouts in Canada that is spent in our neighbor to the south, the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly go over the history of the labor movement in Canada, to indicate how that situation has evolved. In terms of unions, we started in this country in 1812 in Saint John, New Brunswick, and then in the 1820s and '30s in Quebec and Ontario. The main reason for the development of these unions, of course, was that Canada was beginning to industrialize to some degree. Obviously, the management and the owners of companies were not meeting the needs of workers as they perceived them.

In the 1860s, we began to move much more towards international labor affiliations with the British and then with the Americans. Then in the 1870s and '80s, we began to see the development of Canada-wide unions, such as the Canadian Labour Union and the Toronto Trades Assembly. Mr. Speaker, basically the goal of these unions at that time was to create a nine-hour working

day.

The government then began to see the effect of unions, and indeed to feel the political impact of the numbers they represented. The Conservative government of John A. Macdonald implemented the Trades Union Act in 1872, legalizing unions. That was followed by a rash of legislation in the years to 1909 which strengthened the role of unions in the country.

Mr. Speaker, what was the reason for that strength and growth in that particular part of our economy? Clearly it was that the goals of the owners and employers did not coincide with the goals of employees. But what I criticize perhaps most at that time was that the governments of the day rather than trying to break down the growing conflict between management and labor, in fact started to evolve rules by which the war would operate, rules on which labor and management could go into official conflict, rather than really resolving their difficulty in a way that wouldn't be harmful to both or to the country as a whole.

In 1919, Canada hosted North America's most frightening labor/management confrontation, the Winnipeg general strike. There, all unions went on strike, along with about 12,000 non-union employees. Basically, for a period of a month or more, they controlled the city of Winnipeg and were the only bodies that could allow anything of any sort to proceed. The police went on strike at that time. The reason was clearly because during the war and immediately following there had been a freeze on all wages, but prices and profits had increased, prices to the degree of 50 to 75 per cent. The unions felt that they had no choice but to move in that direction. On June 10 that year, the House of Commons amended the Criminal Code, broadening the definition of sedition.

On June 17, the cabinet ordered the arrest of all the leaders of that strike, and therefore stopped the Winnipeg general strike, but unfortunately not before June 21, when a peaceful demonstration was broken up by police. Scores of people in Winnipeg were injured and two killed in what has been known as Bloody Saturday. In my opinion, that confrontation, perhaps more than any other in our history, has identified the break between management and labor and officially moved towards a situation where the rules, in terms of how you deal with the conflict, were worked on even more by governments in the country. What did we learn? Well, we learned that you had to try to break down violence. But again, we as governments made no attempt to break down that conflict situation, to look at options and alternatives that might evolve.

Some 60 years later, we're in a situation where we have little violence, or at least very minimal violence, in labor confrontations, though personally I have faced a couple of situations that have been near violent. I think that's never far beneath the surface in certain confrontations. We have very much formalized that conflict, that legal war, between management and labor that has caused such a drain on the economy and of what has taken place in our country.

In terms of the three groups involved. I suppose we have satisfactorily defined their parameters of authority. In most cases, the companies still have full control of their corporations, jealously guarding the right to own the shares and deal with the problems because of the companies they've created, but perhaps not prudently looking at the possibilities of utilizing their employees' best abilities through other options that I'll speak about soon.

Governments at different times have been able to use the power base of unions or of management, in some cases both, by having legalized this conflict, and at different points in history have found that politically beneficial but have not moved in any significant way to break down that conflict situation. I cannot blame union leaders originally for organizing employees to face what in many cases was definite tyranny on the part of certain companies. But at this point in time, I can say that in very few situations has labor asked that the role of the employee be expanded past the greater benefits and more money concept into a situation where that employee has a direct involvement in the work place, a role in adding his expertise to the management of companies, or an ability to participate in the profits of companies. In fact, unions have fought that concept to a great extent, indicating to me that they fear the loss of their political base. Because if you blur the lines between management and labor by involving the employee in the direct management of companies, indeed the enemy is not as clear, and one would have to deal on a co-operative basis rather than with a power bloc totally opposed to the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it brings us to the question of what do we do. Are there options we can look at? In answering that question, I think one has to peruse other countries and see what has developed there. Interestingly enough, two of the countries that have the best records in terms of labor/management relations are Germany and Japan, which were both destroyed to a great extent during the last war. In my opinion, that's one of the reasons for their success. They were able to start over without any of those three vested interest groups stopping a process of development.

I'm not suggesting at all that you can translate the experiences of Japan, Germany, or any other country of the world to the unique situation that exists in Canada, as it does in any other country. But I am suggesting that we have to begin looking at options to that legalized war we've created with regard to the strike and lockout mechanism, options such as worker/management participation models, co-determination models in areas like Germany, perhaps labor courts, perhaps just different techniques of negotiating, such as final offer arbitration. I've always felt that major labor confrontations, if they have to reach that point, should be dealt with in the same way we deal with legal problems in the community: a jury chosen by both sides. But that may be unrealistic. Still, it's an option I think we have to take a look at.

In the private sector most of all, I suppose I subscribe to some extent to theories proposed many years ago by American economists Adler and Kelso in a document called the *Capitalist Manifesto* and another called The Two Factor Theorem. They basically suggest that for the good of all, we have to begin involving the employee in the profit picture of companies and in participating in the direction of those companies. This has successfully taken place in many instances in Canada to date. It has been applied quite successfully by a fellow named Winnett Boyd in eastern Canada to companies such as Dofasco. Dr. Terence White from the University of Alberta has investigated many of the situations and is quoted as saying that where the worker is involved, it increases motivation, productivity, imagination. Very little labor confrontation results in those situations. A *Financial Post* article titled Most Employees Come Out Winners in Ownership Gamble cited a number of situations which I'd like to go through briefly: In Edmonton, Byers transportation company, which was in very bad shape, sold 45 per

cent of its shares to employees for 10 cents a share. Five years later those employees sold the same shares in a completely revitalized company at \$4.30 a share. In Peterborough, Ontario, 161 employees of the Pioneer Chain Saw Corporation sold a third of their shares last summer for \$16.35 a share, making a profit in just over a year of \$1,300,000, while still retaining 650 shares apiece in those companies.

I could go on with other quotations from that article and other studies that, in my opinion, indicate that there is a great area to be explored in terms of involving the employee directly in the company he works with. In the not too distant future, I hope to suggest in the Legislature a number of ways which we might, from a government point of view, encourage employee participation in the companies they work for and encourage companies to move in that direction. Also, I think we should take a look at trying to bring together the leaders of business, government, and labor to some sort of body to look at options to the strike, with the goal of ending this conflict situation which has cost Canadians such a great amount of their income, and perhaps has taken away the vital moving economy that Canada as a whole once had, though it's still here with Alberta.

In short, Mr. Speaker, while I support the motion before us today and feel that in all fairness, you can't take away from the employees of the Liquor Control Board the right to strike when you afford that to other employees in the community with perhaps even more crucial roles to play, at the same time I think we have to look at every option available to that conflict — that war, if you will — between management and labor. In terms of the leadership of the business community, the labor community, and indeed government, we have to do away with any parochial self-interest and move towards every way of trying to break down the reasons for conflict, rather than continuing to develop rules by which the war will operate.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Three Hills, do you agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:29 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, having given notice yesterday, and prior to resuming debate on Government Motion No. 16, which is to be called next, and in respect of which debate has been previously adjourned, I move Government Motion No. 17 standing in my name:

Be it resolved that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 20, debate on Government Motion No. 16 and any amendments proposed thereto be not further adjourned.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Gogo	Pahl
Anderson, C.	Hiebert	Paproski
Anderson, D.	Hyland	Payne
Appleby	Isley	Pengelly
Batiuk	King	Planche
Bogle	Kowalski	Purdy
Borstad	Koziak	Russell
Campbell	Kushner	Schmidt
Carter	LeMessurier	Shaben
Chambers	Little	Stevens
Chichak	Lougheed	Stewart
Clark	Mack	Thompson
Cookson	Magee	Trynchy
Crawford	McCrae	Webber
Cripps	McCrimmon	Wolstenholme
Diachuk	Miller	Woo
Embury	Musgreave	Young
Fjordbotten	Oman	Zaozirny
Fyfe	Osterman	

Against the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker. R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Totals: Ayes — 56 Noes — 5

16. Be it resolved that notwithstanding any provisions of the Standing Orders, the estimates of the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and all appropriation Bills as herein defined, shall, unless earlier disposed of, be dealt with as follows:

- (1) In this resolution
 - (a) "Appropriation Bill" means
 - (i) Bill 69 — Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83, and
 - (ii) any Bill introduced in the House to appropriate the funds covered by the Estimates:
 - (b) "Estimates" means the estimates and supplementary estimates of the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that have been referred to the Committee of Supply during the 1981 fall sittings, and includes the resolutions before the Committee of Supply relating to them.
- (2) The Estimates shall be considered by the Committee of Supply on 5 separate sitting days after and including the day upon which this resolution is adopted and if, on the 5th day, the Committee has not voted upon all of the Estimates by the following time limit:

10:00 p.m. if it be a Monday, Tuesday or Thursday,
or
4:30 p.m. if it be a Wednesday, or
12:00 noon if it be a Friday,

the Chairman shall immediately interrupt the proceedings and shall forthwith put a single question proposing the approval of every resolution then necessary to complete consideration of the Estimates, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the Committee shall forthwith rise and report.
- (3) A motion in the House
 - (a) that the Speaker leave the Chair and the Committee of the Whole meet to consider an appropriation Bill, or
 - (b) that the House receive a report of the Commit-

tee of Supply on the Estimates or a report of the Committee of the Whole on an appropriation Bill

shall be decided without debate or amendment.

- (4) An appropriation Bill may be introduced in the House at any time after the receipt of the report of the Committee of Supply on the Estimates covered by the Bill, when the Order of the Day is Government business.
- (5) An appropriation Bill may be read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House and the report received, on one sitting day.
- (6) If an appropriation Bill is moved for second reading, and if, on that day, at the time limit defined by paragraph 2, all appropriation Bills have not yet been read a second time, the Speaker shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put the question on second reading of every appropriation Bill then awaiting second reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.
- (7) If, after all appropriation Bills have been given second reading, any appropriation Bill is before the Committee of the Whole for consideration, and if, on that day, half an hour after the time limit defined by paragraph 2, there remains any appropriation Bill not reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put . . . every question necessary to complete consideration of all appropriation Bills still before the Committee, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the Committee shall forthwith rise and report.
- (8) If an appropriation Bill is moved for third reading, and if, on that day, at the time limit defined by paragraph 2, all appropriation Bills have not yet been read a third time, the Speaker shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put the question on third reading of every appropriation Bill then awaiting third reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.

[Debate adjourned December 8: Mr. Sindlinger speaking]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those in favor of the motion please say aye.

[Mr. Mandeville rose]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I've started to put the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think there certainly should be time for the hon. member to speak on the resolution at hand. I think it would be most unfortunate, in terms of the agenda, if the government took the position they're about to take right now to rush through a very significant . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is not a government position. This is a position of the Chair we're discussing now. Let's stay with the subject.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my argument is the very same. In terms of the position of the Chair. I think a

quick ruling by the Chair at this time would be unfortunate, because the agenda before us is one of the most important items that has come before us for a long time: closure, that takes away . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the hon. leader resume his seat. That is not under discussion. Let's not get carried away. What is under discussion is something to which I drew attention last night. It's simply this: there have been calls for the question, I have waited, and there seems to have been some hesitation: an after you, my dear Alfonse, sort of thing. Waiting, and then after I get up to put the question — and I mentioned last night that there are parliaments where once the Speaker is on his feet to put the question, the time for debate is over. I had hoped we weren't going to go through the same exercise tonight.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking further on the point of order. I want to indicate why the hesitation. The main motion before us, Motion No. 16, has an amendment. The reason there was hesitation on this side of the House was that we felt the amendment before us, moved by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, should be dealt with first. That was the hesitation, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to your awareness of that. I think that should be dealt with first of all. Then we can proceed to discussion of the main motion. Two of my colleagues, the hon. Member for Bow Valley and the hon. Member for Clover Bar, have not spoken to the main motion. We wish that the amendment be dealt with first of all. I'd ask you to examine that matter at this time. If we could deal with the amendment, then go to the main motion, we have someone who will be standing and ready to speak on the main motion.

MR. NOTLEY: On the point of order. I would suggest to you, sir, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as I recall, is correct. There may have been some misunderstanding, and the question being called was, in fact, on the amendment. That being the case, it would be appropriate, of course, to put it. Perhaps some of the government members, in their overeagerness, failed to realize there was an amendment on the floor. Of course, we cannot vote on the main motion until the amendment is dealt with. If we're talking about the amendment, we can proceed with the vote on the amendment, and all will be well.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. Perhaps you could provide some clarification of Standing Order No. 20, which I believe bears on the point of order that has been raised with you. Standing Order No. 20 provides that the adjourned debate be not further adjourned, and:

- (2) If the question is resolved in the affirmative, no member shall thereafter speak more than once
 - (a) in any such adjourned debate, or
 - (b) on any such resolution, clause, section or title . . .

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the point of order being raised with you is, in fact, irrelevant. Because regardless of whether we are now dealing with the amendment or the main resolution, in the totality no member may speak more than once. On that basis. I submit that the question of whether an amendment or the main motion is before the Assembly is

in fact irrelevant, given the fact that no person in this Assembly can now speak more than once.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I might, I think I also perceive the grounds for some misunderstanding, in that there was an amendment and the hon. member who moved it had exhausted his time. There is another possibility for some debate, perhaps, of what the rule might actually mean. When we consider the possibility that the argument could be made that once the questions are put, following the passing of Government Motion No. 17, all matters are swallowed up in the decision and dealt with. In order that the differences of opinion can be resolved most easily, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in giving unanimous consent for the hon. Member for Bow Valley to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say that I was persuaded by the explanation concerning the amendment. The amendment definitely was moved; I was aware of that. It was the last thing that happened before we adjourned this morning. Under the circumstances, and assuming there is no objection in the Assembly, we can proceed.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm so accustomed to supporting the government that I almost voted for the resolution to start with, so I couldn't see any reason not to let me on the floor this evening. In just making a few remarks on the main motion this evening . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Not that I want to interrupt my colleague, but with regard to the amendment before us from the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I would like clarification as to whether that amendment is wiped out because of resolution No. 17, which we passed. Are we reverting to the main motion? Mr. Speaker, I'd like clarification of that, because I'd like to know where we can go from here.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume — I'm not sure yet — that the hon. Member for Bow Valley was going to direct his remarks to the subject of the amendment. The amendment causes me . . . [interjections] Was he speaking to the motion?

AN HON. MEMBER: To the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are we dropping the amendment?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, we would have to vote on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. I was going to say that I have some difficulty with the amendment, because it contains argument, and we dealt with last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: It's coming. [interjections] Now, I hope the House is clear. I realize we're a little handicapped because of the hours, and we haven't been provided with the usual copies of Votes, but an amendment was moved this morning by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. We're now going to move on that amendment. Is everyone in the House clear what we're going to vote on?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker declared the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Adair	Hiebert	Payne
Anderson, C	Hyland	Pengelly
Anderson, D	Isley	Planche
Appleby	King	Purdy
Batiuk	Kowalski	Reid
Bogle	Koziak	Russell
Borstad	Kushner	Schmidt
Campbell	LeMessurier	Shaben
Carter	Little	Stevens
Chambers	Mack	Stewart
Chichak	Magee	Stromberg
Clark	McCrae	Thompson
Cookson	McCrimmon	Topolnisky
Crawford	Miller	Trynchy
Cripps	Musgreave	Webber
Diachuk	Oman	Wolstenholme
Embury	Osterman	Woo
Fjordbotten	Pahl	Young
Fyfe	Paproski	Zaozirny
Gogo		

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 58
---------	----------	-----------

MR. ZAOZIRNY: On a point of order . . .

DR. BUCK: [Inaudible] speak was last night.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: I've been saving myself, Walter.

Mr. Speaker, could you perhaps provide the Assembly with a ruling or at least a clarification with respect to the point raised by this member a few moments ago, as to the entitlement to speak at this juncture of the debate, given the passage of Motion 17? Could you confirm that in fact at this point in the proceedings, each member of the Assembly is entitled to speak once, and no more, regardless of whether further amendments to Motion No. 16 are introduced?

MR. SPEAKER: That's my understanding.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, if you're certain we're back on track again, I'll give it another little whirl.

I'd like to say to the hon. members that if I did vote with the government, it wouldn't be the first time. I'm the type of individual — I voted with the small opposition when they were on this side; I voted with the government; and when we had a large opposition, I voted with the government on many occasions. So I'm not one who's only voted one way as far as voting with the government is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, making a few remarks to Motion 16, the main motion, I'd like to say that all the hassle and furor we've had in the Legislature recently is with regard to the heritage trust fund and its too much money. It's certainly a sad state of affairs when we have to be concerned about

having too much money. I'm going to be the first to say that the toughest thing to do is manage money. Managing businesses and so on is not that hard. But when you have to start managing money, with inflation the way it is today, it's certainly a problem.

Three issues have concerned me and, I'm sure, many Albertans. I have some feedback from my constituency. The three issues I'm concerned with are the closure motion, the motion we're speaking to now; the loss of the \$60 million on the bond market; and the time we've taken in this House at the fall session. Those are the three issues that concern me. I have to take some of the blame for the loss of time, but wouldn't say that much, Mr. Speaker. It seems we've dealt with the three issues here, but the important thing we're sitting in this Legislature for is to deal with and pass legislation that involves all the people of this province. I certainly don't think we've spent an excessive amount of time in this particular area.

As I said, the people of Bow Valley are concerned with the heritage trust fund money and how it's spent. I am a strong believer that I should be able to go home on weekends or when we prorogue this session and, when my people ask how we spent the heritage trust fund, I as the Member for Bow Valley should be able to disclose every aspect. I should be able to tell them every cent spent in the heritage trust fund, especially the \$60 million lost on the bond market. I was very hopeful that I would be able to tell my constituents how it was lost, how we dealt with it, and just what happened as far as the \$60 million was concerned. If we had had all this information disclosed to us, we could have avoided the situation we've been in at the fall session. If the information had been before us, I think we could have solved this problem and gone on about the work of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be the first to say that I'm not going to condemn the hon. Provincial Treasurer or the government for the loss of the \$60 million as far as investing in the bond market is concerned. That can happen very easily if you get involved in this type of investment. It's very easy to lose. However, I think that if all the information had been brought to our attention, we wouldn't have this concern.

I have to agree, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer indicated, that there has to be a certain amount of strategy concerned and dealt with when you're dealing in the stock market, the bond market, the horse races, or whatever. It's necessary. But I think 30 days or a period of time would be enough to keep this a secret, or to keep the information from the public or from being divulged in the Legislature.

As I said, when you have losses it's very hard to brag about or discuss them; your wins, it's simple. It's very simple to discuss what you've made on the markets but, from my own experience, it's hard — as I said last night. I deal with a company and handle the cattle commodity markets, but just in a small way. The money we take to the broker's wicket is probably in what you'd call a snooze box. It's not a basket of money that we take up; it's in a small way. But I recall one particular instance when I was handling the cattle commodity market for this particular company. There's three of us involved, and I had to tell them what I'd lost on the cattle commodity market.

What happens when you're in the stock or bond market? When it goes down the limit, you can't get out. There's no way you can cover your position. What happened to me was that on a Thursday, the cattle market went down the limit. I couldn't get out. I had a

terrific loss. I didn't feel very nice about it myself, and I didn't feel nice about telling my partners. On Friday, I had an order in to sell, and I got rid of part of my position. But I suffered the weekend, because I thought I would possibly take a terrific loss again on Monday. However, things worked out fairly well on Monday. The market steadied, and I could get out without losing any more money.

To the Provincial Treasurer: I know it is really hard. That Monday, it was hard to tell my partners that we had got out of the stock market and lost whatever money we had in our small snooze box. It is hard to divulge your losses. But I had to: it was my obligation. The same thing with the government of Alberta: if we're going to be playing the stock or bond markets, we should give all the information to the people of this province, and then we're not going to have any problems in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the best solution I can see is not to play the stock market. Stay out of the stock market; stay out of the bond market. When you start playing the stock market or start gambling, it gets in your system. When it gets in your system, it's hard to get out. We could have terrific losses, especially if we get invested too deeply. Another thing, as far as the province is concerned, is that many individuals in this province play the stock market. If the province has the lever of billions of dollars to put into the stock market, a little snooze-box operator like myself can't compete. There's just no way I can compete in the stock market, because the provincial government takes me out of competition with the amount of money they have.

MR. R. SPEAKER: It distorts the market.

MR. MANDEVILLE: That's right. It distorts the market. It not only distorts the market for the citizens and taxpayers of Alberta, but it distorts the markets for the brokerage agencies as well.

I had a little situation myself last week. I was sitting in the broker's office watching the ticker tape. For anyone who hasn't watched them, they're pretty interesting to watch. You watch your money. You lose it, and you're down in the dust. Then you're up in the slivers, and then you're in the chips. You stand there and watch the ticker tape go up and down. Mr. Speaker, I sat there for an hour and a half last Thursday. I've been playing the stock market short. There's many ways to play the market and, with the economy the way it is, I've been playing it short.

I happened to be playing one particular stock on the Vancouver exchange, and I was shorting it. I had a number of shares. I had it shorted, so I walked into the broker's office and the receptionist took me down to the broker who handles my business. I sat with him, and I was watching. He said, you know, I put in an order today for 5,000 shares of Corona. I said, did you short it? Yes I did, he said. So I sat there at the desk and watched, knowing everything was well. But I really didn't know whether that was my stock he was shorting or whether he was shorting it for somebody else. It could have been the province, as far as I was concerned. I left that brokerage house not knowing whether or not that was my stock. Later on, I got to wondering if that stock was bought for me. He had the order in at \$3.10, then it ran up to \$3.40 and I was shorting it. So I phoned my broker back. Sure enough, it was my stock he bought. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, do you know how they do that? They have a blue chip on one side and a red chip on the other side. The broker goes to the head man in the broker's

office. He speaks through a glass and says, I want to short so much stock at a certain price. Then that broker can come back and sit at the desk. He doesn't have to put a name in there. You don't have to put the province of Alberta. He doesn't have to put the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in there. He has a certain amount of time to put that either on a red or blue sheet...

AN HON. MEMBER: The red one, the red one. [laughter]

MR. MANDEVILLE: ... whether it's long or short. Mine happened to be on a red sheet. I wasn't in the chips; I was in the slivers before I left. [laughter]

But that's how the stock market works. I don't care whether it's the province of Alberta or whoever, you have to sign an application form. You can't be trading stock every minute of the day. I don't care whether it's the Provincial Treasurer or who it is. You have to sign a form and put that in the hands of your broker, to buy and sell. So anything can happen. As the Auditor General said, there could be room for anything when you're dealing in the stock or bond market. I'm sure it doesn't happen, but we still have to be very careful that we don't get involved in this type of thing.

When you're playing the stock market, it's not the secrecy, it's not keeping the strategy away from the other investors. You have to rely on the world economy. You have to rely on interest rates. There are many things you have to rely on before you get into the stock market. One of the main things I rely on when I'm investing in the stock market is what governments are doing or not doing. That has a big bearing on the stock market. On September 11, I got an abstract of what I had in the short market, because the Premier of this province and the Prime Minister were working out an oil pricing agreement. I just flipped a coin and guessed it wasn't going to be good. So I put my money in the short market, because what governments do has a big bearing on the stock market. There are many ways to play the stock market. You can play it short, you can play it long, you can play puts, you can play calls, you can hedge your position...

MR. R. SPEAKER: You can lose \$60 million.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Well, if you're going to lose money, you should hedge it. I've tried to do that in the cattle market. Sometimes it hasn't been that successful. I try to hedge my positions, but sometimes it's not very successful.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make a suggestion to the minister. We have a gentleman who has a lot of knowledge in the stock market. I'm sure many of you who have played the stock market have heard his name. His name is Granville. I want to say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if he were in his seat, that he should get some advice from Granville. If you check Granville, he watches the stock market very closely. One thing he doesn't do is play the stock market. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, he doesn't play the stock market. But you can get advice from him on how to play the stock market. And I think that's as good advice as I can give the hon. Provincial Treasurer: stay out of the stock market, and probably talk to Granville. I'm sure he'll get some good advice when he talks to him.

What could happen when you're playing the stock markets — as I say, if you're going down the limit, it's hard to get out. Have we got a ceiling on how much money we put in the bond market, if they got a margin call or whatever they're doing? Just think what would

happen if we lost good old Alberta. It would be terrible. I know we've got some investments in the Maritime provinces. But the hon. Member for Bow Valley doesn't want to go down to the Maritime provinces to live, if we lose the province of Alberta in the bond market. I'm sure this can't happen but, going to extremes, it could happen. Many investors have gone broke. When Granville had that big announcement that it was going to have a blue Monday, many people lost their shirts. They weren't in the chips; they lost their shirts. That can happen to anyone; it's very easy.

In closing, I think Albertans think the purpose of government is to handle the affairs of the province: like education, our social services, and health. If we're going to invest the heritage trust fund, we should diversify this province. We should develop our water resources and diversify our agricultural industry in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an amendment to the motion. The amendment reads:

By adding the words "commencing March [23],

1982" after the words "be dealt with as follows".

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is saying that we're not holding up anything in the Legislature. All we're saying is, give us more time to take a good look at this. That's what the amendment is for.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few moments. It's amazing how well you can get by on an hour and a half sleep. I've come to the brilliant conclusion that I've been wasting so many hours of my life by sleeping so much. If you can get by on an hour and a half, it's amazing what things a person might have been able to do.

After listening to the hon. Member for Bow Valley. I hope the Provincial Treasurer is out doing one of two things. One, I hope he's out looking for the \$60 million. If he's not doing that, I hope he's out taking lessons in how to deal on the bond market. The hon. Member for Bow Valley certainly could have taught him something. Very seriously, when we are entering a debate that is going to set a precedent in this Legislature, in this province. I feel that the government is derelict in its responsibility, that the Provincial Treasurer, the Government House Leader, and the Premier are not in their places. Mr. Speaker, there is no way they can shirk their responsibilities by bringing in closure...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's deal with the topic. Let's not, as I mentioned last night, deal with the members. Their characteristics, habits, and so on, are not under discussion. I realize it's customary occasionally to refer to the absence of other members. But when we say they're being derelict, shirking, and things of that kind, then I have to get concerned, whether such remarks are addressed at the hon. member who is speaking or at any other hon. member.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw those remarks. But I bring to your attention and to the attention of the people of this province that when we are bringing in a [motion] for the first time in the history of this province, the chairman of Executive Council, the Government House Leader, and the Provincial Treasurer were absent at that time. I'm pleased to see that the Government House Leader is here. Mr. Speaker, this government cannot hide behind the fact that it is bringing closure into this Assembly.

Once again, I would like to quote from this fine little

brochure. I was speaking across the floor to the Premier rather jokingly when I said, Mr. Premier, I would certainly like to have this autographed. Because what we write doesn't seem to be what we stand for, many times. What do we stand for, Mr. Speaker, when the provincial government brings in closure? I'd like to quote from this brochure, because it's very important that we know some of the guideposts of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta. Under the title of this handsome young man, a university friend of mine outside the House, across the House, in the House — under the caption of the present Premier, Peter Lougheed, leader of the Progressive Conservative Party at that time:

Our purpose is not merely a victory at the polls. We are concerned with the use we are going to make of the victory.

Mr. Speaker, is that what this government is going to do: bring in closure? Is this the kind of government we are going to have from this day on? Why do we have committees? Committees of the Legislature are set up by this Legislature to expedite the proceedings of the Assembly. The committee system tries to assist the entire House. It is a long parliamentary tradition that the committee makes recommendations to the Assembly. The estimates we've had on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund have been before that committee. Now the government in its so-called wisdom has decided it has heard enough. It is trying to convince us, but having a very, very difficult time, that the proceedings of the Assembly are being delayed, are being blocked. But the government has not given us any clear indication of why they need closure.

I can't understand a government that has this many members, that can farm out — as we saw last night, they can platoon. When we saw this happening in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister was taken to task for platooning. But this government has the numbers; it can do that. Under the amendment, we are asking that proceedings go along. We are asking that the votes be held until the start of the next fiscal year. This is not stopping the proceedings of the Legislature.

So why closure? The government has not made a case. The government sits in silence. This morning, I happened to listen to a news report that said something to the effect that the members had their heads down doing Christmas cards. I presume they were talking about the government members, because the opposition members were up bright-eyed and bushy-tailed doing their job, doing the public business in public.

Mr. Speaker, why closure, why the guillotine? In the Quebec House several days ago, the flags were lowered to half-mast, Mr. Speaker, after closure is brought in, all members of this Assembly should wear black armbands, because it is a black day in the history of the province. It is a black day, and it is a mark, an infamous time in the history of the parliamentary system in this province. Why closure? What is the hurry? No one from the government side has convinced us.

Mr. Speaker, just to jog the memory of our government friends across the way, I would like to quote a statement made in *Hansard* by the hon. George Drew, a prominent federal Tory, when they were discussing closure in the federal House.

MR. CRAWFORD: This has all been said before.

DR. BUCK: I'm glad he did remember one thing. We missed him last night. The head of the government caucus, the head of the government side of the House, slept

while a small handful of members on this side of the House were trying to convince that big government that they were making a mistake. [interjections] That's right, Mr. Speaker. Last night we discussed arrogance. There is arrogance, and there is total arrogance.

MR. NOTLEY: Then there's this government.

DR. BUCK: I guess you could say, Mr. Speaker, that this government has its own type of arrogance. That hon. member said:

Closure is simply a bald threat to the opposition that they are not going to be permitted to put their case before Parliament, and above all, before the people of Canada so that the opinion of the people of Canada can express itself.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are in this Assembly, to do public business in public.

I think we have to look again at the guideposts of what this government supposedly stood for. The first guidepost of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta:

The following are the 12 guideposts which have been approved for the Alberta Progressive Conservative Party:

1. We believe that public laws should be made in public. This principle must be protected against the comfortable drift to government by cabinet or through Order in Council. It must be applied to open the doors of federal, provincial, or any other conferences whose private decisions today profoundly affect our future. The public has a right to know.

Mr. Speaker, then the government has the audacity to bring closure to this Assembly.

Another guidepost I think we should be reminiscent of:

9. We believe that provincial government should always accept the necessity for sound financial responsibility of its affairs and the affairs of the municipal authorities financially dependent upon it. This should obviously include a refusal to support radical and irresponsible monetary theories. But we do not believe that the necessity for financial responsibility should be an excuse for ultra-cautious fiscal policies. We believe in the concept of putting one's money and resources to work for improvement and development.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker:

We consider unnecessary hoarding of surplus funds as a lack of progress.

Maybe that's why they lost the \$60 million. They thought maybe there was too much money. They were hoarding it, and that showed a lack of progress.

Mr. Speaker, closure is a very, very serious matter. In the future, are we going to see that the government with its numbers can decide that maybe certain estimates have gone on longer than they would like? Under what we're proposing to do this evening, the government, with its large majority, can invoke closure at any time. Once we have set the precedent, we can do it anytime we wish. Mr. Speaker, the guidepost of doing public business in public is just a hollow note on some paper.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker: in my recollection, there was never any thought of closure in this Legislature from 1967 on. The only time closure was even thought of was by the opposite side of the House, when the Leader of the Opposition at that time was discussing that they thought the government was considering closure, because they were doing exactly what a responsible opposition should be doing: questioning, badgering, looking under every

rock. We heard so much about how they were going to look under every rock. At that time, there was some thought of closure by the government. Here's what the Leader of the Opposition at that time, now the hon. Premier, said

he was appalled at any suggestion that he was looking for the government to call closure or something equally ridiculous because of the Conservative questions.

My, how things have changed in a decade. How we forget when we get into power.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Our Premier used to sit there all the time. This one can't even sit and take his responsibilities.

DR. BUCK: Well, the Premier's a busy man.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Look at his attendance record. It's not very good.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: What do other people say about closure?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Maybe he gets marked present when he's out collecting Tory funds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Closure has brought down more governments than any other act, as far as I can tell. Mr. Speaker, we saw what happened in the infamous closure on the pipeline debate. At that time, many prominent Tories stood in their places and were appalled at the thought that the government would invoke closure. One of the most famous Tories, the former prime minister of this country, the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker: the champion of protection of the parliamentary system, I would say; a very famous Canadian who believed that Parliament was supreme, that Parliament was what it was all about. [interjection] Fine, be flippant. Your day will come. The voter will look after you. Mr. Speaker, we are not here to be flippant on a matter as serious as that before us tonight. I find it extremely disturbing that the government would treat this so flippantly.

I'd like to quote one statement made in *Hansard* by the Rt. Hon. John G. Diefenbaker:

It means that parliament is being asked to abrogate its position as the predominant factor in legislation. It means that we are being asked to agree to be dragged at the wheels of the Prime Minister . . .

in this case, the Premier

. . . to make parliament an appendage of the executive.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from this government how action should be in the Legislature, how public business should be done in public, and now the government is using the supreme weapon for limiting that debate, for giving the government itself the opportunity to say, we have listened politely, you are irritating to us now, we will bring in closure.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be listening with great care to the hon. Government House Leader, because he has not indicated to this Assembly or to the people of Alberta why they are considering invoking closure. At a time like this, I don't think we want to get into personalities. That's not what we're here for. But this government is going to be placing itself before the people of the province and

trying to defend why it invoked closure. Mr. Speaker, we've seen terms like "managing time", but closure is closure. The guillotine is the guillotine. It is a sad day in the history of this province and this parliament.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, rising to comment on the amendment before the House this evening. I join with other members of the opposition in expressing no small amount of regret. I don't say this in a personal way, but express regret that the hon. Premier and the hon. Provincial Treasurer are not in their places. Today we're dealing with perhaps one of the most significant motions this Legislature has ever debated, a motion which for the first time in the history of the province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are not really debating the motion. We're debating an amendment. It would seem to me that if there were any observing of the rules of relevance, debate on the amendment would be different than it would be if the amendment had not been proposed. I realize the hon. Member for Clover Bar was entitled to debate both the motion and the amendment since he moved the amendment. But we're now on the amendment, and I think I should be able to distinguish between what would be said if the amendment hadn't been proposed and what would be said since the amendment has been proposed. It would seem to me that that difference would indicate the choice between the advisability of having the motion take effect now, and having it take effect on March 23, 1982.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just correct you. We're not dealing with an amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. We're dealing with an amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley. We have already had some debate with a certain amount of liberal application and latitude, and I'm sure you would want to treat all members fairly.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to relate this amendment to the importance of the issue. Of course the importance of the issue is, in my judgment, so fundamental to the operation of the Assembly that I just repeat the observation I made before, and that is that the Premier and the hon. Provincial Treasurer should be in their places. I should point out to members of the Assembly that a matter of this nature should not be taken lightly by any member. During closure on the famous pipeline debate in 1956, a debate that probably divided the country more than any other event in Canadian history until that time, it should be noted, in fairness to the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent the Prime Minister of Canada, that through that entire debate, with the responsibilities of leading the entire nation, the Prime Minister sat in his place. He was there; he took his responsibilities. He faced the opposition day after day after day, Mr. Speaker, without any personal reflection on either of the two hon. gentlemen, the importance of any move to close, qualify, or reduce free speech in this House is so fundamentally important that the Premier of the province and the Provincial Treasurer should be in their places.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the amendment, which suggests that instead of ramming closure through at this point in time, we defer the matter until March 23, which would then allow seven days before the expiration, if you like, of the financial year. At that time, Mr. Speaker, there might be some argument for closure. We

would be facing a deadline. We would be dealing with estimates that must be completed if programs are to be authorized and undertaken in the upcoming financial year.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all hon. members of this Assembly: on what possible basis can members vote closure tonight? On what possible excuse? On what possible rationale can we reduce freedom of speech on an appropriation Bill that doesn't have to take effect until April 1, on estimates that don't begin until April 1, 1982. What is the rush? What is the reason for us to set aside the historic right of free speech in this Assembly, and reduce and qualify it as it has never been reduced or qualified before in the history of this Assembly, when we are dealing with items that do not begin until April 1?

That's why the amendment is in order and so relevant. The amendment would at least give some degree of rationale to the imposition of closure. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of this amendment, this government must be totally accountable for bringing in closure. For what reason? For personal convenience; is that the reason? In the case of the pipeline debate in 1956, there were contracts that had to be met. In the case of closure in the Ontario Legislature, which members of the opposition rightly opposed, at least there were obligations to the public service. Salaries had to be paid. With all the criticism aimed at the federal closure, in the mind of the Prime Minister, at least, there was the timetable of Mrs. Thatcher in Great Britain. But what timetable have we in this particular instance?

I'm pleased to see that both the Government House Leader and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs are in their places. Because as we examine this amendment, I think it is important to note again what both hon. gentlemen very properly said last year with respect to the imposition of federal closure. The hon. Government House Leader referred to it in the most derogatory terms. Indeed, he referred to it as the contemptible use of closure. And he was right. Then the hon. Government House Leader went on to say that it may well be calculated to try to achieve a tentative legislative result prior to a decision by the courts. And he was right.

As well, I look at the comments of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, page 1217 of *Hansard*:

I think last night all Canada experienced perhaps one of the most repugnant and reprehensible moves of parliamentary power I have ever seen in some time. I think the use of the closure movement last night, to gag the official opposition, will go much beyond the precedent set in the pipeline debate and the flag debate, two important uses of closure in our history.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs was right. [interjections] Yes, hon. minister, you'll have lots of opportunity to stand up and talk.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that those hon. gentlemen were correct when they criticized the use of closure in the federal House of Commons. But I say to them, to you, and to other members that in the absence of any reason other than the convenience of members of the government, on what basis are we justifying the use of closure in this House? We haven't had any reasons advanced. We haven't had any rationale produced. We had the hon. Government House Leader suggesting that all this was, was time management, this euphemism for closure. He mentioned other precedents — the British House of Commons and the Canadian House of Commons —

neglecting, of course, to point out that you can arrange, as a result of interparty discussions, as we pointed out last night . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: *Standing Orders*.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. I might say the *Standing Orders* in this House as well, which set out certain times for certain debates, are developed as a result of interparty discussion. The very *Standing Orders* we operate on, came as a result of a special select committee of this Legislature that represented both sides of the Legislature, as the Government House Leader well knows.

So let's not confuse the consensus that developed in the application of our rules as a result of both sides being part of the issue of developing an approach on one hand, and unilateral action by the government on the other. That's what closure is. It's unilateral action which qualifies freedom of speech. I say to the members of the government: you can call it anything you want; you can call it time management; you could find some other euphemism for it. But the fact of the matter is that it's closure and it's wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Clover Bar quoted the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker. But I think one additional comment that Rt. Hon. gentlemen said in the pipeline debate is applicable, not only to the amendment but to the entire question that we look at tonight. He said:

I am one of those — and there are many of us — who love parliament. The House of Commons — with its traditions, its dedication to preserve and maintain freedom, its necessary dependence on the fact that an opposition must be able to express itself fearlessly and powerfully upon the issues of the day . . .

Note that, Mr. Speaker

. . . requires rules that are interpreted fairly. As you know, Mr. Speaker . . . the rules of parliament should not be altered, dare not be changed in order to meet the demands of an overwhelming majority.

A quote from perhaps the most distinguished parliamentarian of our time.

Mr. Speaker, in this House the numbers speak for themselves: "overwhelming majority". It is incumbent upon the Government House Leader, on the part of the Premier, on the part of those who lead this government, to demonstrate clearly in the Legislature today why it is necessary to vote against this amendment. If they had immediate public business that was being blocked, if there were obligations staring us in the face — contracts that had to be signed, obligations that had to be met — that would be one thing. But we've not had that advanced, Mr. Speaker. All we've had advanced is specious arguments that perhaps we've taken long in the debate.

We have this interesting arithmetic: the amount of the estimates is \$400 million; in the federal House it's 150 times that. But that's totally irrelevant. The amount of time that is determined under the House rules is their business. The way in which we do our business in this House is based on the precedent of this Legislature. If this government is going to change those precedents, let them come to the Legislature and ask that a standing committee of the Legislature be established, representing both sides of the House, to look at changing the rule book. Don't come in at this eleventh hour of the Legislature and say, well, you know, these are the rules we adopted collectively as members of the Legislature, both sides of the House being part of it. But we're going to

throw that rule book away, or at least we're going to bring in closure. We're going to bring in the kind of action which, as the Member for Clover Bar properly pointed out, the leader of the now government was aghast at when he was Leader of the Opposition in 1968, even the prospect of closure. He was right. What makes closure against a Conservative opposition in 1968 so bad, and closure against a tiny opposition in 1981 in the public interest?

I say to members of the government that it is for you to demonstrate to the people of this province one logical reason you can take to your constituents as to why this amendment should be voted down, and why it isn't possible to continue with the normal public business, including examination of the estimates and of Bill 69, which is the appropriation of 30 per cent of the natural resource revenue to the trust fund, until March 23. Mr. Speaker, we have to have clear, concise arguments presented by the government before freedom of speech is qualified or altered, if we are seriously committed to that concept. With great respect, we have not seen one strong argument presented by any member on the government benches.

What makes this matter even more outrageous, in a sense, is that we had the announcement by the Provincial Treasurer, who is not here tonight, that he's going to ask the Auditor General to investigate thoroughly this question of what happened to the \$60 million — the Premier wrote, and Executive Council authorized, the letter.

Mr. Speaker, surely if this government had any respect for the legislative process, they would not prorogue the House before the report. They would recess it if necessary. They would accept this amendment, which would allow the option of recessing the Legislature until that report is completed so that it can be debated by the members of the House. What is the point in asking the Auditor General to undertake this kind of comprehensive analysis and in-depth report and then say to the members of the Legislature that when he completes the report, we're not going to have the Legislature in session. Who's to say it will even be called into session next year. Who's to say it won't be an election — I'm going to come to that in a moment or two. But there's no guarantee that this Legislature will ever be called into session again in order to evaluate the report of the Auditor General.

I find that just amazing, Mr. Speaker. If the Rt. Hon. John George Diefenbaker were still alive and were in this House, let me tell you: the hon. government members would be squirming because they would have every precedent, the entire history of the parliamentary process thrown at them, regardless of their political viewpoint. Because there was a gentlemen who understood and respected parliament. To have a government with its huge majority coming and saying, for political convenience, or you've talked too much, or maybe the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care didn't like some of the questions. Well it's too bad, Mr. Speaker, if he didn't think some of the questions were good. That's a matter of opinion. That's up to him. I didn't think some of the answers were all that good either, but that's up to me.

The fact of the matter is that we are here representing our constituents. We're here representing the people of Alberta, and we have the right to ask questions. The government has the obligation to give answers. That whole process of the exchange of opinions is part of the free speech which is the fundamental building block on which parliament rests. Mr. Speaker, if you're going to qualify that, you've got to have reasons. Every other

example I know of where closure has been invoked in this country, there was at least some rationale for doing it. But here we don't have any at all, other than that we think you've talked too much and we don't like some of the questions. Isn't that too bad.

The hon. Government House Leader — and I'm glad he's in his place — mentioned the government of Saskatchewan yesterday. When I responded to this in one of the amendments, I don't believe he was back. But, for his edification, I could just repeat what I said last night. There was a filibuster in the province of Saskatchewan, led by the tiny Unionist group which used to include the leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan. He now believes that Saskatchewan should join the United States; that's fine. He was part of the big, happy family in the Conservative Party, but we won't get into that, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that there was a filibuster. What happened? The government of Saskatchewan didn't bring in a gag. They didn't invoke closure. They sat day after day after day, and properly so. They allowed the public business to go on. Finally, Mr. Collver ran out of questions, the filibuster stopped, and the session was prorogued. But they didn't go the route of closure, because there was no need to do it. There was no immediate problem they had to face. There was no issue of paying civil servants. It wasn't the issue of meeting a deadline as far as a contractual arrangement was concerned. Because no compelling provincial interest had to be satisfied, public business went on. Mr. Speaker, that may be inconvenient for some. But as I think the Leader of the Opposition pointed out yesterday, if the inconvenience is too great for some of us, perhaps we have to decide whether we wish to remain as members of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned that there is absolutely no reason for closure. We have the use of the term "time management". I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that not only is this time management a savage assault on freedom of speech, but it is an even more savage assault on the accuracy of the English language. What we have today in time management is closure, pure and simple, in plain English. Let's call it what it is. That's how it's identified in *Standing Orders*, *Beauchesne*, and *Erskine May*. Why in heaven's name do we borrow some sort of corporate management rhetoric and try to describe it that way. Mr. Speaker, this is parliament, not the Harvard business school. It's parliament, the Legislature of the province of Alberta. We should use parliamentary language that conveys the meaning of what we intend to say.

In concluding my remarks to members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I once again draw your attention and the attention of hon. members to the importance the Premier gave in 1976 to the process we have gone through this fall: the examination of the estimates of the capital works division and, beyond that, the discussion of the appropriation of 30 per cent — or whatever we decide — of natural resource revenue to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker . . . I thought it was interesting listening to some of the government members say that the federal government spends 150 times what you people are talking about. Of course, they overlook the fact that the 30 per cent appropriation Bill also deals with over \$2 billion, five or six times as much as these estimates are worth. Over the next five years, we're probably talking about a minimum of close to \$20 billion that will be allocated as a result of Bill 69 or successive Bills. So the precedent we set in this House in terms of debating that kind of thing is pretty

fundamentally important to any opposition that's concerned about the supremacy of parliament and about legislative traditions.

Mr. Speaker, when I look back on the comments made by the hon. Premier, I recall that debate very vividly because there was a lot of concern about legislative control over the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I remember very clearly that the Premier gave a very good speech that day. It was a speech where he poured a lot of oil on troubled waters. It was carried across Canada. Basic to that speech was the legislative mechanism which was set out, which this government, not the opposition, now seeks to qualify, and which needn't be qualified under the terms of this amendment until there is some immediate reason for doing so on March 23. Mr. Speaker, the government is going to have to come up with a much better explanation than we've heard today. And members of this Assembly sitting row on row quietly is not the way to deal with it.

Sometimes there are occasions when one has to go beyond the confines of an assembly and ask the people of the province for their views. One of the great debates that took place in Canadian parliamentary history over this item, involved just what should in fact be done where there was imposition of closure. The proposition was properly put that there is a time and place when you make the appeal directly to the people. I say to the members of this government that this little opposition is a tiny minority within this legislative Chamber. There is no question of that. But I am totally convinced that on this issue we reflect the majority opinion of the people of Alberta, that the people of Alberta basically feel that the concerns we raised about the \$60 million, about accountability, our fight against the imposition of closure, are valid and that they support us.

I say to the hon. members of the government that if there is any dispute over that, one option is available to any Premier: dissolve the House and call an election. Let's test the waters. Let's ask the people of Alberta for a judgment on free speech. We're not afraid of facing our constituents with that kind of question. We've had elections before where we confront the rest of Canada, where it's confrontation with Ottawa. Perhaps it might be well to fight an election in this province where the issue is the performance of this government and the way in which they have trampled upon our legislative traditions and our parliamentary history for no apparent reason at all.

As one member of the Assembly, I would be prepared to debate any member of this Assembly anywhere, anytime in this province, and to see the people of Alberta make a judgment on the position of all of us as hon. members of this Legislature on an issue of this importance. It's not a minor issue and shouldn't be considered frivolously. *Beauchesne* makes the point that the most fundamental privilege in the parliamentary system is free speech. It's not talked about a great deal, because it's so basic to the system. It is so fundamental that you don't need to have scores and scores of citations to back it up. It is part of what our entire system of democratic government is based on. Mr. Speaker, if you're going to qualify that, then I say to you and to members of the House, you must show why. The amendment before the Legislature tonight is very clear. We know that we as a tiny opposition cannot stop the passage of the closure motion, but the amendment would force this government at least to use the ground rules of some immediate public need before closure is invoked by delaying it until March 23.

I think it's incumbent upon government members to tell us, in this Legislature and through us to the people of Alberta, why they can't support this amendment, why free speech must be qualified. I say with great respect to all my hon. colleagues in this Legislature, on both the government and the opposition side of the House, that that case has not been made by the government. And until it is made, the people of Alberta will quite rightly look at a government which they see as an administration which has forgotten one of the basic tenets of responsibility in a system of parliamentary democracy: that there must be the supremacy of the Legislature, and part and parcel of that supremacy must be the clear, unextinguished, and indeed unqualified right of the members of this Assembly to exercise free speech.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, It is with some reluctance that I participate in this debate after, I guess, 14 hours. [interjections] I was with you part of the time, but not all night. I have some concern that I may lend to the debate some credibility that it doesn't deserve, especially in light of some of the comments made, especially by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I believe a lot of members sitting in this Assembly right now are probably asking themselves: how did we get in this situation; why are we here tonight? After all this time, having listened for the number of hours we've been listening, I am still asking myself that question.

Members of the opposition have been saying that the situation we're in right now has never happened before in the history of the Alberta Legislature. So the question obviously has to be asked: why? I suppose the answer is that either we have an unreasonable government, or we have an unreasonable opposition. Who's to judge what is reasonable? Obviously we hold some very, very strong opinions at this particular moment, in terms of judging what is reasonable.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, as the M.L.A. for Three Hills, maybe I'm looking at it in a way that's not proper but, somehow, sitting in this Legislature for the last two and a half years and looking at the Legislature in terms of its sitting prior to that time. I had a feeling for how long the government business, the business of the people of this province, ordinarily takes in the spring sitting, give or take a few weeks; the same in terms of the fall sitting, which was instituted after the government changed. That has been somewhat the same, given just a small difference in time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I set my priorities. To a great degree, those are at the behest of the constituents in the Three Hills constituency. In my view, the opposition certainly have been attributing a great number of thoughts to members of the government over the last number of hours. So I would attribute some thoughts to the opposition. Probably they were carrying on as normal for a certain number of weeks in the fall sitting of the Legislature. Then, possibly aided and abetted by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, they changed horses in midstream, discovered there were possibly a few things they could have done better. They should have asked more questions at certain points in time. They've looked at that, and possibly quite rightly so, and said: how do we do a better job? There are more questions that could have been asked.

Certainly I know the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has an abiding interest in numbers, and properly so, because that's his background. All of us bring certain interests to this Legislature as a result of our training, the

way we make a living, a number of things. Those interests probably take precedence over other interests. Even though the government members have been characterized by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview as somehow being proud of this resolution, being proud that matters before the House had to be handled in this way in order for us to carry on with government business, I would say that that certainly is most untrue. The members of the Legislature on the government side should be proud of their determination to carry on with the business on behalf of the people of Alberta, as we see it, even with the kind of distortion we knew would come.

I'm elected, and I believe I have as much right to set priorities as every single member of the opposition. I'm willing to state those priorities. I'm willing to listen to my colleagues' priorities and somehow try to strike a balance. The Leader of the Opposition has said he's restricted in being able to represent his constituency. I too feel restricted. I too feel that the hon. member has so talked about free speech, on and on and on, for a lot of hours, that he is restricting me in my ability to do my job. Certainly I have just as much right to make that statement as does the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

For example, some notes were made by people reading the comments of the last number of hours. This was done until about supertime tonight. Items were raised time and time again, and then embellished; the same statements, over and over. The Leader of the Opposition stated something seven times, eight times the same thing, nine times the same thing, six times, seven times, and on and on, embellished with exactly the same comments. I think it's probably very important that the Leader of the Opposition give some emphasis to the comments he wants to make. But I ask, in the interests of all the Members of the Legislative Assembly and the priorities they might have in terms of serving their constituents, just how long do we listen to that?

There's been no curtailment of freedom of speech in this Assembly. What we're talking about is how long any one member talks about any one item. I'm sure we have been straining very hard, because it's a big job to try to hear innovative and new ideas put forward by some members of the opposition. We've all been sitting here straining to the utmost to hear, in all these hours, some new and valid points made. Mr. Speaker, there has been none of that. Instead we hear the same old cries. I fear the hon. Leader of the Opposition may be an undiagnosed anencephalic. In fact, the pig may be left with only an oink. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's an amendment before the Assembly. It has something to do with a date. I'm not aware that it has anything to do with any attempt at medical or psychiatric diagnoses. Could we get back to the subject of the debate.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping I would be allowed the same kind of latitude I feel the members of the opposition have had. However, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I'm not aware that there has been any great difference. In fact, possibly the hon. Member for Three Hills has gone a little further in one respect.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to the amendment and the time so noted, it's also

interesting that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview now feels that another seven days is the magic number; that that indeed will suffice in dealing with the estimates, and so on, that are before us. However, in all seriousness, I believe the debate has been very instructive. It certainly has been for me. In the world we live in, and I believe it's true in all the parliamentary democracies and democracies period, I guess, governments have tended to invade the private lives of individuals more and more. So certainly that has made government very complex. I have sat here and determined that there must be a debate in terms of how time is spent in this Legislative Assembly, maybe a debate that isn't done with what appears to be a cloud over it and the very high feelings that are accompanying this debate.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that all of us must think very seriously about our priorities, what they are, and how they mesh with the time that we certainly must spend in the Legislature. Government is absolutely enormous. Our programs touch everyone's life. If we're not in our constituencies, turning over those rocks — as some members would say — and looking to see exactly what's out there, not always in here, in terms of how those programs are affecting the lives of our constituents, then possibly we don't have a balance in what I believe to be our obligation as members of this Assembly.

For instance, I think the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has made some very serious comments, and rightly so. Later on, I would be interested to find out what he believes his obligations are, both inside and out of this House, and what the time frames have to be to accomplish those obligations. We must all strike a balance, bearing in mind that we have very diverse constituencies.

I'm sure I could be very adamant in saying what I believe the people of the Three Hills constituency would want me to do in this case. I believe I am doing that, as a result of communication with my constituents. Indeed, they wish they were seeing more of me. Weekends aren't enough, and they are saying, what are you doing here? You may be talking about looking at how some dollars are spent. But if you have an Auditor General, are you saying that somehow he isn't doing the job? I'm not sure whether the opposition is saying that, but we believe the Auditor General can do a job. If there is anything, in light of the amount of time we've had to reflect on the work of the Auditor General and the frame we've established within which he will do that work, it may well be that something comes to light and has to be looked at, and very rightly so, but not necessarily in the heat of a debate such as this.

I only add that I completely fail to understand the use of the word "closure" in looking at this particular motion. For some time, since April 3, 1959, when the former government amended the *Standing Orders* and introduced Section 18, which has been alluded to tonight, we have established a very important principle. It has to do with the time allocation on debate on the Speech from the Throne. Certainly all hon. members must accept that that's one of the most important debates of the year. I haven't heard any hon. member protest the kind of time allocation here when we're discussing all the programs going to be proposed by the government in any one year.

I'd ask hon. members to reflect very seriously on their very dramatic use of the word "closure", or the denial of free speech. I, and most of the hon. members here, find the opposition interpretation completely unacceptable.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's what it is.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I believe they do a disservice to the public in describing the work of the Legislative Assembly and the resolution before us as closure, when certainly the hon. members of the official opposition had to know that the previous government, which I'm sure they feel proud to be a part of, introduced the very standing order that established a principle for this Legislative Assembly.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments, if I may, in regard to the amendment please. Beginning yesterday, we said a lot of things about closure, especially in that marathon debate that began at 8 o'clock last night and ended at 9:30 this morning. A lot of comments were made about the closure motion itself. I don't want to reiterate them here today, but I'd like to summarize them briefly, if I could, and draw my concluding remarks.

Mr. Speaker, throughout that debate last night, five members of the opposition stood and, time after time, moved amendments and subamendments to the motion. Those were not just frivolous amendments. There was a purpose for them, and that was to present an alternative to closure. If closure had to be invoked, something had to be done to ensure that the rights of the minority in this Legislature were somehow protected. By moving those amendments and subamendments, it was our feeling that we were being reasonable, and that we were demonstrating to the government that we were willing to meet them halfway in resolving this particular impasse.

Despite those consistent and persistent efforts by the opposition, very few government members got up to address the motion, the amendments, or the subamendments. Mr. Speaker, at adjournment this morning at 9:30, we were left with the same question we had before us when Motion No. 16 was first introduced. That question has been posed again tonight: why closure?

I'd like to segregate my remarks into two categories: one addressing the question of why closure, and the other for why not closure? First of all, in regard to why closure, Mr. Speaker, only one member of the government stood to speak in support of that motion, and that was the Government House Leader when he introduced the motion to the Legislative Assembly. The reason he gave for closure was that there had been time devoted to this particular item, the capital estimates of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which was almost comparable to the time spent on the estimates of the House of Commons.

The ratio of 150 times was recited by the minister; that is, the estimates of the House of Commons were 150 times those of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is not a relevant comparison. The relevant comparison that has to be made in this case is the time spent on the estimates for this Legislative Assembly, and the time spent on the capital estimates for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because on an annual basis, when we come to the Legislative Assembly in the spring, we spend anywhere from six to eight weeks going over the annual budget of the provincial government. We go through thick booklets that compare, line by line, the prospective spending plans of the provincial government. Thousands of numbers in there provide information on expenditures that we vote line by line after extensive review.

On the other hand, when we look at the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, we get one document: the capital

estimates document we've been perusing for the last seven weeks. In the document this year, there are only 24 votes. Mr. Speaker, the problem I have with that is twofold: first of all, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is now much larger than the annual budget. The annual budget of the provincial government is about \$6.5 billion. The size of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund now is somewhere in the order of magnitude of \$10 billion. So we have a small, thin booklet that we are supposed to peruse in regard to \$10 billion, but we get thick documents for only \$6.5 billion, and we peruse every number in them.

The problem is that we have before us only about 12 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for prior approval. One of the fundamentals of democracy is that whoever controls the purse controls the throne. That's why we scrutinize the annual budget each year, before the expenditures and not after the fact. However, in regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which is now larger than the annual budget, we peruse only 12 per cent of the expenditures before the fact. The other 88 per cent is handled in secret by the provincial cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I think that has to be the central issue before the Legislative Assembly. That's the reason we in the opposition have spent so much time on those capital estimates this year. It has been time well spent. We have asked nothing but reasonable questions, and we have posed them in a responsible manner. Mr. Speaker, the information that has been developed over those seven weeks has been enlightening, in regard to government expenditures in the past and proposals for the future.

There were times when we inconvenienced some of the government members. There's no question about that. If I were the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, coming before the Legislative Assembly and asking for \$54 million from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and then being asked what some members of the government considered an impertinent question — what's the money for — and being in the embarrassing position of having to say, I don't know: I'll find out for you . . .

When we were questioning the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care in regard to the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, it was revealed to the Assembly that there had been a very serious breakdown in the controls and checks for the allocation of funds. To the credit of the minister, as has been pointed out by other members, there was no attempt to conceal that fact. But a very valiant attempt was made to demonstrate that the problems had been identified and remedial things put in place to ensure they would not occur again. Those are the types of things we found when we looked at the capital estimates over the last seven weeks. It has been time well spent. I think we should be spending more time on those particular things.

Mr. Speaker, the next question that arose from this was, why not closure? The reason that's being presented so much today and yesterday, is because it curtails the freedom of speech of members of the Legislative Assembly. In instances like this, I suppose it's always well to hang one's hat on principles such as that. We often grope and grasp with it in all kinds of situations and under different circumstances. But I have a feeling that this is one particular case where that really does apply. As has been pointed out in other places — and as some of the members, for example, Edmonton Glengarry, pointed out the other day in the parliamentary principles of *Beauchesne* — one of the guidelines we have for democracy is that there is majority rule. There's no question, Mr. Speaker, that we have majority rule here in the Legisla-

tive Assembly. But on the other hand, there is a responsibility that goes along with that majority rule: there must be respect for minority rights.

Mr. Speaker, unless this case for closure can be amply demonstrated to be justifiable under the circumstances, I don't believe there has been respect for minority rights in this Legislature. Until somebody in the government gets up and gives a more specific reason for invoking closure, until somebody in the government demonstrates that there's an urgency and an immediacy for closure, then I'm going to hold to the conviction that in this case closure is not justified.

Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental problems that was foreseen at the time the Heritage Savings Trust Fund debates were going on in 1975-76, was the absence of accountability. I obliquely referred to that earlier when I pointed out that 88 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is done, not before the Legislative Assembly but within cabinet. At that time, when that concern was raised, the present Premier of Alberta tried to allay that concern by demonstrating that there would be different ways that the government could be held accountable for its management of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, bearing in mind the fact that there was not prior approval of the expenditures.

Of those ways, two stood out in my mind. One, according to the Premier, was the ability of the Legislative Assembly to debate the capital estimates of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the Legislative Assembly. The Provincial Treasurer also supported that point of view when he appeared before the standing committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, when he said that although he could not respond to detailed questions, he could certainly do that and provide more information when he appeared before the Legislative Assembly in support of these estimates. Mr. Speaker, another way the Premier said the province could be held accountable was through the annual debate in the Legislative Assembly on what we have now before us: Bill 69, that annual Bill that appropriates about 30 per cent of natural resource revenue from the General Revenue Fund into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The Premier said the government could be held accountable for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in those two ways: the debate on the estimates and the debate on Bill 69. But now we have before us a closure motion that will deny us that opportunity that was held out to Members of the Legislative Assembly in 1976; that opportunity for members of the opposition, representing the constituents of this province, to hold the government accountable for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Now even those two things are being taken from us by this closure motion.

There was another individual who spoke at the time of the original debates. That individual expressed the same concern and reservations that are being expressed here today about freedom of speech. That individual, with considerable foresight, identified the problem there would be with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, not only in terms of what to do with it, not only in terms of how it should be managed and handled, but more importantly, from an overall point of view, in terms of the accountability of the government for its handling of that trust fund. That member also cited the unprecedented nature of surpluses to governments and how governments aren't set up to handle surplus funds, and the problems that could result from something like that. With a great deal of prescience, Mr. Speaker, that member said he could fore-

see the day when the Heritage Savings Trust Fund would cause governments to rise and fall, and that there would be many of those in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I think we might be close to a point like that right now. We've talked in very broad terms about the Auditor General. Last week in the Legislative Assembly, a letter was tabled from the Premier to the Auditor General, requesting the Auditor General to review certain circumstances relevant to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In my opinion, and in the opinion of some other opposition members, that letter was very vague in its terms of reference. We attempted to submit to the Auditor General our own letter, which elaborated upon the terms of reference contained in the Premier's letter. We received a response from the Auditor General today. He has told us he cannot pay any attention to our letter, because he is bound by the statutes that establish his office.

I was very interested to hear that the Member for Three Hills felt that we think the Auditor General is doing a good job. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear right now that I should not be included in that "we". I say that simply because I don't know. I do know he is doing a job; he is doing a lot of work. But until we found a leaked document through the heritage fund committee this fall, we didn't even know what that work was. There is no way we can assess or come to a definitive conclusion about the work the Auditor General is doing until we get to see that work. As it is right now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot see that work. So I cannot say to that member over there that the Auditor General is or is not doing a good job. That is why for the last seven weeks the Leader of the Opposition has so diligently tried to get the Provincial Treasurer to give us more information on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, information that has come from the Auditor General but is held confidential in the hands of the government.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distressing moment to have to stand here and speak on closure. We all know of the precedents and of the feelings the parliamentarians had when that happened in other jurisdictions. We all know about the parliamentarians leaving their seats and running up to the Speaker's Chair, trying to vent their frustration in whatever way they could. Somehow, I can't really get that excited about it right now. I think the conclusion to this closure debate occurred at 9:25 this morning, after the five opposition members had stood here all through the night and argued amendment after amendment, while the government members were platonizing themselves and going back and forth. We stood here throughout the night for what we believed in. We fought the good fight, Mr. Speaker, and there's no doubt in my mind that we won that fight.

Mr. Speaker, today closure is being invoked on us. But I'm giving oral notice to the members of this government that I'm invoking closure on them. I'm giving them five days to respond to all the questions this opposition has posed over the last seven weeks. After those five days, if they cannot see to respond to us, then I'll drop the guillotine on them. I will say to them that I no longer have any confidence in this government, and I will go home and tell my constituents about the \$60 million government.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the amendment to the motion before us, which seeks to put off the effective date of the motion before us. I'd like to commence by first of all removing any concern which

some hon. members may have had. There has been some light-hearted discussion about bald threats. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and other hon. members that I'm certainly not one of those; that is, threats.

With respect to this Legislature, we're on a very important debate this evening. I want to participate in it, because I have the utmost and complete respect for the ability of informed citizens to organize and make their own decisions. This Assembly epitomizes the ability of the individual MLA to function. Furthermore, I suggest that while we've heard much discussion about the freedom to speak, we've heard very little discussion about the responsibility that should be exercised in conjunction with that freedom, and the responsibility which flows from that freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a motion which is for the purpose of scheduling the business and the time of the House to a priority. Having said that, we're obviously talking about a very fundamental change in a rule of this Assembly. So I invite hon. members to address yet again our rule book. *Beauchesne*, and the principles of parliamentary law. If we're going to delay the proposal before us, I think it's important to understand the principles that over hundreds of years have been found fundamental to the operation of the Mother of Parliaments, all the other provincial legislatures, the Parliament of Canada, and our own Legislature.

What are those principles? First, Mr. Speaker, there is a requirement to protect the interests of the minority; second,

to enable every Member to express his opinions within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time. . .

Mr. Speaker, I submit that those are two sides of the same street: protect the minority and, on the other hand, enable every member to express his opinions, preserve decorum, and prevent waste of time. I invite hon. members to think about the rules and the opportunity for individuals to express themselves.

If hon. members will look at the Order Paper, there are a total of 45 bills submitted by individual members of this Assembly; not government bills, but bills submitted by individuals. There are now 18 motions on the Order Paper, submitted by individuals, not government members. Every Tuesday for two hours, there is an opportunity for individual members to debate and consider the business of their choice. It's not government business; it's not arranged by government. It's arranged by individuals exercising their initiative and their responsibilities as elected MLAs in this Assembly. Every Thursday, there are two hours for the same purpose. Every day at the commencement of the session, there is a question period. It would seem to me that that gives a great deal of leeway for individual initiative and free speech. Nothing proposed in the main resolution would change that in any respect.

If we move to a third point that is stressed as a principle of parliamentary law, we find it is to secure the transaction of business in an orderly manner. In respect of that law, I draw attention to rule 28 of our own rulebook. If hon. members will read that rule, they will find there is a limit on how much time any hon. member may speak to any motion. The exceptions are the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, the leader of government. Why is that rule there? Why is there a limit on the speaking time of members? It's a very obvious reason; that is, to move the business of the House forward and to be fair to all hon. members.

Now, what we have is an opportunity in our regulations, at the committee study of any Bill or at the committee study of supply, for any hon. member to stand in his place and ask questions without limit. The only governing factor is the responsibility of that hon. member to the rest of the Assembly. It's a consensus situation: it's that simple. We move by consensus. We can talk about the tyranny of the majority, but we can also talk about the tyranny of the individual in that situation. Because it is possible, in that situation, to ask questions without end and to speak without end. The only limitation is a physical limitation. As we well know, under our rules for adjournment, et cetera, that shouldn't be a great burden on any hon. member.

We have, then, a situation where, if responsibility is not exercised in conjunction with freedom, rule 28 in this book can be end run and made a mockery of by an individual. Mr. Speaker, in all my 10 years in this Assembly, I haven't heard of anybody complaining that that rule is a limitation on freedom of speech. We well know why it's there: to protect freedom of speech in this Assembly and get House business done. [interjections] You may not wish to hear about this, hon. leader, but it's a fact. That's the rule, that's the premise behind the rule, and it's essential to a group of people getting together, whether it be in this Assembly, in town council, or in any association we may be a member of.

Mr. Speaker, a fourth premise is to provide "abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure". Much has been said about an opportunity to consider the Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates before us. This year we've spent — and I would draw this to the attention of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, and I regret he's not here, because he brought it to my attention. Just a few moments ago he said that the relevant comparison in this Assembly is the practice in this Assembly, the time spent in this Assembly. All right. We're talking about the majority abusing the minority. What have we had? In previous fall sittings when we've dealt with the very same issues, our practice has been about six days spent. About six days has been as long as we've spent dealing with heritage trust fund estimates. By the time we complete the five additional days allowed under the scheduling motion, with what we have already spent, we will have spent four times the amount of discussion and questioning that we have ever spent in this Assembly on Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates. And somebody says that's a denial of free speech, a denial of opportunity.

I raise the question of whether it's an abdication of the responsibility we all must have in this Assembly if we're going to get business done. Is it freedom we're losing, or is it responsibility that's slipped away from us? On that point, I'd like to make the observation that this House has been very well served in the past. The fact that we could go as many years as we have in this Assembly without having to consider a scheduling motion of this type speaks exceptionally well for previous members of this Assembly. It means the responsibility has been very well combined with freedom of speech; responsibility has been retained and maintained, and well looked upon at all times.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Ten years and you guys ruined it: you blew it.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, we should be proud of that. To the best of my knowledge, no other Assembly in Canada has that record. In no other assembly I know of

is there an opportunity to do that. All other assemblies have rules which limit debate and the amount of questioning that can go on. I presume they all do so because there's been a need in times past. But until now, there has not been a need in this Assembly, or else there would have been some kind of limitation in our parliamentary law.

Mr. Speaker, the next premise we should address is "to prevent any legislative action being taken on sudden impulse". There has been discussion and concern about what this motion would do. The motion before the Assembly does nothing other than the one stage per day for a Bill, which is already in our rule book. It doesn't change it in any respect. So the rules that have stood the test of time, in respect of assuring that no impulsive actions will be taken in the Legislature, will still be before us.

I've reviewed the principles of parliamentary law that have been distilled through time. I've tried to indicate why they are important to this Assembly and how they relate not only to freedom of speech but also to the responsibility of all hon. members to use that freedom with the care and caution for which I believe I was elected and expected to observe by my electors. I hope it's shared by all other hon. members and their electors.

In the context of those premises and principles, we talk about the historic right of free speech. I don't really want to add to what I've said about that. Whether it's free speech or free anything else, I don't think our society can talk sanely about it without talking about the responsibilities that go with it. We as human beings are not free in any respect unless we are also equally responsible. In this Assembly we pass laws because people in our society regrettably don't combine the responsibility that goes with some of the freedoms they enjoy.

Some reference was made to a recent closure motion in Ontario. I point out that the closure motion there was after three whole days of debate, by my recollection, and concerned about a quarter of their annual budget: a vastly different situation than we have in Alberta. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who is not in his place now — and I regret that, because I wish he could listen to my observations; he may wish to debate them with me at some future time — indicated, what's the rush? We don't have a court deadline; we don't have a contract deadline; we don't have to pay the public service; so why do we have to organize the business? Let's just think behind that statement. He's really suggesting that we can rationalize; if we have a reason like that, we can rationalize. It's not so bad, after all. He stood there and remonstrated about freedom of speech.

DR. BUCK: We're not spending the money till March, Les.

MR. YOUNG: He was concerned that we not apply this rule at the present time. But he was willing to rationalize all his principles away. Why? On the circumstances he was putting before us. I suggest to you that if we're going to advance that kind of easy principle, then we don't stand a very good opportunity to have a quiet House nor to exercise the full responsibility which I believe our citizens wanted us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure some persons are watching this debate on television and trying to relate the practices they observed here to city council and school boards. Well, we're talking about estimates of expenditure which I guess might be about three times the size of the estimates

of total annual expenditure of the Edmonton Public School Board — maybe three and a half times, maybe not even that much. I wonder what citizens of Edmonton or Calgary have been able to watch a school board spend six days in public debate on those estimates, and whose freedom of speech was sacrificed because they couldn't do it. I can say the same about city council and about the Parliament of Canada — and reference has been made to it. I don't think there has been any lack of opportunity in that respect.

Let me just make one other observation. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo talked about the big, thick documents presented in the springtime for the estimates for the operation of government, compared it to the little, thin document of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital estimates, and implied that not much information was available. I point out to him that in that little, thin document we're not talking about the billions of dollars he was suggesting; we're talking about some hundreds of millions of dollars. It doesn't compare in any sense with the total budget of this province, and you shouldn't expect the same kind of information.

The other distinction that ought to be made quite clear is that we're not talking about expending or spending the total amount of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We're talking about an allocation for the purposes of capital budget, and we're comparing that to investing. The hon. member gave us quite a dissertation on stock market investing, which to the best of my knowledge is not engaged in, in respect of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund at the present time. We're talking about investing, if we want to talk about that portion of the fund other than that which is before us in those estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I want to summarize my position very simply. What we're talking about here are the rules which will govern the balance of the discussion relating to these estimates. There's an opportunity for about one day for every one of the various ministerial responsibilities that come before the opposition and this Legislature. Already there's been some time, at least one day if not more, available to the hon. members opposite to question. If they apply themselves in advance, they can organize their questions in priority, and I'm quite satisfied that they'll be able to get the answers they need, especially inasmuch as they will have spent four times as much time and energy on checking those estimates this year as they found it necessary or were interested in doing in the year past. Mr. Speaker, I think we can accomplish all that: preserving the operation of this Legislature in an orderly manner, preserving freedom of speech, and combining both of those with the responsibility of all MLAs, which I am sure the voters who sent them here expected us to observe.

MRS. CRIPPS: I sat here all last night and listened to the same speeches over and over. In fact, we've had nine votes, so I've heard some of those speeches seven times. I hope the Speaker will allow me the latitude that's been allowed to other members. As my remarks refer generally to the main motion, Mr. Speaker, and since this is just extending the time of the main motion, maybe they'll be applicable. The Leader of the Opposition said get up and speak, but he kept putting in amendments that I couldn't speak to, or at least I didn't want to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Stick handled.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right, stick handled. Oh, I certainly enjoyed the pig, though. I really enjoyed that.

It's a good thing the Premier made some resounding speeches in 1968 and '69, because we heard them all last night. I didn't know the Premier made so many good speeches. I guess it's wise to quote great men, and we heard him quoted again and again last night. [interjection] That's what I mean about the seven speeches I heard last night — consistency.

On the motion, Mr. Speaker, according to *Beauchesne* I'm not permitted to use "dishonest insinuations", "hypocritical", or "deliberately misleading", although I heard the Member for Clover Bar using it last night; in fact, more than once. Since I can't use any of those terms just indicated . . . What did he say?

MR. SPEAKER: I just said, in fact I really just muttered, that it didn't happen while I was in the Chair. I rather doubt it happened when any of my colleagues were in the Chair. I know that observations were made about rotation in the Chair, but I think it's good for the House to know that the Chair is not shiftless. [laughter]

MRS. CRIPPS: I won't argue the point, Mr. Speaker. I'll accept your wise judgment. I'll present my case, and let the members be the judges of what terms to use.

The purpose of the estimates is for the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Certainly the opposition, and indeed every member in this Assembly, each and every one of us, is responsible to assure himself and the public that the government has taken the precautions necessary to protect the public interest. We must ensure that the capital projects referred to in this motion are in the interests of Alberta both for today and for the future. We must also ensure that acceptable accountability and accounting procedures are established and followed. To this end, it's our responsibility to ask questions pertaining to the estimates, and I highlight "pertaining to the estimates".

I've done some research, Mr. Speaker, and a good portion of the questions that have been asked don't pertain in way, shape, or form to the estimates that were under discussion. In fact, in going through the estimates, I was amazed that Agriculture went through without this filibuster — 'sillybuster' — we have. No, I'll give it the right term. Maybe that's because it was mostly on irrigation, a pretty touchy subject for the members for Little Bow and Bow Valley. On October 23, page 1240 of *Hansard*, Committee of Supply voted \$27 million for irrigation rehabilitation and expansion without so much as a question. Supply estimate was another \$4,988,000.

Mr. Speaker, we speak of irrigation in acres, but I did some cost/benefits on a per farm basis. In fact I mentioned those cost/benefits and asked the irrigation council about them at a recent meeting. The cost of one project — it doesn't matter what way, shape, or form you look at it — is \$10,000 per year per landowner. It doesn't matter whether you choose a pipeline or an open ditch, that's the cost to Albertans. I'm not questioning the future benefit of irrigation to Albertans or the rehabilitation and expansion of the irrigation system. I believe that that's a good expenditure out of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division. I believe it will benefit our children and our grandchildren, and probably their children and grandchildren.

The point is that those estimates weren't questioned. Why? Not one question from our public information trio over there. It's high time we did something in irrigation.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm on the water management committee, and we looked at the irrigation projects. We haven't done anything in irrigation except study for the last 50 years. And for 35 years of that, your government was in power. We studied it to death. It's now very expensive to take up the slack for 50 years of non-movement.

We were told they hadn't thought of this filibuster yet, not until we were doing Environment. Mr. Speaker, that's not a credible argument either. In Vote 3 in Environment, irrigation headworks and main irrigation system improvements, we voted another \$62,827,000 to irrigation. Twenty-five per cent of the total estimates were voted and not questioned. Most of that relates very directly to the constituencies I just mentioned. My constituents in north-central Alberta have to wonder whether this so-called concern for the capital projects division estimates is for real.

Mr. Speaker, at exactly 4:34 yesterday, the Member for Little Bow said the government should allow the opposition to ask as many responsible questions as they like. I agree, but the key word is "responsible". I agree that you should be able to ask responsible questions. It's not only your right; it's a duty and an obligation to ask those questions.

Let's compare the Friday December 4 debate on the Walter MacKenzie hospital, which was responsible questioning, after a little hassle to start, to Monday, November 23, the Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital. Most of the entire afternoon's debate on that particular estimate was totally irrelevant. A long discussion took place on the northern Alberta children's hospital. The Member for Calgary Buffalo spent some time in a dissertation on names — what it had been called, what it should be called, and what it was called — then on location. If I remember rightly, they discussed whether it was in his constituency and on what street. Mr. Speaker, I ask you what relation that has to the expenditure that was being discussed. Absolutely none.

Then considerable time was spent on relevancy. We did get to that; in fact, for the remainder of the afternoon. Three of 13 pages in this *Hansard* on the Alberta children's hospital pertains to the estimate under discussion. That's less than 25 per cent. There's plenty of time for information pertaining to the vote. But, Mr. Speaker, it's important that it's related to the vote. If Monday, November 23, is an example, 25 per cent of the time was spent on [relevant] discussion. I'll give some leeway here. Let's say that a third of the time was spent relative to the estimates. That means we wasted 66 per cent of the time, or 12 of the 18 days, talking around the estimate, not using it in legitimate questioning.

So [much] for the opposition leader's statement yesterday afternoon, to allow the opposition to ask as many responsible questions as they like. Mr. Speaker, the dictionary definition of "responsible" is:

The government is responsible to the people for its proper conduct of the country's affairs . . . obligations or duties . . . accountable, answerable.

I agree. We are accountable; we're answerable. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to go through the estimates and prove me wrong, prove that we didn't waste a good deal of time talking about things that didn't pertain to the estimates under discussion.

Speaking of accountability, Mr. Speaker, we're not talking here of a principle of disagreement. The speakers don't disagree with the principle. I'd like to use some examples. I have a whole file of them. The Member for

Little Bow:

[We're] bringing benefits to . . . Albertans or families in this province. That's great.

This in Committee of Supply, on the general concept of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. On farming, the Member for Bow Valley:

I can recall [though] . . . it was a great thing when we put this money into Farming for the Future. I still think it can help somewhere down the line.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo on land reclamation:

Secondly, I'm not questioning the relative merit or the value of the program. Obviously it does have value . . .

Again the Member for Calgary Buffalo on land reclamation:

I'm not questioning the merit of these programs. I'm not questioning where they go, whose constituency . . . Obviously, they're good programs. The government wouldn't have undertaken them if they weren't.

Lesser Slave Lake outlet, the Leader of the Opposition:

. . . on the east shores, looking at the potential of doing what we're doing at this point in time. That's why I'm supportive of this program and very interested in its progress.

So we don't disagree on principle. We don't disagree on the use of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview:

I certainly agree with the minister that it's an area of the province that has considerable potential. But it's also

an area that needs to be developed — and we're talking about tourist development. Again the Member for Spirit River-Fairview:

I think this is one of the exciting aspects about the program, and one of the reasons we should support it. In my view there's no question that Lesser Slave Lake does have enormous tourist potential, and I think we have to trumpet that far and wide.

AOSTRA, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview:

I certainly intend to vote for this appropriation; I want to make that clear . . .

The Member for Calgary Buffalo:

In general, I think the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund is a good idea. I think it's a prudent way to put away our resources . . . if you might like to call it that, or opportunities for the future, especially in regard to a depleting natural resource.

Mr. Speaker, I've got stacks of them. They agree in principle. So we're not talking about a disagreement with what the government is doing with the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

On page 1660 of *Hansard*, we get into the \$60 million. It amazes me how inconsistent we are, Mr. Speaker. On that day, we were very, very sure that we put forward that Bill 94 didn't benefit the members themselves. We wanted to ensure that the public of Alberta really knew what the Bill was for. We didn't want to mislead them. We didn't want to have any misunderstanding out there. Yet, we have spent the last seven weeks deliberately misleading all Alberta about the \$60 million, repeating "lost", "ignoring gains"; using such words as "collusion", "fraud", and "theft" again and again in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not we.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, not we.

I think I'll skip the reference to Bill 94; I really shouldn't.

MR. SPEAKER: Could I confess to the hon. member that the use of the expression "deliberately misleading" causes a great deal of discomfort in the Chair. The only reason I didn't intervene quickly was because I couldn't distinguish the target.

MRS. CRIPPS: The target, Mr. Speaker, is the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's just leave the target out of it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, since I'm a member of that target . . .

On Bill 94, Mr. Speaker, we must have a fair and real understanding when it comes to public perception and the members. I agree with that. But it just amazes me how we can piously stand up and talk about public perception. No such sense of fair play is involved when we discuss the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I'd like to make one more point, with regard to Bill 69, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83. Just so we're absolutely clear about the position. I'd like to quote from second reading of Bill 69. On second reading of Bill 69, the Member for Little Bow says:

. . . we support the transfer of 30 per cent of the resource revenue from the General Revenue Fund to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I would like to clear that matter at this point in time. We have no argument with the 30 per cent. We think that amount of money in terms of savings in this province, in terms of investment, in terms of strengthening and diversifying the economy, is an acceptable objective.

That's great. I'm glad to hear that the Leader of the Opposition supports the government.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo . . . [interjection] I listened to him all last night. The Member for Calgary Buffalo also supports it:

First of all, I think the general principle of the heritage fund is sound. Several times today the point has been made that we're spending a great deal of the revenue we get from non-renewable resources, and that's true. We are spending . . . 70 per cent and only 30 per cent is going into the fund. I think that's a prudent thing to do.

If you want to check that, it's page 1627 of *Hansard*. Mr. Speaker, the principle of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is agreed upon. We don't disagree on principles.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to know all the rules of the House, but I can spot a deliberate diversion when I see one — no real pun intended. I believe the tantrums that took place in this House the other week are an abuse of the privilege of representing the people of Alberta. As a representative of those people, I believe all members must act with integrity and honesty; integrity in the manner in which they approach the business of the House, which should be done with dispatch. The questions must be responsible and sincerely designed to get legitimate information about government policy.

Mr. Speaker, last night I heard the Member for Spirit River-Fairview commenting on some comments of a gov-

ernment member. The opposition can say anything they like, promise the moon, because they know they don't have to back it up. Last night the Member for Spirit River-Fairview said: I wonder if what the government members said is government policy; since nobody has refuted it, I have to accept it as government policy. As members of government, we have a special responsibility for our actions and for what we say, because we are responsible to the people of Alberta and our actions and what we say could be interpreted as a policy of the government.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief notes. Those of us who were here through the night may not be as bright and quick on our feet as we should be. We're starting to show evidence of lack of sleep.

I agree with the members of the opposition. There's no quarrel that freedom of speech is very important. But freedom of speech exists for us all, not just the minority. It exists for every member of this House.

We've had hours of debate over a stolen letter. Let's not evade the truth; it was a letter stolen from confidential files and was used for weeks on end for whatever purpose served the opposition. I appreciate the fact that the Auditor General or the government has refused to give them — as the Auditor General pointed out, the method of recording sales wasn't as tickety-boo as he would like as an auditor, but these were professional people we had employed. They were not buying willy-nilly; they were buying as professional people. To suggest that they have acted improperly is most unfair and not at all a reasonable position to take.

On the matter of closure, I think the reason for closure — and I'm not afraid to use the word "closure". I don't like evasion and equivocation; I'll use the word "closure". Why are we using closure? We've been here three weeks longer than normal. When the members of the official opposition were in government, we weren't here in the fall at all. So let's not try to suggest we're not doing the business of the people.

I would like to suggest to the leader and the members of the opposition that 69 people who were elected to govern are still here. Five members of this Legislature were not elected to govern. One member was elected to do that, but he chose to do otherwise. And that's his decision. Last night, we spent 13 hours in this Chamber. I suggest that approximately 11 hours of that time was given to members of the opposition to use as they saw fit. This morning, I thought it was rather interesting that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview — and I'm sorry he's not here — was practically hysterical because the government members wouldn't get up and debate. After he made that little speech, he launched into the fact that we were frustrating him and wouldn't give him time to debate. You can't have it both ways.

One other area I would like to touch on is that members of the opposition mentioned freedom of speech. I point out that we have a *Hansard*, which we never had before. We have photographers all around us. That was not allowed before. We have television cameras in here all the time recording everything we do, whether or not it's to our benefit. I suggest that the people of Alberta have a much greater opportunity to know what's going on in this Legislature than they ever had before.

I don't quarrel with the fact that we've given a letter to the Auditor General for further advice on the matter at hand. If he wants, I think it's good to try once more to

convey to the members of the opposition that nothing is wrong. There's no fraud, no collusion, no theft. I know that members of the opposition and all of us here have to represent the people of Alberta. But, going back to late summer, these questions were asked in the heritage trust fund committee on several occasions. The answers are there.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo mentioned how the minister of health answered his questions. But I think he answered in a very forthright manner. He agreed that the problems may not exist there. I think it's most unfair to be critical of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources because he couldn't answer one question. He's had a very difficult year, and I find it most amazing that the hon. member would suggest that he should know the answer to everything that comes up in his department.

Getting back to the matter of the investment. I know the hon. members think we should buy low and sell high. As the hon. Member for Bow Valley says, that's not the easiest thing in the world to do. It doesn't work. In the market place we have stock exchanges, over-the-counter market places, and people in institutions making decisions every day. Some of them are wise, and some are not. Some of them depend on the death of foreign leaders or bad crops in Russia. They depend on the way the interest rate goes; they depend on lots of things. As the Premier mentioned earlier today, if you have a portfolio of investments you're looking after and you don't make any mistakes, then obviously you're not being a very aggressive investor.

I'd to mention one other thing. When we first held our meetings on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund this summer. I was distressed that the members of the opposition didn't even appear. We were concerned that perhaps they were boycotting the entire hearings. They had lots of opportunity to come and ask questions, but they never showed. The Member for Calgary Buffalo brought forward many, many recommendations. Then he would not support them, Mr. Speaker. He voted against his own recommendations, and said they were just brought by him as a messenger from the people.

MR. SINDLINGER: That's not fair.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Check the record.

MR. SINDLINGER: I know what I said, and you know it, too.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, we know the record is there, and it can be checked. I'd be quite happy to have it checked anytime.

I'd like to read one other thing. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo mentioned something about the person who preceded him in that seat mentioning the railroading of the Bill in the House. I would just like to point out an item in *Hansard* that I would like to comment on. If I can just find it, it'll perhaps answer the . . . Here is the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo speaking on the Bill when it was introduced:

Mr. Speaker, with major [investments] of legislation that come before this House, it is often the case that a number of principles in a Bill warrant discussion. This is certainly the case in the matter of the Bill presently under discussion. But there is one major, overriding principle in this Bill that is of fundamental significance, Mr. Speaker. It is simple. It is alluded to in the preamble to the Bill, and it basically

says to Albertans: wake up, you have it better here than anywhere else in the country. You have the lowest taxes. You have the lowest gas prices. You don't have any sales tax. There's more per capita spending on education, health care, and social assistance in this province than anywhere else. You're getting these benefits, not because you're any smarter or any better than anyone else, but because of the God-given gift of the resources in our ground that are coming out and won't be returned. It's a one-shot deal, and when it's gone, it's gone. If you don't put something away for a rainy day, those who follow us will have good cause to criticize the selfishness and greed of Albertans and this Legislature in the '60s, '70s, and '80s.

A simple principle, Mr. Speaker: in my view, a principle that is unquestionably correct, irrebuttably sound, and unquestionably accepted by all responsible Albertans; a major principle in this Bill that I am sure is accepted by all members of this House, and if it is not, it should be.

I want that in the record, because the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo was leaving the impression that perhaps the former member was not in support of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I say one other thing in closing, Mr. Speaker. As the previous hon. member mentioned, the nature of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is unprecedented. As I mentioned earlier, I'm distressed at the performance of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, and I've been a member of it ever since its inception. I know that we have had weeks of argument about a \$60 million loss on a fluctuating market. What concerns me is that there was no debate on the direction of the funds. We have billions of dollars that have to be fully invested, and the recommendations that come forward have nothing of this nature. There was no evidence of any fraud, collusion, or theft, and the Auditor General was sure to tell us that.

Mr. Speaker, the implication was left by one of the members — I forget which one — that they stayed here all night, and those of us over here were coming and going on a reserve system, and weren't here all night. My colleague on the right and my colleague on the left were here all night long, Mr. Speaker. We did have to go to the bathroom occasionally; we did have to get coffee occasionally to stay awake. But we were here all night as well as them.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is going to go to Calgary and tell the people that \$60 million was stolen. I can assure him that other members are going to be there, telling people that while \$60 million was lost, it was a loss generated from an investment in the market place. There was no theft, no fraud, or no collusion of any kind.

Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, point of order. Just for the record, at no time in the House or outside the House, have I ever said, or even implied, that \$60 million was stolen from the heritage fund.

MR. MUSGREAVE: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, he's absolutely right.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments on some very significant charges laid during the course of debate on this motion and the numerous amendments and subamendments put yesterday and today. The charge

somehow suggests that we as a government are interfering with the freedom of speech of some hon. members in this Assembly. I've considered that charge very seriously, because it is a very significant one.

Freedom of speech is freedom — together with the other freedoms we list in our Bill of Rights — that we've enjoyed and that we will strongly defend. Freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press: nowhere in that list of freedoms is a freedom to listen or a freedom not to listen. Presumably, it's assumed that we will never force anybody to listen to the remarks of others.

As I listened, forced or otherwise, to the remarks of some of the members of the opposition who spoke. I was reminded of the story — and I think the Member for Vegreville first related this story to me — about a very, very cold Alberta Sunday. The minister at a particular church was ready for services, and because of the weather, nobody showed up, save one lone farmer. The minister approached the farmer and said, perhaps . . .

DR. BUCK: I've heard that story.

MR. KOZIAK: I'm glad the hon. member remembers this, because it'll be useful in the little lesson we'll be using during the course of my remarks.

Perhaps we should cancel the service. The gentleman said, well, you know, I'm a farmer. I have a herd of cattle, and on occasion I take a load of hay to feed those cattle. On certain occasions, perhaps only one cow will come. When that occasion arises, I still feed that one cow. The minister was inspired by those remarks, continued with the service, and went on with a blistering sermon. After a substantial and lengthy sermon, he went to the back of the church where the farmer was seated and said, well, what did you think about that? The farmer said well, when I go out with my load of hay, and there's only one cow, I don't feed it the whole load. Mr. Speaker, we've been getting the whole load from members of the opposition throughout this entire debate; the whole load that for some reason or other, their freedom of speech is being eroded.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech provides the opportunity for individuals in a free and democratic society to express their point of view without worry about recrimination, subject only, as I mentioned on previous occasions, to the laws of libel, slander, and defamation. And even in that respect, members within this Assembly are protected. So we have that freedom of speech, whereby we can share knowledge, express our thoughts and emotions, entertain, and we don't have to worry that we are limited in some way in the content of what we say. Now we are getting from members of the opposition, a new interpretation of the concept of freedom of speech, whereby freedom of speech is expanded, not to deal with freedom from recrimination for what one says, but freedom to speak for as long as one wants and to require others to listen to them.

Now, that's a new concept of freedom of speech. As I say, we have not listed freedom to listen in the freedoms we hold dear. We can assume that any time someone's expressions are boring or otherwise, we can leave. We're getting a new approach to freedom of speech in this Assembly; one that suggests a member should be entitled to speak on a subject, or without a subject, for as long as he wishes, and that others should be required to listen. That's a completely new concept of freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the motion, of the five

members who have risen on numerous occasions, I would single out perhaps one who has in fact shared some information and provided us with some knowledge and entertainment, and that's the Member for Bow Valley. But in all other respects, we've been getting a repetition of such things as freedom of speech, as if by repeating them 10 or 100 times, somehow or other the weight of their argument is improved. That has not, in fact, been the case.

We have been told that the opposition has decided upon a course of action, a filibuster. They fully realize the meaning of that. The only reason they put that forward is because they haven't got certain answers on \$60 million allegedly lost in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Well, there was a request by the Executive Council of this government to the Auditor General to provide that information. Still, they're not satisfied. They want to hold the session and continue speaking, and have everybody else listen while the Auditor prepares his report. Then, perhaps in March, while we've had a continuous monologue — or what one might call it — of bunk, we would consider the Auditor's report, as if it would go stale in the meantime were we not in this Assembly speaking all the time the Auditor was working on his report.

If there's a failure, when one considers the freedom of speech, it's the failure not of the one who is listening but the one who's speaking. Mr. Speaker, we don't say the reader has failed because an author cannot write a book that people will purchase. We don't say that the listeners fail because the musician cannot play to the audience, and the audience doesn't want to listen. It's the speaker, Mr. Speaker — not you in your Chair, but the one who is speaking — who fails if he is unable, during the length of time he is on his feet, to sway the opinion of others.

I've listened to see if there is some modicum of truth to the charges that have been laid that the freedom of speech of members of this Assembly has somehow been eroded by this resolution, that some black day has fallen upon us. They've spoken for hours, Mr. Speaker. And during those hours, they have not raised anything that would sway me to their point of view. With that, Mr. Speaker, they've used their freedom of speech, but not very effectively. There is no reason for me to change my mind in the way I will vote on the motion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, today we approach the end of this debate with regard to the closure motion, the amendment before us that asks that the closure motion be delayed until March 23, 1982. We can say that today is a black day, a very sad day for the democratic process in this Legislature, that is to represent the ideas of the people in Alberta and follow through and fulfil the wishes and desires of Albertans. Mr. Speaker, it's the day when all those kinds of things are cut short. The hon. minister, the Member for Edmonton Strathcona, says he can't see where there is a black day, where there are shortcomings in the act that's taking place at the present time. The hon. member is as callous as the other members in that government, and are not observers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think hon. members will realize that the latitude on the debate that has been going on since yesterday afternoon has been phenomenal. If we're going to discuss the topic, as I've said on previous interventions, let's leave the personality of the members alone. They were chosen by their constituents. We're not here to assess their shortcomings. We're here to assess the

merits and shortcomings, possibly, of ideas and proposals. It's unacceptable to say that a member is callous.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, this government is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I respectfully ask the hon. leader if he would deal further with the question of somebody being callous.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. As I understand the situation, I as a member am allowed to interpret or use an adjective to describe the government in general. I could in turn say that possibly one of the members is part of that callous government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is ample parliamentary precedent to indicate that a full and unquibbling withdrawal of an offensive expression does credit to the member who withdraws it. I invite the hon. leader to consider that. There is no question about the government. It wasn't said that the government was callous. The government isn't a member of this Assembly. It was said of another hon. member. I respectfully ask the Leader of the Opposition if he would kindly direct his attention just briefly to that remark before he goes on with the rest of what he wants to say in this debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly know that in the rules you're not allowed to talk specifically about a member, but I certainly still apply the word "callous" to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not concerned about that. I'm concerned about the word "callous" as used with respect to another hon. member of this Assembly, whose rights to his good name here, and the respect of his constituents, are equal to those of any other member of this Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, then I withdraw that. That's fine. But it doesn't change the situation one iota. Today is a black day in this Legislature, where the freedom of speech is eroded by a government that is bludgeoning free speech, pushing it down into the ground, so that members in this Legislature and members in the future will be limited in expressing their points of view for their constituents, for the people they represent, for all Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, that concept of free speech, the ability of members in this House to speak for their people, is very important. The desires and needs of people are only met when that kind of objective can be fulfilled. We have had a member in this Legislature say that speaking at length, speaking on topics without persuading other members of the Legislature, is not part of the concept of free speech. Maybe it is; maybe it isn't. I don't believe that long discourses for no reason have any purpose in this Legislature. We on this side of the House have not taken that approach. The debate all last evening was for a very specific purpose, Mr. Speaker. We as a minority group in this Legislature knew that if we didn't fight for our rights and for the rights of future minority groups in this Legislature, they would be trampled by this closure resolution, trampled during this period of time.

We are setting a precedent in this Legislature. It is the first time that closure will be used in the Alberta Legislature. That means that other governments that follow, other members who sit in this Legislature, will be faced with the concept of closure. Because it has occurred once,

there is precedent. It's easy for the government to use it again. There will be members standing up on the government side of the House; House leaders in the future will stand in their place and say, the minority groups, the small opposition, has been delaying the supply and the estimates. What do you do with them? Historically and by precedent, you bring in closure. That's what you do. So governments will find it a very easy type of technique to push down that freedom of speech in the future, to not allow the democratic process to be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, that's why we're concerned. Albertans today are concerned the very same way. I have never had more phone calls to my office in a period of one day than I have had today. I have had some 75 calls to my office indicating support for the move, the debate, and the stamina we have taken in this Legislature. I as Leader of the Opposition, and my colleagues the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the independent Member the hon. Mr. Sindlinger, have stood for freedom of speech, have stood against a large government, that's going to push a resolution through, that will defeat the amendment of my hon. colleague that we're discussing at the present time; an amendment that says, give us just a little more breathing room, don't rush the closure resolution through, don't bring in closure till March 23, 1982.

By the end of March 1982, when the estimate must be passed, when Bill 69 must be in place, closure may have a purpose. But today in this Legislature, this evening in this Legislature, a motion of closure has no place. There is no need for closure. No reasons have been given by any member of this Legislature. The members for Edmonton Strathcona, Three Hills, Drayton Valley, and Calgary McKnight have not given one good reason why a motion of closure must be brought in at this time, why they want to defeat the amendment: not one good reason.

The only thing that happened in those few words presented in this Legislature was an attempt to discredit the contribution of debate of members on this side of the Legislature, to belittle them, to say that the debate was insignificant, that we were repeating ourselves, that we repeated ourselves eight or nine times. That kind of debate has nothing to do with the real question before us. The question is closure. The question with regard to the amendment is whether it happens tonight or March 23, 1982. That is the question. We in the opposition are saying, give us a little breathing time so the democratic process can exist. But I know, we know, the government is going to defeat the amendment and is going to say breathing time isn't necessary in the democratic process; you have asked enough questions; you have embarrassed us enough; you have exposed the fact that this government will not reveal documents and information necessary for good study of estimates and expenditures of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

We have exposed the fact that this government doesn't really care about public information for the public, so that the public knows that all accountability has taken place. We have exposed that fact. That fact today is out in the rural and urban communities of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: The people of Alberta know it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: They know today, firstly, that there is a \$60 million realized loss. As well, they know that we as members of the Legislature have no documented evidence as to why that loss occurred, not one iota of documented evidence that could be presented in this Legislature. This government has had the opportunity for

10 years to sit in a complacent, callous position, callous to the needs of other members of the Legislature, to the minority groups of the Legislature, to the basic principle of parliamentary law in *Beauchesne*, quoted in this Legislature a number of times in the last few days, saying that government has a responsibility to be concerned about the minority rights of smaller groups, parties, or individuals in the Legislature. But that's ignored. It doesn't mean anything. The government says, we have the information: we're running this show; don't worry about it; don't bother asking for information, because we're not going to give it to you anyway; whether it's needed or not, we're not going to give it to you.

In this debate that has gone on up to this point in time, and as well the study of estimates . . . Sure, we've been given very generalized kinds of material. In the study of Executive Council estimates, in terms of workers' compensation, I raised the question: why can't we get specific information instead of generalizations like we're always getting? The minister had never done his homework and brought the material here, so we could have specific information to make good decisions and take our responsibility.

But that's not the custom of this government. They have grown to a position where information, documents, and investments of nearly \$2 billion to the heritage fund should be privileged to cabinet. We as Albertans, who really own the money, can't even question or ask to see some documents as to how those millions of dollars are invested. We don't even know what traders are handling the money. We don't know what markets are being distorted. Canada investment division: we can't even see the agreements with other provinces. We have no part in the discussion as to whether or not another province of Canada should get money, not one iota of discussion. The Alberta investment division: we can't even ask questions about the Alberta Energy Corporation. We can't even ask questions about PWA, because they're two arms removed from this Legislature with public money. How can you hold anybody accountable with that kind of attitude. The capital division: sure, we get some information about 12 per cent of the expenditure: 88 per cent handled by the Premier, the Provincial Treasurer, and most likely the House leader. The rest of the cabinet may get a bit of a view of projects and may not. That is not the democratic process. That is not how public business is done in the public. You don't make decisions behind closed doors unless you can be answerable for them in the public arena, and that's here in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, what's our reward? What's the reward of this minority group, this opposition group on this side of the Legislature, five members of the Legislature who have worked hard to hold that government accountable. What is our reward? Our reward is the strong arm of government through a motion of closure, to grab us by the neck and say, you're going to stop speaking; go home; we don't need you in this Legislature anymore; you're too much of a problem. As I said last night in my remarks, it's a backhand to members on this side of the Legislature, a backhand to our responsibility. We are trying to be responsible, but the government that hides information, that has a big majority, that doesn't show a bit of tolerance, understanding, and responsibility to their public function by providing more information as we requested, doesn't participate in that responsible action. That's sad. That's the sad part of it. That's the way this Legislature is.

After all these years in the Legislature of Alberta, in

the year 1981, after a Conservative government took over in this province, a government that is supposed to believe in free speech and individual initiative, that people can reach their own potential by providing the right environment, by allowing people to participate and interact to help the province grow: believing in those kinds of basic concepts. Believing, as the Premier of this province said in earlier statements, that the Legislature is supreme, that all information should be made available to the Legislative Assembly, that decisions shouldn't be made behind closed doors in the cabinet room through orders in council — he's going to turn every rock over, look underneath, and find out all the information. Mr. Speaker, those kinds of objectives were supposedly part of the government that came in 10 years ago.

In 10 years, this government has eroded and abused its right and responsibility to the democratic process. Today we face a closure motion that is unnecessary, that doesn't serve any purpose other than to send us in the opposition home. Mr. Speaker, I most likely would have been proud to be able to stand on this side of the House and debate good reasons for closure. But as I said, the government came in with the measure, they're strong-arming it through the Legislature without a list of reasons of any kind. I think the least we could expect from this government is three good reasons why closure should exist at this time, and there were none. Not one good reason was presented to us in this Legislature: no reason of urgency, no demand on funds. The only reasons we could come up with were personal reasons of the Conservative members in this House, Mr. Speaker. They wanted to have a holiday; they wanted to get out of the Legislature; we were too much of a bother in their daily work and pattern of life, and supposedly in their responsibility as elected members to this Legislature. Well that's not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, we have staked our responsibility, our future, on two arguments in this Legislature this fall. We think they are very important arguments. They are very important principles to fight for. As long as we're in the opposition, I'm sure we're going to fight for those principles. The first one is freedom of speech. We've fought for that over the last three to four week period, and we're not going to stop. We're not going to let the majority government take that right away from us or from future members of this Legislature. We feel we have some good reasons, with regard to freedom of speech, when we look at this closure motion. As I mentioned the other day, the first closure was by Speaker Brand in 1881, because of obstruction. In our debate last evening and early on Monday, we pointed out that we did not obstruct the progress of this Legislature in any way. All business, as far as we can see and understand from the government's agenda, has been completed except Bill 69 and the study of estimates. All other important business has been completed. Mr. Speaker, the reason for closure historically — because of obstruction — is not here.

Secondly, in terms of freedom of speech, we believe that the Legislature is supreme and that decisions must be made in this Legislature. All evidence and information should be provided to members of this Legislature so good decisions can be made. That relates to accountability, Mr. Speaker, and that's the second principle. The specific item of concern we've had in this Legislature — and it is not only our concern but the concern of Albertans all over Alberta. They're saying: where is that \$60 million; where was it lost; can the government document what has happened? And during this last week as I traveled through my constituency and people phoned

me at my office, they added something else to the story. People in Alberta today are concerned that the government is hiding something, that they're not coming forward with material information. They say what are they hiding? What have they done that's wrong?

Finally in the history of this Conservative Party. Albertans have a big question in their minds that this government has not answered, a question that could have been answered six or seven weeks ago. In the most responsible way, through question period, we asked the Provincial Treasurer to table documents that would support the reasons for the loss of the \$60 million. Motions for a returns, letters in the House, estimates study, private conversation: saying to the government, we need that kind of documentation. It is the only way we can assure ourselves and Albertans that the \$60 million was lost in a responsible way, that all documentation was in place, that management procedures were in place, and that we didn't have to worry about the concern of the Auditor General in this report, where he said

there is considerable scope for collusion between an investment trader employed by the Treasury Department and someone in one of the brokerage houses, which could result in fraud.

Mr. Speaker, that's how serious the situation was. We gave the government ample opportunity to present that information to us in this Legislature on many occasions. But the government said, no, you can't have it.

So the government has a couple of problems to deal with because of that very fact. One, they're answerable to the public of Alberta today, not only to us on this side of the Legislature. That's going to be a tougher situation, a tougher question to answer than the question we keep raising in this Legislature when, on behalf of Albertans, we say produce the documentation. Show us how that \$60 million was lost. Give us the documentation. Tell us what management procedure was put in place so it would not happen again. Mr. Speaker, that's the way it is.

After they've pushed this motion of closure upon us, it's going to be incumbent upon the government to answer that question for the public of Alberta. We can do it a number of different ways. The obvious way is through the polls. The government can go to the people and say, look, we are responsible, we can account for that \$60 million loss. Secondly, they can come forward again, reassess their position, and provide the documents for us. Thirdly, I suppose the government can do nothing and sit in a rather callous position and say it's going to go away, don't worry about it. We've got lots of money; we can buy all the votes we want next time. We'll distract the attention of Albertans. Mr. Speaker, this question in the minds of Albertans today: the erosion of freedom of speech in this Legislature, and the erosion of freedom of speech of the representatives of the people of Alberta, and number two, that this government has not accounted for the \$60 million loss, is going to question the accountability of this government.

We feel very strongly about this matter. We have been persistent in our debate and in raising questions. We know this motion of closure is going to come down upon us here tonight. I appreciate the backbenchers who at least stood up and said something in this Legislature. I look at a number of backbenchers taking their directions from the House leader or others. Maybe they are not taking a personal stand with regard to this matter. Those members must live with their conscience, because it's something that's even greater than loyalty to the House leader or to the Premier. Historically when members in

this Legislature look back, if they haven't stood in their places to fight this motion of closure, they can live with their guilt. I hope the people of Alberta — and I will assist in this situation — will not have short memories and forget the way this government has treated the opposition, members of this Legislature, elected representatives; have violated the very basic principle of parliamentary law which says the government or a large majority has the responsibility to protect a minority in that legislature so they can have freedom of speech.

Well, that's the way this government has treated the opposition. They're treating the people of Alberta with the same kind of contempt, and collectively they will have to live with that responsibility. As individuals, members on that side of the House will have to live with their conscience because they didn't fight this motion of closure that's coming in without any reason at all — no valid reason in the parliamentary system, only personal desire and reason of individuals who would rather be doing something else than sit in this Legislature and take responsibility.

MR. CRAWFORD: It's the first opposition in history to make it necessary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, we in this Legislature . . .

DR. BUCK: We're the mean five.

MR. NOTLEY: Beating up all you guys.

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . will continue to take our responsibility. We have allowed the business of this House to proceed and have not delayed it in any way. The Government House Leader has not argued the case of obstruction in any way, has not made any case for it because there is no case. In his remarks, the House leader may try to make a case that we have delayed or stopped business. The two items of business, Bill 69 and the study of estimates for supply, do not require approval until March 31, 1982, and this should not be forgotten by the public or members of this Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY: Exactly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: There is no haste.

MR. NOTLEY: There's lots of time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The amendment before us says that if the government has such a desire to put closure and the principle of closure in this Legislature, then the least they can do is delay it until March 23, 1982, so that in the meantime, as the House sits in a reasonable way and at a reasonable time, we can study the estimates and hold the government accountable. Because that's our responsibility in this Legislature. We're not going to stop that responsibility. On behalf of my colleagues, I would have to say this has been the first time that this government has really been held accountable for some of their actions — this Legislature, spring and fall. That type of situation is difficult for this government to handle. Because the normal practice of this government is to have things their way all the time. After observation, I have found that that is not necessarily the best way for the public of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government must learn that they have a responsibility in this Legislature equally as

much — and even more — as they have to their cabinet or whatever other responsibilities ministers and backbenchers take. The greatest responsibility is here. The Premier of this province said "the legislature has supremacy over government". This Assembly has supremacy over the Conservative government. The Premier made that statement on February 16, 1968. Today that statement is forgotten, and it's unfortunate.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have pursued two objects with all gusto. We feel we have accomplished as much as we can and have taken responsibility in this Legislature. That responsibility for accountability of the government will not stop. We have a task, and it is made even more difficult by the motion of closure. It is made more difficult because of the way this Conservative government views a minority opposition. It is made more difficult when individual members and ministers feel they are not responsible, firstly, to the public of Alberta and we on this side of the House; that they can quickly dismiss us by a motion of the back of the hand. But that kind of attitude of this government will only encourage us to fight on, and we intend to fight on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion on the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. members at the back of the Chamber please resume their seats.

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker. R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Adair	Hyndman	Paproski
Anderson, C.	Isley	Planche
Borstad	Johnston	Purdy
Chambers	King	Reid
Chichak	Kowalski	Russell
Crawford	Koziak	Schmidt
Cripps	Kushner	Shaben
Diachuk	Little	Stromberg
Embury	McCrae	Thompson
Fjordbotten	Miller	Topolnisky
Fyfe	Moore	Trynchy
Gogo	Musgreave	Woo
Hiebert	Oman	Young
Hyland	Osterman	Zaozirny

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 42
---------	----------	-----------

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments, I would like to address my remarks to the two issues which have been combined in the discussion of this resolution. The first relates to the investment of certain moneys of the Alberta heritage trust fund. The second relates to the business of the House, or perhaps to the question of freedom of speech.

On the first question, Mr. Speaker, the House hardly needs to be reminded that during the course of the fall session, concerns and questions were raised about some of the investments of moneys in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It is important to note that no charges were

ever made, either formally or informally, not at least to my knowledge. There have been no charges of malfeasance in any of the operations of the fund, no charges of malfeasance with respect to any of the funds under administration. Simply, questions or concerns have been raised about the possibility of malfeasance.

The reaction of the government to that was quite simple and straightforward. Pursuant to the legislation, a direction has been given to the Auditor General, who is not an employee of the government. He is an employee, a servant of the Legislative Assembly; that is to say, he is a servant of every member of this House, irrespective of the side of the House on which they sit, although it goes without saying that he is not the servant of any member individually but of the House as a whole. A direction has gone to the Auditor General that he should consider the circumstances surrounding the concerns raised, that he should make a report upon those circumstances to satisfy himself, and that that report should be provided first of all to the Executive Council, secondly to a committee of this House, and thirdly to the public generally.

In other words, in response to the concerns having been raised, an officer of this Assembly is going to investigate those concerns and is going to make a report, which will be public information. Of course, we know that recently the opposition exercised its undoubted right to make representations to the Auditor General about a more precise consideration that he might give to the questions under review.

The question of course is: why did the government choose this course of action? We have been asked for management letters. Why have we not simply laid the management letters on the table? The answer has been given on more than one occasion, but bears repeating here briefly this evening. The heritage fund is one of the largest pools of money in Canada. Aside from the consolidated cash investment fund of the federal government, and perhaps the government of Ontario, it exceeds virtually every other pool of money in this country. As such, it is clearly the case that many people would dearly like to have clues as to the investment strategy of the managers of the fund. It is unquestionably the case that shrewd people, knowledgeable in the investment community, could benefit, either on their own behalf or on behalf of clients, either directly or indirectly, if they were able, and to the extent they were able, to deduce the investment strategy of the fund managers. It is equally true that some of that deduction would be possible on the basis of the publication of the internal working documents of the administrators of the fund. The question is very simple: do we want to make public the kind of information which might constitute the basis for shrewd deductions about the investment strategy of the fund, by which deduction not only could others benefit but we would have to appreciate as well that there might be a consequent loss of opportunity for the fund itself, or susceptibility to influence.

The concerns were expressed by the hon. members opposite; the reply has been made on more than one occasion by representatives of the government. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the opposition are under no obligation to accept any argument by the Provincial Treasurer or any member of this government. But granting that it is true that they have no obligation to accept our position, it is equally true that they have no inherent right to paralyze the business of the House simply because they refuse to accept the argument of the government.

There has been obstruction in this House. It has been a limited obstruction, confined to Bill 69, with the prospect of its application to two other Bills on notice. It is limited obstruction; nevertheless it is clearly obstruction. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that in consideration of the heritage fund issue, it quickly became apparent that the arguments of the opposition had no compelling attraction among the electorate generally. Therefore, it became necessary to shift the ground of the argument. That appears to have proceeded.

We come then to the question of freedom of speech and the rights and privileges of hon. members of the Assembly. I'd like to begin by saying that I believe that inherent in the idea of freedom is the idea of responsibility. No freedom is unrestrained. Freedom is not licence: the two are not synonymous. There can be no consideration of rights without the consideration of the inherent responsibilities associated with each and every right.

It is also true that we rely upon and value more than one freedom. In this country, in this province, and in this Legislature, we enjoy an array of freedoms, each of which we should guard jealously. I want to congratulate the opposition for their vigor in that respect, if not for their judgment. There can be no consideration of freedom without recognizing that it has many dimensions. The freedom we enjoy in this Legislature is not simply freedom of speech, important though that freedom is. We are free to speak. We are also free to stand for election. We are free to assemble. We are free to conduct the people's business. And, perhaps most important, we are free to conclude the people's business. We are free to judge and to be judged by our peers in the electoral process. We are free to benefit from the judgment of our peers, and we are free to suffer from the judgment of our peers. We have all both benefited and suffered from time to time.

For the exercise of all these freedoms, delicate balance and difficult judgments must be made. For just a moment, let's consider freedom of speech. I say again that it grants no licence. It is not unrestricted. In the community generally, I am not free to defame a man. I am not free to espouse race warfare. In this Legislature, I am not free to speak for the same length of time as the Leader of the Opposition. I am not free to use unparliamentary language. I am not free to speak to any issue I choose at any time I choose. My freedom exists within a structure. As someone once said, your right to swing your arm ends where my nose begins.

I don't consider freedom of speech to be unrestrained. A certain order is required if our individual and collective freedoms, the freedom of the majority as well as of the minority, are to be manifested in harmonious ways. Closure — and this is what has been applied — has not limited in any way whatsoever any hon. member's freedom to say what he wants to say. His rights with respect to freedom of speech now are precisely what they were one day ago or six months ago. Last week, if we could use Thursday afternoon as an example, the so-called defence of the Alamo was abandoned briefly in order that at least some members could speak to the media. I find it interesting that we describe this as the defence of the Alamo, because it reminds me that at the first Alamo, Davy Crockett would not have stepped outside the fort to speak to the media. If he had, he would have left some dummies on the palisades.

DR. BUCK: The dummies were in here.

MR. KING: The proposed limit is on how much time may be taken to say what needs to be said. I would only recall for hon. members that the Sermon on the Mount and the Gettysburg Address took considerably less time to communicate than some of the ideas expressed in this Assembly. I know they have had, and suspect they will continue to have, more impact than anything said in this Assembly.

No one has ever described the essential characteristic of free speech as the right to speak *ad nauseam*. No one has ever described the essential characteristic of free speech as imposing on anyone else an obligation to listen *ad nauseam*, or to respond to unworthy, irrelevant, or repetitious statements. No one has ever argued that the essential characteristic of free speech is that we should sacrifice service for talk.

The government has made a judgment, for which we accept responsibility. We have expressed our judgment to the House. There has been public debate, characterized by free speech, and the public will judge us. We have the conviction that our responsibility to serve the people of the province is exercised not only in this House but outside this House as well. We have the conviction that we have an obligation to serve the people of the province by establishing a budget, for example — not a problem, I might say, prior to 1971 since the House never sat in the fall to interfere with the budget-setting process. We have a responsibility to develop service programs. We have a responsibility to respond to constituents. We have a responsibility to meet with groups that have valuable ideas for the improvement of life in this province. We have a responsibility to negotiate various agreements on behalf of our citizens. We have responsibilities outside this House. They are not related to the convenience of any members of this House. We will honor our obligations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Hyndman	Paproski
Anderson, C.	Isley	Planche
Appleby	Johnston	Purdy
Borstad	King	Reid
Carter	Kowalski	Russell

Chambers	Koziak	Schmidt
Chichak	Kushner	Shaben
Crawford	Little	Stromberg
Cripps	McCrae	Thompson
Diachuk	Miller	Topolnisky
Embury	Moore	Trynchy
Fjordbotten	Musgreave	Woo
Fyfe	Oman	Young
Hiebert	Osterman	Zaozirny
Hyland		

Against the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R..
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Totals	Ayes - 43	Noes - 5
--------	-----------	----------

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is negated.

MR. NOTLEY: Negated?

MR. SPEAKER: Negated.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. The motion is carried, adopted, agreed to.

MR. NOTLEY: We were a little more hopeful there for a moment.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask you not to keep us in suspense too long on such matters.

Later today, Committee of Supply will be called. The sitting at 2:30 will be the first day of the five. The items in Committee of Supply will be under Hospitals and Medical Care. The suggestion is that the committee begin with consideration of the item regarding funds for applied cancer research, and if there is time, to look at the next item as well, the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Special Services Facility.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly adjourn until this afternoon at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS. Agreed.

[The House adjourned at 12:07 a.m. on December 9, 1981]

