

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Land Assembly

Title: Tuesday, March 23, 1982 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 20
Coal Conservation
Amendment Act, 1982

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Coal Conservation Amendment Act, 1982.

The purpose of this Bill is to enable the Department of the Environment, in routine matters, to simplify the procedure for issuing approvals in respect of orders or permits, et cetera, granted by the Energy Resources Conservation Board.

[Leave granted; Bill 20 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Department of Tourism and Small Business for the year ended March 31, 1981, and to file with the Legislative Assembly three copies of the South-eastern Alberta Tourism Resources Extension Study.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file four copies of the economic stabilization program. If you would permit me a word of explanation, it was a special program designed last fall through the Department of Transportation and approved by government, to take some of the pressure off small construction companies which were capable of building roads but couldn't bid on major contracts. The amount of money involved was \$35 million. It put to work over 1,000 pieces of heavy equipment that would otherwise have been idle, and produced over 1400 kilometres of roads.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Good job.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, quite a large contingent from Canadian Union College in the constituency of Lacombe, here to see the day-to-day operations of the Legislature. They're accompanied by Mr. Milovanov and Mr. Goodburn, both of whom are teachers, and by Mr. Jacobson and Mr. Neal, who are bus drivers. They're in the members gallery, and I ask them now to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It's with regard to the land purchase program of the Department of Housing and Public Works, through Canada Permanent Trust Co., and the purchases of land north of Calgary, between Calgary and Airdrie. Would the minister indicate the status of the purchases at the present time?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. In terms of land banking, the province banks land for many purposes across the province, whether for residential or institutional purposes, and so forth. At such times as titles are registered, obviously that's public information. I'm not exactly sure what the leader is getting at.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a more specific supplementary question. Could the minister confirm that Canada Permanent Trust Co. is purchasing land, on behalf of the Department of Housing and Public Works, for various purposes as outlined by the minister? Could the minister confirm that those purchases are going on as of today?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I guess I wasn't clear in my first response. I said to the Leader of the Opposition that the province is land banking in many different areas. It has for years, for many different purposes. At such time as a title to that property is registered anywhere in Alberta, that's public information. I don't know how I can respond, more than that.

Obviously if I were to deny the allegation of the Leader of the Opposition this time and next time say, no comment, that would tell him something. So I think the logical way to approach this sort of question . . . Surely the Leader of the Opposition understands the importance to the public purse of land purchasing, over the years, and the way one does it. Therefore, I would neither confirm nor deny any land purchase anywhere in Alberta at any given time. Once the title is registered, that's public information.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. It's very difficult for me to understand the secrecy, when those who are developing and buying land in the area are paying upward of \$17,000 an acre. If the government is intervening in the market place, then we in this Legislature should know about it. So that's my question.

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the reluctance of the city of Edmonton to develop the land involved in purchases we already know about, could the minister indicate whether there is documentation with regard to studies to determine what the servicing cost would have been, or will be, to the area already purchased by the department in this annexation?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, obviously that's a planning exercise which would be premature. I think it's fair to say that the land is ideally situated, in terms of drainage basins and access, so the servicing cost would be cheaper than in many other areas. But that's developed during the planning process on any parcel of land. As far as that land is concerned, it is my understanding that the

city has not indicated any difficulty with that. Negotiations have commenced between my department, the Housing Corporation, and the city. I am not aware of any particular problems with it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, with regard to land purchases between Calgary and Airdrie. Can the minister indicate the specific purposes for which that land is being purchased? Are any studies in place that look at future costs with regard to developing and putting services in an area such as the one being purchased?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I've answered that question. The Leader of the Opposition can play around all he wishes, but I've answered his question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate what amount of money is being spent in that area, in terms of land purchases? If the government is intervening, what is the amount of money? What are you doing?

MR. CHAMBERS: Again, Mr. Speaker, I've answered that question. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition isn't really aware of the government's land picture, whether here or there. For some years, the province has been involved in Airdrie. The Housing Corporation has been actively developing there. We have a significant amount of land and lots available. Perhaps that's what the leader is referring to.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if there is a firm government policy as to what the department does surrounding cities and surrounding towns? Is there a set policy as to how much land will be purchased, or is it just on an *ad hoc* basis?

MR. CHAMBERS: You say an *ad hoc* basis, but situations differ from municipality to municipality. We normally consult with the municipality. A small community will perhaps make a representation, if there should be land for an industrial park or for a residential purpose. Then a government committee sits down and looks at it with them and says, okay, maybe 20 acres are justified for that particular industrial park. That's the way it goes. The Member for Clover Bar may want to call that *ad hoc*; I would call it good management.

Calgary Olympics

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question — and hopefully we will get a little more detail than we had for the first one — is to the Minister of Recreation and Parks, with regard to the 1988 Winter Olympics. Could the minister indicate at what level the talks are with regard to the Olympics? Are the minister or department officials in contact with the federal government? I understand they are involved in discussions at the present time. Secondly, what is the status of the sports lottery being looked at for supplying funds for this venture?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the sports lottery, that question should be directed to the federal government. With regard to our discussions with the federal government, I met with the minister recently and expect to meet with him again. Discussions are ongoing, and no decisions have yet been made to finalize financing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, with regard to the cost. I understand the cost for the Olympics is going to be around \$415 million. Could the minister indicate whether that amount is still the projected cost, or have there been some changes, from recent discussions?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, the last information we received was around that figure. I understand the Calgary Olympic Development Association is now trying to firm up these figures. There might be a change, but I am not aware of it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The province of Alberta has committed some \$70 million to be put into the Olympics. Could the minister indicate whether procedures are being put in place with regard to direct accountability and formal reporting, or are these procedures being worked out at the present time?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, we will have accountability. We are in the process of setting up a management team, and accountability will be our number one priority.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, at the earliest possible time, if they're not completed at present, would the minister table those accountability and procedure documents in the Legislature for our information?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can table them. When I have them ready, we will have a look at them, and possibly we can make that information available.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if the amount of fiscal involvement by the provincial government is a set, firm figure, or will it be a percentage figure? I ask that question because I would hate to see the minister "having a baby", as Jean Drapeau said, when he said it would never happen. We want to know if there is a firm commitment, and the government will not move above that figure.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, when we announced our support to the Calgary Olympic development committee, we had a set figure. We hope that when the final figures are announced, that figure will be correct.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement the hon. minister's answer, in terms of the way the question was phrased by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in terms of cost for the 1988 Olympics. I think the government's position should be made clear. The funding for capital purposes is only in part funding for the 1988 Winter Olympics. In almost every case of capital funding, it is anticipated that the facilities are going to be funded for the overall recreational use and benefit, both before and after the games, by the citizens of the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier assure this Assembly that the supervisory or control group will not be the same one that supervised and controlled the spending of funds in Kananaskis?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that debate is something we would welcome at any time. I am sure that in

due course there will be an event in which Kananaskis will be an issue that I will be delighted to debate.

DR. BUCK: It's not a debate; it's a specific question asking the Premier if that same supervisory or budgetary control group will not be controlling the spending of money on the Olympics, as it did with the Kananaskis project.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of debate, and surely I should have a chance to respond. The issue that has been debated in this Legislature is the amounts involved within the ambit of Kananaskis Country, and what was intended to be involved. As far as we're concerned, the construction and operation of Kananaskis Country has been a total success story.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to either the hon. Premier or the minister, to follow up a question of a moment ago. As I recollect his answer, the minister said that there would be a fixed amount but he hoped things would be on budget. Mr. Speaker, just so there is no misunderstanding, is there any very clear commitment that overages will not in fact be the responsibility of the government of Alberta, or is that very much in the realm of hoping that there won't be overages?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, until we receive the final budget from the Calgary Olympic Development Association — and we feel that the private sector will be involved in ski development — we won't have a final cost figure. When we have that figure, we hope it will be final. Until we receive that, I can't say what figure will be final.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The question is not the final cost but whether a final figure has been laid out in terms of provincial responsibility. Is that a percentage figure or a fixed-dollar figure, even pushed forward to 1988 dollars?

MR. TRYNCHY: I don't believe we have a set figure today, in 1981 dollars. I'm sure Albertans want to see the games go ahead. I guess they'd all support whatever figure it has to be, to promote the games.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all Albertans want to see the games go ahead; I'm not sure all Albertans want to put in "whatever" the costs may be.

I didn't quite understand the minister's answer. Have there been any figures updated to 1988 dollars? The minister said 1981 dollars. Has a ceiling been fixed, in terms of the amount of responsibility this government would shoulder, and beyond that will have to come from other sources?

MR. TRYNCHY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, with regard to the choice of Mount Sparrowhawk as the major downhill skiing competition site. Could the minister indicate whether any further decisions have been made with regard to that run, and whether consideration is being given to changing that site?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, the question should be directed to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, as that is under his jurisdiction.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in response to the question relative to Sparrowhawk, the Calgary Olympic development committee and the organization responsible for hosting the games in Canada are looking at a number of sites. No decision has been made at this particular time. We have been involved in a recreation ski study in the region, looking at it in the sense of being consistent with an Olympic site as well.

Auditor General's Recommendations

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. What consideration is the government now giving to the specific recommendation of the Auditor General with respect to requiring a legislative appropriation for investments in Crown corporations from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as yet we haven't had an opportunity to consider that matter in the Auditor's report.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier, with respect to the recommendation concerning the expanded role for the heritage trust fund watchdog committee, especially as that recommendation relates to the financial affairs of all government entities receiving heritage trust fund money being subject to specific scrutiny by the trust fund watchdog committee. What consideration has been given to that?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have to give the same answer as I did to the first question.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In view of the importance of the Auditor General's observations on greater legislative accountability, is the Premier in a position to give the House some indication as to when the government will have a position, specifically on those two recommendations?

MR. LOUGHEED: I'd like to, Mr. Speaker, but I'm unable to do so.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Could the Premier advise the Assembly whether the government has set any target date for making a decision on those recommendations, and whether or not we might expect, should there be a fall election — or should there be a fall session, I should say. And perhaps a fall election too; who's to know?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Try two.

MR. NOTLEY: One following the other rather closely, I suspect.

To the hon. Premier: will a position on these two recommendations be finalized by the government before the fall session? Would a position paper be presented to the House on that matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I just can't give that undertaking at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Could the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly what review he is undertaking of the proposal that the government retain the services of an

independent analyst to assess performance of the fund, and make that assessment — and this is a question I'd like to direct specifically to the Treasurer — available to the watchdog committee? Mr. Speaker, I raise this now, before the watchdog committee considers its 1982 activities.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the review of the report is not yet complete. When it is, the government's position on all aspects and recommendations will be made clear.

Spring Flooding

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Because of the ice conditions on the Peace River this year and the possibility of flooding, can the minister advise the Assembly if his department is monitoring the river for spring break-up?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can respond in a general way to the question of the Member for Grande Prairie. Particularly from Edmonton north through the Spirit River-Grande Prairie-Peace River area, there is a major concern that flooding could occur. Of course a lot of this will depend on the weather conditions in the ensuing days. Therefore, on a 24-hour basis, we are monitoring very closely the movements and activities of the rivers, depending on the weather conditions. We will have contingency plans in place, in the event that something drastic occurs.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What implications have the Bennett dam and the control of the water on the possibility of flooding? Have there been discussions with the B.C. officials by your department?

MR. COOKSON: Perhaps I should permit the member from Peace River to respond in this regard, since we have had some very recent meetings with those involved with the Bennett dam and B.C. Hydro. I think we have made the point that they must be more concerned with regard to the timing of releases, not only in terms of the season of the year but the flooding aspects at different times of the year. As a result, we are pretty well in daily communication with B.C. Hydro on the Bennett dam. They are well aware of the dangers of releasing at an inopportune time. So those types of controls are pretty well in place.

Labor Negotiations — Nurses

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Labour, with regard to the United Nurses of Alberta and the Hospital Association. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether there have been any negotiations since the nurses went back to work?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I must advise that regrettably there has not been any resumption of negotiations during the time the hospitals have been operating, to my knowledge.

MR. MACK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the Assembly as to the status of the arbitration board at this point in time?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that tomorrow I will be able to indicate the composition of an arbitration tribunal.

Labor Negotiations — Transit Workers

MR. MACK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. We're increasingly receiving more calls from constituents, with regard to the transit strike. It is our understanding that the minister himself has initiated bringing both parties back to the collective bargaining table. Can the minister advise whether there is a degree of health at the table?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the best response I can give at this time is to indicate that the least said about what's happening or not happening at the bargaining table today, yesterday, and perhaps tomorrow or however long it may take, will be the most helpful to bringing this particular dispute to a conclusion. It is a dispute which has caused a great deal of inconvenience and hardship to some people. It is one in which the parties are very much at different positions. I think it is helpful for those parties to be able to work away quietly, if they can, to resolve those differences.

PWA Operations

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Transportation has to do with the Pacific Western Airlines maintenance hangar in Calgary. Can the minister indicate what consultation took place between the provincial government, the minister's department, and PWA, before the decision was made to move the maintenance facilities from Edmonton to Calgary?

MR. KROEGER: None. Mr. Speaker. That's a management decision, and we don't get involved in that sort of thing.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying there was no consultation between the provincial government and PWA. Has there been any consultation between PWA and the minister's department, or the government, as to the relocation of the families who will be dislocated by being asked to move, forced to move, from Edmonton to Calgary?

MR. KROEGER: Not to this point, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if the government is giving any consideration to consulting with PWA to find out if there will be any assistance for these families being asked to move from Edmonton to Calgary, either through mortgages, the same way companies do, or moving assistance?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a useful and compassionate view, and I'd be quite prepared to discuss with my cabinet and caucus colleagues whether we should consider this kind of intervention.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate, or does he know, if any help has been offered to upper- and middle-management level people to relocate, but not to the ordinary working people at the maintenance depots?

MR. KROEGER: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker.

Surface Rights

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It concerns the brief presented to the caucus committee by the Alberta Surface Rights Federation, particularly with respect to builders' liens and the concern of that group that under this provision some farmland could be sold to satisfy debts. My question to the minister is: what review has he given to this specific concern expressed by the Alberta Surface Rights Federation?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the submission of the federation to the caucus committee added to the discussions of the report of the select committee that was presented to the Legislature. The topics and areas of discussion will be available for debate within the House. The recommendations are under study in the department itself, recognizing that the results of the debate and the recommendations will form the basis for the new legislation.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Has the department undertaken to monitor the situation? The minister indicated that the department is evaluating the proposal, but has there been any specific step to monitor the situation in the province, as it applies to the concern expressed by the Surface Rights Federation?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the Surface Rights Board has had the opportunity to go over the recommendations. I've had the opportunity to sit down with the chairman to compare some of the concerns of the Surface Rights Board with regard to the day-to-day operations they're tied to. We have and will continue to bring together some of the suggestions. Those problems which arise more than once and become a particular sore in the whole aspect of surface rights will be considered when the total legislation is drawn up.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister raised the prospect of "total legislation". Is the minister in a position to give the Assembly some indication of when the Legislature might look forward to that legislation? Presumably we'll have a discussion on the report this spring. Will there be a fall target date for legislation on this matter, and will it include this question of builders' liens applying to farmland?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to the debate on the submissions. Recognizing the demands and pressures before the Surface Rights Board, as soon as possible we hope to bring together the recommendations that form the basis of new legislation. At the present time, it would appear that the earliest legislation could be brought in would be early fall. It would depend upon the time of the debate, the sitting, and the pressures that continue on the Surface Rights Board itself, in the applications before it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the two

notices of motion standing on the Order Paper retain their place.

[Motion carried]

head: **GOVERNMENT DESIGNATED BUSINESS**

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

4. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

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

[Adjourned debate March 22: Mr. Kowalski]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue my remarks on the budget debate that began yesterday. Yesterday I did an overview of the anticipated revenues of the province for fiscal 1982-83. I also reviewed the estimated expenditures for fiscal 1982-83. Today I'd like to conclude my remarks by looking at an overview, in historical perspective, in terms of the economy of Canada in much of the last four decades.

Mr. Speaker, when we compare the economy of Canada to other countries in the world over the last four decades, I think it's safe to say we've had a very, very prosperous four decades. Despite the horrors of current high interest rates, climbing unemployment in some parts of the country, and an inflation spiral that perhaps defies traditional control, in my view the basic fiscal integrity of Canada remains, as does the fiscal integrity of the province of Alberta. It's safe to say that politicians in all parts of Canada, particularly in the province of Alberta, have not abandoned the very important aims of compassion and an approach toward a more egalitarian type of society.

Certainly on a day-to-day basis, when individuals take a look at the stock market, the news may hardly be cheerful. But presumably there will be a recovery in that very important sector, which is high-risk and entrepreneurial in spirit. I certainly don't want to provide any notes of false optimism, but I think it is very important that while Canada may be hovering on recession — and perhaps, in the views of some, may already be in a recession — it's a condition that's not new. It's certainly not a condition that's incurable; in fact, if you look at the last four decades, in essence there have been seven recessions of varying lengths since the Second World War.

I'd like to spend a couple of minutes looking very specifically at the time frame of 1946 through 1982, a period of 433 months or 35 years and 5 months. If you look at the economy of Canada, you have to look at it from two perspectives: the perspective of expansion in the economy, and the downturn or contraction in the economy.

If we begin in February 1946 and go through to October 1948, a period of 32 months, the economy of Canada and Alberta expanded. In the time frame of October 1948 through September 1949, a period of 11 months, we experienced a feeling of contraction. From September 1949 through May 1953, a period of 44 months, the economy expanded. From May 1953 through June 1954, a period of 13 months, it contracted. From June 1954 through April 1957, a period of 34 months, the economy expanded. From April 1957 through April 1958, a period of 12 months, the economy contracted. From

April 1958 through January 1960, a period of 21 months, we experienced expansion.

From January 1960 to February 1961, a period of 13 months, it contracted. From February 1961 through March 1974, a time frame of 157 months, we experienced expansion; April 1974 through September 1974, six months of contraction; October 1974 through December 1979, a time frame of 63 months, expansion; January 1980 to June 1980, six months of contraction; and July 1980 through June 1981, expansion. Of course, since July 1981, I think we may all agree that we've experienced some degree of contraction.

Mr. Speaker, the gist of all this is that if you look at these 433 months, 363 of them were a period of expansion in the economy of Canada, and 70 were a period of contraction. I think the important point of all this is that while we may be hovering, or may even be, in a recession, we are not by any stretch of the imagination anywhere near into a full-fledged type of depression that the world experienced during the 1930s, the [1890s], or the 1870s. There is considerable malleability in our country and in our province. After a period of time, the cyclical forces of contraction and expansion will be back in our favor, and we will experience business expansion.

We in Alberta are fortunate. When you look at the extent and magnitude of the provincial budget, one key theme goes through it. Of all the people in Canada, Albertans have the greatest disposable income per family of any Canadians living in Canada. Even though the economy may be in a downturn, we're so fortunate that we must never forget.

From time to time, we have to review the importance of such things as the personal income tax structure in the province of Alberta. Our provincial income tax is 38.5 per cent, compared to federal income tax. We have to compare that with the existing personal tax rate in other provinces in this country: British Columbia, 44 per cent; Saskatchewan, our neighbor, 51 per cent of the total federal; Manitoba, 54 per cent; Ontario, 48 per cent; New Brunswick, 52.45 per cent; Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, 52.5 per cent; Newfoundland, a whopping 58 per cent.

A second very important point that really contributes to the amount of disposable income we as Albertans have is the retail sales tax. We in the province of Alberta have a zero per cent retail sales tax. That has to be compared with sales taxes in other provinces: 5 per cent in Saskatchewan, 5 per cent in Manitoba, and rising as high as 10 per cent in the province of Prince Edward Island.

We have no gasoline tax in the province of Alberta: zero cents per litre at the gas pump. Again, that has to be compared to the gasoline tax in other provinces: British Columbia, 20 per cent, as is the case in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario; Quebec, 40 per cent sales tax on gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about disposable income for individual corporations, big or small, considerable savings are being incorporated in the province of Alberta. You look at the small corporation tax of 5 per cent, and the large corporation tax of 11 per cent. One has to compare that to the existing structures in other provinces.

Basically the gist of all this is to say that we have a new provincial budget of \$8.71 billion, which will be available to all the people of Alberta in the fiscal year 1982-83. In addition to our provincial budget, we have enormous commitments in the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, through the Alberta investment division, through expenditures and funding through the Agricultural De-

velopment Corporation, the Alberta Opportunity Company, the housing infrastructure, and the like. In terms of the capital investments division, we also have substantial amounts of money — several billion dollars — that this Assembly approved last fall for the fiscal year beginning April 1. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the provincial budget and the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, we also have on the horizon a commitment that in the ensuing months we will be looking to the Alberta economic resurgence plan, a program that in essence will assist all of us in getting over the short-term economic difficulties our country and our province are experiencing.

We have an enormous package for Albertans, Mr. Speaker. This budget is one that I think all Albertans should be very proud of. Albertans should never forget that they directly pay for only one half of the cost of provincial services they receive, and that is far less than the residents of any other province pay.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I might add that I'd really have no difficulty taking the provincial budget tabled in the Legislature last Thursday night, tucking it under my arm, and going door-to-door through the constituency of Barrhead, seeking re-election as a Progressive Conservative candidate.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the budget debate this afternoon. I want to make a number of observations about the general economic situation in the province. But for a few moments before doing that, I'd just like to recount to members of the Assembly some of the observations brought to my attention during my constituency tour.

There is no question that one of the major issues you hear everywhere — certainly in the Peace, but I think it's fair to say throughout the province — is a concern about high utility rates. Despite all the ballyhoo we heard from this government about the new marketing commission, it's still not in operation. We're not sure when it is going to be in operation, and utility rates have climbed. That has caused a particular hardship, especially on some of our senior citizens in many of the smaller communities in this province.

Another issue that has come up over and over again, in discussing education matters with school divisions, has been a genuine frustration with the grant system as it applies to rural transportation. The divisions in the constituency I represent — Peace River, Spirit River, and Fairview, as well as the separate division of St. Thomas More — all report that the amount of education money that has to be funnelled into subsidizing the busing system is a matter of no small frustration. Whereas five or six years ago, provincial grants comprised about 90 per cent of the cost of operating the bus fleet, that now has dropped to in the neighborhood of 60 to 65 per cent. That means educational dollars have to be taken to run the school buses. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, with the problems facing rural divisions in the first place, that kind of situation is not fair.

Another matter of concern in the north has been the problems of the Grande Prairie health unit. Because of budgeting problems, there has been an inability on the part of the Grande Prairie health unit to supply home care in both Spirit River, in my constituency, and Valleyview, the constituency of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. The reason they aren't able to supply the services is not a failure on their part to want to proceed; they very much want to proceed. They recognize that, in the long

run, home care is a saving of money for the public. It's far more sensible to provide home care than to have people in active treatment hospital beds at many, many times the cost. But because of the penny-pinching attitude of this government, the home care program has not been extended to those two communities.

Mr. Speaker, moving from those three areas, which I'll be dealing with later on in the estimates when we talk about the departments one by one, I want to confine my remarks this afternoon to the general economic state of the province. But in prefacing those remarks, I have to express no small amount of concern that on some of the crucial recommendations in the Auditor General's report, we apparently have a government that has not yet made up its mind. It is reviewing, assessing; taking the Mackenzie King approach, if you like, to some of the basic recommendations in the Auditor General's report.

What are those? Mr. Speaker, one recommendation is to expand the legislative accountability of the fund, to make sure there is prior approval, not just for the capital works division but that all money flowing to the entities of the province — Crown corporations — should be approved on a prior basis by the Legislative Assembly. Another recommendation is that the watchdog committee should be armed with more relevant information, including whatever assessments have been done on the performance of the fund. Another recommendation is the recommendation with respect to the accountability of Crown agencies, before the watchdog committee.

Mr. Speaker, members of this government can talk all they like about the move to the political right, but I think one of the reasons there is so much restlessness in this province today is a feeling that we have a closed-door government; that major decisions which should be made in the open, up front, are made behind closed doors. In my judgment, the recommendations contained in the Auditor General's report would be a welcome departure from the strategy the Lougheed government has followed for the last number of years, a strategy that I predict is gaining more and more opposition throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the budget itself. I suppose we might call this the budget of the province of Alberta, but I almost think it is an interim financing package, as opposed to a 1982-83 budget. No less than two days after the hon. Provincial Treasurer presents the budget, we have the Premier telling the Conservative convention that we're going to have a new program, an economic resurgence program.

DR. BUCK: Maybe we all have to join the party to find out.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right.

It's not presented in the Legislature, where it should be, but to the Tory convention. What does that say about the hon. Provincial Treasurer's budget? What in heaven's name are we doing debating this budget, when two days after the Provincial Treasurer introduces the budget we have the Premier saying, shucks, if you don't find what you want in this budget, we're going to have another little set of goodies for you. Of course, we'll bring it out in dribbles and drabbles, when it's politically convenient to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier has turned our hon. Treasurer into the Allan MacEachen of the Alberta Legislature. Already, two days after the budget comes in, he's forced to retreat by his leader who, at a Tory convention,

says: well, notwithstanding what's in the budget, we're going to have to do something a little better down the road. I agree with the criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, and I would just say to the government members of this House that that kind of announcement about a new economic recovery program, resurgence program — call it what you will — should have been made in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it's 10 years since we had the first budget speech by the hon. Premier. I'd like to go back to that speech, because one of the observations Premier Lougheed made in 1972 — and most of the backbenchers have forgotten it; they have very short memories about these things. In those days, the hon. Premier was in favor of open government. Remember open government? One of the observations he made was that when you're bringing in a new policy, a new proposal, there should be a white paper. There should be an opportunity to discuss it in the Legislature, to evaluate the options. I think it might be worth quoting the hon. Premier's observations 10 years ago, because they were so sound:

Another part of our approach to this area involves the matter of position papers. This is not entirely a new approach. Certainly the previous administration presented an excellent one with regard to the oil sands development policy . . .

Mr. Speaker, I might just add that that's another area where we ought to have a white paper, but we haven't had one. But then he says: "but we intend to be more extensive." More extensive. When was the last time we had a white paper on anything in this Legislature? Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say:

These position papers may be of three types: They may be definitive, they may set up alternatives, or they may leave specifics within ranges. In all cases, the objective is to state that first . . . the position [should be stated] and then the budgetary; and the legislative or the regulatory action will come later. In this way we hope that government will be more responsible to the review of the public's mood and the public's feelings.

Mr. Speaker, very wise, very sound thoughts in 1972.

But with this background in 1972, why didn't the hon. Premier present to the Assembly on Friday morning under Ministerial Announcements, a position paper on his Alberta economic resurgence program, before he trucked off to meet with his fellow Tories across the way? Why did he not show this Assembly the courtesy to do as he would have insisted the former government do in 1970, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, as he himself promised he would do in 1972? But lo these 10 years later, we seem to have forgotten that we are here to serve the people we are elected to serve, not simply do things behind closed doors or by-pass the Legislature and make these announcements at partisan political rallies. So where was the white paper, and when are we going to have a white paper outlining just what this so-called Alberta resurgence program is?

Mr. Speaker, as one travels the province, there is no doubt that there is a serious recession. There's no point in mincing words. All you have to do is travel in any part of Alberta, and you'll find businesses going broke in small community after small community. It's not just the oil supply business; it's not just that aspect of the economy of the province. There is a more widespread recession than many of us have seen — I might say that I've seen in the 11 years I've been a member of this Assembly. In our forestry industry, the story is layoff after layoff after

layoff.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the economic picture of the province of Alberta in 1982, it just simply isn't accurate to say that it's all Ottawa's fault. I know Ottawa is a convenient scapegoat, but the fact of the matter is that over the last 10 years, certain mistakes were made by this government that have contributed to the present economic slowdown. For example, the cutbacks: you can't cut back oil and not have an impact on the position of your suppliers. The suppliers are going to go elsewhere. I don't think they should be going elsewhere now. I certainly agree with the concerns over the economic impact of the import compensation plan. I think that regardless of where we sit, we as Albertans should insist that the federal government not pay a premium for refiners who can buy on the spot market for considerably less and, in fact, pocket a significant surplus. I think we should be working, together with the government of Saskatchewan, on that aspect.

But let's not kid ourselves, Mr. Speaker. If you're going to come in with a cutback program, as we did in 1980, the refiners are going to look to Mexico and Venezuela. They did, and they found sources of supply there. It isn't good enough to say that we had nothing to do with the situation. Indeed, an action of this Assembly did have something to do with the current malaise.

We've had this fixation with the megaprojects. First, the whole business of the heavy oil at Cold Lake, disregarding the excellent report of the ERCB on smaller projects, as opposed to one major project. We have the Alsands project. Heaven knows where that's going to be, except that at this stage it would appear that if it proceeds at all, it's going to have to proceed with massive public subsidies, unparalleled in the history of our country. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, if Alsands is not able to stand on its own as far as the private sector is concerned, it shouldn't be propped up with massive amounts of public funds. I think that's the kind of situation that has to be plainly put out for people. It has to make sense, and if it doesn't make sense, we shouldn't be pumping hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars through the front door and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars through the back door in order to keep it afloat.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, that fixation with megaprojects has left our economy extremely vulnerable, where right now we have a serious outlook in three areas. Agriculture: input costs are rising; the prices we're receiving under the national commodity markets are doubtful at best. We've got a serious situation with our cattle industry. As a consequence of the slowdown in house building in the United States, the situation in our forestry industry is probably the worst it's been in the last decade. Hundreds of people have been laid off in the forest industry as a consequence of the slowdown in the U.S. market.

We have the situation where for the first time in the 11 years I've sat in this Legislature, there is some serious doubt about the world outlook for oil prices. I remember in 1972 and 1973 when we first saw the price of oil begin to rise, the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc at that time, Jim Henderson, raised the question of what would happen if oil prices began to decline. Members of the House sort of snickered, because they just didn't think it was possible. Over the last 10 years, I suppose very few of us thought it would be possible. But now, Mr. Speaker, we see serious evidence to indicate that there is a pause, and perhaps even a serious decline, in at least international spot markets. One of the problems with this import compensation plan is that refiners can now buy on the

spot market for considerably less than the world oil price.

So here we are, locking ourselves into an economy where, quite frankly, we have an overreliance on the petroleum industry. Mr. Speaker, if anyone doubts that, all one has to do is look at the sources of revenue for the Provincial Treasurer this year. Some 55 per cent of the revenue that will be coming into the province of Alberta is from non-renewable resources. When you look back over the last number of years, this is the highest percentage of revenue from non-renewable resources in the history of the province. That puts us in a very vulnerable, dependent position. If international oil prices, at best, stagnate and don't go up with the rate of inflation or, worse yet, begin to decline, that's going to have a serious impact on the budgetary position of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with both the short term and the long term. In the short term, dealing with inflation, it seems to me that we have to examine what practical steps can be taken over the next few months to get the economy rolling again. In the long term, it seems to me that some significant structural changes have to be made. I want to come to that in a moment. Let's take a look at the short term.

I would say that now is a time to get some things done in the public sector, when we have surplus men and equipment at our disposal. We talk about roads. The hon. Minister of Transportation tabled the report today on the special program that was announced. I think the special program was fine, as far as it went. But as the hon. minister knows, and I'm sure most northern MLAs know, there was no small end of problems as a consequence of the quota system that we had to bring in as part of that program.

The point I want to make is that now is the time to substantially expand the budget of the Minister of Transportation. I know hon. members will say, but where has the member been; there's a 25 per cent increase in the budget. Well, there's a 10.4 per cent actual increase over the forecast of last year, not 25 per cent as the government members would like to imply. But now is the time to move beyond that figure. Now is the time to really begin to push forward, because we have idle men and equipment. All you have to do is drive through any part of this province and you see contracting firms, highway construction firms, people who've been working in the oil business, and the Cats that would have been out clearing brush and what have you in other winters, sitting in the yard.

Mr. Speaker, we can move forward. I agree that moving forward two or three years ago, when we still had the impact of the Syncrude project, would perhaps not have been wise, because you would have just spent more money to build the same number of miles of road. But that's not the situation now. The situation now is that with this available excess equipment in the province, we can boost our highways budget. Nobody — in other words, Mr. Trudeau, or whoever it may be — is going to run off with our highways.

One thing is rather disconcerting. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie chairs the Northern Alberta Development Council. The figures contained in the Northern Alberta Development Council — and I'm sure they're accurate — indicate that in Alberta we have 1,775 miles of primary highway, not secondary, that is still not hard-surfaced; in 1982 almost 2,000 miles of primary highway that isn't hard-surfaced. That is really quite an incredible situation in a province like ours. Not only do we have all these miles of unsurfaced highway, but as the minister

will tell us when we get into his estimates, we've got a tremendous reconstruction and resurfacing job on the roads that have already been hard-surfaced. I say to the members of the House that if we're interested in a short-term recovery package, let's substantially expand our highways budget. The money invested in roads today will go further because we have excess equipment. It won't be eaten up with higher bids and inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the second area the government has to proceed on quickly is this business of LRT. The government has to make up its mind whether it's in favor of LRT or against it. If it's against it, that's fine. They can just drift along as they are, and there won't be any LRT expansion in Edmonton or Calgary, because by the time we get the show on the road we'll be competing with the Olympics in Calgary and other megaprojects in the north. The cost of expanding LRT in Edmonton or Calgary will be so completely out of the picture that the government will not want to finance their portion and the cities won't want to proceed. But if this government favors LRT expansion, now is the time to do it. I quote from the paper presented to the Calgary caucus by the city of Calgary. They indicate on page 6:

Our most recent projections show that Transportation debt requirements will [amount to] 55% of the City's total borrowing requirements by 1985 if we proceeded on the high priority projects included in the transportation plan.

In the process of this submission, Mr. Speaker, the city of Calgary is asking for some kind of action on the part of the provincial government in terms of making funds available. If they proceed on their own, they're going to find themselves seriously in debt, and the city's debt load is going to be too difficult to bear. If this government is concerned about economic recovery in the short run, then let's take a look LRT expansion in both Edmonton and Calgary.

As well, we have the slowdown in our energy industry. Instead of the preoccupation with Alsands, let's look at a co-operative project with Saskatchewan on the heavy oil fields, on the upgrader. The tremendous potential reserves in our heavy oil fields — something in the neighborhood of 2.5 billion barrels, twice the amount of oil we will recover from the Alsands project during its lifetime — would have a number of advantages. In order to get the show on the road, we'd have to drill hundreds and hundreds of wells. That would be good for the oil drilling industry. It would be good for the oil service industry. If we're going to be stimulating the economy rather than looking at the huge subsidies Alsands will require, let's take a look at the cost benefits of a much less dramatic stimulating of the heavy oil fields in this province.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I've said that when it comes to small business and agriculture, let's recycle some of that Heritage Savings Trust Fund money. In his budget speech, the Provincial Treasurer is telling us that he's going to use most of the trust fund money to buy debentures in Crown corporations. That may be a simple way of investing the trust fund, but it's not a very imaginative nor sound way. Because with the credit rating of the province, the Crown corporations can go anywhere in the world and borrow money under the very best possible terms. Small business men in Vulcan, Fairview, St. Paul, or Wainwright can't do that. Instead of having our Crown corporations taking up these debentures, one of the things we should be doing is borrowing on the markets for those requirements and shifting some of this excess trust fund money into loan programs in the areas

of small business, farm development, and first-time mortgages. While there is some housing money today — and I don't decry that fact — indeed we could do more in that area.

But where there is no doubt about our failure to do enough — no doubt at all — it's in the area of the Alberta Opportunity Company and the Agricultural Development Corporation. The other day in my constituency, I was contrasting the ADC with the Alberta Opportunity Company. There was a young employee of the Department of Agriculture. I'm always very fair to the government, as members of this Assembly know. I said, we have real problems with the AOC, but it's nice to see that the Agricultural Development Corporation is off and running. He said: correction, Grant; off and crawling.

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that's true. It is off and crawling. The ADC is not meeting the credit requirements of the younger farmers, let alone many of the other farmers who are getting a one-way trip to bankruptcy by having to pay usurious interest rates when they could be borrowing money that belongs to the people of Alberta, which would be putting some economic stimulus in this economy. I say, why not use some of that money for revolving loans? What's wrong with that? Because it's coming from the opposition parties? Or are we just going to wait until just before the election? All of a sudden, on the road to Damascus, this revelation is going to come to the Premier just before we go to the polls. Mr. Speaker, people of this province are going to judge the government and the MLAs representing the government party in the House, and they're going to be saying, why do we have to wait until just before an election to get access, in a reasonable way, to money that belongs to us anyway?

Mr. Speaker, another area in terms of an economic recovery package that this government should be looking at is the whole question of major improvement in our transportation system. By transportation system, I especially make reference to the railroads. In 1980, Premier Lougheed made an offer. Part of that offer was substantial public investment in rail improvement: twinning of the rails where needed, links where required, upgrading in terms of additional bridges. That's the sort of thing we should be looking at when we have excess men and equipment, when we have unemployment. There's no sense getting into these kinds of public projects when the private economy is overheated. But now that you have a gap between the amount of investment forthcoming and the amount we need to get the economy back on the road, surely it makes sense to push ahead.

One of the proposals the government of Saskatchewan has made, in keeping the Crow, is that the difference in terms of capital upgrading, whether it's rolling stock or improvements to the rail structure — we should get on with that job. It could well be consistent with the recommendations of Mr. Justice Hall's report on transportation in 1977. So I say to the members of this Assembly that a short-term recovery program is possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the closing moments of my remarks today, I want to move from the short term to deal with the longer term questions. I don't think it was good enough for the Premier to rise in the Assembly yesterday, suddenly say he's not going to pull Alberta out of Confederation, and fail to recognize that so much of the current climate in this province is a result of a two-year war between two governments, both of which frankly are arrogant and insensitive, and both of which need to be condemned by the people of Alberta and Canada. In my judgment, it isn't good enough for this government to try

to escape responsibility from the whirlwind of public reaction, if you like, which is now being generated and threatens to sweep away many of the members as a consequence of decisions taken in this Legislature and an attitude, a sense of grievance and alienation, which has developed as a direct consequence of those actions; actions not only in Ottawa, though in Ottawa there have been foolish actions, but actions in Edmonton and Alberta too.

Mr. Speaker, the question of where we go from here is not only the short-term economic recovery package that I think would generate some buoyancy in the Alberta economy; we have to look at the long term as well. There is no doubt that this government has totally failed in the area of diversification. All one has to do is look at page 86 of the budget. You see that the output share in Alberta by industry, manufacturing, is now only 9.5 per cent. Where have we been in all these years where the pledge and the promise has been to diversify the economy? Well, we haven't been doing very much.

We look at page 59 of the budget, revenue from taxes. In 1980-81 the revenue from personal income tax was \$937 million; the revenue from corporate income tax, \$434 million: a ratio of about two to one. This year the estimate is: personal income tax, \$1.5 billion; corporate income tax, \$359 million. What does that mean? It means that while the revenue from individuals has gone up dramatically, the revenue from corporations has gone down. Part of that is due to deliberate actions by the government. But the major reason it has gone down is rather more significant than that.

The major reason it has gone down is that we have not broadened the economic base. The major reason we have trouble is that this government's whole program of diversification has failed and that, despite the comments of the last decade that in this decade we must move forward or else, we really haven't. We haven't broadened our base. We are still vulnerable and dependent on the non-renewable resource industry. These figures belie all the rhetoric about what this government claims to have done in the area of diversification.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to do a good deal more in terms of diversifying the economy. It's my judgment that we need an inventory of what is possible in this province. We have to be able to make intelligent judgments between options: the question of whether we should be getting into heavy oil development or whether we should be subsidizing a massive project like Al sands; the question of what kinds of new industries are practical in Alberta. Do we want to buy obsolescence? Hardly not. Do we want to get into the kinds of things which can't compete on the world market. Well, obviously not. But, Mr. Speaker, there has to be some sort of perspective, some sort of bench mark, some sort of relevant information, if you like, so that not only we as people who are elected to serve all Albertans can make choices but Albertans themselves can make choices. So we need an economic inventory.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, we need to recognize the need for longer term economic planning. I am not suggesting the kind of economic planning that is going to force everything into a narrow focus and along rigid lines. I am saying that if we look at the economies in the world that are performing better than ours, we find a planning mechanism in place. We find there is a recognition that while economic councils of one kind or another are not a panacea which can be a substitute for other action, they are helpful. Mr. Speaker, that is really one of the things I

want members to consider at this point, and whether as a consequence of this debate we can come forward with helpful suggestions.

I think that in the last few years, the economies of the Atlantic region have been assisted because there has been an Atlantic economic council. They haven't been solved, but they've been assisted. I think that in recent years, the Ontario Economic Council has provided some useful information, not just to the government of Ontario but to the entire political process in Ontario: government, opposition, business, labor, and what have you. When I look at our failure as a province to diversify much in the last decade, it seems to me that it would be useful to have an economic council of Alberta that would be able to clarify some of the options, so not only members of the Assembly but Albertans would have relevant information on which to make choices. Mr. Speaker, that after all is what a democratic society is all about: not only the right to speak, but the right to be able to have relevant information on which to make intelligent judgments as to the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the budget speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I have some doubt whether this amendment is going to be in order, because the hon. member is four minutes over his time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members would allow me the courtesy of 15 or 20 seconds to move the amendment.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. NOTLEY: I would like to move the amendment that after the words "in the resolution" the following words be added: "and that this Assembly supports the creation of an Alberta Economic Council". Now that I am four minutes overtime, I think I have stated the reasons for the amendment, and I put it before the hon. members.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments on the amendment by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I can look at some of the remarks he made during his 30-minute dissertation in the Legislature and show hon. members of this Assembly why we don't need an economic development council as he outlines.

The hon. member started his remarks this afternoon by discussing high utility rates in northern Alberta. He was a member of this Assembly last fall when the House voted and put in legislation to allocate in the neighborhood of \$72 million for subsidization in the Electric Energy Marketing Act. As the hon. member well knows, that Act takes place April 1, 1982. The Utilities and Telephones Department is now working on that legislation.

I take with interest the remarks by the hon. member regarding a program the Premier announced this weekend at a well-attended convention in the city of Edmonton. I refer the hon. members of the Assembly to pages 9 and 28 of the budget. On page 28, under Summary and Highlights, the budget reads:

Undertaking the first steps to encourage those segments of the conventional oil and gas industry hurt most by the 1980 federal proposals and who will

benefit primarily in the latter years of the energy agreement. These steps will also benefit the oil and gas service sector and increase off-farm income.

If the hon. members of the opposition were doing their homework, they could have asked questions about what that meant on the floor of the Assembly last Friday after the budget was presented. [interjections] But they don't do those types of things. We came out with the announcement to a partisan group, and they certainly accepted it, better than the members opposite. The 2,000 people at that convention on the weekend accepted that wholeheartedly. Mr. Speaker, just as a point of interest, the 55 delegates from my constituency accepted that announcement by the Premier.

MR. NOTLEY: How about the Schellenberger supporters?

MR. PURDY: This is part of the economic development in the province. What the hon. member is talking about — I am trying to say that we don't need the amendment the hon. member is proposing to the Assembly.

The hon. member argues for an economic plan in the province, that we should not go ahead with any equity position in Alsands but funnel everything over to the heavy oils in the Lloydminster area in conjunction with the Saskatchewan government. I have some doubts on that particular aspect, if we in this province should be involved in an equity position with another government. I don't think we should be.

He wants to get the economy rolling in the province of Alberta. He talks about the short term, that we have to get the public sector more involved. Mr. Speaker, I look at the budget and at some of the things that have happened here in highway construction and other sectors of it: a 33 per cent increase in the public sector to get a number of things done in provincial buildings, highway construction, the whole thing. He indicates we should increase the highway budget to get the economy rolling. This year the highway budget is up 25 per cent — he says 10 per cent — up to \$750 million, which is a pretty significant influx of money into the provincial economy. I personally don't think we could infuse any more money into the highway system in this province, because we will not have the primary contractors to do the job. The hon. member will want a piece of pavement done. The department may then have to announce it in October instead of other times. I think the people in the province who are doing these programs are doing them in an effective manner. The economy could not stand any more than the \$750 million we now have in place.

He also spoke about the infusion of more money into the LRT system for Edmonton and Calgary, to get the economy moving.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I have some concern about the normal effect of an amendment, which is to narrow the debate. Of course in keeping with that, there is a very practical rule of most of our parliaments that the person moving an amendment may speak to the amendment and the main motion in one speech. But anyone speaking after that — and the word that's used is "strictly" — must speak in a way which is strictly relevant to the amendment. The amendment is quite simple, clear, and straightforward. It simply says "that this Assembly supports the creation of an Alberta Economic Council". It would seem to me that henceforth,

and until the amendment is voted on, that should be the test of relevance of what is being said in debate.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I have been trying to stick to the amendment. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview clearly outlined in his 30 minutes, various things that should be done with the economy. I have been rebutting those on why we don't need an economic development council in the province of Alberta.

Now where was I?

MR. SPEAKER: On an amendment dealing with an economic council. [interjections]

MR. PURDY: On the amendment, but speaking about LRT in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, where the hon. member says to put more money into the economy by another sum of money into the LRT system. If my memory serves me correctly, in the budget we have something like \$190 million.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this amendment to the motion of the hon. Provincial Treasurer is needed. Some of the things I have outlined in the provincial budget right now will help the economy of the province to keep increasing as it goes. Sure we have some areas that are in a depressed state. But other areas are going along very well. The hon. member also talked about the farming programs in the province, and indicated that to get the economy of the farmers flowing again, we should be appropriating a lot more money for our young farmers program. I imagine the hon. member missed the committee study of agricultural development lending assistance to young farmers, in which we appropriated \$58,655,000 last Friday to that very worthy program. It's going to infuse a lot of dollars into the economy, to have it flowing in the agricultural sector.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I ask hon. members to defeat the amendment by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to oppose this amendment too. I have been in this House for seven years now. I've watched Alberta grow for a lot of years. Some of my first living memories were sitting on buffalo heads and picking black currants. In the years that came, from open range and prairie wool to the type of economy we have today, it was all done, by and large, through the hard work and the sweat of the brow of individual farmers and business people, and from time to time some assistance from governments.

I believe we should have government when necessary, but not necessarily government. If we have to set up and try to buck the system by having an Alberta economic council, which would probably bring in academics more than practical people who have the opportunity to either make or lose a dollar, or make or lose a whole bunch of dollars — being a free-enterprise province and a free-enterprise country, we have the God-given right to be able to go broke. In the short term, in the 11 years since 1971, some people got caught with their guard down. And I'm one of them. I'm a businessman and a bit of a farmer. I borrowed some money when I thought this was going to keep on going, our economy was going to really go. Then we have someone in another part of this continent who starts messing up things for various reasons. It's not just in Canada but, I would think, in the whole world. We have OPEC developing some things that perhaps we hadn't suspected. It's impacted, and now we're

feeling the bite.

If the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview thinks that a group, probably academics — it would be making most of the noise and talking to most of the media, and that's where they would report things from — is going to turn around, twist around, and develop an economic base from that, then he's got rocks in his head. [interjection] I believe that ...

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not aware of that expression being on the list of approved parliamentary expressions. [interjections]

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I carefully looked through *Beauchesne* some time ago, and I suppose that soon it will be on the list of expressions. I thought I would get something original in.

In the last 10 or 11 years, things have happened in Alberta that have happened nowhere else in the world, as far as I know, other than in wartime and perhaps with the exception of the great economic resurgence in Israel a few years ago, which didn't last; in order to keep the peace there, they had to keep the army out. If anyone were to think that we can develop a system outside the market place — the supply and demand, Mother Nature, act of God sort of thing — and be able to do that through a committee or council, they're wrong. We must develop our economy on hard work and the ability to win some and lose some.

MR. SPEAKER: We've exceeded the allotted time. I can put the question with unanimous consent, otherwise it would have to wait until the next time this topic comes up for debate. Does the Assembly agree that the question should now be put?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion on the amendment lost]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not necessary. The debate's already adjourned, because we've gone past the time.

MR. PURDY: Is that why the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking sat down?

MR. SPEAKER: Probably that, but he was speaking about the amendment.

MR. PURDY: Then who adjourned the debate on why he made the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: The *Standing Orders*.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

201. Moved by Mr. D. Anderson:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to consider establishing a committee or commission consisting of labor, business, and government leaders to investigate alternatives to strikes and lockouts. This body would consider labor courts, co-determination models, final offer arbitration, or any other means by which strikes and

lockouts might become an obsolete way of resolving differences.

[Adjourned debate March 16: Mr. Hiebert]

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to debate Motion 201, I must indicate that it was a very timely motion introduced in the Assembly by the Member for Calgary Currie. I've noted that many members have participated in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce an amendment to the motion by adding "preventive mediation" after the words "This body would consider", and by striking out the phrase "by which strikes and lockouts might become an obsolete way of resolving differences" and substituting "that might be preferable to strikes and lockouts". If I could now speak to the amendment, Mr. Speaker — I have copies of it available for distribution to the members.

I noted that the debate with regard to collective bargaining certainly brought out a number of points and certain trends in the province of Alberta. There appears to be an atmosphere of mistrust in our collective bargaining; a nearly confrontationist type of bargaining has been taking place. I think we're getting many entrenched attitudes on the union side and possibly on the management side. As Alberta becomes a more industrialized province, we're going to continue to experience more difficulties in labor relations in the future.

In negotiations over the past few years, another trend seems to be evident, Mr. Speaker. Working conditions seem to be the prime factor. Sometimes it's a smoke screen, possibly leveraging for greater economic benefits through wage increases. However, in the last few strikes, we've noted that working conditions are a prime consideration. It is my view that many times it denotes something is going on in the work force in the working atmosphere of various institutions and industries. There's a tug of war with regard to what is management's responsibility and what is the worker's area of jurisdiction. I have always felt that in the work place there's a spirit behind how people work together. Many of the contracts being negotiated are trying to dot all the i's and cross all the t's with regard to their responsibilities. I think it just [underlines] the mistrust that seems to be occurring.

We have to look for different ways to try to resolve these differences. With regard to negotiations on a province-wide basis, we have many variances with regard to institutions and different organizations. We have disparities between rural and urban situations, and quite often negotiated contracts tend to be on a province-wide basis and reduce everything to a common denominator. Consequently both parties are not very happy with the situation.

For example, we can recall the Calgary school board strike a couple of years ago. Their problems were quite different from what we might find in many of our county school situations, yet this particular strike addressed itself to many working conditions. These working conditions are now being applied to all situations or jurisdictions in the province, so you can see the impact. Although it is initiated at the local level, it has ramifications for the entire province.

Rather than deal with solutions today, Mr. Speaker, I think the motion before us suggests we set up a commission, consisting of labor, business, and government leaders, to look at solutions and other alternatives. Hopefully this commission can examine positive alternatives. If we

look at strikes or lockouts, they imply that failure has occurred. Many times the general public is held hostage in this situation. Mr. Speaker, I think the motion as amended suggests that we look at positive alternatives that are fair and just to all: to employees, management, and the public. Hopefully these alternatives will alleviate some of the breakdowns that have been occurring. Maybe we can look for different methods that can be applied early. That is why in the amendment we suggest putting in the words "preventive mediation", so we're not to the lockout, deadlocked situation, but rather some effort is made in the early stages of collective bargaining. Hopefully such methods will avoid the growing interruptions and loss of productivity ever increasing in our province.

The purpose of the amendment is to consider preventive mediation in the collective bargaining process; not to make any conclusion that strikes or lockouts are obsolete, but that preferable means ought to be sought before we ever reach that stage. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support the amended motion.

For the record, I would like to read the amended motion for the benefit of the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the Government to consider establishing a committee or commission consisting of labor, business, and government leaders to investigate alternatives to strikes and lockouts. This body would consider preventive mediation, labor courts, co-determination models, final offer arbitration, or any other means that might be preferable to strikes and lockouts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope the members get behind this particular resolution.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if I may address the amendment briefly, I welcome the opportunity to do that. In speaking to the main motion on a previous occasion, I alluded to but did not expand upon some comments I'd now like to make.

The motion before us, particularly with the present amendment, suggests there are, if you will, two elements to the process by which the parties get to a work stoppage. The first portion is what comes before the parties become involved at the collective bargaining table. The second portion, when there is an impasse, is how to resolve that particular impasse. As I understand it, when the amendment addresses preventive mediation, it speaks to what can be done to assist the parties to a better understanding of their position and responsibilities before they go to the bargaining table.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly comment that this is indeed the area of focus the Department of Labour and its staff have been addressing with considerable vigor in the last year and a half. From experience with the parties in collective bargaining — and we have extensive records — we have found that where certain types of problems exist and where they may flare up again, is reasonably predictable. Over the past year and a half, we have worked with companies in the areas of coal mining, the tar sands, manufacturing, the public sector — by that I mean the municipalities — firefighting services, and the health care sector, and have been very effective in resolving difficulties which had been identified, and removing those problems which exist between the two parties well before the parties are prepared to go to the bargaining table.

By so doing, we have removed a difficulty which would have gone to the bargaining table. We've also created an ability for the parties to relate to one another in a more

objective way. By that action, we've managed to build the confidence level between the parties and create an understanding of individuals, so the persons on one side of the bargaining table know the persons on the other side. I believe that is a very major and important role for the Department of Labour, and it is one of the means by which we can remove the possibility of impasses which lead to work stoppages.

I shouldn't dwell on the kinds of initiatives taken prior to the commencement of negotiations, but there is a variety, and they are called by a variety of names. Relations by objectives could be one of those; preventive mediation is a sort of broader expression. But I simply want to advise hon. members that that has been a focus of the Department of Labour. We have developed our staff very much in this particular area, and it has been a fruitful avenue for positive improvement in labor relations.

It has one risk to it, and perhaps I should identify that. The risk is that not all the parties on all occasions feel inclined to invite the Department of Labour to their particular difficulties. Sometimes it seems we have to have the impasse brought forcibly to the attention of the parties before they will look outside for assistance.

The second point I want to make with respect to this resolution and the proposed amendment is that I believe it is critically important, in trying to achieve the objective, that the parties themselves are participating in the exercise. It seems there is no value, or not as much value, in having a commission or committee going around the province if the problems being dealt with aren't deemed to be relevant by the parties who must voluntarily accept the conclusions.

Coming back to preventive mediation, getting the parties involved has been useful. With this resolution, I believe it's necessary to get the parties involved, participating, and understanding how they may work together. To that extent, I see that we might do more in the area of industry-wide councils and committee structures, whereby the breadth of the responsibility on management and on the union representatives is fully explored.

The third comment I'd like to make is that this resolution, as amended, looks clearly at alternatives. It doesn't suggest that we're going to outlaw strikes and lockouts, but rather create a heightened awareness of the possibilities, the alternatives, to a strike or a lockout. The present labor Act contains a possibility for voluntary binding arbitration. Our mediators recommend that to the parties. But usually by the time it's recommended, the parties are in such a lather with one another that they don't really consider it very seriously. Sometimes, later on they regret that omission to consider. Nevertheless that's a position they take at that time. So again, I think this resolution has value in terms of highlighting the alternatives.

My concluding comment is this. I do not believe it should ever be necessary to have a strike or a lockout. That is a failure of the system, in combination with a failure on the part of the parties. It is a decision on the part of one or the other party that they can replace reason with economic force. It is a sad day for most parties when they get themselves into this kind of position, because it is always a loser for the parties and, because of the interdependent nature of our society, it is also a loser for society. So it is my view that we should do more to create a broader understanding throughout society of the alternatives to strikes and lockouts.

I think the resolution is particularly valuable, because

it seems that every generation must learn how to practise citizenship. I regard the exercise of determining what is fair, right, reasonable, and one's share in the economic aspect of our society as part of the citizenship function. I hope this will assist the present generation to learn alternatives to the strike/lockout mechanism and persuade them that they should voluntarily accept these alternatives rather than resorting to economic force which, in my experience, is always a losing proposition for those who participate in it and those who are affected by it.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on the amendment carried]

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to make a few remarks in closing debate on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that the hon. member may close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ANDERSON: I'd first like to thank the many members of the Assembly who have participated in discussion on this particular resolution over several days of debate. I believe the debate has been excellent. It has afforded to anyone who will read *Hansard*, or anyone who has listened to the debate in full, a wide cross section of concepts and ideas, possibilities, and an outline of difficulties that have existed.

I also thank the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, who proposed the amendment. I believe the amendment adds to this motion. Indeed the preventive mediation aspect is one that should be looked at in full as well. The changes to the last part of the motion allow us to clarify, in no uncertain terms, that this motion in no way wishes to take away rights from any individual or union that now has them, but tries to develop alternatives.

In closing debate, I would also like to make clear that it is true that the vast majority of negotiations in this province are completed in an amiable way between the parties involved. I congratulate those employers and employees who bargained responsibly in the past and continue to do so for the betterment of themselves and our society. This resolution is aimed at that 5 per cent that have caused problems and difficulties for employers, employees, and the general public of the province of Alberta. It's aimed at looking at alternatives and ending the conflict that has developed in that percentage of strikes and lockouts; indeed, perhaps in a different way, in terms of lost motivation when conflict hasn't resulted in those strikes and lockouts.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I would just like to reiterate remarks made in introducing this resolution. At that point, I indicated that I believed any alternative had to have three dimensions to it before it could be considered a positive alternative. I think those are worth briefly mentioning again: first, that any change to our labor relations system must be fair to all involved; second, the changes must break down rather than create conflict between labor and management; and third, the changes should not interfere with but add to the

progress of business and government programs. Having said that, if this motion is passed today I believe it will be historic in the Canadian system of government, in that I am not aware of any other legislature in this nation which has taken the initiative to pass a resolution that calls upon labor and management to come together to look at alternatives to that conflict way of resolving difficulties. Indeed, if we move with this resolution today, we move toward establishing *détente* between those parties who have had conflict before, and perhaps toward a time in the future when the citizens of this province can enjoy the full fruits of their labor and all the benefits of employment and business opportunities without the threat of work stoppage, lockout, and strike.

Mr. Speaker, I express the hope that rhetoric which is sometimes used by one side or the other in labor disputes, those elements of conflict and inflammatory statements which are made, will begin to end with the passage of this resolution, and that we will move toward a better and more enlightened way of dealing with negotiations for salary and benefits for working conditions in Alberta.

Having said that, I again thank the members, and urge all members to vote in favor of this resolution.

[Motion carried]

202. Moved by Mrs. Embury:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government, through the Department of Transportation, to initiate a multimedia campaign to increase public awareness regarding traffic safety.

[Adjourned debate March 16: Mr. Pahl]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I feel very interested about taking part in the debate on Motion 202 this afternoon. At the outset, I would like to thank a number of members of the House who have already participated in the debate on this motion, namely the members for Stony Plain, Edmonton Glengarry, Camrose, and St. Albert.

I think one of the fascinating things about traffic safety in the province of Alberta is that it means different things to different people. This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read into the record a number of statistics with respect to traffic safety in the province in recent years, give a brief overview of the transportation infrastructure in the province, and then leave the Assembly with 17 specific recommendations in the area of traffic safety. At the outset, I think one has to recognize that the province of Alberta has one of the worst collision records in Canada. A survey within the last two years indicates that Albertans tend to blame factors other than themselves for traffic collisions.

I think it's important that we spend a couple of minutes looking at the statistics in the time frame 1970 to 1980, a decade of activity in this province. During that decade, a total of 5,866 people were killed and 170,735 injured as a result of traffic collisions in Alberta. As the decade moved on, there was a gradual increase in the number of traffic deaths and injuries. Motor vehicle deaths rose from 461 in 1971 to a peak of 708 in 1979, and injuries doubled from approximately 12,000 in 1971 to some 24,000 in 1980. Since 1970 the number of traffic related injuries has increased at a rate of about 10 per cent each year, while the number of fatalities has increased at a rate of 4.5 per cent each year.

If you specifically take a look at the most recent year

for which statistics of this type are now formulated, in 1980 a total of 103,719 traffic collisions were reported in Alberta. Of those collisions, 84 per cent or 87,096 involved property damage only, approximately 16 per cent or 6,085 involved at least one non-fatal injury, and less than the remaining 1 per cent or 538 were fatal collisions. If you take them on an average day, these statistics reveal that Alberta's roads are the scene of 283 traffic collisions, in which approximately 66 people are injured and at least one person killed as the result of traffic collision.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 the Minister of Transportation initiated a driver attitude study in the province of Alberta. That study, which included face-to-face interviews in the homes of various people, was given to a random sample of 1,200 Albertans. Some very, very interesting attitudes came forward; in fact, some startling attitudes. They can easily be identified in a number of quick points. Point number one is basically that the average Alberta driver thinks he is a reasonably good driver, and he doesn't really believe that a refresher course in driving would significantly improve his driving. Secondly, he believes there are probably as many poor drivers on the road as there are good drivers, and that alcohol is the leading cause of traffic accidents in Alberta.

A third conclusion of the study is that the average Alberta driver feels that no matter how hard you try to avoid accidents, you're still likely to have one. That's a rather incredible conclusion: that it's going to happen by fate. A fourth conclusion is that the average Alberta driver estimates that about half of traffic accidents where someone is killed can be directly attributed to alcohol. A fifth conclusion is that the average Alberta driver doesn't wear a seat belt, he doesn't ask that his passengers wear a seat belt, and he's quite ambivalent on the question of whether seat belts actually save lives. The last major conclusion one can get from the study conducted in 1980 is that the average Alberta driver can recall some safety advertising. That advertising is found on television, radio, or billboards. I think the traffic attitude survey was important. For the first time, in a very statistical nature, it outlined the attitude of the driver in Alberta.

In addition to attitudes, I think it's important that we also take a look at the magnitude of the road system in Alberta. Alberta leads Canada in terms of the number of miles of accessible, well-travelled, well-constructed roads. Essentially we have three types of road systems in our province, if you get outside the urban centres. We have the primary system, approximately 9,000 miles, most of which are paved. We have the secondary system, again approximately 9,000 miles, of which approximately half are paved. Then we have the local road infrastructure, some 82,000 miles, and a very, very small number of these miles are paved. Of course they are under local jurisdiction. In addition to that, we have literally thousands and thousands of miles of streets in our towns, villages, and cities in the province. But on a provincial basis, outside the urban centres, we have some 100,000 miles of roadways.

We have an interesting highway system, and I'm going to go back to this in a couple of minutes. It not only goes north and south; it also goes east and west. If you look at the topography of Alberta and the different climate conditions we have in this province, it really makes quite a difference in the winter if the road in your area is a north-south road or an east-west road.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Calgary Fish Creek should not walk between the Chair and the member speaking.

DR. BUCK: If the House were arranged properly, he wouldn't have that problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: The voters did arrange it properly.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to get back to the debate on Motion 202. We were on the subject of geography: north and south, east and west. I guess the last two interruptions were really basic reflections of that geographic difficulty some of our hon. members have.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the large number of miles in the province and the direction of the roads, I think all members also have to appreciate that the number of trucks operating in the province is very significant. In fact, they are so numerous that they equal the number of trucks that operate in the provinces of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. Because of a very inefficient, ineffective rail transportation network and grid in Alberta, we move goods primarily by road and truck. Of course that adds to considerable road usage. I think it's a reflection of our heritage; Albertans like to drive. In essence we're all cowboys, and our horse of 1982 is really the vehicle — a car, a truck, or whatever.

Looking at traffic safety in the province and recognizing the attitude of our drivers — and I think the study was a very important reflection of driver attitude — and looking at the number of miles we have and the topography and geography of our province and recognizing the heavy usage of our highways, over and above the need to have a good media campaign pointing out to people some of the difficulties we have on our provincial highways, I think we also have to take a look at a number of other things. This afternoon I have 17 different recommendations or ideas that I'd like to leave with the Legislature. Some are already being implemented by Alberta Transportation. I hope Alberta Transportation would have an opportunity to look at some. They're really not unique. I guess it's just an opportunity to take a few minutes in preparing comments to give this afternoon, to highlight them.

The first item I want to highlight is the need for increased numbers of lighted intersections in the province. When traffic comes to either a T intersection — I'll talk about this a little more as well — or goes over an overpass, particularly at night, I think it's extremely important that we light the intersection with overhead lights as much as possible. I recognize that the cost of the electricity that goes into the components is horrendous. If my memory serves me correctly, in 1978 I believe the electricity for lighted intersections in the transportation district of the Edmonton area, outside but around Edmonton, amounted to some \$200,000 to \$250,000 a year. Without a doubt, all members of this House know of at least one, two, or three intersections in the constituency they represent that they have been encouraged by their constituents to bring to the attention of the government, the transportation people, and the Minister of Transportation.

A second point I would like to raise with respect to the improvement of traffic safety in the province of Alberta, is that we have to move continuously toward the elimination of T intersections on most rural roads. A T intersection — all members just have to visualize what a capital T

looks like — is really a 90 degree intersection where traffic moves right into it. Those intersections are very, very dangerous, particularly in winter. They also tend to have a degree of hazard in summer. All too often, drivers coming off the less travelled road onto the more heavily trafficked connector, see a stop sign, and of course they have to stop or slow down. Unfortunately, many do not brake as they should.

An alternative to the T intersection is known as the S intersection. One just has to visualize what the letter S looks like. Instead of coming directly into an intersection at a 90 degree angle, you sort of swerve a bit or curlicue all the way to the intersection. That has two objectives: one, it slows you down and, secondly, it puts a little warning in your head in terms of slowing down, because your foot has already touched the brake. That's the second type of improvement that I think would benefit our transportation infrastructure.

A third improvement is proper signing in all parts of this province. I recall that a previous government, in power prior to 1971, did not believe the towns and villages in various parts of this province should be signed. They somehow believed that was a desecration of the environment of this province, and that all individuals in Alberta should really have a road map. And you shouldn't get in your automobile unless you first found a road map, took it out, and then sometime along your journey, when you were travelling 55 to 60 miles per hour, you would have to take your attention off the highway to consult that road map.

In the last number of years, I think this government has done a super job of ensuring proper signing in all parts of Alberta. But I still believe we have a distance to go. The signing policy Alberta Transportation utilizes needs to be updated every couple of years, because new things happen in rural Alberta. People want to go to new places. I do not believe we ever want to be in a situation where we have soft drink signs every 3 miles, shaving cream signs every 4 miles, or that sort of thing. But good, easy-to-read directional signing is extremely important.

Along with clear signing, one also has to look at the road topping itself. If we have pavement — and I'm now onto a fourth recommendation — we have to ensure we have clear, sharp road markings. Two types of road markings are currently available. One is basic paint. It costs approximately 8 to 10 cents a foot. The other is a thermoplastic that can be inlaid in the pavement. Essentially a little machine sort of chips an indentation of about 1/8 of an inch in the road and a type of plastic that sits about 1/8 of an inch above the surface of the pavement is inlaid. There is a cost implication to the plastic; it's expensive. It runs to well over \$1 to \$1.25 to \$1.30 a foot. However, it does last longer and little glass crystals that will reflect at night can be inlaid in the plastic.

Another item one can look at with the question of road markings is the use of small metallic cat eyes indented in the pavement. I think they can work quite well in those parts of Alberta which do not have a great deal of snowfall. It is a small piece of plastic about the size of the bottom diameter of these glasses all members have, about 3 or 4 inches. They rest approximately 1/2 to 3/4 inch above the pavement. As you swing over to the oncoming traffic zone, your tire hits the little cat eye, bounces, and immediately wakes you if you're fatigued. In addition, little glass crystals can be inlaid in those cat eyes and act as a reflector at night.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that there is one problem with the cat eyes. When graders come to do their winter

maintenance in those parts of Alberta which have a lot of snowfall, they rip them all out. So that's a negative point. I'm sure a little research might find a pressure point or a little spring that can be attached to the cat eye that would allow the grader blade to bounce off the cat eye and go merrily along the road without ripping them all out. That's a climatic problem we experience in this province.

Another area I think we might want to take a look at is used considerably in France. Many highways in Alberta are essentially two lanes with wide shoulders. Of course, when we have the type of traffic we have in our province, particularly in the summer when we have a lot of recreation vehicles on the road, and you're following a motor home that's going 45 or 50 miles per hour, you get very frustrated about having to follow that vehicle for a period of miles. But in France, they have a unique idea. Periodically they put a third lane on the road. Instead of two lanes and two shoulders, you move the centre line over on both sides and you throw in what is known as a passing lane. For a distance of some miles, those vehicles travelling on the right-hand side of the road have an opportunity to pass. A couple of miles down the line, those travelling in the other direction have a couple of miles to pass. It works very, very efficiently and effectively, and tends to move traffic much faster, without the hazard of pulling out and passing a vehicle, and leaves the shoulder ignored for the most part.

A sixth item I think we should look at is increasing the number of passing lanes we have on hills and gradients — that is, the lane you would see on the extreme right-hand side as you go up — and with considerably more vigor than we have in the past; post signs that indicate: slow traffic keep right, climbing lane. Those kinds of lanes built periodically — especially on hills and gradients, but they can be expanded on flat terrain as well — would move traffic much, much quicker and more effectively.

The seventh item I ask the Assembly and the Minister of Transportation to look at: we have a number of overpasses in the province of Alberta. We can use computer-controlled technology to have overhead warning messages wired on those overpasses. As an example, there are numerous overpasses between Edmonton and Calgary. We can have these flashing signs periodically. You see them all over the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. They give you the temperature, the climate conditions. Those signs can flash out warnings. If there's a traffic accident down the road, they can say: caution. If it's sleet and slippery, hazardous weather in the winter-time, they can put the word "caution" and something else on it. I think it's an innovative concept that we have to move to in the province of Alberta. To date, we haven't. I'm not aware of any such example anywhere, but it certainly provides a continuous warning, a continuous new idea to the person driving a car.

I think the record of Alberta Transportation and of this government in providing shoulders on roads in this province, is second to none in Canada. In fact, I think all of us are very, very proud of the high quality condition of the roads. But there is an additional need for a number of traffic rest areas, which are essentially shoulders built along highways to allow traffic to stop momentarily every 30, 40, 50 miles, or whatever, to allow people to put garbage into garbage bins and perhaps have a drink of water and a five-minute reflection on what the next phase of the traffic journey is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, a ninth point that needs some amplification is proper summer and winter maintenance. I recall the debates in this Assembly several years ago when the

Minister of Transportation came forward and asked for a rather significant increase in maintenance. A number of members really wanted to find out what this maintenance business was all about. Of course, it's everything from grass cutting to proper signing and painting on the roadway. That is one area of extreme importance that this Assembly should not minimize. In fact in the years to come, with the large transportation system we have in this province, I think it will be inevitable that the amount of money assigned to capital transportation development will decrease and the amount allocated to proper maintenance will increase. I think the performance of the last number of years is very, very important and positive.

One could talk for hours and hours on a tenth area. It's simply, let's get more pavement out there. A good paved highway is a heck of a lot better than a good paved oil road. I think it's important that a lot of municipalities and counties in the province of Alberta really understand the cost implications of putting on oil as compared to pavement and, in essence, say: let's hold off on oiling for a couple of years; let's work toward pavement.

An eleventh item I want to suggest would really be part of the responsibility of the Solicitor General. One of the most frustrating things any traveller along the highway faces is finding himself behind a big truck or recreation vehicle. Periodically, he moves his car out to the left-hand side of the road to see if he can pass that particular vehicle. I don't understand why there's not a way of inventing a new kind of light with three colors — read, amber, and green — that can go on the back of all vehicles. I don't understand why the driver ahead of the individual who wants to pass him is not then in a position to flick his light. If there's oncoming traffic, he can flick the red light, which is really a warning to the person behind him not to pull out and pass. If it's a fifty-fifty chance, and you know you'd take the chance — don't have me responsible — flick on the amber light. Then you understand that you take your chance. If it's a go situation, where there is no oncoming traffic, it's a clear thing, he can flick on the green light and you pass and go merrily on your way down the highway. This particular light is not used any place in North America that I'm aware of, but it is used in Spain. Spain has more mountains per square foot than any other country in Europe, despite the fact that everybody believes it's Switzerland. Spain also has the largest number of trucks of any country in Europe, and it's used very, very well.

A twelfth item that I think we have to take a look at in terms of transportation safety is tree removal along all highways. A little earlier, I talked about north-south and east-west roads. It's always remarkable to drive down a highway and see where trees have been removed on both sides. In the winter, you also see very, very little ice. But when you drive up to a section that has trees on both sides of the road, you invariably run into an ice patch: one, because the trees, of course, keep the snow from drifting merrily across the highway and, as well, keep the sun from thawing the ice. It may be an environmental concern to some; it may be an aesthetic concern to some. But the traffic safety factor is extremely important.

A thirteenth point that I think we have to look at — and I was very pleased last week when the Minister of Transportation got up and talked about the much-needed improvements in slope development — is, in essence, to reduce the degree of gradient from the highway top into the ditch. I think that has two very important points. We can maximize agricultural utilization and decrease maintenance costs by doing that. As well, if necessary, we're

increasing the movement of the vehicle off the road into the ditch. Of course that translates into a very important safety factor. With a degree of initiative from Alberta Transportation, it's an idea that I think has started to develop in a number of MDs and counties in the province. It's one that certainly has to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I think a fourteenth point is that we have to maximize use of the media with traffic advisory messages, particularly radio stations in the urban areas. I know the Alberta Motor Association does a really splendid job in this area, and the Alberta Safety Council is very much involved as well. But each morning in the urban core, a number of people involved in transportation could be better synchronized with the various media outlets we would have in our major cities providing on-the-spot evaluations of how traffic is moving. As an example, all Transportation vehicles are connected to a province-wide communication system. They are in a position to phone radio stations and say: look, traffic is not moving well in this part of the city or this part of Alberta; here is the problem.

A fifteenth point is the need for increased overpasses. Mr. Speaker, this is one I'm sure you'll very much empathize with, because you have more of them in your constituency than any other member of this Assembly. I know the constituency of Stony Plain has done very well in this regard. The point I would like to make is that it's a very costly area, but an area that certainly improves safety.

A sixteenth point I would like to present to the Assembly today is not so much for traffic safety but the decrease on the nerves of the individual who finds he has broken the law and has to pay a fine. I suppose it really follows as an offshoot to what the Member for Edmonton Glengarry said the other day. He said he wasn't concerned, that if he broke the law he'd be happy to pay a \$2,000 fine or something like that. There's a lot of bureaucracy in paying fines. I'm suggesting to the Assembly that the traffic control officers who flag us down when we break the law should be in a position to receive a payment from us on the spot. That would reduce the paper war and the bureaucracy of all these things attached.

As an example, if I break the law — as I did a couple of months ago when I was getting back on the last day of highway safety week in this province. I was going to Barrhead from Edmonton late at night. Near a little place called Pickardville, I was picked up for going 3 kilometres above the speed limit. [interjections] I was given a ticket. Of course, I had to appear in court and pay a fine of \$30. After giving me the ticket, an excellent RCMP officer advised me this was highway safety week. I said I was very much aware of that. He said, how were you? I said: I'm a Member of the Legislative Assembly, and we were just discussing that. He started to laugh, and said, you know you're the second one I've caught today. He'd picked up the Member for Athabasca a few hours before. So I'm not alone. I would like to say that I really very much appreciated the good humor and the diligent work of the young RCMP. [interjections] I very, very much appreciate the diligence of the RCMP traffic control people in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, my point in this is that my fine was \$30, so he had to do a lot of paperwork. I don't understand why I couldn't have paid the \$30 fine on the spot and got a 20 per cent discount. Members will laugh, but this exists. This is the policy in Spain. This happened to me. I got a speeding ticket in Spain a number of years ago. I

thought that when the officer said, it's so much money for this, that would be it; I'd never see it again. But the officer explained to me that I had a choice of pleading guilty, going to court some day and paying the whole fine, or pleading guilty on the spot. If I paid cash, I got a 20 per cent discount. I said, yes, ha ha, and was going to go merrily on my way, but he made me stay there. He wrote out four copies of the ticket, and sure enough, I read it all in English. That is the situation in Spain. It's a way of decreasing red tape and bureaucracy, and it may be an innovative approach. It may also be a reminder to the individual who has broken the law that he should be cautious. In this case, I would have been \$24 lighter after my discount.

Mr. Speaker, the seventeenth point I would like to make in this question of traffic safety is that while I very much appreciate the motion put forward by the Member for Calgary North West, I think the whole question of traffic safety in the province of Alberta has to be reviewed at a province-wide level. I think it is very important that a select committee of the Legislature be established and appointed in 1982 to review the question of highway safety in Alberta, and that there be public hearings from all sectors to have a complete overview of the question of traffic and highway safety in our province.

I think the role the Alberta Motor Association has played in this subject in the past year is very, very commendable, as is the role of the Alberta Safety Council. The people want to have an opportunity, to a greater degree than they believe they might have had in the past, to present their views further.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by once again congratulating the Member for Calgary North West. I hope the points I made this afternoon might ring a bell to all members of the Assembly.

Thank you.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate the Member for Calgary North West and to propose this motion. I would also like to congratulate the member for her previous motion, which recommended a foundation to examine the occupational health and safety problems in this province, which was passed by this House.

Speaking of traffic safety, the feature that absolutely amazes me, and never ceases to amaze me, is how we in North America have come to accept traffic death and injury. The automobile has killed more people than all modern wars combined; 60,000 people per year die on American highways. There is a rule of thumb that for every person killed, 30 are injured, many confined to wheel chairs or hospital beds for the rest of their lives. Yet we are quite prepared to accept this. If you break it down, it means that 135 people die daily on United States highways and roads.

When one aircraft containing 135 persons crashes and kills them, we have inquiries, investigations, and recommendations. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that if we averaged one aircraft per week killing 135 persons, all the airports in North America would be closed down. Yet we are quite prepared to accept this unbelievable carnage that just goes on and on. I am particularly sensitive to it because, at one time, my responsibilities on the police force required me to attend all sudden deaths in the city, which included fatalities on the road. If all offending drivers had a visit to the morgue once a week, I suggest there would be a lot fewer accidents and a lot less carelessness.

I think three areas are worth looking at, the three Es:

education, engineering, and enforcement. When I speak of education, a number of years ago my Rotary club in Calgary built what they called a safety city to train children from the ages of 4 to 9 in road and pedestrian safety. The last figures I got on that project were that 30,000 children had passed through that training program. To the best of the ability to gather statistics, not one child who had taken that training had been injured in a street accident. Maybe when they grew up and their fathers drove them in the car, we would have a different picture. But in street accidents where there were pedestrians, not one child was injured, indicating that you can't go too early with the training. The Canada Safety Council is deeply involved in the education aspect of traffic safety, with a great deal of success.

The next area I would like to touch on briefly is engineering. Of course, the Member for Barrhead has gone rather deeply into engineering faults in the province. But any of you who have driven the Los Angeles freeway might be amazed to know that they have the best record in the world, the lowest rate of fatalities for miles driven. One of the main reasons is that the freeway system has eliminated the head-on accident, and the head-on is the killer. If you're going down the highway at 80 miles an hour and somebody doing 85 hits you in the rear end, you will probably both end up in the ditch but will probably survive it. But if two of you doing 30 miles an hour. . .

DR. BUCK: Highway 16 to Jasper.

MR. LITTLE: Do you mind me speaking while you're interrupting?

DR. BUCK: You're the government that had the highway built to Jasper.

MR. LITTLE: If we eliminate the head-on, we eliminate a huge percentage of fatalities. On the other hand, two cars proceeding at 30 miles an hour will almost certainly kill a number in the cars. I recall a two-car accident a few years ago on a morning like we had today, in snow, near the Calgary airport. Independent witnesses testified that neither was exceeding 25 to 35 miles an hour, yet six persons perished.

When I speak of engineering, it brings to mind the split diamond intersection, of which I have two in my constituency. I consider them one of the worst abortions ever developed in a traffic interchange. Two years ago we had a very, very serious bus accident. The driver had driven 2 million miles without an accident. He had one on the diamond intersection and about half his passengers were killed.

What is wrong with the diamond intersection? It violates all your expectations. On the normal interchange, the old clover leaf, you peel off on the right side of the road. To make a left turn on the diamond interchange, you must turn from the extreme left-hand lane. Insurance statistics indicate that 90 per cent of all insurance claims are for left-hand turns.

I could tell you of some of the other abortions we have in Calgary, the intersection of the Crowchild and the Bow Trail. Why in the world we had to reinvent the wheel, I can't understand. Los Angeles put up the most efficient freeway system the world has ever known, with the best interchanges. All we have to do is copy them. We don't need a new engineering staff to dream up new ideas.

Very briefly on enforcement, enforcement is simply not

working. I don't know why. Maybe the penalties are not stiff enough in certain areas; maybe they are too heavy in others. But I do know that we have 35,300 suspended drivers in this province. It is estimated that 50 to 80 per cent of suspended drivers continue to drive. I think it is totally reasonable that certain of these drivers receive what we call restricted licences to drive during business hours; a woman with a husband in the hospital having permission to drive to and from the hospital, to drive the children to kindergarten. Restricted licences do work. However, a violation while using the restricted licence should get the full penalty of the law.

Selective enforcement as developed by the Los Angeles department also works extremely well. They were the first organization to use the computer to determine the areas where most accidents were occurring and the reason for those accidents. Those intersections would be given excessive enforcement for a period of time. It was determined that months after the selective enforcement drive, those particular intersections still remained exceptionally good. However, excessive enforcement does not always work. There are studied opinions that excessive enforcement, especially of a chintzy nature, can have a reverse effect.

Once again I would like to congratulate the Member for Calgary North West, and hope she continues her people motions.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to take part today in the debate on Motion [202]. I too would like to compliment the Member for Calgary North West on bringing this important subject to the attention of the Assembly. I'm sure that everybody on both sides of the House, rural and urban areas, agree that traffic safety is very important in Alberta.

I would like to mention a few concerns I have about safety. I would also like to bring to the attention of the Assembly some of the programs the Department of Transportation has put into effect or is putting into effect for the safety of traffic in Alberta. With that, I would just like to say what some of my concerns are. I don't think I'll even use my own constituency for an example because . . .

ANHON. MEMBER: You don't have roads.

MR. CLARK: You guys are gun shy. I thought that all we needed down there was some of that new topping they put on these roads. What do you call it? Asphalt?

Mr. Speaker, to see how serious the problem is, I would like to add a bit to what the Member for Calgary McCall said. Every year the United States claims that 25,000 persons die because of drinking and driving on the road systems, at a cost of \$5 billion. To put that in perspective, we lost 50,000 people in the 10 years of the Vietnam war. Every year we lose half that in drinking and driving in the United States alone. It's odd that 75,000 people went to Washington and complained because of an accident in an atomic energy plant that took no lives. But we have never seen a march on Washington for the 25,000 who die annually drinking and driving.

One of the things they've done in the States is to put in a speed limit of 55 miles per hour. They didn't put that in for safety; they put it in to save their oil and gas. It has an effect of saving 5,000 lives annually. That is with a compliance rate of only 50 per cent. You can see that speed is one of the greatest killers on the highway.

The state of Minnesota started out to enforce their 55

mile limit. They put in what they call project 20, where they had 20 policeman. In 28 months they would go into one small area and really concentrate on stopping everybody in that area who was over the rate of 55 miles an hour. Last year in Minnesota, they had 100 fewer traffic fatalities than in 1978. So their program is working to quite an extent.

The Member for Barrhead laid out very well the statistics in Alberta. I'm not going to repeat them except to say that our death rate is very high, with 5,866 killed on our highway systems. There are a lot of collisions: 103,000 a year. We have to stop and wonder: what is the primary cause of these collisions? Eighty per cent are caused by human error. I suppose we really can't avoid human error.

When we look around our cities, one of the things that has to come to mind is signing. When you go into cities like Calgary or Edmonton, and you're a stranger, you really have to look to find these little street signs. It takes your attention off driving. You're concentrating on finding out where you're going. The signing, especially in Calgary, is very poor. In fact, 76 per cent of urban collisions are in our five major cities of Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat. Of course, Calgary leads the way. That might be from some of the diamond intersections that our friend from Calgary McCall spoke of. I don't know why Edmonton's isn't a little higher with some of the circles they have here, because they're a mystery to people coming in.

Rural people don't get off the hook either. Last year in rural Alberta, there were 22,000 traffic collisions on the rural roads. What is interesting about that is that although our primary system takes 33 per cent, 48 per cent of these traffic accidents occurred on our primary highways. Only 30 per cent of the traffic is flowing on the primary highways, but they were getting 48 per cent of the collisions. That has to tell us that maybe our primary highway system could use some upgrading.

I would like to use a couple of examples of roads in the area I travel quite often. It's not in my constituency, but I'll use them anyway. That is the area of sharp, almost right-angle corners. There are a lot of them on our highways. Highways 21 and 56 have to be good examples. I'll use Highway 56 first, because I travel it every week. You come straight as an arrow for 60 miles, from Drumheller to Stettler. Then a quarter of a mile north of Stettler you run into two corners that you almost have to come to a halt on. The ditches are always full of vehicles and tracks, 'because they have no place else to go but straight into a bank. I believe this could be remedied. The highway was upgraded last year; it was paved. It would seem to me very little extra to eliminate some of these bad corners before it is paved. These corners are signed. Even though they're signed, I don't believe the majority of people in Alberta driving down a primary highway expect to come to a right-angle corner.

The same holds true for Highway No. [21], well-known for its curves, sharp corners, and narrowness in many places. It's something that could be improved and modified without too much expense and without being an overly long program. I've used these two highways because I travel them every week. I'm sure they're not the only problem roads. From travelling the rest of Alberta, I know that they're not unique. There are roads like that all over Alberta.

The department has done many things to increase the awareness of traffic safety. One of them has been ads on the radio. I'm sure you've all heard the ads where they get

quite mean about people who drink and drive. They say some pretty nasty things about them, but it's a very effective program. I would say it might even be more effective than Check Stop, because it's educational, not enforcement. As the member says, Check Stop is very effective. I think it's doing a fine job.

In an urban area, signing has always been a problem to me. The Member for Barrhead mentioned it a couple of times in his address. There are two types of hazards on the road. One is man-made, a lack of signs and people getting lost. The other is a natural hazard. I don't know what the Minister of Transportation can do about that, but when a young girl walks across the street in a short skirt it's a kind of natural hazard, which might cause an accident or two. Those are the two hazards.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak for yourself.

MR. CLARK: No, I'm just talking about the younger fellows. In her remarks, the Member for Calgary North West mentioned the driving habits of Albertans. I don't believe the driving habits of Albertans are any worse than in any other province, although some people seem to think they are. If anyone has ever driven through Vancouver in the rush hour, I'm sure they would find it just as bad if not worse than Edmonton or Calgary.

Another program Transportation has responsibility for that has been well-received over the years has been driving programs within our high schools. This is a real plus. I hope it's continued and maybe even increased some. I understand there are provinces that don't even have a learner's permit for children. There's been talk about the age limit we should have and where a child should learn to drive. I may be alone on this, but I believe that the younger a child learns to drive, the better driver he becomes. It's just like skating, skiing, or any other thing you learn when you're young. You learn it well when you're young. If you can learn to drive when you're young, like many of the young farm boys do, you end up a better driver. If you learn to drive a car early in life, it's only natural that your actions become more natural in an emergency, and you're much better prepared.

One thing that has always stuck in my mind — my son took part in this and almost drove me wild for a while, but he learned a lot about driving — is stock car racing. I believe you can gain a lot of experience. If young people want to drive fast cars, let them go into stock car racing. They gain a lot of experience, not only in driving. They find out the results of bad judgment very quickly.

They also learn about the safety devices of a car. I'm now talking about seat belts. I know that compulsory seat belt legislation is not very popular in some areas, especially in Drumheller. Just the same, I don't think that even the youngest and most inexperienced stock car driver would ever get into a race without his seat belt done up and his helmet on. He's almost certain to get in an accident, the way I look at the stock car races. They knew it too, and they knew that that was going to save their lives.

I know we have some bad intersections in this province. We have intersections off Highway No. 1 to the left without even a left-hand turn lane. We have one just a little east of Strathmore we've been trying to get changed for years. When it becomes a double lane, I hope we still don't have to pull out in the middle of that road and get the scare of our lives trying to get across it. There is a lot of room for improvement in some of our intersections, but it takes time and a lot of money. I know the minister

is doing his best and needs the support of the Assembly to do it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the department has done a lot of things in Check Stop. It's had radio ads, upgraded intersections and, in my area and some other places, it's also upgraded the crossing so if people do happen to go off the road and into a ditch, they don't slam into a straight bank in the crossing. They've done these things well. We still have a long way to go. We have a long way to go with education. We have a lot of improving to do with signing in urban and rural areas. We have a lot of improving to do with safety on curves in our primary highway system, where people really don't expect those kinds of curves. I urge all the ministers to support not only the motion but the minister in improving the safety of traffic flow in our province.

Thank you very much.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this motion too. It's been pretty well handled on two days now, and looked at from about every angle there is. I've listened with interest to what the other members have said. A lot of figures and statistics have been thrown around. I agree with most of the points made.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I have real difficulty with one area. I can't support mandatory seat belt legislation. To some extent, I'm surprised that no one has yet taken this stand in the Legislature. Basically, I have a couple of reasons for it. The hon. Member for Stony Plain had some statistics, and I'll quote them from *Hansard*. He says the updated figures

... of people using seat belts in various provinces are: Newfoundland, 8.2; Prince Edward Island, 15.5; Nova Scotia, 18.4; New Brunswick, 14.8; Quebec, 42.3; Ontario, 52.3; Manitoba, 54.9; Saskatchewan, 59.4; Alberta, 15.8; and British Columbia, 62.7.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I have a real problem understanding where these statistics come from. They're very accurate figures. I've driven in Alberta and B.C. for several years now, and I really don't know if I've ever been observed as one of these negative people who don't use seat belts, because I don't use my seat belt. I have real difficulty understanding who's making up these statistics. Whatever the case, I'll accept them as accurate.

Basically then, the point is that you have the province of B.C. with 62.7 per cent compliance, which means over one person out of three ignores the law. As far as I'm concerned, that is a very serious thing. I really believe that a law that is ignored shouldn't be passed in the first place. I'll give you an example. The city of Edmonton has a by-law on its books that there's no smoking in public places. I don't know how many dollars they've spent putting signs up in the airport and other places saying, no smoking. The ash trays are there. The people are smoking right underneath the signs. I have never seen any attempt made by the police to enforce this by-law. To my way of thinking, when you put a law on the books that the police will not enforce and that the people ignore, you are better off without the law in the first place.

I'm not going to say much more on this, I think the solution is education. I know we've made a few half-hearted attempts at it in the past, but we have some very good films — and I've seen them — on the advantages of using seat belts in case of accidents. I would like to see the school system put those on once a year for students in

grade 10 and again in grades 11 and 12, and let the students see the advantages of using seat belts and, obviously, the disadvantages if you don't when you get in a car accident.

Another solution I'd like to see the government look at is to try to encourage the insurance industry to rebate the premiums of people who will use their seat belts on a regular basis. I really think that is more of an incentive than trying blindly to enforce a mandatory law that people ignore. I am in favor of seat belts in cars. I think they should be there. I'm even in favor of people using seat belts, but I am certainly not in favor of mandatory law on the use of seat belts.

Thank you for your attention, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the disadvantages of being seated at this end of the Assembly is that you

can barely see the clock or what time it is, particularly the lower part of the clock. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the Assembly sit this evening, but I would like to remind members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing that there will be a meeting of that committee this evening at 7:30.

[At 5:29 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

