

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, March 8, 1982 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Commonwealth Day

MR. SPEAKER: As hon. members are no doubt aware, today is Commonwealth Day, a day of special significance to us, a reminder that we belong to a parliament, which in turn belongs to a long tradition which is shared by a substantial number of other parliaments throughout the Commonwealth. I think it is probably accurate to say that the Commonwealth is a group of parliamentary self-governing democracies unique in history. The day has a special significance for us because we are also members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, an association which gives us opportunity for exchange and sharing with our colleagues in the other parliaments throughout the Commonwealth.

The day is of course significant to both men and women, but there is another day which is also significant to men and women today, namely, International Women's Day. Perhaps it would be fair to say that that has a special significance for women. Consequently I have taken the liberty of asking the longest serving woman member of the Assembly if she might wish to make some remarks appropriate for this day.

International Women's Day

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed very grateful for this opportunity to bring a message to my colleagues, the members of the Legislature, and to you. As you indicated, today is International Women's Day. March 8 was proclaimed International Women's Day in 1910 to commemorate a women's rights demonstration for economic independence and freedom in New York city in 1908.

Over the last few years, a coalition of women's organizations and individuals has renewed the celebration in most Canadian cities. In Alberta, numerous activities have been planned to mark International Women's Day. Some of those activities commenced on Saturday in the city of Edmonton. The activities are to continue over the next week with various functions to take place to indicate the progress that has been made, the further recognition that needs to be given, and the struggle that continues for recognition of the equality of service and the significance of women. Various activities are also being planned in other centres across the province.

On behalf of my colleagues I would like to extend support, recognition, and encouragement to all women in Alberta on this International Women's Day and to recognize that among the members, both the men and the women have a common goal and are working together. It is an encouragement that there be established as early as possible in those areas where there is an absence, equality of service and recognition.

We wish all women and their organizations well in

continuing to pursue — and I wish to applaud those men who, as the other half of our population, are with us and are hoping that we resolve the differences and the difficulties and that in fact we will all come to the same ultimate goal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 8****Transportation of Dangerous Goods
Control Act**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 8, being the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Control Act.

This Act is similar, if not almost identical, to the legislation which was introduced last fall and which has been reviewed by many parties throughout Alberta during the course of the fall and early winter. It is our intention that this Bill proceed through all stages of the Legislature and receive Royal Assent in the spring session.

[Leave granted; Bill 8 read a first time]

Bill 7**Planning Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 7, being the Planning Amendment Act, 1982.

This Bill is designed to ensure that parcels of land registered for title under Section 84 of the existing Act have proper and legal access.

[Leave granted; Bill 7 read a first time]

Bill 205**Ambulance Service Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 205, the Ambulance Service Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish a uniform, high standard ambulance service across Alberta. The Bill sets out a mechanism for legislative approval for funding the service and establishes the basic standards which ambulance services would provide.

[Leave granted; Bill 205 read a first time]

Bill 204**Agricultural Land Protection Act**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might introduce Bill No. 204, the Agricultural Land Protection Act.

Among other things, it establishes an agricultural lands commission. The commission would have the power to review the Planning Act and recommend changes to reinforce the primary policy need to protect agricultural land from redevelopment. It would also establish an agricultural land preservation fund. Among other things, that fund would purchase protection rights on prime agricultural land.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

Bill 5
Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 5, the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation Amendment Act, 1982.

The purpose of this amendment is to enable the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation to have a broader investment base and to clarify and update the authorities and responsibilities of the members of the corporation.

[Leave granted; Bill 5 read a first time]

Bill 3
Department of Government Services
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 3, the Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1982. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, there are three principles in the Bill, all very brief but all very significant. The first is the substitution of a representative of the Auditor General to the Public Records Committee in place of the representative of the Provincial Treasurer. This results from a recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, which recognized the independence of the Auditor General, and is a carry-over from the period when he was the Provincial Treasurer.

The second provision is the provision of statutory authority for the Department of Government Services to provide a telecommunications service for government. The third point is the increase of the revolving fund of the Department of Government Services.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 read a first time]

Bill 2
Legislative Offices Statutes
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I also beg leave to introduce Bill No. 2, the Legislative Offices Statutes Amendment Act, 1982.

The amendments are to provide for the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices to review the estimates of expenditure of the offices of both the Chief Electoral Officer and the Ombudsman. It is consistent with the legislation that applies to the Auditor General and, again, results from a recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

Bill 203
An Act to Amend the
Financial Administration Act to
Control Special Warrant Procedures

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 203, An Act to Amend the Financial Administration Act to Control Special Warrant Procedures.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would require more rigorous

certification of the urgency of a special warrant expenditure requested by a cabinet minister. As well, the Bill would limit the total special warrant spending by government to 4 per cent in the fiscal year. Any expenditures beyond that amount would require calling together the Legislature for the appropriation.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

Bill 6
Public Lands Amendment Act, 1982

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 6, being the Public Lands Amendment Act, 1982.

These amendments will serve to improve the management of dispositions of Crown land in Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 6 read a first time]

Bill 10
Law of Property Amendment Act, 1982

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 10, the Law of Property Amendment Act, 1982.

It is a significant Bill for the consumer. The proposed amendments in the Law of Property Amendment Act, 1982, provide that the mortgagee provide a statement of charges at no cost not more than twice a year at the request of the mortgagor, or purchaser, and that the mortgagee furnish a discharge of mortgage at no cost when the mortgage has been fully paid.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

Bill 9
Cancer Treatment and Prevention
Amendment Act, 1982

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 9, the Cancer Treatment and Prevention Amendment Act, 1982.

This Bill changes the name of the Act to the Cancer Programs Act. It also changes the name of the board to the Alberta Cancer Board. A new section is added, which extends the functions of the board to non-cancerous diseases. Section 11 expands the purchase or sale of pharmaceuticals or radio-pharmaceuticals. The amendment to Section 19 permits employees to be members of the hospital services utilization committee.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

Bill 4
Wildlife Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 4, the Wildlife Amendment Act, 1982.

This Bill will make a number of administrative changes which will provide more flexibility, thereby increasing the benefits to Albertans of the fish and wildlife resources in the province.

[Leave granted; Bill 4 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 4, 9, and 10 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table two documents. I've given notice to the Assembly with regard to the Speech to the Throne from the opposition; and secondly, a document called The Case for Revenue Sharing in Alberta. I'd like to share that, and I am tabling the required numbers.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure today in introducing a class of 25 grade 6 students from Lendrum school in the Edmonton Parkallen constituency. I'm not sure about these particular students, but I know their group leader has been here before.

I just take this opportunity to say what a very useful thing it is for students to be able to come and see the Legislative Assembly, as these youngsters are today. I hope they learn a lot about the building and the process while they're here. Mr. Speaker, I ask that they now rise and receive the recognition of the Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, today I'm pleased to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly 12 adult students from Continuing Education in the constituency of Edmonton Centre. They are accompanied by their leader Mr. Scragg, who is well known to many of us. These students represent many countries: China, Hong Kong, India, Vietnam, and the Ukraine. I ask that the members of this Legislature join me in welcoming these students as they rise.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce some members of Local 79 of the nurses' organization in general, as well as some specific people: Barbara Surdykowski, Deborah Weber, George Bowen, and Irene Gouin, who are leading members of that group. I'd like them to stand with the rest of Local 79 and be recognized by the Legislature.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Nurses' Strike

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, with regard to the strike we are facing at present and an update as to what is happening today. First of all, I'd like the minister to comment with regard to conditions in the hospital system. Secondly, could the minister look at the responsibility he has taken with regard to the negotiations and the partnership he forms with the AHA in the settlement of those negotiations?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to make the same correction I made last Friday. There's no partnership between me and the Alberta Hospital Association.

DR. BUCK: Who do they get the money from, Dave?

MR. RUSSELL: They are an autonomous body representing a number of various owners and a number of

elected and appointed boards. After what I've heard about autonomy from the other side, I'm really surprised that that question would come. I do not have any role with respect to the negotiating position or responsibilities of the Alberta Hospital Association.

Insofar as the condition of the hospitals is concerned, the report I got today shows things in a slightly improved manner, I suppose. Because of increasing staff numbers, some hospitals are able to expand services slightly. The count of nurses crossing the line this morning went up to 1,072. I'm told that the only significant change over the weekend is a noticeable tiring of the night shift at the University of Alberta hospital. Other than that, the system seems to be managing and holding well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Last Monday, the minister told the Assembly that his department receives reports daily from all the hospitals currently operating. Is that information exclusively from the administrators, or are the nurses of the hospital who are working a source? The minister just made reference to the staff at the University hospital. Specifically, are the nurses consulted with regard to the care going on in the various institutions?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the report itself — and it comes in tabulated form, phoned in by hospital administrators to my deputy minister, where it's put on a comprehensive provincial report form — is assessed that way. I'm advised that the administrators, through their nursing directors or acting nursing directors, get that advice with respect to the level of patient care and also with respect to the status of the nurses themselves; for example, the shifts they're working, what time off they're getting, whether or not they're tiring, how many nurses are crossing the line, how many out-of-scope nurses are on duty, and whether or not nurses are coming from other jurisdictions to take temporary employment. So we have a pretty comprehensive assessment of the nursing situation.

The other source of advice comes from the medical chiefs of staff, who report to the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Again, that advice is either relayed to me directly or through my deputy minister.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, then the hon. Member for Bow Valley. Then, if we don't forget the order, the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Recognizing that the department is monitoring the health care system, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has information as to whether those who are ill and awaiting hospitalization are getting sicker or their health is deteriorating as a result of the nurses' strike.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that is very difficult to assess. Because of the nature of the topic, it causes us a great deal of concern and a great deal of distress to me. We're getting advice from individual doctors and from a group such as the College of Family Physicians, from the medical staff of the University of Alberta hospital, and

from individual patients phoning the office in considerable numbers each day about the effect the work stoppage is having on their particular medical problems. There's no question in my mind that it is causing increasing distress and discomfort to a number of people waiting for hospital services.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care as well. I noted that some very precise numbers are kept as to the number of nurses working or crossing picket lines, and I wonder whether the minister could share similar precision in terms of the number of patients in the hospital who have surgical requirements that are not being treated because of this labor dispute?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't have those numbers, Mr. Speaker. And I don't know if there's any way of collecting them, because this goes back to every individual doctor's roster of patients throughout the province. We do have the number of surgical procedures that are occurring in different operating rooms throughout the province each day but, as I said earlier, my concern is for those people who aren't included in those statistics of work being done.

MR. MANDEVILLE: My supplementary question is also to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is the minister monitoring the number of nurses leaving the profession or the province to seek work elsewhere at this time?

MR. RUSSELL: We're not monitoring that as part of the strike situation, Mr. Speaker. I believe that information would be available by a canvass of the individual hospitals, asking for numbers of staff resignations.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, then the hon. Member for Calgary North West, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It's a follow-up to the questions my hon. colleague Mr. Mandeville and I asked. Is the minister in a position to indicate how many spots will be available when the minister has the new training facilities in place? How many students will those facilities be able to take? He can answer a supplement to the supplement at the same time: is there a waiting list of applicants wanting to get into these facilities?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Grande Prairie school of nursing, which was discussed in the question period last week, expects to take 20 students for the first manpower intake in the fall of this year, but of course the schools will grow substantially beyond that point as they adapt. Unfortunately, the school at Keyano hasn't yet progressed to the point where there will be an intake of students in the fall of 1982. But it is hoped that by the time the two-year schools are in full operation, they will each be able to accommodate significantly more numbers than the original intake at Grande Prairie.

I should point out as well, supplementary to the question asked the other day — and I did not have precise figures at that time — I indicated that approximately 900 students would receive upgrading courses this year. That was a two-year figure for the funding that was made available over a two-year period. In fact, I'm now advised that approximately 600 students in the first year of that two-year program received upgrading to permit nurses to return to the profession. In the coming year, approximately 530 spaces will be made available to accommodate in excess of 1,000 students in the two-year period, to permit them to upgrade and get back into the profession. Of course, that will have a much more significant impact than the introduction of the two nursing schools I referred to.

I should point out to the Assembly that it is also the intention of other nursing schools within the province to increase the number of students they will take. For example, in the degree nursing programs at the universities, an additional 18 student places will be made available; in the colleges programs, 79 additional student places; and in the hospitals programs, 110 additional places: a total of 207 additional places in the fall of '82-83.

As I indicated in my remarks in the Assembly last week, the increase in numbers of spaces available in Alberta will certainly not be sufficient to meet the future nursing manpower needs in this province. We will have to seek in-migration from other provinces and, indeed, from other parts of the world in order to increase the number of nurses to accommodate the growth in the hospital building program, which is well under way in the province.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I received a number of calls, and reports that a number of cancer patients who require surgery are being delayed have been made public. Has the minister had any reports from either the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the medical profession as to the status these delays in surgery are causing, particularly with respect to these serious cancer patients who are indicated as requiring immediate surgery?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in that by far the majority of persons I referred to earlier, waiting to get into hospitals but unable to, usually involve the treatment of cancer in some form or another, either as follow-up to radiation treatment or exploratory surgery. While their doctors are unable to say that it is an emergent type of surgery that should be carried out, it is very urgent in the eyes of the doctor and the patient. Naturally, the distress and worry of waiting two or three weeks' additional time to have that work done is affecting a large number of families in Alberta today.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the answer given by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care on that important subject. I've been concerned about the level of care of our citizens, particularly the sick at home. As a result, I asked for a special meeting with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which was held on Friday with the Minister and Deputy Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and me. Over the weekend, they provided us with their professional advice and assessment. We're considering that assessment, and I'll be reporting to the Legislature tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and the Minister of Labour. It's with regard to a document I have in my hand, from the acting executive director of the Royal Alex hospital to all nurses, urging them to come back to work and indicating to them that during the strike period it's legal for them to be in attendance at work.

My question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is: in terms of the minister's statement that all is well at the hospitals and that adequate service is being provided, could the minister indicate why the pressure is being put on the nurses to return? My supplementary question is to the Minister of Labour, as well in light of this letter. In terms of the letter and the negotiations going on, is a letter from one of the persons in the bargaining process — a letter such as this — an act of bargaining in poor faith, or part of that bargain?

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the second part of the question, it would certainly constitute a matter of opinion, probably a legal opinion. Might I respectfully suggest to the hon. leader that it might be sought otherwise, apart from the fact that it's somewhat unrelated to the first part of the question.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the ability of a particular hospital, wherever it is or whatever size it is — the reports I get with respect to it deal with how well they are managing vis-a-vis the services they are providing. Many hospitals are running on a very limited basis, and others have a fair selection of services available. I think it's well known that many hospital administrations have made the decision to try to get additional nurses to come back, either to give working nurses more time off and rest periods or to expand the services they have under strike conditions. So if a particular hospital advertises in the province of Quebec or Ontario, or asks its nurses locally to consider returning to work pending the resolution of the strike, I think that is a direct decision of the owners of the hospital and its board of directors.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the minister. It flows from the minister's response last Friday with respect to the nursing study conducted by the Alberta Hospital Association in 1980. The minister indicated there was a global figure as to the cost of implementing the recommendations. In view of the fact that working conditions now seem to be the major obstacle to a settlement, is the minister able to report to the Assembly whether the government, in concert with the Alberta Hospital Association, has acted upon any of the recommendations from the 1980 report and, if so, what recommendations?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the nature of that question, I think it would be better to put it on the Order Paper. I'll provide a written response.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether there have been any discussions between the department and the Alberta Hospital Association, at which the minister was present, to discuss the recommendations of this important study and what steps might be taken, in the last year and a half since it was presented?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I meet regularly with the Alberta Hospital Association, either with their full board of directors or just their executive committee, and I would have to search the records to see at what times that study was discussed in any detail. I think the steps our government has taken with respect to the nursing profession and, more particularly, the challenge that faces us vis-a-vis adequate manpower in the nursing sector are well known. I won't repeat what my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower just went through in some detail.

MR. SPEAKER: We have supplementaries outstanding by the hon. Member for St. Albert, the hon. Member for Calgary North West, and the hon. Member for Three Hills. I wonder if we might deal with those and then go on to another topic, since we've already spent a very substantial part of the question period on this topic.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In your statement, I believe you indicated that there's grave concern in this province for people who are at home, and the Premier has also substantiated this claim. Would the minister please advise the Assembly if, from the calls you have received, you are speaking primarily of people in Edmonton who wish to enter our acute care facilities in this city, or is it geographically right across the province? I'm particularly concerned about the situation in Calgary.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we keep a log of those calls, and it's province-wide. Last week, the number was an even 100.

MRS. FYFE: As those hospitals admitting patients are unable to accept persons for admission unless they qualify for a certain definition of emergency and the number of people who desperately need treatment seems to be growing, is the minister aware of any patients, other than the four neo-natal babies, who have been referred to hospitals outside the province of Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any more who have been sent out by hospitals. Some patients have voluntarily gone to other provinces for the types of cancer surgery I mentioned or for therapeutic abortions. But those are the only two classes I am aware of, and that was done by patient decision.

MRS. FYFE: Thank you. One further question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise the Assembly if negotiations between the United Nurses of Alberta and the Alberta Hospital Association have resumed?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I can advise that the mediator has called the parties to the bargaining table this afternoon. In line with the commitments given to me by the presidents of both associations last Thursday morning that they are responsible and do not wish that I should become involved in the bargaining process other than through the mediation, then they have a very great responsibility this afternoon to get on with the job. I trust they will do that, with the assistance of the mediator.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is along the same lines as that of the hon. Member for Calgary North

West. Would the minister give a commitment that his department will involve itself in an assessment across the province to determine where the most critical people are, in terms of their needs for surgery? From many calls, I am given to understand that there may be a disproportionate number in some areas, depending on what hospitals are on strike. It may well be that we need to prioritize those people on a provincial basis. I hope the minister could give the commitment that the department would be so involved.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I partially dealt with that question earlier in today's question period. It would be very difficult to do that without going to each practising doctor in the province and assessing his patient waiting list. I could offer this information: it is fairly obvious that a very limited number of hospitals are able to do this at the present time and that the major load for the province is falling on Foothills in Calgary and the University of Alberta hospital in Edmonton.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has kindly indicated that he is foregoing his second question.

Suncor Emissions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the minister in a position today to confirm statements by the department's water quality control engineer to the effect that toxic liquids in excess of Suncor's licence to operate have been discharged into the Athabasca River on a number of occasions over the past several years?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to go into total detail at this time. I don't have all the details on the emissions since November 1978. There have been a number of excursions on and off. In practically all these cases, the department has been in consultation with Suncor. I think it is fair to say that most of the problems are emissions such as oil and gas which go beyond our limitations of about 200 kilograms per day. Because of the emission control order issued by the department last week, we are satisfied that we should be able to handle both the present problem and some of the problems in the past.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. Bearing in mind the minister's answer on the last day of the recently prorogued session, is the minister able to advise the Assembly what happened in the department that the information with respect to the excessive discharging of waste, of toxic liquid emissions into the Athabasca River, was not reported to the minister so that he was in a position to advise the Assembly last Monday?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult for me as minister to deal with all the emissions that occur throughout the province continuously, where there are excursions from our normal regulations or guidelines. I think I have responded in that respect at other times in the Legislature.

These events occur, and it is the responsibility of the company concerned to report them to the department. Under both the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, it then becomes a responsibility of an official appointed under the legislation — the director of pollution control in this respect — to review with the company any excursions that have occurred and respond accordingly.

Later in the week, I will have a little more detail that perhaps I can table or give to the member that will indicate those emissions as we have checked them through. As I said, the emission control order which has been issued should effectively deal with future emissions of this nature.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether any consultation took place with the people in the Fort McKay Band by any official of the Department of the Environment, to warn them of possible danger — even though it is a matter of some opinion — as a result of the toxic emissions, prior to the band deciding to take the matter to court?

MR. COOKSON: In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I think I stated earlier that the company itself has a responsibility. My information is that they were rather negligent, to say the least, in not reporting. We were subsequently advised, and we followed through on the complaint that was made. We are satisfied there was no toxic problem in this respect in terms of the volume released into the river. However, as the member well knows, I have asked for a detailed inquiry into the events. Both the Energy Resources Conservation Board and ourselves will be proceeding with that inquiry to see if there is sufficient evidence for negligence and perhaps subsequent charging of the company. But I wouldn't want to prejudge what events will come out of the inquiry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, with respect to the inquiry. Will the terms of reference of the inquiry to be conducted by the department and the ERCB include an evaluation of the department's role? The minister has indicated that the inquiry will examine whether the company was negligent. Will the terms specifically review the possibility of whether the department was negligent?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the NDP member is getting a little overanxious about the procedures we go through. The terms of reference for the inquiry should be available within days and will take into consideration the kinds of problems that led up to this particular issue.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. So are the people of Fort McKay rather anxious about it.

I ask the minister whether the inquiry that was announced — outside the House, I might add — is going to be under the provisions of the inquiries Act, with broad terms of reference and the ability to subpoena and have people under oath. Or will it be an informal, departmental/ERCB review?

MR. COOKSON: I think I've responded to that, Mr. Speaker. As yet, the actual detail of the inquiry has not been totally reviewed, and we'll take into consideration any particular submissions the member might like to make on the issue. We'll deal with it when the time comes.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Will the minister give an undertaking that either the minister or someone from the department will in fact meet with the Fort McKay Band before the formal details, including the terms of reference of the inquiry, are established and discuss the proposals made by the Fort McKay Band with respect to this inquiry?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the members of Fort McKay — I think it is Chief MacDonald — have not as yet approached me as far as the problem they're alleged to have had is concerned. I say "alleged" because last week the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated that they had proper water supply. They had some problems with one of the pumps, and so on. I've said many times in the Legislature that no one should be using water from any of our streams without proper treatment as far as boiling or whatever may be necessary. I don't know how many times I have to repeat that point; it's extremely important.

If the members of Fort McKay wish to make any submissions to me and to the department with regard to the sort of procedures we might go through in the inquiry, I have no problem with that. I'd be happy to advise in that respect.

MR. NOTLEY: A final supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister give the Assembly a time frame as to when the terms of reference will be completed and the determination as to whether it's an inquiry under the inquiries Act, with the full power of that Act, or whether it will be a departmental review in conjunction with the ERCB. When can the Assembly expect either a specific ministerial statement or a position with respect to that matter presented to the House?

MR. COOKSON: Again, Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that we should be able to do this in a few days.

MR. WEISS: [Not recorded] could you clarify the extent it was necessary for the residents of Fort McKay to drink water from the Athabasca River or snow water?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking the minister to confirm a report?

MR. WEISS: No, Mr. Speaker. Thank you once again. Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs advise if it was necessary for the residents of Fort McKay to drink water from the Athabasca River or melted snow water?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I can say this. As I reported earlier to the Assembly, there are two sources of domestic drinking water in Fort McKay, aside from the river. They had problems with both water supplies from time to time during the period from near the end of December to late February. But generally, with the exception of a few days, one or the other of the sources of water supply was available to all the residents of Fort McKay. Mr. Speaker, one must also recognize that we're not just dealing with band members from Fort McKay. There are many other citizens of Fort McKay who require domestic water supplies as well.

During the period of time that both wells were out of production, water was being hauled by the Department of Municipal Affairs improvement district operations into the community and delivered to some households. In addition to that, I'm advised that the Indian band in

question has in its possession for hauling domestic water supplies, a new or nearly new water truck that was not used at all during that period. One would have to assume that there isn't any question at all that there was no necessity for the people of that community to draw water supplies from the Athabasca River. Now, whether they did or not is a matter I can't determine.

MR. WEISS: Supplementary to the minister. Did Municipal Affairs offer to hire the services of the Fort McKay Band's truck?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware whether that was the situation or not. I don't believe it was, because the Department of Municipal Affairs improvement district operations had access to other means of hauling water into the community. I am advised by officials in my department that the band's water truck was not utilized, and one would have to assume they didn't feel there was any necessity for their truck to be put into operation.

Nurses' Strike (continued)

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, my question basically deals with a ruling you made a little earlier on the question of topic on the supplementaries on the interruption of the health delivery system. However, it is of a somewhat different nature, and I wish to pose the question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Have the parties to the dispute, the Alberta Hospital Association and the United Nurses [of Alberta] representatives, requested either the minister's or the government's assistance in direct negotiations to the dispute?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the parties have accepted mediation services. They have not, however, asked for further involvement. In fact, at the meeting I had on Thursday morning with Mrs. Ethier, president of the United Nurses of Alberta, and Mr. Pals, president of the Alberta Hospital Association, the parties did ask that I not become further involved. That is a matter which I must leave with them because, clearly, with the privilege of collective bargaining goes some very heavy responsibility. As I indicated earlier, that responsibility is to the respective members of the two presidents and to the general public. At this point in time, I am not satisfied that the presidents and their staffs have exercised that responsibility to its fullest measure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I already asked my question regarding the serious concern of delayed hospitalization due to the nurses' strike.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Clover Bar has indicated that his question has been asked.

Metrication

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the government of Alberta making any effort to stop compulsory metrication, which is causing undue hardship for Albertans through this economic turnaround?

MR. NOTLEY: Okay Julian, answer that.

MR. KOZIAK: I'd like very much to answer that question; however, I don't want to impinge upon the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Government Services, who answers in this House on that very important topic.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that should more appropriately be raised in another House.

I appreciate the hon. member's concern about metrication. It isn't something that any of us wax eloquent on or are enthused about, but it is something that appears to be happening across Canada. I could refer the member to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa, who is the minister for this federally inspired and instituted program. Or I could give the member all the names of the federal MPs for Alberta, which I'm sure he's familiar with.

Mr. Speaker, the province has had a role in metrication, but it is a very remote or facilitatory role. If I could give the history, it might be important to do that. The whole thing was initiated by a federal white paper in about 1970. Subsequent to that, and after passage of federal legislation accommodating weights and measures and other adjustments to metrication, the provincial government set up a branch of metrication in the Department of Government Services. It was intended to facilitate the federal move toward metrication; not to impose it provincially but, if it had to be brought into Alberta as it was agreed to among the several provinces, to assist farmers, agricultural people, and people elsewhere in adapting to or learning about metrication.

So if there are problems the [member] would like to take up, and I'm sure there are — I have difficulty myself, not only with weights and measures but with speed limits — I would recommend that he make those views known in Ottawa.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the government of Alberta had any representation for this province in dealing with the metrication problems?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Government Services has already answered that question.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As this order in council infringes on the rights of Albertans, will this government take action to protect the people of this province from the encroachment by this policy upon their individual rights?

MR. NOTLEY: That's to you, Dick.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. As this order in council infringes upon the rights of Albertans, will this government take action to protect the people of this province from the encroachment by this policy upon their individual rights?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, first of all, to give a very broad explanation of the constitutional propriety of whether the province can legislate in that area, probably suggests an understanding of the constitution of Canada, the BNA Act, which sets out the jurisdictional responsi-

bilities for that. If the hon. member is suggesting that the province has some new jurisdiction which we have acquired as a result of order in council or that the federal government is impinging on our jurisdiction by an order in council, then we should know about it and it would be settled in the courts.

But to this point, no question has been raised by us or suggested to us that the federal government is legislating improperly. As the hon. Minister of Government Services has indicated, that is clearly a federal responsibility. Any further question with respect to the details as to how metrication will be phased in, here in the province of Alberta, should be properly addressed to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville has attempted to get the floor several times; followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Government Services. The minister has stated that metrication was initiated in 1970. Could the minister advise what stand the government of that day took towards metrication?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, that is an exercise in historical research which perhaps might be carried on outside the Chamber.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The government that has had 11 years to put all things right and hasn't, must take responsibility. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development, because this question does sit in provincial jurisdiction. The economic impact of the implementation of metrication in Alberta is serious. For example, a small store called "The Alberta": it cost the store owner there, a one-man owner, \$500 to change his gas pump — second-grade gas — \$1,500 to change his scale. He says to me, where do I get it from? We all know: consumers. And his consumers do not want it.

Mr. Speaker, pardon me for the long explanation, but it was necessary. My question, which needs the hon. minister's serious attention: has the minister studied the economic impact of metrication in Alberta? That's number one. Number two: if the government is going along with the program, has the minister looked at any kind of relief to assist some of these small business men who are getting hurt very seriously?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, to both questions: no we haven't.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs — I hope he's the right minister this time. As this order in council will effectively eliminate many of the Alberta trading partners, has this government prepared for alternative markets?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's always been my disposition in this Assembly to be as helpful as I possibly can in responding to questions. However, I find that I'm troubled somewhat by trying to provide the information the hon. member requests. Perhaps he could enlarge upon his question, so I have a better feel for the information he seeks.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, metrication in Great Britain, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and the United

States has been phased out or is currently being phased out. Is this government currently pursuing markets to replace those that will be lost when we're on metrication and others are on the imperial system?

MR. KOZIAK: First of all, Mr. Speaker, my colleague . . .

DR. BUCK: Horst has an answer. Welcome back, Horst.

MR. KOZIAK: . . . the Minister of Federal and Inter-governmental Affairs did deal with the aspect of constitutional jurisdiction. As members are aware, weights and measures come foursquare under the federal . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, that would not appear to be the topic of the question. I don't think it was directed to constitutionality, rather to [alternative] markets.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to answer that question. It would really misinform Albertans if a question put like this would stay the way it is. First of all, it seems that the best technology and also, naturally of course, as far as manufactured goods are concerned, specifically in the oil and gas sector is, after our natural resources, one of the — what can I say — most successful export items we have in the world. As it happens, specifically in that area we deal internationally in tonnes, and of course in all other metric products rather than using barrels or anything else that is done with other measurements. So wherever we go in the world, except in the United States — in Australia, Japan, and everywhere else, we deal in metric standards only for our oil and gas equipment as well as for our products. They're not phasing it out.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Perhaps he could tell us why they're moving grain in both metric and imperial through the rail system and loading the ships with imperial measurements.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to answer that. Naturally, of course, in order to help our people in Canada in that process, we're using both measurements. If you go to any capital city around the world and discuss exports even of grains, not only of oil and gas equipment — the hon. member said, exports to other countries — you will find that most of the time it's being discussed in tonnes. Of course, you have to figure it back to bushels and everything else, to make sure that the selling country can know what kind of capacity and load we are talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary, since we have exceeded by a few minutes the allotted time for the question period.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question. Have the hon. minister and his department been able to do a study to find out the additional costs in dealing with two systems of measurements and the confusion that is caused by that?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I answered the hon. member only in regard to seeking out other markets where the metric system is not used. All these markets use

the metric system. The question he has just asked is something for the Minister of Economic Development.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Moved by Dr. Carter:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate March 5: Mr. R. Speaker]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank you again for the honor of speaking to the throne debate.

First of all, I'd like to recognize the honor that was bestowed on two members of this Legislature: the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, Dr. Carter, to move the Speech from the Throne, and the hon. Mr. Isley from Bonnyville. Historically, that honor bestowed on a constituency is certainly a mark of recognition of the contribution of those members and a recognition of the citizens or residents who live in those respective constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I am speaking today with regard to the throne speech, I would like to deal directly with the Speech to the Throne, that I introduced to the Legislature the other day and tabled for members' examination. I feel this had to be done for three very basic and important reasons at this time in Alberta's history. First, the signal is coming from the general public that the Conservative government is not listening, and that one of the functions that must be performed to bring ideas into this Legislature is the process of listening: not only government or legislators thinking they are listening, but that they are actually hearing what the public wants them to do in the management of its affairs. That phrase may ring bells with some members of this Legislature, but it is applicable to this point in the history of Alberta government.

Secondly, listening must not only be recognized, but responses to those concerns of Albertans must be laid before this Legislature and discussed during the period of time that this 19th Legislature, Fourth Session, sits and is responsible to the public. Thirdly, along with those concerns is to outline, which we have in this Speech to the Throne, some very good policies and programs that we feel will meet the needs of Albertans. They're alternatives that can be looked at and used to manage the affairs of Albertans.

This Speech to the Throne is a first from an opposition in Alberta, introduced to the Legislature in a formal way. We feel it's a responsible document. If it can be implemented in this Legislature over the next year, or the next short period of time, certainly it can set the parameters of our economic development and meet the desires of Albertans. The suggestions in it will be the framework from which my colleagues and I will work during the next few

months and into the fall session of the Legislature. We will be introducing Bills, resolutions, amendments, and various forms of debate to cover the different topics.

In my remarks today, though, I'd like to highlight what I called three bold responses to the general public that I feel this government has not had the capability of accepting as bold responses, has ignored the questions the public is raising. The public is saying: this government is not listening, because the bold responses or reactions by the government have not been taken. They're very simple, Mr. Speaker, but they are the voice and the request coming from the general public of Alberta.

What are those three bold responses necessary for Albertans? First of all, Heritage Savings Trust Fund loans to other provinces must be frozen immediately. That response by government is necessary. The second response being asked for by the people of Alberta is that fixed low-interest loans for fixed terms should be made available to Albertans from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Thirdly, a home and business heating rebate program should be implemented, returning a substantial portion of the natural gas royalty tax to home-owners, renters, and businesses in Alberta. We could call it the residential and business heating rebate. Those are three bold responses that are necessary by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about each one for just a few moments. This government will ask: why freeze the loans to other provinces? They say, isn't that not being Canadian or not doing our thing? Well, when you examine what this government has done, I think we can agree that it's time to freeze them until this government examines exactly what they are doing. First of all, other provinces in Canada get fixed-interest loans at fixed terms. Individuals, corporations, and businesses in Alberta do not qualify for those loans.

Some members here will say, what about AOC and ADC? That isn't to general Albertans; you have to be in a special category. Less than 1 per cent of Albertans in either the business category or the farming profession even qualify. But every province in Canada qualifies for a fixed-interest loan for a fixed term. Albertans are being discriminated against, and today that story is out loud and clear in the grass roots of Alberta. This government is so callous, so disinterested in what the people are really saying, that they can't hear that one simple message. When they go to the polls the next time, they'll be told about that message. But I don't think they've heard it, and it's been said in this Legislature before. But it's a bold response, because it's a change in attitude that is necessary by this government.

Secondly, the Premier has said — and I remember him sitting on this side of the House when the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee raised the matter last summer — that some people here want to squander the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Mr. Speaker, that's nonsense in itself. We have given \$2 billion — some \$380 million this year — to other provinces in Canada. We haven't any collateral. We're just hoping it comes back. But if we make low-interest loans at a fixed rate to Albertans, they're here; their business, their farm, whatever they're doing is collateral.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Albertans. I believe they'll repay those loans in a responsible way. As my hon. colleague from Bow Valley pointed out to me as we discussed this matter, many Albertans will have the opportunity of having funds to build their business, their farm. They will spread it out across the economy of Alberta. All Albertans have opportunity, and economic

development can occur in this province. We can protect people in their business or in whatever form they earn a living. That's pretty basic. Albertans will not squander the fund.

What else, Mr. Speaker? When I examined some of the information from other provinces, it really surprised me. I found that other provinces that get our low-interest money at 15 per cent and less — and we in this Legislature all know the low percentages — use the money, or a derivative therefrom, to give low-interest loans to their own residents. A couple of days ago, we phoned the Ministry of Agriculture and Marketing in Nova Scotia and said, what kinds of loans are you giving? They said, some farmers qualify for an 8 per cent loan; they go out at 10, but under certain circumstances they get a rebate of 2 to 2.5 per cent. They said that farmers in Nova Scotia can get that.

As I look at the documents here, on January 21, 1982, we loaned \$25 million to the province of Nova Scotia: fixed term, six years; interest rate, 15.75 per cent. Nobody in Alberta can even get a fixed-term loan for 15.75 per cent, or for six years. As a farmer, I'd love to have that kind of interest, but like the other farmers I pay 18, 21. That's what we pay in this province — total discrimination with our own money.

Another example — we have been researching this, and the information was given to me just before I came into the House today — is very interesting, a document *Farm credit in the Canadian Financial System*. This is a 1980 document that covers 1979 and 1980. We understand that Quebec is looking at this at the present time because of the economic pressures. This is what it says about the Quebec government Farm Loan Act:

The Quebec Government pays the amount owed to the lending agency in excess of its own rates, i.e. anything over 2 1/2% on the first \$15,000.

I go over my list of loans to other provinces, and again we find the province of Quebec on the list: loans of \$200 million, March 31, 1980. There it is: a fixed loan of fixed money. There's more for the hydro corporation as well.

Here again we find the very money we send down there, given to the farmers at a low interest rate. They couldn't do it unless we gave them loans. They couldn't administer their government; whether it goes directly or indirectly to the program, they'd have to cut back somewhere. We give them the incentive to do it.

Farm credit administered by the Farm Credit Bureau in Quebec:

Up to 39 1/2 years. 2 1/2% interest for the first \$15,000 and balance at 8%.

Well, you wonder why any farmer in this province will ever vote for a Conservative government.

DR. BUCK: They won't.

MR. R. SPEAKER: There is no way, when that kind of discrimination goes on with their own money. This government can't trust the businessmen and farmers of this province, but they'll give it to the other provinces so they can compete with them in an unfair manner.

Hog producers in Quebec get this low 2.5 per cent interest loan and compete with our hog producers. You should hear that one out at the grass roots of rural Alberta. They tell me that, day after day after day. When I travelled my constituency for two and a half weeks, went door to door and talked to many people, they told me that story over and over again. I said: I'll check it out, I'm not sure; maybe you heard that, maybe it's a rumor.

But it's no rumor. This document has it documented as fact. That's the way it is, and this government goes on in a carefree manner, giving away our money at terms we who live in Alberta don't even qualify for. Mr. Speaker, that's disgusting.

That matter is going to be dealt with at the polls if this government can't take some bold responses and deal with it. What they're doing is totally irresponsible. That's why we have to quit giving it to other provinces until this government straightens itself out. I think it has to stop as soon as possible. Alberta farmers and small business men will stop this government if we can't do it in the Legislature.

The other fact of the matter, and I've already mentioned it, is that these loans go to the other provinces and there's just no security. As I've mentioned, people in this province — farmers, businessmen — will certainly give their land, machinery, business, or inventory as security. What's wrong with a loan like that?

I think there should be some very basic principles to those loans. My colleagues and I feel that this government could put a loan program in place. The \$2 billion is now to the other provinces. There's no reason we couldn't have \$2 billion here for the people of Alberta and put a program in place. What would the program be based on? There should be some very basic principles, and I've listed seven.

One is equitable treatment for Albertans, as for others who get loans. I've mentioned the example of provinces of Canada. Secondly, in that principle we must protect the integrity of and the rate of return to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think we can do that. Thirdly, there should be fixed interest for a fixed term. The fourth principle: the loans should be for a broad cross section of Albertans. The fifth principle: Albertans must have repayment capability before the loan is given. The sixth principle: the loans could be used for operating and capital loans for businesses or farms, mortgages; the loans would be used for basic economic development or home ownership, or retaining the business, farm, or home. The seventh principle: in each fiscal year, a fixed amount would be allocated through the Legislature to the loan from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think those general principles are important for this kind of loan program. This is what Albertans are asking for at the present time.

What is the suggested program for fixed-interest, fixed-term loans from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Number one, I've said that \$2 billion should be allocated by the Legislature to the loan fund. The investment portfolio has nearly \$2 billion. When I look at that investment portfolio — the recent report of the Auditor General, that just came out a few days ago, pointed out to us that the rate of return for that investment portfolio in terms of bonds and short-term money, is not too good. For example, for the fiscal years ended March 31, '79 and '80, the median Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund return with regard to bonds was minus 9.2 per cent; 1980-81 was 14.2 per cent; '79-81 overall was 1.8 per cent. Short-term money: '79-80, 11.4 per cent; '80-81, 14.2; '79-81, 12.8 per cent. When you combine those two investments, bonds and short-term moneys, we find the return in 1979-80 was 3.7 per cent; '80-81, 13.6 per cent; '79-81, 8.5 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, we could set the loan at a fixed term of 15 per cent today and meet the rate of return of the investment portfolio without even as much risk, without risking it on the bond market and losing \$60 million over

a three-year period, like we did in the last Legislature: no risk and a way to help every Albertan. But this Conservative government, under Mr. Lougheed, wants all the control of the money in its own hands. Albertans don't count; they couldn't spend it responsibly. So Albertans can't even have a loan at a fixed rate, at a fixed term, out of their own money.

What's the second thing that could go into a program? Through the treasury branches, we could establish a special agency or department to allocate the loans to Albertans. Maybe other lending agencies could be involved there as well. That's one of the agencies already set up to do this across the province; another bureaucracy isn't necessary.

Thirdly, the ceiling on the loans. To initiate a program like this, I'd say a ceiling of \$50,000 would be sensible. That would help a lot of Albertans. In one year, we could help a minimum of 40,000 Albertans with loans, who in turn would repay it. In other years, we could allocate more money to the loan fund. We could get the economy moving in the right direction. We could do something in Alberta.

Fixed interest: I've said 15 per cent. I've pointed out from the Auditor's report that that would give a reasonable rate of return to the investment section of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Fixed term: I suggest maybe 10 years, but it could be five or 20. As we look at the loans that have gone to other provinces, they vary anywhere from one to six to 20 years. I believe some are even close to 30 years — loans at a fixed term, at a fixed interest rate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this government doesn't even understand how to be fair to its own people here in the province. If they aren't able to respond to that very basic need and request of Albertans, then they don't deserve to be government. As an added comment, Mr. Speaker, many people feel that way today. Certainly, as we talk to Albertans and explain this program to them, if the government can't come up with something that is even comparable to this, they will suffer the consequences, which they should.

The third area I want to talk about in terms of bold responses necessary by this government is keeping people in their homes, keeping heating costs at a very basic rate. I heard Albertan after Albertan, constituent after constituent — and this is no underestimation and comment about how many people told me this. They said: here I stand in my store, here I am in my own home, here I am on my own farm, and right under the ground, if we drilled a hole here, there's gas that belongs to all Albertans; in the last year, my heating bill has become totally unreasonable and unacceptable. They can't understand how a government in Alberta could agree to an energy agreement that would cost them a fortune, practically put them out of business, make it impossible to stay in their homes and, at the same time, not even recognize the problem, not even have the capability of responding. The throne speech before us was a disaster in terms of that, Mr. Speaker, not even recognition that the problem was there, that heating your home has become a major cost.

We did some research with regard to that as well, and talked to people in specifics. One of the most interesting was a fellow right here in Edmonton, in one of the hon. members' constituencies, west Edmonton. The fellow is a 77-year-old pensioner. I tell you, he won't vote for you guys anymore. He owns an 1,100 square foot house, 3 bedrooms, and he uses natural gas for furnace and water heating. In 1971, his cost for the year was \$90.59. He

produced all the bills, and they're available for anybody to see. In 1981, the total cost was \$454.13. From 1971 to 1981, the cost under this government went up nearly 500 per cent. The reason we chose this person is that he's on a fixed income, always on pension. In 1971 he was on pension; today he's on pension. The cost for heating his home has gone up 500 per cent. His pension hasn't gone up that much. His income hasn't gone up anywhere near that. As well, he's faced with increased food and other costs that are unbelievable.

He made a couple of comments that I thought were interesting. He said he's absolutely convinced that if 30 per cent of the revenue from the natural gas wasn't going into the heritage fund, his monthly heating bill would be 30 per cent lower. I know it isn't all connected like that, but that's what he believes about this government. He doesn't agree, however, that he ought to pay 30 per cent into a heritage fund for future generations when he is being driven from the home he's lived in for over a quarter of a century by ever-increasing utility costs. He is a proud pensioner who wants to stay in his home. So the heating cost has gone up 500 per cent.

We also made some other examinations. We looked at the gas rebate over that period of time. I recognize that gas prices at the gate are reduced a certain amount to the consumer. The consumer gets the gas priced less because of the natural gas protection plan. But even in light of that, the heating cost is significant and unbearable. As he looked over his bills and showed them to us, the rebate from that \$454.13 in the final year came to \$8.27, an average of about 1.8 per cent. It just isn't adequate.

You look at gas co-ops, the price of gas that was supposed to be stabilized. I remember the minister, the hon. Dr. Horner, standing in the House saying, we're going to bring cheap gas to all these Albertans; we're going to hold the price. From 1979 to 1982, it as well has gone over 490 per cent in increased prices. I have a number of the rural co-op gas prices here to show that the price has increased. We can't say that that is all capital cost, because that was usually built in at the beginning of the distribution system. Canadian Western for example: we find the very same kind of . . . When we examine their general bills on the cost of 250 MCF per year, the percentage gas price increase from 1971 to 1982 is 458 per cent. The ICG Utilities (Plains Western): from 1971 to 1981, their increase was 419 per cent.

I examined bills in some of the businesses in the town of Vulcan, and it alarmed me. That's the first place that really triggered it to my attention. A number of the businessmen were saying, my bill has gone up from \$100 to \$250. I checked some of those bills and talked to them. From 1980 to 1982, the increase in one businessman's bill was over 30 per cent; another one at 43 per cent; another at 51.9 per cent; another at 43.3 per cent; from January '80 to February '82, one of the confectionery stores increased 157 per cent — significant increases. That's the story of all these figures: another added cost to the small business men, to the home-owner, to the farmer in this province.

This government doesn't even recognize what it's doing. All it does is lurch ahead for a money grab for its own treasury, so that most likely we can invest \$2 billion in the Alsands plant or some other venture that the Premier and a few cabinet ministers have control of, rather than giving it to all Albertans. Mr. Speaker, in this province it's time to go back to basics, back to helping individual people in their own livelihood: lowering input costs so they can meet the common daily pressure that's

on them from the economic turndown. It's there. If this government can't respond in these two or three ways, they don't deserve to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people of Alberta deal with them accordingly. This government, which continually blames the problems of interest and high costs of heating on the federal government, is not telling the truth to the people of Alberta. They do have control. This Conservative government, under Mr. Lougheed, can answer the questions, and it's incumbent upon them to do so. If they don't act in this legislature, it'll be too late. And, thank God, it'll be too late when the people are able to deal with them as they should.

In the Speech to the Throne, which we raised, there are other areas we are going to cover during the legislative session. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund: we're going to press as much as we can for legislative and public accountability. We think there should be some new priorities in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I've mentioned a couple, but we also feel that the shares in PWA, Syncrude, and Alberta Energy Company should be sold so that instead we can help all Albertans. The crisis in health care: doctors, nurses, other health care personnel are demoralized today. This government must deal with that problem. We intend to press the government for a better health care system. There should be a public inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Ambulance service: my hon. colleague, who worked hard in the Legislature of 1976, called for a province-wide paramedical ambulance service to be put in place. This Legislature passed the resolution supporting it. This government has not even acted on that resolution — a direction of the Legislature, and we have had no results. Agriculture: we must deal with input cost — interest, fuel cost, establishment of a better transportation system.

Five-year program of roads, which my hon. colleague from Clover Bar has called for a number of times; improvement of the Trans-Canada Highway through the Bow Valley constituency, for which my colleague has worked hard a number of times. The Crow rate: we're hoping the government will introduce a resolution on the Crow rate, so that discussion can follow in this Legislature and the Conservative government puts its position clearly before the people of Alberta so they're not hiding behind the skirts of the federal government. Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from Bow Valley will lead us in that debate.

Housing: high cost of mortgages, shortage and price of rental accommodation, and the wasteful burden of development planning and the approval process are three areas that we think have devastated the housing industry in this province. This government is responsible. It must take the responsibility.

I've mentioned natural gas for home heating. Business environment for the oil and gas exploration industry: we think the 1981 cutbacks, suspension of the oil sands, and the September energy agreement were devastating actions by this government that ruined the basis for the economy in this province. We've now suffered an economic turndown, capital moving into the United States, and we have a government that will not take the responsibility and turn it around. We have Alsands negotiations going on, but we don't know what they are. They're always behind closed doors, secretive. All of a sudden the people of this province will be told about it and be hosed again, just like the energy agreement and some of the other agreements of no good to the people in Alberta that come out of the back rooms of the Conservative caucus. I don't know

when this government will learn to do business in public, in this Legislature. But with that kind of tactic, the public will deal with them eventually.

Corporate income tax: I think that's been on the books about three years now. In 1981-82, it cost the taxpayers of Alberta \$6,800,000 for the Provincial Treasurer to set up a bureaucracy of people, a bunch of bureaucrats — most likely a few political appointees — who now have jobs in this government. That's number one. Number two, we have 40,000 or 50,000 businessmen — I forget the number — in this province who are paying anywhere from \$400 to \$1,000 to fill out a form and register with these bureaucrats. Unbelievable waste of money, Mr. Speaker. If at the same time, this government had the initiative and concern for the small business man, they wouldn't put the bureaucracy in place till they told the businessmen the benefits. In our survey, we could not find a businessman who knew of the benefits. But they knew they had to refer a form to their accountant, who charged them \$250 to \$400 to fill it out and file it. Wasted money. About the only benefit was a tax write-off by the federal government.

That's the kind of dumb planning that occurs by this government. They have no concern for the guy out on the street, the man who has to pay the taxes, pay the bills, support his family, and make the economy run — just another example of the attitude of this government. They feel they rule by some right — I hesitate to say divinely — that's given to them at election time. They feel that that right will be given again, which I don't believe. With this kind of administration, it shouldn't happen. Hopefully democracy will work in a positive way, but that's the way it is.

Another program area: fair share for local governments. Today I tabled a report on revenue sharing. If you look at the picture on the cover of that report, you'll notice a big pair of pliers where the municipalities of this province are right in the pincers. That's an actual graph of how the education costs and tax have been added on to the property tax of the people of this province. Big promise by the Provincial Treasurer a few years ago at a municipal convention that they were going to get rid of that education cost on the property tax. The Premier promised it before he came into government, but it's growing continually. At the same time, this government is starting to blame the municipalities for overspending and not controlling their budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the fault lies with the municipalities. Give them funds with which they can manage their affairs, don't intervene, share revenue, and they'll do their job. But that's not the format of this government that wants to control everything, that wants to set up a bureaucratic system so they approve any dollar spent. That system in this province has got to go. We've got to get down where people — municipalities, small business men, and farmers included — can do their own job and be responsible for themselves.

In this report, I mentioned the International Year of Disabled Persons because I was disappointed that a committee was appointed, after the fall session closed, to go around and have hearings from all the various groups as to what the disabled wanted. I have read reports in this Legislature. There are organized groups that can present the cause of the disabled. Those programs should have been implemented in the year of the disabled. We're now a year late. By the time we have these hearings, it will be two years. By that time there will be an economic downturn, and the poor disabled will be at the bottom of

the list again. To me, that was very disappointing. We had a chance to do something for people who have a social need and want to participate in general society, but we blew it.

The last point I want to make in my remarks is about the general attitude of this government, and to some extent I've already touched on it. As Socreds, we make four points in our Speech to the Throne. The number of orders in council by this government has increased significantly, which means laws are not made in this Legislature but in cabinet. It's a violation of a principle we talked about and pressed for last fall; that is, public business being done in public.

The second point is the use of special warrants. I thought the law case we held a year ago would be an indicator to this government that they should change their plans or their format. But this government thinks: who cares, we can do what we want. Albertans again live with the decision-making of special warrant spending, where the government budgets poorly, talks about restraint and being responsible, and on the other hand, after we leave the Legislature, spends millions of dollars. Between January 6, 1982, and February 24, 1982, a total of \$419.5 million in special warrants was approved — half a billion dollars approved outside this Legislature, without our even having the opportunity of saying anything.

Can you blame me as a member for introducing a bill which would limit that to at least 4 per cent? When we look at this, we find that the total budgetary expenditure for last year is \$6.7 billion, which is 16.3 per cent above the revised — and to be fair with the government, this is the revised — 1980-81 budget, or 22.5 per cent above the comparable 1980-81 estimates. That's how much the actual budget approved in this Legislature was increased: 16.3 per cent on one figure or 22.5 per cent. These special warrants that this government passed, which should have been new added money to the budget at most anyway, came to 9.5 per cent. So the actual increase this government made in expenditures, in increasing the bureaucrats and looking after contracts that don't help the people of Alberta, was 25.8 per cent. That's one-quarter of the budget that was approved outside this Legislature: 32 per cent. Why didn't you do it in the Legislature?

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of arrogance — I've called it callous attitude — that this government has towards people of Alberta. The people don't count; they don't matter; they are not part of this government's plan. The plan of this government is to look after their own jobs and power, and to look after the big corporations. Who cares about the little guy? Not one bit of care about the free-enterpriser trying to make his business or farm operate, and to participate in a community and pay the taxes that are going to be given to him as a blessing from this government. Mr. Speaker, that is the second one.

Third, we have talked about the exclusive control of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund: 88 per cent by the Premier; 12 per cent, supposedly, by the Legislature. But that is a joke in itself. We are here to talk about it, but we don't really count. The legislation is brought in. Cabinet has decided and told all the backbenchers what to approve. It doesn't really matter anyway. You might as well say 100 per cent of that Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and no programs in there for the people of Alberta.

The cancerous growth of regulations: we are having a study done on regulations in this province. Our initial study indicates an unbelievable number of regulations passed outside this Legislature that tie up the hands of

people, that introduce all kinds of red tape for people in the various communities who are trying to do their own job, look after themselves and be individual, competitive free-enterprisers. This government doesn't understand that, Mr. Speaker. I think they are going to have to look at the role they are playing in the affairs of people, because Albertans are not accepting it.

I would like to make these concluding comments. First, the Speech from the Throne put forward by this government was not perceptive of the problems I raised. They don't even hear the voices of Albertans, Mr. Speaker, and I believe they don't want to hear them. Secondly, when I wrote my remarks and thought about them, I was going to give some very good advice about the years 1970 and '71, when I saw the same kind of environment in this Legislature. The government thought they were really listening to the people, but they weren't. The people dealt with them accordingly, and rightly so. I think we are at the same threshold again, where the people are going to deal accordingly with a government that has forgotten where they are, who they are, and what their needs are.

Mr. Speaker, this government does have a chance. Programs such as the ones we have introduced in our Speech to the Throne should be taken with some sincerity. This government can admit its mistakes even yet and become a little more humble than they are at the present time — humble not for their own good but for the good of Albertans, because that is who they represent. Their own personal needs are irrelevant in this whole democratic process; it is the needs of Albertans. But that will take a change and a bit of humbling, Mr. Speaker.

There's still time for this government to do something in their budget speech. I hope the hon. Provincial Treasurer doesn't come in with a bunch of excuses. We hope the minister is able to deal with spending priorities and say what this government really thinks is important and isn't important. How are they going to deal with interest rates? The province can deal with that question and not say it is a federal problem. If I hear that in the budget speech, that is just an insult to Albertans. They can deal with residential and business heating, and health care. This government has a responsibility to lift morale. In the history of any province, we have never had more money to spend on basic social services like hospital care and extended health care for Albertans.

This government has blown it, Mr. Speaker. We procrastinated for 11 years. The minister prior to the present one procrastinated for four years in terms of planning and organizing, and got caught up with four bureaucrats who cost us a fortune in this province. We still haven't caught up, nor have we made some proper decisions. It is unfortunate. Mr. Speaker, I call on the government to deal with those problems. It is their responsibility. The people of Alberta elected them to take that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, of which I gave notice the other day, to the motion which is on the Order Paper. The amendment reads as follows:

The motion is amended by inserting the following words after the words "present session":
 "but we regret the omission of adequate provision for the needs of Albertans as outlined in the document entitled, 'Speech to the Throne' tabled today in the Assembly."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, before we move to the question, I want to take the opportunity to make some

comments this afternoon on behalf of all the good people in the constituency of Barrhead. First of all, I would like to extend my congratulations to the Member for Calgary Millican and to the Member for Bonnyville for being involved in the actual debate. I want to make it quite clear at the outset that I am speaking against the amendment put forward by the Member for Little Bow.

MR. SPEAKER: I see some expressions of concern on the faces of some hon. members about the continuation of the debate on the amendment by the hon. Member for Barrhead, but I don't know of any strictures in parliamentary usage which would prevent the opening of debate on an amendment by the inclusion of some compliments.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will be geared by your direction and take the liberty, but not the wanton liberty, of just adding a few more comments of congratulations to my colleagues from both Calgary Millican and Bonnyville. I very much appreciated the very, very humanistic approach that the Member for Calgary Millican took in moving his speech the other day. I am particularly pleased with some of the basic comments he made on behalf of individual human beings in the province of Alberta.

To the Member for Bonnyville, an area I come from, my home town in fact, I am very pleased he was asked to second the speech. I think that is a great honor to both the people living there and the people he represents, and even to some of those who have long gone from that part of Alberta and who now are trying to find their roots in other parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking against the amendment put forward by the Member for Little Bow. I want to comment on a number of subject areas: the question of property rights in the province of Alberta, a few comments with respect to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, housing, special warrants, the electrical marketing agency Act, agriculture, Alberta municipalities, and Alberta business.

I want to assure you, sir, and all good members of the House, which is everyone in the House, that I do not intend to use phrases such as: don't want to hear the people of Alberta, do not trust, doesn't understand how to be fair to its own people, is not telling the truth to the people, arrogance, callous attitude, no programs in there for the people of Alberta. I certainly will not take the wanton liberty of exercising those phrases this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, really since the midpoint of December, all hon. members have had an opportunity to visit their constituents, travel about their constituencies, and meet people in all parts of Alberta. We've all had an opportunity to listen, hear the concerns, and be involved in a lot of discussion.

One interesting item a number of my constituents brought to my attention in the latter part of December, the first part of January, and through February, was some degree of misapprehension or perhaps misunderstanding of the whole question of property rights: the resolution of property rights in the new Canada Bill that will soon become law in this country and, in essence, how it relates to the Alberta Bill of Rights. Interestingly enough, in undertaking numerous discussions with my constituents, inevitably and invariably I found they were reading magazines published in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, which in fact looked at property rights in those two provinces. My constituents were

saying: now look, we don't have any property rights. I consistently and continually had to sit down with them, and I then started referring to two documents. One is the new constitutional proposal, that in essence has been cleared through the various provinces in Canada, the House of Commons, and is now awaiting recognition and approval by the British House of Commons prior to its return to Canada.

One particular section in that new constitution to which I specifically had to draw my constituents' attention, was Section 26 in the Charter of Rights, which very, very specifically points out that it provides for the continuation of all existing rights and freedoms that particular individuals in our country have. The second very important document I take and show to my constituents is a Bill passed in this Legislature in 1972. It's known as the Alberta Bill of Rights. I had to take just a little bit of time to read Section 1 of the Alberta Bill of Rights to them, and I would like to read it into the record this afternoon:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Alberta there exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely:

- (a) the right of the individual to liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law . . .

Those two documents, Section 26 of the new Charter of Rights in our new, soon to become, made in Canada constitution, and Section 1 of the Alberta Bill of Rights emphatically prove to me without any doubt or reservation at all that the property rights of Albertans have not been lost. In fact, they are protected in a manner and way in which few citizens in perhaps other parts of Canada have their same property rights protected. That really is primarily because their legislatures have still not moved to incorporate the whole property rights question as our Legislature did some 10 years ago, in 1972, when it was included as Section 1 of the new Alberta Bill of Rights. I think my constituents are much more relaxed now about this whole question of property rights and their protection than they were several months ago when there seemed to be quite a public debate on this question through a number of magazines. Not all were published in the province of Alberta, but certainly those magazines gave the unfortunate opportunity of some misapprehension to some of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, listening and responding to the concerns of my constituents and talking to people in all parts of Alberta gave me an opportunity to point out what this government has really been doing in a number of areas over the last 10 years. We have just gone through the 10th anniversary of this government, a government that I think is well respected in all parts of Alberta, a government that has taken bold initiatives over the last decade in a number of areas, and a government that has said again that as it enters 1982, it's going to take bold initiatives in a number of new areas.

Again, a point of reflection. I listened to my constituents and, of course, responded to their concerns. They said: well, have you thought about doing this, and what's the direction you'd like to go in in this regard? We talked about alternatives, because we always do that. Any government that purports to be a government of the people, as this government is, is consistently looking for new alternatives, new directions, new approaches.

I had another little document that I took around with me, and I basically looked at very significant expenditure areas: people programs, programs for people. When I looked at the expenditure by selected provincial government departments over the last 10 years and compared the expenditure levels in 1971 with the expenditure levels of those same departments in 1980, I came across some very fascinating statistics. As an example, on the question of hospitals, in 1971 the total provincial expenditure was \$189.8 million. Mr. Speaker, my constituents were very surprised to learn that by the year 1980, expenditure levels in that one department alone, that very important people department, had risen to \$822.3 million. In 1971, total provincial expenditure on education was \$378.1 million. In 1980, the figure for our young learning students, the people who will become our leaders 20 and 30 years from now, had risen to \$1.421 billion. In 1971, expenditure level on agriculture was \$25.3 million. In 1980, that expenditure level was \$93.7 million — people programs.

A very important infrastructure development in our province over the last 10 years deals with the area of highways and transportation. It's not peculiar to people who live in urban or rural Alberta. It transcends the wants and desires of everybody. We need a fine transportation system to do two things: bring people closer together and bring goods to market. That's what Alberta is all about. Look at the expenditure level in 1971, \$93.7 million. In 1980, that expenditure level had risen to \$483.9 million.

Mr. Speaker, in every one of those cases — hospitals, education, agriculture, highways and transport — those budgetary expenditure increases from 1971 to 1980 were all in the magnitude and neighborhood of 400 to 500 per cent. I for one, as a member of this Assembly, don't stand up and say that we should be proud, because look at all the money we're spending. We're not spending our money; we're spending, investing, and using money that belongs to the people of Alberta. But the point, the key reality, is that over that decade this government has responded to the needs of the people of Alberta, and has responded very, very well in a number of very important areas. Some can say that a 400 to 500 per cent expenditure level increase hardly keeps up with the pace of inflation. So, Mr. Speaker, I went a little farther and checked the 1971 consumer price index as a base. It was 99.7. In 1980, it was 210.6. So according to the consumer price index for that decade, the increase was approximately twofold. All the figures I've just finished talking about show a magnitude of expenditure in the neighborhood of four to fivefold for people programs in this province now — not 40 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that I also wanted to make some comments on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, a very, very important aspect to the way of life in Alberta. A lot of my constituents said, what are you really doing for us; isn't it true that you're putting all this money away for the future; what are you doing now? So we sat down and had some chats — some around the table, some on the street corner, some in a car on main street, but they were held. We had some interesting discussions on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We talked about what the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is doing for the homeowner, for the person who has to live in a home in the province of Alberta.

It's very interesting, when you take a look at the magnitude of expenditure levels just in the last short period of time, the magnitude of expenditure, development, expansion, and assistance through such agencies as

the Alberta Housing Corporation and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation in the last year, the 1981-82 fiscal year. The expenditure level in that regard will see us provide some 24,000 units of shelter to the people of Alberta — in this province, not in some other part of Canada that somebody's wanton exuberance might suggest might take place. That commitment for those 24,000 units really amounts to some \$1.7 billion. That's only in the 1981-82 fiscal year. A commitment in years previous to '81-82 really brings our total commitment to housing in the province of Alberta to \$3.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, through the various housing programs that are part of it, encompasses a whole variety of different types of programs. We have only to take a look at an excellent booklet, called Provincial Housing Programs in Alberta. It's made current every several months [as] a new program comes out. We take a look at the 24,000 units that are being provided. In the '81-82 fiscal year, 3,425 senior citizen units are being developed, from Etzikom to High Level, Alberta.

Rental units through CHIP, or the core housing incentive program — a lot of people don't like acronyms, because they don't quite appreciate what they all stand for. We're living in a world of acronyms. We have MAP, or the modest apartment program; mobile-home parks; municipal non-profit housing; community housing; and transitional housing. We've even got a few little houses we're building for some of our bureaucrats, as the Member for Little Bow referred. Those are bureaucrats living in some areas of the province of Alberta where there really is no opportunity for conventional housing. As a former bureaucrat — and I don't say that too loudly in coffee discussions with some of my colleagues — we found in the department I was once a deputy minister of, that in fact it was to the advantage of the public purse of the province of Alberta to provide government housing. It was much cheaper in the long term, from an administrative point of view, to do that than to provide an assistance factor to the individual to move his own trailer in, and the like.

Mr. Speaker, 9,680 units were provided in the fiscal year 1981. There were various home ownership programs: the Alberta family home purchase program, the farm lending program, the rural and native housing program, the rural home assistance program, the rural mobile-home program, and land assembly and development which was provided to a number of municipalities in this province.

We have programs for renovation and adaptability for various homes under the Alberta pioneer repair program. I don't know of any member of this Assembly who would suggest that that is not one of the most important people programs this government has ever brought forward. Our handicapped housing grants, our emergency repair programs, and our home conversion programs are all there.

We have other incentive programs for municipal governments. To repeat, the fact of the matter is: over 24,000 units; a commitment of \$1.7 billion in one fiscal year alone; and, in the Speech from the Throne, a commitment for more in the 1982-83 fiscal year. That's just housing. That's just one part of the various people programs we have.

Let's talk about what we're doing for Alberta farmers. I represent a constituency that is rural, as do a large number of members in this Assembly. Our farmers are independent, proud people.

MRS. CRIPPS: The greatest.

MR. KOWALSKI: As the Member for Drayton Valley has correctly said, they are the greatest you'll find anywhere in the agricultural community in the world. Our farmers came to this province. They developed the province. They are creating; they haven't stopped. They're innovative. They are upset with the current economic situation for their products. But they also understand that if they're in beef in the province of Alberta — and two and a half times the amount of beef produced in this province must go out of it; it's not consumed in this province — they have to meet a market competitive factor that's really set in the North American market, not set totally in the province of Alberta.

Our grain producers understand that they have to sell their products in all parts of the world. They recognize that the transportation system in western Canada and Canada is a prime responsibility of the government of Canada, not a prime responsibility of the province of Alberta, although this government has decided by itself to get involved in the system and do whatever it can to improve the transportation system.

Our farmers also recognize that interest rates in this country are not set in the province of Alberta or in the province of British Columbia, but in a national city in the country of Canada. They don't appreciate the interest rate policy of the federal government, but they're also not confused about the fact that a government sitting in Edmonton can arbitrarily say that henceforth the interest rate in the province of Alberta will be 12 per cent for each and every individual, and that's the way we're going to live. It doesn't happen that way, Mr. Speaker.

My constituents appreciate that. In fact they're very thankful for the total commitment made under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to Alberta farmers. They look forward. They make very positive statements about the beginning farmer program, which since April 1980 has made some 2,000 loans amounting to over \$3 million. They're also very pleased with the Farming for the Future program, which talks about research. In fact, I think one of our difficulties today is the lack of really top-notch ideas to address, forward, further cultivate, and develop research in agriculture in this province. My colleague from Macleod, who is very active in that particular program, is consistently looking forward to new ideas that can be further expanded and developed.

In southern Alberta, a great part of this province, some \$60 million has been devoted to irrigation rehabilitation and expansion. The people who live in the constituency of Barrhead are really part of southern Alberta, because the geographic centre of the province really goes about 30 miles north of the town the constituency is named after. None of my constituents believes we live in southern Alberta, but from a geographic point of view, we're really a part. We're looking forward to when irrigation rehabilitation and expansion take place between the Paddle and Pembina rivers in the heart of the constituency of Barrhead. I'm sure we'll have total support from some of my good colleagues living in the deep south, the banana belt part of our province.

The grazing reserves development program funded under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is one we're all very proud of. Mr. Speaker, we have 1,000 very distinctive heritage cars hauling Alberta grain and helping out the western grain industry. They're going to be hauling some of that grain to a new terminal this province is investing money in to help its people, its agrologists.

What about small, business? I've met with a lot of small business men. They're angry with high interest rates; there's absolutely no doubt at all about that. For any small business man to go down to the bank and have to borrow money at 21, 22, 23, 24 per cent — they're furious. But by the same token, not too many of them are suggesting to me that the province of Alberta should make available 12 per cent interest money. They're particularly not suggesting that if it's meant to finance new business, where business may already exist in a particular town. They recognize and understand — from a risk point of view, because along with our people in agriculture they are the foremost risk-takers in this province — the difficulties of an international market and a national market as much as they understand the difficulty of only a provincial market, if artificial barriers are maintained within that particular environment.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of questions have been raised by my constituents: why are you saving 30 per cent; what are you doing with the other 70 per cent? I say we're using it today. The 70 per cent that doesn't go into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund goes into the operating budget of the province of Alberta on a year-to-year basis. In essence, it's being used today for some of those programs I talked about before: hospitals, education, transportation — prime expenditure functions.

They said, you've got so much money in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; how come you're lending all this money to these other provinces in this country of Canada; why aren't you spending more? First of all, we're not spending; we're investing. Secondly, do you really appreciate or comprehend the magnitude of investment in other parts of Canada and understand the reason why? Alberta being a good citizen, being a good partner in a strong Confederation known as Canada, has been prepared to assist the national economy by loaning money to other provinces.

When you take a look at the Heritage Savings Trust Fund today, you see the make-up of it: 57 per cent of the funds are found in the Alberta investment division. Those are the loans to the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, the Alberta Housing Corporation, the Alberta Opportunity Company, the Agricultural Development Corporation, the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, Alberta Government Telephones.

Thirteen per cent is found in the capital projects division, an enormity of activities. We've even got a little dirt-moving project not very far away from where I live outside Barrhead. It's on the Paddle River. We're building a great big dam there to protect the flow of water. That will really help some 500 people in agriculture. Those of you who were in this Assembly as long ago as 1967 and 1971 will surely have heard my predecessor, a colleague of many of you, talk about the Paddle River. It was one of his dreams. I'm just delighted that for his satisfaction and for the satisfaction, as I said, of literally hundreds of individual farmers, the Paddle River project is now going.

The Canada investment division, Mr. Speaker, 16 per cent for Canada, in terms of loans to other provinces. I want to correct the Leader of the Opposition. He indicated that we're really loaning money to the province of Quebec. That's not correct; he's wrong. There are no Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund loans to the province of Quebec. There are loans to Hydro-Quebec, but that is not the province of Quebec. We also lend money and have assisted the province of Manitoba. Other income-earning investments under the Heritage Savings

Trust Fund: 14 per cent. That gives you the total of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It's important that we remember that, number one, it's savings, and that it's based on trust.

I was a member of this Assembly last fall when we had a great debate on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and how people were administering it. Then some people suggested that all of a sudden somebody got up one morning and found out that \$60 million had gone, disappeared. Somehow it was away from us. We scurried in here for 30 days. Some of us — not me — even sat through what seemed to be an eternity one evening, and we had debate and we had question and we had speech. It was fascinating. And the whole thrust of it was that we lost \$60 million, and somebody better go find it.

So after various speakers on the government side tried to calm down some hon. members on the opposition side, the government decided, okay, maybe we should have a study. You don't want to trust us; you don't want to appreciate that we're honorable people and that when we stand up in the House and provide an answer, that answer is based on truth, not on fiction. A letter was sent. The Auditor General, an independent officer, did a report.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on the report, known as the *Conspectus of a Report of the Auditor General of Alberta on Certain Matters Related to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund*. I want to make the comment, if I may, on the basis of some opening statements used by my colleague from Little Bow, who talked about such things as not telling the truth to the people, arrogance, callous attitude, doesn't want to hear the people of Alberta, do not trust. The document put forward by the Auditor states very, very specifically and very, very much to the point that:

The main conclusions contained in the report are that throughout the life of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund:

- (a) no malfeasance, including fraud or collusion, has occurred relating to marketable securities owned by the Fund;
- (b) satisfactory action [has been] taken by the Government respecting audit observations and recommendations made pursuant to the Auditor General Act in connection with marketable securities owned by the Fund;
- (c) marketable securities owned by the Fund were adequately safeguarded and accounted for.

We're talking about trust, and that was the trust. The Auditor even goes one step further and says:

In the event that fraud had been discovered, or marketable securities had not been adequately safeguarded or accounted for, or audit recommendations had been ignored, the Auditor General would have reported these matters previously in an annual or special report to the Legislative Assembly.

The Auditor even went beyond his own good offices and got hold of a firm in Vancouver, British Columbia, and asked that firm

to perform an independent performance appraisal of the Fund for the thirty months during which most of the \$60 million loss was incurred.

The firm provided an opinion letter. I think it's important as well. I'd like to read it as part of my contribution to the Speech from the Throne and the amendment put forward by the Member for Little Bow. The Auditor's consulting firm said:

Combined Marketable Bonds plus Short Term Se-

curities [of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund] when compared against similarly structured Fixed Income Funds . . . demonstrated superior combined performance.

Mr. Speaker, that was there last fall. We've now gotten over it.

A few comments on special warrants. I'm very, very fascinated by the whole question, phraseology, and comments put forward by my colleague on the question of special warrants. It seemed we had question after question after question on a daily basis about a beef cattle program for our very hard pressed beef producers in this province, and we talked about it and talked about it, and we had to get a good, fair assessment of what was happening on a province-wide basis — how many people were hurting and the like. They said, why don't you get going with it, why don't you deal with it? Well we did. We've got a production assistance program. We reacted to it with a special warrant last winter. If we hadn't done that, our farmers would still be hard pressed and waiting to see what we'd do.

Let's just take a look to see where special warrants are going. The Member for Little Bow said that some \$632 million had been expended in special warrants in 1981-82. He's wrong. It's actually a little more than that; it was about \$637 million. But item number one in the special warrant proposal was to agriculture: \$153 million for production assistance to beef cattle, sheep, hogs, feed freight assistance, and the like. A second very important area in special warrants — again for people — in the form of forestry protection: \$105,397,000. My constituents, the people in Swan Hills, want to say thank you to the government of Alberta for being in a position to provide that special warrant. Otherwise Swan Hills would not be here today; it would have been nothing but a pile of dust and ash.

A third active major expenditure area we're talking about in terms of expenditure in special warrants: appeals and deficits through active care hospitals, \$52 million. Regional and municipal water sewer programs came fourth on the list of expenditures under the special warrant provisions: \$48 million. Fifth on the list, Alberta Transportation received \$47.5 million for the construction and maintenance of highways.

People programs: our good citizens in this province who happen to live in Calgary are going to get a new coliseum. I think we all agree the coliseum should go. There was some assistance under special warrants, to the tune of \$22 million. The Member for Calgary Millican smiles. But the people of rural Alberta were not forgotten. Under the major cultural/recreation grant program, they came in seventh on the question of special warrants, with the expenditure level of some \$22 million.

Eighth on the list: energy research, \$21.5 million. My, isn't that important; this is an agricultural/energy province. Water management is important in some parts of this province. We like dams in the constituency I represent. I think the Dickson dam is another important expenditure: \$21 million. Manpower contract settlements for active care hospitals, people who work in our hospitals. The other day the Member for Calgary Millican talked about some very, very gifted and dedicated people. They're not to be forgotten. There had to be some contracts to assist these people. They were funded in terms of salary settlements under the special warrants provision.

Mr. Speaker, we can go on. The gist of the whole thing is that special warrants are important if governments

care, if governments want to be in a position to react to ongoing problems, and if governments are prepared to say to people, look, we not only listen, but we're prepared to do something about the concern you have. We've talked before about the importance of special warrants when we had that tragedy in northern Italy. When the earthquakes came, Italians were out of homes, and many communities in this province came together to assist people.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'm just about running out of time, and unfortunately I won't be able to talk about some other subjects, including the Electric Energy Marketing Act which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member and I have come to exactly the same conclusion with regard to the time.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'll sit down in just a fraction of a second, Mr. Speaker, by just saying thank you to my colleagues who paid very careful attention to what I was saying. I hope that perhaps I'll get in when the motion comes. Just to conclude, I am definitely opposed to the amendment put forward by the Member for Little Bow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we deal with this amendment, may I mention to the House some difficulty that I foresee with the amendment. By reference to the document entitled Speech to the Throne, the scope of it is so extensive that I could see that difficulty extending to both sides of the House. As hon. members know, there is a rule of practice which is pretty solidly established that when a matter has been decided in a session of the Assembly, that same matter may not be raised for further consideration subsequently in the same session unless in some way some further scope is found, or perhaps the previous decision is rescinded.

What we have here is an amendment proposed to the motion for the address in reply which is of such wide-ranging extent that to adopt the amendment would of course cause one set of difficulties, and could have the effect of taking a considerable list of topics out of the reach of the Assembly for consideration further in this session. To reject the amendment could constitute a negative judgment on those same topics or on other topics, and hence also take those out of the consideration of the Assembly during the remainder of the session.

I haven't my *Beauchesne* here, but I have looked at it recently, and I'd like to refer to — I think it's page 124. If I'm not mistaken, the citation is No. 130, but I'm not sure of that; that's subject to checking. In any case, whatever it is, if the Assembly agrees, may I suggest that we might continue with the debate. Certainly the amendment is not as confining as some amendments might be. It's a rather unique amendment as a matter of fact, insofar as throne speech debates go. Might I respectfully suggest we continue with the debate without being unduly restrictive — and certainly the speech by the hon. Member for Barrhead wasn't unduly restricted — while that matter is under consideration by hon. members, and perhaps someone might like to make a proposal or suggestion with regard to this amendment this evening or later on in the throne speech debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: If we call the question, we may be getting into exactly the difficulty I have indicated. However, if it's the wish of the Assembly that we go ahead notwithstanding, with the vote on the question, I'm in the hands of the Assembly.

MR. COOK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, in referring to your ruling or observations, if the effect of either approving or rejecting this amendment would preclude the opposition and also other members of the House from raising any topics in the Speech to the Throne package prepared by the Social Credit opposition. I suppose if the opposition wanted to do that and effectively remove themselves politically from raising any of these topics, either by way of motion or Bills, they're certainly welcome to do that. Perhaps it might be possible for them to withdraw the motion and substitute some more narrow amendment for it. I think that would be about the only recourse hon. members would have.

AN HON. MEMBER: They know the rules.

MR. COOK: If they don't know the rules, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could elaborate further on withdrawal of the motion if the House would permit with unanimous consent, if that would be a reasonable way to go.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, and appreciation for his intervention, I'm not sure we can come to a conclusion on this topic as rapidly as this because, as I see it, it's conceivable that whether the amendment is accepted or rejected, it may introduce substantial difficulties during the remainder of the session. Therefore I would respectfully suggest to the Assembly that we not vote on the amendment until hon. members have had an opportunity to discuss its implications further. It may well be that my fears are groundless. But if they are not, the repercussions could be somewhat serious.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Would it not be possible for you to instruct the Assembly on whether it would be practical to have the motion simply withdrawn and therefore not approve or reject the amendment offered by the Official Opposition? That way the Assembly would not be bound by Citation 350 in *Beauchesne*, which would suggest that if it's either supported or rejected, the opposition would not be free to comment further on the items in their Speech to the Throne.

MR. R. SPEAKER: On the point of order, I think the suggestion you have made is very sensible. Certainly we should have a look at it and see if the concern you raised is there. I think we should recognize — and remove all partisanship from it — that one of the purposes we have in this Legislature is that subjects in our Speech to the Throne are duplicated and listed in the Speech from the Throne. I think any restriction by my amendment in terms of debate on those issues has some serious effects, and I'd like to look at that. Mr. Speaker, I think your suggestion that we hold it and maybe come back to it this evening has some good common sense. In the interim, I don't see any restriction on the debate that can be entered into by anyone in this Legislature under the present circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Assembly agrees, then perhaps we could continue with the debate. I'm grateful to hon. members to my right who referred to the citation that is causing me concern. It isn't just something that's peculiar to the House of Commons. As I say, it is really based on a pretty solidly established parliamentary practice which I think would have to be said to be part of what you might call the common law of Parliament. It's Citation 350 on page 124 of the 5th edition of *Beauchesne*. It refers to the House of Commons Journals, a statement by the Speaker in the House of Commons in 1955. I have a copy of that statement, and I'm just having copies run off so I may be able to share it with the House leaders on both sides.

DR. REID: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the remarks I've heard from you, I didn't intend to enter into the general debate on the Speech from the Throne this year, but I felt I should get into the debate on the amendment put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Before doing that, I would like to compliment both the Member for Calgary Millican and the Member for Bonnyville. Unfortunately I was absent, so I didn't hear them in their full flow of verbal comment and have had to read both speeches in *Hansard*. I'm sure they lost something in the process of losing the input of both members in a verbal fashion.

As I said, I don't intend to get into the debate on the Speech from the Throne, but I am concerned about some of the proposals mentioned in the document. These are regarded as being adequate provisions for the needs of Albertans according to the amendment put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have concerns with many of the items listed here and also with some rather glaring absences. First of all, I would like to get onto those issues I might regard as being constitutional. They really come with the first two paragraphs on human rights and property rights, and then, on page 7, the size and role of government. In both the two items on page 1 and the item on page 7, remarks are made that I have to take some exception to and which concern me greatly because of the interpretations that might be put on these by Albertans.

First of all, on the issue of human rights, the paragraph finishes off by saying that the opposition, believe it or not, is going to give the members of this Assembly "the chance to affirm [the] fundamental rights [of] Albertans." Mr. Speaker, surely we do not need any chance to affirm those rights or to affirm our belief in those rights. We function under a parliamentary democratic system where those rights are taken as given on the basis of the Mother of Parliaments in Westminster. Indeed, when Acts such as the Alberta Bill of Rights and the Individual's Rights Protection Act are proclaimed by a legislature such as this — and we must remember that those were the first two Bills put forward by this Progressive Conservative government after its election in 1971 — they are not restrictive; they are only definitive that those rights are affirmed, but they are not limiting.

Approximately a year ago you and I travelled this country . . . The Leader of the Opposition said that the members of this government don't listen to Albertans. Mr. Speaker, not only do we listen to Albertans — and we listen very carefully to our constituents and to Albertans from other constituencies — but also very specifically on the matter of the Charter of Rights and property rights and on other matters under the constitutional debate, we, the four members of the government side, you, and the former Leader of the Official Opposition,

listened very carefully to the opinions, desires, and expressions of other Canadians across this country. A government and a legislature that does such a thing surely does not need to affirm its belief in human rights, either individual rights or in the broader term.

The first paragraph also goes on to discuss the opting-out clause that was put into the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The difficulty is that this charter is entrenched in the constitution and is, therefore, only amendable by changing the constitution of Canada. All statements made by legislators are open to interpretation by the courts. There is no doubt that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms will be taken to court repeatedly by Canadians over the next decades.

The difficulty is that if the courts choose to interpret the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in a given way, that would then be binding upon a legislature, unless that legislature had the power to introduce its own Bill of rights and also had the right in that legislature, provincial or federal, to opt out of any of those rights. In actual fact, in the future, the opting-out provision will quite likely safeguard individual rights and freedoms rather than restrict them, and I cannot foresee any legislature in the province of Alberta ever trying to restrict individual rights and freedoms.

There is a greater importance, of course, to having the ability to opt out, and that is that this is a very large country. I remember one of the Newfoundland legislators telling us when we were standing on Signal Hill — and it was news to me — that we were closer to Warsaw, Poland, than we were to Victoria, British Columbia. In fact I had to check the distances, and he was correct. In a country as large as that, there are going to be differences of society, mores, and values that in the future may well result in different freedoms and rights being applicable in different areas of a country as large as Canada. Indeed, if we did not allow for those differences, we might hasten the break-up of this country we live in.

The other important thing about tying the Alberta Bill of Rights and the Individual's Rights Protection Act too closely to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, is that that charter, as I said, has to be amended by amending the constitution of the country, and it is much more difficult to amend such a charter than it is to amend an Act of this Legislature. We must remember that legislators, however wise they may think they are, do not have all the wisdom of succeeding generations. It is quite likely that in the future there will be further amendments either to the Alberta Bill of Rights or to the Individual's Rights Protection Act. It's also quite likely that in a much slower process, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms may be amended.

Let us take just one example; that is, the disabled people of the province. We've just finished the International Year of Disabled Persons. Provision had to be made for disabled people within the Individual's Rights Protection Act. Provision also had to be made for special programs. I think every legislator in this Legislature presumed that special programs or, to use that catchall phrase, affirmative action, were presumed to be allowable under the existing Act prior to the amendment. But the courts said it wasn't true, and for that reason the Act had to be amended.

I would like to go on to the subject of property rights. Reading through the two paragraphs under that heading in this document, the Speech to the Throne, one would get the impression that Albertans did not enjoy property rights and that if they had enjoyed them, they were going

to be taken away under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in our new constitution. Nothing could be further from the truth. Albertans have property rights, and one must remember that the land of Alberta is held by the Crown in right of the province of Alberta, not in right of the country of Canada; that property rights are under provincial jurisdiction in the present British North America Act, and none of the amendments will take any of those property rights away from a province. Indeed, that provision was part of the motion put in front of this Assembly in the fall of 1980, which I believe was approved by a vote of 70 to 1, the dissenter being the New Democratic Party member from Spirit River-Fairview.

An explicit reference to property rights in the charter would cause some difficulties in other parts of Canada if it were too broad. Perhaps the members of the constitution committee of this Legislature have a broader base of understanding of this country than the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition. One only has to look at the situation in Prince Edward Island, a very small province, all of it privately owned and having suffered in times gone by from what are known as absentee landlords, to understand the sensitivity to a property rights entrenchment in the constitution which would give all Canadians equal right to own a piece of the small province of Prince Edward Island. They've already been through that once, and they are very content to have restrictions on ownership of Prince Edward Island property by non-residents of the province.

A broad property rights entrenchment in the constitution would quite possibly override the ability of the people of Prince Edward Island to control the land in that small province. For that reason, I think it's much better that property rights be left with the provinces, so that the small differences that may be necessary because of the discrepancies and disparities in this diverse nation can continue to exist to the benefit of the residents of those provinces.

I was glad to see in the references to the size and role of government that the Social Credit Official Opposition does not accept separation from Canada in any form as a reasonable solution to Alberta's concerns. I hope they would take that attitude, and I was somewhat surprised to hear the Leader of the Official Opposition say that loans to other provinces must cease forthwith. Mr. Speaker, those loans to other provinces from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund have been made at the same rate of interest to all provinces.

In this province, in this Legislature, and particularly in this government, we believe that all Canadians are equal and that when we lend to a province, it should be at the same rate, regardless of the credit rating of that individual province or provincial body, such as Hydro-Quebec. Indeed, were it not so, we would be lending to provinces at differential rates, and we would be penalizing the people of a province which has some economic problems. We would be penalizing those people by charging a higher rate, and surely there is no better way to destroy the cohesiveness of this country than to indulge in differential interest rates on loans to provinces from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Surely, also, there is no surer way to cause problems than to say that we will not lend those funds outside the province of Alberta. Those loans have enabled provinces, in particular those with economic difficulties, to borrow at a rate somewhat lower than on the open market. Also, in spite of the federal government's ridiculous fiscal policy, they have helped to decrease borrowings outside the

country, which have an effect on our balance of payments. They have also affected our interest rates within the country by restricting borrowings outside the country. However, the Official Opposition would like to cease these lendings from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund forthwith.

In the same section in this document on the size and role of government, some remarks are addressed to a decade of federal/provincial warfare — and they use the word "warfare". Mr. Speaker, if one wants to use the word warfare, one can use it. But surely if there has been a war, it has not been at the seeking of this government or this Legislature but rather the result of bad decisions and bad policies made by another Parliament some thousands of miles to the east of us, in Ottawa. The warfare was not started by this government, but surely any parliament whose prerogatives and rights are threatened by another is entitled to respond in the strongest way to those threats. One only needs to look at a few issues.

The ownership of the natural resources: it's in the British North America Act and, subsequent to the resource transfer Act of 1930, there was no doubt about the ownership of the resources by the people of Alberta. The natural resources belong to the people under that Act. But had we not expressed strong opposition to the proposed changes of the federal government in their documents, it was quite possible that the ownership of those resources would either have been taken away from the province of Alberta or rendered more or less meaningless and valueless. With the ownership, of course, goes the control of development and sale, the rate of development, and also the control of export from the province.

One only has to think of the amending formula proposed by the federal government in their constitutional proposal. That amending formula was going to entrench in the constitution of Canada the principle of inequality between provinces. Surely if we were not entitled to indulge in interparliamentary warfare on that basis, we would never be entitled to do it. One cannot imagine any legislator sitting in a provincial parliament, not feeling that he or she should take the most vigorous action in order to entrench in our constitution a principle of equality between provinces.

If the Social Credit opposition feels that the government was wrong in that instance, I would like to see them take that issue to the people of Alberta and say, we feel that it is not the right of the government of the province, indeed we do not feel it's the duty of that government to take on the federal government when they propose inequality between provinces. If they take that issue to the people of Alberta, they may find that the issue of federal/provincial warfare has much greater support from the people of Alberta for the stance taken by the provincial government in those instances than they thought.

I would now like to make some remarks about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the handling of it by the government, and the things that have been done with it. First of all, I would like to mention housing. Had it not been for the existence of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and the assets in it, and had it not been for the policies of this government, last year there would have been hardly any low- or medium-cost housing constructed in this province, again because of the policies of the federal government. But that heritage fund gives us some freedom to act independent of their fiscal policies. Had it not been for the existence of the ability, through the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation and the Alberta Housing Corporation, to develop housing programs

necessary in a rapidly growing province with an increase in population, the housing situation and, in particular, rental and low-cost housing in this province would have been at a crisis stage.

There are specific criticisms in this document of the \$260 million development at Kananaskis Country. But surely in the history of Alberta, if we are not going to do things such as the development of Kananaskis Country at this time when we have the assets, when are we going to do those things? If one is going to criticize Kananaskis Country, one has to criticize all that is in it. That means criticizing William Watson Lodge and other facilities in that rather magnificent park. If one is going to pay attention to people as well as to developments, one has to include Kananaskis Country and similar developments.

I already mentioned the loans to other provinces at equal rates regardless of their fiscal state. There has been some discussion by the hon. leader this afternoon about the control of expenditures from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I presume he was referring to the capital projects division. All moneys expended or used through the capital projects division are debated in the estimates in this Legislature every fall. They're debated very fully. In fact, last fall we debated them for some 23 days, I think. Those deemed assets could be interpreted as expenditures, but are handled exactly the same as all other budgetary proposals by this government. Indeed, the select standing committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund subsequently discusses with every minister the expenditure of those funds in the previous year while discussing the report on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I find the reference to the \$60 million reflecting pool outside the Legislature a little difficult to accept. I don't think the pool is going to cost \$60 million. I seem to notice that all members of the Legislature are using some very much needed parking space included in that development. When one stands in the foyer of this Legislature Building and thinks of the economy of this province in 1905 when our forebears decided to build the Alberta Legislature, surely if they could commit to that expenditure, then we can give the building the surroundings it so justly deserves.

In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, prior to adjourning, I was discussing some of the benefits Albertans have derived from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the areas of housing and Kananaskis Country in particular. In his remarks, the Leader of the Opposition criticized

the alleged lack of discussion in this Assembly of the capital projects division and of the fund in its entirety. Surely if one looks at the Alberta Opportunity Company, the beginning farmer program, the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital, the scholarship fund, and the medical research foundation, those matters were discussed in this Legislature fully. Admittedly they are non-interest bearing investments from the fund. But the other investments which are interest bearing and of limited duration and which return a financial investment to the fund are surely in a different category. I think the care that goes into the allocation of those funds by the investment committee is well performed. One only needs to look at the recent report by the Auditor General to have confirmation of that.

The only other matter in the document put forward last week by the Leader of the Opposition that I wish to draw attention to is some of the rather glaring omissions in it. He discusses the crisis in health care, and there is not a crisis in health care in Alberta. The health care system delivers care to Albertans, and I say this with some expertise, which is second to none anywhere in the world. It is better than the totally free enterprise system in the United States and vastly better than the socialist system in Britain. Although the intent of the federal government may be to try to push it into that British system, again it will be the responsibility of provincial governments whose constitutional responsibility is to deliver health care. It will be the responsibility of provincial governments to once more, if necessary, indulge in federal/provincial warfare, to use the leader's term.

The hospital construction program in this province is better and more adequate than any I know of. To have approximately \$1.5 billion worth of hospital construction under way or in the planning is a remarkable achievement for a province of some 2 million people.

The most glaring omission in the document is that I can find nothing referring to education. Preschool, the school system of grades 1 to 12, and postsecondary education appear to have no involvement with the opposition at all. I can find nothing in this document that would indicate interest in the education system from, I think the expression is, K to 12 and post-12. There seems to be no interest in it at all. Surely if there was ever an investment in the future of Alberta and Albertans, it is in the educational system.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I can find little in the document to recommend it and much to criticize. It may be unusual for a government member to be criticizing a document in the way that I have done. That is the normal prerogative of the opposition dealing with proposals by government. But surely if the opposition makes proposals, they are open to the same reaction the government expects when it puts forward proposals. Therefore, depending on the decision that is made about the handling of the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, I would recommend that either he withdraw the amendment and preferably the document it refers to — but I doubt if that will happen — or, failing that, the House should reject the amendment.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of making some comments relative to the amendment or the throne speech, or whichever way we are going to go on it. In many ways I feel somewhat sorry for the opposition. I would like to explain why in just a moment.

First of all, I would like to join with other colleagues in

the House in congratulating the Member for Calgary Millican, the mover, and the Member for Bonnyville, the seconder, of the throne speech. I think once again we see an example of speeches in this House from members who have a firm understanding, a great understanding of the thoughts, wishes, dreams, and desires of Albertans. In particular, I would like to compliment the Member for Calgary Millican, who seems to have that deep understanding of matters other than what the Speech from the Throne was all about; that is, empathy for his fellow man or, to quote him, his fellow person.

Very clearly, Mr. Speaker, when we look at *Hansard* a few days from now and consider the comments by both the Leader of the Opposition and, I am sure, others who will follow, I think we will feel some empathy for them in terms of what the opposition can really say. I am sure they have their own rule book — the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is not in his place — that says, whatever this government does is no good. I am flabbergasted when I hear the comments I heard a moment ago that this government has done nothing good. I didn't know we had time limits in this House that prevented anybody from making good comments, yet I didn't hear any. I don't lightly criticize the Leader of the Official Opposition. I don't think I ever have. But after hearing the comments today — his document may well have been prepared by the Member for Clover Bar, because I hear him to my right making comments and not giving me the opportunity to make mine. I tend to get a little upset.

I heard the other member of the opposition — I didn't see him in the gallery today; I watched him on television. The leader of that party that is near extinction said at the conclusion of the Speech from the Throne that in reviewing it he had some difficulty as to whether it was the same as the one last year. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I feel a bit sorry for a party that has as its leader one who cannot tell the difference between the Speech from the Throne in 1982 and the Speech from the Throne in 1981.

Then there were comments that went on as though this government in particular was responsible for everything. When I look at the throne speech I see very clearly what would appear to me to be some of the most basic characteristics that are important to all citizens, certainly Albertans. I would term them the four cornerstones for 1982 and perhaps a little longer, itemized as the economy; that is, the job — if people are not employed, we only have to look at the results of mental health in other parts of Canada where there is high unemployment. When a man does not have a job, he really doesn't have very much. He certainly doesn't have his dignity. I don't think agriculture needs expansion in this Assembly. It is what this province was born from; it spawned the rest of what we have. Granted, many of us don't pay enough attention to it. I suppose the environment means many things to many people, but certainly clean air, clean water, and not having to walk through what I often hear mentioned in this House with regard to the Bow River: hazardous chemicals. Finally, something that psychology at least teaches that in the hierarchy of needs is fundamental not only to dignity but a way of life is some degree of security of housing or shelter or someplace you can call home. That is what the Speech from the Throne is all about.

I agree that fundamental to that and running through that continuously — if one were to choose a common denominator, it would have to be the term "economy" or "economics". Then I hear people in this House this afternoon saying that the government is responsible for all that is bad. It's like the fellow who went into a store and

said, I want to buy that item; how much is it? The owner said, it's \$25. Oh, he said, I can get it down the street for \$20. Well, why don't you go down and get it. Oh, he doesn't have any; he's sold out. Well, if I was sold out, I'd only charge \$15.

For some reason, we sometimes think that once government becomes involved, if the supply is not there, no matter what it is, the government is responsible. I don't pretend to be a great student of the democratic system, but I'm student enough to recognize that my job is to provide that contribution to the Assembly on behalf of my constituents and the role of government should be to help those who either cannot or, in some cases, will not help themselves. Not all things to all people.

Mr. Speaker, because it's generally economic in nature, it's probably important to make a comment or two relevant to the economy of the country. I can appreciate that when a man is out of a job, when he can't meet his mortgage payment, he lashes out. For most of us, being human, when disaster occurs it's never our fault. It's always someone else's.

I don't like to be one who keeps harping that the high interest rate is the responsibility of the government of the nation, of Ottawa, even though I recognize that. I happen to be one who subscribes to the fact that the only reason interest rates are where they are is because people didn't stop borrowing when they were somewhat lower. I have no great difficulty with the high interest rates. I suppose I'm like other members of this Assembly who feel bad when they see ventures going under. But surely there's a lesson there too. Why is it, when you look at our health delivery system in Alberta where we provide last-dollar financing, there are many businesses in this province that have gone beyond last-dollar financing and are borrowing, and for some reason we're responsible when the incidence of bankruptcy increases twofold, threefold, or fourfold. I have some difficulty with that.

We hear people talking about the national debt. It's no secret that Statistics Canada, if one can believe it, now indicates that it takes 500,000 Canadians — we only have 10 million working — a year's income to pay the interest on the national debt. One might not be very proud of that, but I suppose if you look at the responsibilities of Ottawa you begin to realize that, like our school boards in this province, about 85 per cent of their expenditures are virtually statutory. The quickest way out of office, for anybody I know, is to do away with the old age pension. A slower way, but just as certain, is to do away with the children's allowance, and on and on and on.

I have some degree of empathy for the federal government, but an area that concerns me is that for the past five years every province east of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border has had a deficit. Last year it was over \$3 billion. This year Quebec alone is going to have a deficit of \$3 billion. Perhaps it wouldn't be a bad thing, Mr. Speaker, if we believe that Canada, like synergetics, is the sum of its parts, for members to give a little consideration to what some of the sister provinces are going through; not a bad idea either to remember that west of that same border, Manitoba-Saskatchewan, there has not been a deficit since 1976, which I think tends to give an imbalance to the country.

Reference was made earlier to the special warrants. I don't want to get involved debating that. It seems to me that on the one hand we had people saying, for heaven's sake, bail out the cattleman. Well, how do you bail him out, if that's what you're going to do? Perhaps subsidy by any other name is bailing out. How do you do it, unless

you respond as a government. I understand a special warrant had to be passed to do that. But as I said, I don't particularly want to get involved in talking about special warrants.

DR. BUCK: What's \$600 million to the Tories?

MR. GOGO: As I recall, Walter, \$600 million was just about the deficit this government inherited from you. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: You've been reading too much of that Ottawa PC bunk, John.

MR. GOGO: Here in the province, Mr. Speaker, when I as the Member for Lethbridge West and a member of a government look at it in context of the rest of the country, I can't help but believe that although this government's made some mistakes and, I'm sure, will continue to make some, surely this government has been honest enough to respond to needs when they've been identified. I think of what some people would think are somewhat minor matters. I recall Social Services and Community Health just a year or so ago when, in the judgment of some, our day care standards weren't high enough. What happened? I think the government responded overnight. To me that's the type of response the government's prepared to make. As we go through the Speech from the Throne, I think we can see many, many occasions reflected here that are an indication of not only what the government's prepared to do in terms of response but indeed how it's prepared to fill a void left by the private sector.

I was one of the strong critics not very long ago — October 1, 1981, I think — when Housing and Public Works, through its subsidiary Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, amended the regulations for family home ownership. I've long believed it was discriminatory in the first place, but it was changed, virtually arbitrarily, that unless you had a child you didn't get a mortgage. I felt that was wrong. I think that somehow this government has felt that, because here in this Speech from the Throne we're changing it back. What better admission could you get that perhaps the way it was was the way it should be. It has been changed. What more could you find in terms of honesty in a government that says, maybe we were wrong and we'll change it. Incidentally, I'm very pleased to see that's been done.

The area of health care — and of course it's a sensitive area now in view of certain professionals being on strike or withdrawing their services — becomes somewhat touchy, but in my mind it relates back to the economy. I just happen to have a document I picked up yesterday and I would like to comment on it relative to: are we really that bad off in the country? For example, if we look at a period not many years ago, 1969 — we can go to '59, '49, or '79 — and the amount of work effort required by various people, assuming they earn average incomes, we find that it took 33 weeks of wages to purchase an automobile. In 1981, and this is the average wages now, it takes 19. Well, maybe that's not a necessity, so we'll look at something that is. We look at 50 litres of gasoline. I'm told by many people that gasoline was never higher. Is it really high? The hon. Minister of Transportation knows what I'm talking about. In 1959 it took three hours of work for a so-called 40 cents gallon of gasoline or whatever it was. Today it's only 18 hours. And we can go through. Heating: there have been so many complaints

today about the very high cost of heat. Not that many years ago it took 11 hours of your wages, and today it takes six.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, I'm not talking about the senior citizen, the one on the fixed income referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. I have a great concern for that person who's locked into a situation and is faced with ever-increasing costs.

Of course I just have to refer to a favorite one: in 1959 you had to work 213 minutes to buy a bottle, and today, through the tremendous increase in prices, you can now get a full 26 ounce for 51 minutes of work.

DR. BUCK: They make the bottle smaller.

MR. GOGO: They make the bottle smaller. I think that is a very intelligent response. A 26 ounce bottle today is smaller than a 26 ounce bottle was then. Metrication.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the farmer just doesn't get enough income, but we find that 30 years ago he had to work 33 minutes for a pound of steak. He can achieve the same thing today at its all-time high price with 21 minutes, fully a third less. I just relate that to indicate to members of the Assembly, particularly those of doom and gloom, that although prices might appear to be high, although the cost of living may appear to be getting out of hand, although all these things may appear to be happening, why is it that most people — and I say "most" because I refer now to the average income being \$17,680 — are working 10 to 35 per cent less to achieve the same goods and services that they did 20 years ago? Pardon me, I didn't talk about lawyers; that's not on the sheet. That may be an exception to this.

Frankly, many people in our society were never better off. I point that out because at this time the average income in Alberta is \$21,000. The average income in Canada is \$18,900. I don't want to get into the rhetoric, because it will just spark catcalls when I mention all the great benefits we have in this province in terms of the income tax, no sales tax, and on and on.

With regard to labor, Mr. Speaker, along with members of the Assembly, I recognize that not only do we appear to be in a difficult position now with regard to our health delivery mechanism and the nurses, but indeed — and I don't cast any aspersions, I assure you — I've had many constituents explain to me, try to explain to me, or certainly say to me: John, we may be experiencing Reaganomics in America, but I think we're experiencing 'greedonomics' in Canada. Everybody seems to think that by virtue of the fact they're still alive, the first day of every year they're entitled to another 10 or 15 per cent income, irrespective of output or productivity. Maybe that's the way it is.

A document just published the other day that I really wasn't going to mention, except that I have it here, is the progress of negotiations for the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees to the provincial government: two full pages, one third of which are new items. I'm not saying you shouldn't be entitled to seven weeks' pay. I'm not saying you shouldn't be entitled to two days off per week in the last six months before you retire, but somebody is saying it, and this government is going to have to respond somehow. I simply remind members of this House that we're representing 2.1 million Albertans out there. Many of them don't get seven weeks; many of them don't get two days a week off for six months prior to retiring. As a matter of fact, some of them are working seven days a week to make sure they can retire. We as a government

have to respond to those kinds of proposals. I don't know how we're going to respond, because no matter which way it goes, I know it's a non-winner. I'm a member of the government. If we do it, we're in trouble; if we don't do it, we're in trouble. What else is new?

Mr. Speaker, this evening when the dinner bell rang, there was a letter on my desk. It annoys me a little, and I want to make reference to it. It says:

I am a fourth generation Alberta citizen; I am a woman, I am a mother, I am a wage earner, I am a nurse and . . . a taxpayer. [More] important [than that] I am a voter, the relative of voters and the friend of voters. As an individual I am worth many votes to some one.

The first paragraph alone tells me that somebody out there who, for whatever reason, is at odds with their association, be it the UNA, or their employer, be it the AHA, has suddenly deemed that this Legislative Assembly, or certainly some of its members, is responsible for them. It goes on to say:

I'm tired [very tired] of having to battle with the A.H.A. each time a new nursing contract . . .

I can appreciate that. Sometimes I get tired of battling my colleagues in the caucus about something. Now I know what the alternative is, because there's no mandatory membership in the caucus I'm in. As a matter of fact, it's a pretty high price tag. It might be higher this year, because this is the year for nominations. It goes on to say:

How dare you tell me I don't do active nursing care on the evening or night shifts? How dare you tell me my skills and knowledge don't improve after five years employment? How dare you tell me that I must arrange my family and personal life second to the needs of the . . .

And on and on. The conclusion is:

I chose nursing as a career and do find the work fulfilling and challenging. I did not receive a call from above . . .

which is reminiscent of a political party to my right . . . directing me into nursing as a vocation. I did not become a bride of the A.H.A. If I had, I might be content to accept the dogmatic, paternalistic, chauvinistic . . .

this must be a postgraduate student out of our new postgraduate program

. . . views they take of me and of my [sisters].

You are responsible to me . . .

and this letter is addressed to me, and this is what I take exception to

. . . as a citizen, taxpayer and wage-earner to force the A.H.A. to return to bargaining and allow me to return to work with dignity.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we've somehow reached the point in this province — I don't know how — when government is responsible for everything. I'm going to reply to this letter, and I'm going to reply in kind. I'm simply going to say, if you want me to become involved in an active way in response to your letter, tomorrow I will commence lobbying my colleagues in this government to create you a civil servant. If that's the price tag of having government interfere with the collective bargaining process and the only solution, then that's the kind of action I'm prepared to support, because here someone wants the best of both worlds. They want to play by their own rules as long as things are going their way. It's a bit reminiscent of the energy agreement with Ottawa, when I think of it. When the rules don't go your way, you suddenly want to rewrite the rules.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, looking ahead in 1982 and beyond, I think that unless there are some dramatic changes with regard to labor relations in Alberta — and I'm not pointing fingers — changes in terms of attitude, whereby we can get people away from the thought that under this dome lies a responsibility for everything from the concept of the womb to the tomb.

Let me simply conclude, first of all, with an apology to my colleague from Little Bow. I didn't mean to sound off in the way it may have appeared to you, although frankly I found it that way. Secondly, I think each member of this Assembly is going to have to assess his or her own role in this Assembly with regard to what government should and should not be to people.

Finally, I won't say the constituents of Lethbridge West have had the best representation ever, but I will say that in my view the constituents of Lethbridge West have had exceedingly good government, have been well treated. The city of Lethbridge has publicly stated that it feels the government of Alberta has funded it for the necessary programs. The government of Alberta has upheld its position in terms of local autonomy, and the city of Lethbridge will set its priorities for its citizens and not be imposed on from on high in Edmonton. Indeed I think most of us are fortunate to be living in Alberta in a free society in 1982.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to participate in the throne speech debate. At the outset, I would like to compliment the mover and the seconder on their eloquent addresses.

DR. BUCK: And the amender.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this month I presented my maiden speech. Today I took the bother to review *Hansard* to see what I said at that time. I described the Vegreville constituency to some extent, and I also expressed the concerns and needs of the constituency. I feel today may be an opportune time to make some comparisons and review some of the accomplishments over the last 10 years.

I had the opportunity of serving in various areas of local government for approximately 17 years before I was elected to the Legislature. Serving on the Lamont school division, one concern I had was that the population was dwindling. In the '60s we already had combined classes which did not provide the education we would have liked. It was a real concern. I remember very well attending an administration seminar in the mid-60s at the Jubilee Auditorium, where there were elected representatives to school boards, town councils, and other areas. There may have been 700 to 800 people at that seminar. The Premier of the day, who was the keynote speaker, told us very bluntly that within 10 years 85 per cent of the population in the province would be located in the two major cities and nothing could be done about it. It was a big concern, and I knew it would be detrimental to the rural areas, but if nothing could be done it was accepted.

Mr. Speaker, I also remember very well mid-November of 1970 when the Premier of this province, who at that time was the Leader of the Opposition, addressed approximately 500 delegates attending the annual meeting of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. He stated that should his party form the government, this trend would be reversed. Looking at it today, that trend did reverse. It was difficult, it was costly, but the communities have revitalized.

Also, one of the first priorities of our government was to help the handicapped and, secondly, to bring relief to our senior citizens. One of the very first programs initiated by our government in '72 was the home-owners tax discount. Senior citizens were the first ones to receive it in '73. During the subsequent period of time three senior citizens' lodges and an extension to one have been built in the Vegreville constituency. Self-contained units were built in five urban municipalities. One hospital was replaced and another one has been approved.

I have a concern for the aged because of the number of senior citizens who reside in the Vegreville constituency. Just less than two years ago when we were distributing the golden medallions, I learned that the Vegreville constituency had the second largest number of senior citizens in this province. There is a concern for our aged and for the sick; they need care. There was a real concern about the recent nurses' strike. I really wondered about the many aged people and the sick in the constituency. I hope the people of the Vegreville constituency will read *Hansard*, because I want to commend the many nurses — some who had committed themselves to household duties, others to retirement — who have come to the hospitals in need of help. Our hospitals have functioned and coped very well.

I must say that our government looked at these needs, and I guess the 1981 energy agreement along with the Canadian constitution gives an indication of what steps our government has taken. The constitution is an Alberta-made constitution debated and approved in this Legislature in 1976. It is a constitution that nine provinces along with the federal government were able to accept.

The energy agreement also ... Some may think we were greedy, but I think we were fair. We felt Alberta should get a fair return for its depleting resources, but at the same time we said we would request only 75 per cent of the world price.

I look back when my parents and grandparents came just before the turn of the century. They came for several reasons, but the most important reason was that they knew they would be able to acquire 160 acres of land for a token price. They also knew they would be able to do what they would like with that land with very little government interference. They also knew they were leaving a land where socialism and state control were already creeping. They expected there would be a day when Canada would be a strong, united country, and I think their expectations materialized.

Some of them were very shortly called to go to war. Many of them went willingly. Many of them sacrificed their lives for that same purpose: to protect this country, to have a strong, united Canada. Unfortunately, over the last five or six years this country has been disunited more than ever before in the previous 100 years. There have even been suggestions that maybe part of Canada should break away from central Canada. Then there were suggestions that maybe even the provinces should break up.

Mr. Speaker, every year on November 11 Canadians across this country go to the cenotaphs to pay tribute to those people who gave so much of themselves so we could live in a strong country. Have we forgotten so quickly what our forefathers worked and sacrificed for? Maybe it would be a good time now to pause and consider how fortunate we are to live in a country like Canada, a province like Alberta, where opportunities abound and relatively few suffer. Maybe it would also be appropriate for us to commit ourselves to help those less fortunate

than ourselves. When the violence in this world of ours is on the increase, probably a commitment such as this would be beneficial, and I am glad the Progressive Conservative government of this province has gone that way, to help those who are in need.

We hear criticism here and there about the loans to other provinces, and today we heard today that we loan money to other provinces that we could use here. Here is another area where our government feels we should help the needy. Would it look better for New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island to go to Wall Street for their money when Alberta could do that. I think this is a way we are showing that we are helping our brother Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture continues to be the basic industry in this province. I am glad to see the many programs we have initiated over the last number of years to help agriculture continue. Whether it is assistance to the farmers, beef producers and hog producers, assistance for flooded land, the natural gas program, the transportation allowance on fuel — and I would like to say that it seems the biggest concern in the rural area now is the high cost of tractor fuel. Other areas can be pushed off on somebody else, but when you have to spend \$150 to fill up your tractor one time and it only lasts a day, I hope a further transportation allowance will be considered in any future assistance to farmers.

There have been several accomplishments in the constituency. One was the official opening this past summer of one of the biggest decentralizations of government services, the environmental centre in Vegreville. Even though this gave a good boost to the community, the constituency, it is providing service for the entire province and beyond. Even though that complex brought a lot of people, I think the biggest accomplishment in the last year was the regional water line from Edmonton to Vegreville. History tells us that in 1973-74, which was quite a severe winter, the spring thaw flooded a good portion of the town of Vegreville. All the medical facilities had to be vacated. Many homes were damaged. Right then and there, the Premier came up on his own. He assured the people that there would be assistance and something would be done so that river would not flood again. I am glad the final phase is almost completed to prevent future flooding.

Since the 1973-74 flooding of the river where Vegreville uses its water, every year thereafter water rationing had to be put on the people because of the shortage of water. So I believe this regional water line is not only going to provide Vegreville but every community between Edmonton and Vegreville is going to gain from it. We know we can get by without natural gas — we can still use propane, and if not propane we can use fuel oil or the wood and coal that we used to — but there is no substitute for water. I think this is one of the biggest accomplishments.

In the throne speech, provision has been given in culture, one of the areas I'm quite concerned about. I'm proud the Minister of Culture asked me to chair the advisory board for the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village, even though it's not located in the Vegreville constituency. I believe it's going to be one of the finer living museums in this country within a couple of years. It's predicted it should even exceed the Fort Garry museum in Manitoba.

Since the Minister of Economic Development — International Trade is here — he has held that portfolio for two consecutive terms, and I think in his wisdom he saw

fit to provide assistance to our communities to provide a better quality of life. In the past that was why the population was dwindling. The farming conditions were not different, but people saw they had no cultural aspects. Their recreation was very minimal. I am glad the former Minister of Culture saw the need to help improve these community halls, cemeteries, history books, and many other things.

As I mentioned the Ukrainian village, I must also pay tribute to the many who started off on a voluntary basis without any assistance whatsoever. They had gone far before the provincial government purchased that village. This past year, 1981, there were slightly over 33,000 registered visitors to that village. Now everybody who comes does not sign the register, and there have been several occasions — and I know this last summer when the Ukrainians were celebrating their 90th anniversary of Canada, there may have been well over 8,000 people. There was no guest register, so there may have been up to 75,000 visitors. Within the next few years, I think this is going to be a real living museum that will attract people from all over the world.

I would like to add that there has been a lot of controversy over the selection of a hazardous waste materials site. There have been studies. There has been a lot of complaining, Mr. Speaker, but I still think our government, the Minister of the Environment, will have to decide what the study tells them, what the best location is, and that is the place it should be. If that hazardous waste site had to be in my own back yard, if that's the best place for it, that's where it should be. I think we'll have to go along. With all the accidents over the last little while, the spills we've had, we cannot go on forever hauling these chemicals across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is about all I want to mention. This throne speech indicates our concern for our province, for our residents. And looking at it, when the budget speech is presented, I think it's going to explain still further the value of this throne speech.

I would like to thank hon. members for listening.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[Amendment lost]

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to speak this evening in the fourth session of the 19th Legislature, and wish His Honour continued good health in the future. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of His Honour's speech. I listened with great interest to the comments on their constituencies, one urban and one rural. The Member for Bonnyville spoke of the economic turndown in his area, the speculation and bankruptcies very similar to the Grande Prairie area.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting reviewing my speeches in the throne speech debates of '79, '80, and '81. In 1979 Grande Prairie and area were experiencing an unprecedented growth; growth rates in some of the urban centres in the constituency of 11 per cent and even higher. Oil and gas exploration in the Deep Basin created an economic boom, creating a huge demand for new services, housing, apartments, and a demand on municipalities to supply water, sewer, roads, et cetera. There was also a demand on developers to supply more serviced land. People coming into the area were unable to find accommodation. That's only a matter of a few years ago. Many of them were living in campers and tents in the park

during that year of 1979. Business, city, and developers geared up rapidly to handle that housing demand that was put upon them.

During 1980 our 75th birthday celebrations took place. Business continued to expand to meet that demand. The city of Grande Prairie and the towns of Beaverlodge and Sexsmith had to make immediate plans for upgrading their water and sewer services in order to cope with the in-migration of people. Wages and rents continued to rise. In fact cafe operators in those days were advertising for waitresses at \$10 an hour, quite a change to what we see today.

But, Mr. Speaker, the storm clouds were on the horizon. The October 28 national budget and energy policy started a trend which continued from that date to the present time — first a closing down of the oil exploration, a movement of the rigs out of the country to greener pastures, a slowing down of the activity, jobs becoming scarce, and recently people moving away because they're unable to find a job or unable to handle the new mortgage. The complete turnaround in the oil and gas industry and forest industry plus two poor years of crops have left the area and its residents depressed and frustrated; frustrated to see their business have to close, not because of poor management, as many have been in business for many years, but because of external forces through federal policies and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, because of the high interest rate effect on the building industry, both North Canadian Forest Products and Procter & Gamble had cutbacks which meant a loss of jobs. Farming has had a turnaround too because of two years with not much moisture. All in all, the bloom is off the rose. Things cannot get much worse, so any change will be an improvement.

Today in Grande Prairie we have well over 100 new homes sitting idle. People can't get into them because they can't afford the mortgage. Apartment vacancies are 20 per cent and more. Our major building contractors are in trouble because they have serviced land, and lots of it, which they got into in order to handle the boom. They are now trying to carry that land at the high carrying charges forced upon them today. Many of them are in serious trouble.

The slowdowns and layoffs in the forest industry have had an effect on the farming community too. Many farmers work in the forest in the wintertime to supplement their farm income. These off-farm jobs have dried up, which creates extra pressure on those farmers who need that extra income in order to survive.

Mr. Speaker, the new Workers' Compensation Board Act and its changes will have some serious effects in my constituency. The high forest industry rate hits them when they are almost on their knees. The new definition of "proprietor" has a very serious effect on some small business operators: skidder operators, truckers, and others. I urge the minister to review that section. I know he's looking at it, and he's made some minor changes. I'd only encourage him to make those further changes so we're encouraging people to get into business rather than discouraging them. I'm sure it was not planned that way.

On behalf of the citizens of Grande Prairie, I want to express my appreciation for the amount of public building that is going on in the constituency at this time, such as the AGT building, the provincial building, the forestry building, and the hospital. If it wasn't for those, we'd be dead. There's nothing else going on in the constituency at the moment. These are the only buildings being built at this time.

I was pleased with the recent announcement of the spring commencement of the long-awaited Highway 40. That is going to be a shot in the arm for that area which, when completed, will open up a total new area of the province. I hope the routing for the balance of that road can be announced fairly soon.

While speaking of transportation, I must thank the minister for the very successful completed economic stabilization program. The program enabled many small operators from my area to at least get some work, which enabled them to hang on. I would urge the government to continue that program to stimulate construction work through grading, gravel crushing, stockpiling, paving, and rehabilitation of roads. The dollars spent now will help many small operators keep in business and get them over the hump. It means doing work today that we would be doing in the future anyway. So it would be of great assistance to some of those small operators.

The much spoken about Grande Prairie regional hospital is moving along very well. Because of the economic slowdown in the area and the letting of contracts out to smaller contractors, most of the work is coming in well under estimate, with local contractors getting some of that work, which is greatly appreciated. I suppose you'd have to say that out of all bad comes some good.

The nursing program recently announced by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower will take its first students this fall. I'd extend my best wishes to the college board and the new president, who are doing a terrific job. The student residence of the college is finally under construction. It should be in operation by the fall of 1983 and, when completed, will greatly assist the students from the outlying areas. I want to thank the minister for his assistance to the college to help them cope and clear up the budget they accumulated over the past few years. That is appreciated very much.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the stop-loss program for hogs and the beef cattle support program were of great assistance and very much appreciated by the farming community from my area. I hope all parties will work together to develop long-term programs to remove cyclical pricing in those industries.

Farm input costs continue to rise. To assist one area, the fuel distribution cost allowance should be changed from 12 cents a gallon to 20 per cent of the cost of that product. The cost of that product would then move along as the cost increases, not leave the 12 cents per gallon behind as it is today. I ask the minister to consider that proposal and on behalf of the farmers of my area thank him for the programs I mentioned earlier.

Some resolution to the surface rights report should be taken up in this session. There is much expectation in rural Alberta about that report.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens of my area appreciate the increase in the renters' assistance grant just announced from \$400 to \$600 per year. This will greatly assist them in these trying times when they're on fixed incomes. They also look forward to the new lodge and self-contained units now under construction in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I refer now to the speech of His Honour by saying I am pleased to see the priorities emphasized this year in the Speech from the Throne. No doubt the economy needs some stimulation. If the export gas sales were to increase in the Deep Basin of my area, work would start creating new jobs. We'd get back on track again and get into business. An early announcement of the start on the Alsands project would create a ripple effect across Canada which would get the nation back on

track too and get some investor confidence back in Canada which we are sadly lacking at this time. More particularly it would assist this province in creating jobs.

Agriculture has long been the backbone of the economy of this province. I am pleased to see us recognizing it as it is and trying to overcome the transportation problems plaguing the industry for years. We also plan to assist in reducing the pressures of increasing input costs. As I mentioned earlier, one of those would be a change in the farm fuel distribution allowance.

Under the environment, proper water management is very important, be it irrigation in the south or proper drainage in the north. The motion I proposed in the 1981 spring session spoke of that need. I am very pleased to see that we are moving in that direction and increasing the attention to proper drainage and water management.

Housing is another major thrust. In the major urban centres, this will greatly assist. In the long term it will assist my area, but more particularly it will aid us now in land banking. Right now there is a glut of housing in Grande Prairie, but if interest rates were to come down to something more reasonable, those 100 houses would soon be taken up. The unprecedented budget of \$1.7 billion in housing last year greatly assisted many young couples and seniors with accommodation across the province.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward with interest to the task force report on education financing. While speaking of education, I congratulate the Grande Prairie school district for their hard work in conjunction with the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower in developing the first child development centre in Grande Prairie. The centre is for the severely handicapped and construction should commence this spring. I was also pleased to see the decentralization of social services. If there is decision-making at the regional level, no doubt health and social problems will be greatly assisted by local sensitivity. We continue to receive excellent work on behalf of A A D A C across the north, and I would like to thank them for their work. I believe their ad campaign has been especially effective.

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to see support for our native population increased through assistance to Native Outreach and our friendship centres, but I believe much more remains to be done in more isolated communities with the installation of water, sewer, and roads. I want to thank the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife for his continued efforts to open up more farmland in the north. As we lose good farmland in the south around our cities through annexations and to industry, we will have more pressure to open up more land in the north on class 4 soils. I congratulate the minister for moving in that direction. The creation of the natural gas bank, improvements in gas sales, and changes in taxation to assist small operators will have a positive effect on the Grande Prairie region. The Brazeau timber area will be offered for tender this year. Unfortunately it's being offered at a time when interest rates are high, but because of the quality of the timber and the limited amounts left in Canada, no doubt there will be some very serious competition.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that transportation is most vital to Alberta. With the increasing coal sales, we must find new methods of getting our products to tide-water. The coal slurry pipeline which the minister mentioned could be very important and affect our total export market if it goes ahead. Again I ask the Minister of Economic Development to look north when he's establishing future plants that use natural gas as a feedstock. I

had to get that little dig in, Mr. Minister. I look forward to the establishment of the electrical marketing agency which will greatly assist many of the northern communities through rate equalization. I strongly believe something must be done to improve rural electrification associations across the province. I think they're in serious trouble, and something must be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, at year end, all areas of the province are to have a regional plan completed. In the Peace River region work has been going well with their plan, but I'm afraid that if it goes ahead as I understand it and as I last read it, we're fast forming another level of government. We're also going to create some obstacles. I think a developer will find it almost totally impossible to ever try to develop anything in northern Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens look forward to the Seniors Games at Camrose this summer and, from the letters I have received, I know they appreciate the consideration that in future they will be held every two years. Planning and community input is taking place this winter on the Grande Prairie urban parks program. Work on that project should commence this summer. We appreciate the program very much, Mr. Minister, and look forward to the extension of that program to some of the other smaller communities across the province.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I would like to make a few comments about the Northern Alberta Development Council. The council has been very active this year, holding seven public meetings. We received 165 briefs, almost double the amount we received last year. We have extended the time we spend in the community so we get to know the people and their problems first-hand. There are those who would say that the council is a toothless tiger and possibly a thorn in the side of some departments. But I must say again that this is not correct. The council was created to listen to the citizens and to relay those concerns to government. We are proud to say that of the briefs received over the years, 54 per cent have been successfully brought to conclusion. Sixteen per cent are under further review and follow-up and could be brought to a successful conclusion. There's nothing we can do about 30 per cent of the briefs because they're totally outside our scope. I want to publicly thank those departments we have worked with in order to help make living in the north more equal to our southern friends.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? There being no further debate, I have no choice but to put 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	Fyfe	Pahl
Anderson, D.	Gogo	Paproski
Appleby	Harle	Pengelly
Batiuk	Hyland	Planche
Borstad	Hyndman	Reid
Bradley	Isley	Schmid
Campbell	King	Schmidt
Carter	Koziak	Shaben
Clark, L.	Kroeger	Stewart
Cook	Mack	Thompson

Cookson
Crawford
Cripps
Embury
Fjordbotten

McCrae
McCrimmon
Moore
Musgreave
Oman

Topolnisky
Trynchy
Webber
Young

Totals:

Ayes - 44

Noes - 5

[At 9:15 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

Against the motion:

Buck
Kesler

Mandeville
Notley

Speaker, R.

