

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Tuesday, March 30, 1982 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have four filings: firstly, the 1980-81 financial summary and budgetary review of the province; secondly, the financial summary of the General Revenue Fund for the six months ended September 30, 1981; thirdly, supplementary information to the public accounts, being details of expenditure by payee, 1980-81; and lastly, for the interest of members, a list of the qualifications and experience of all senior investment Heritage Savings Trust Fund staff positions.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislature Library the Remote Area Heating Allowance Appeal Committee 1981 annual report.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 43 grade 6 students from St. Wilfrid junior high school in the constituency of Calgary McCall. They are accompanied by teachers Pat Morris and Jerry McDonald, and bus driver George Cameron. They are seated in the members gallery, and I request that they stand and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 50 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre in the constituency of Edmonton Centre. Accompanied by their leaders Mrs. Fay and Mr. Burghardt, they are seated in the public gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the very warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it's my pleasure to introduce three officials of the United Nurses of Alberta: Irene Gouin, the vice-president of the Edmonton General hospital local; Heather Smith, chairperson, professional responsibility committee, Edmonton General hospital; and Diane Huisman, staff nurse at the General. I'm not quite sure which gallery they're in, but I ask them to stand and be recognized by the members of the House.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly — and, I might add, to the students who are in the gallery — Dr. Earl Hawkesworth, who is retiring tomorrow after serving most recently in a distinguished career as Deputy Minister of Education since 1971.

Dr. Hawkesworth came to Alberta in 1958, after an educational career in Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan.

Important policy decisions have been made by the government during the past 11 years, and the deputy has been responsible for their implementation, including new ventures in the provincial funding of education, early childhood services, and extensive new services for handicapped students. New student evaluation programs are under way, private school funding has been greatly increased, and elementary education has been revamped. The Alberta heritage learning resources project, which was an outstanding development of western Canadian historical, geographical, and cultural materials, was provided to Alberta schools during the term of his deputyship.

Dr. Hawkesworth's services have not been confined to Alberta. He has been president of the Canadian Education Association, vice-president of the Agency for Instructional Television, and a valued member of the advisory committee on the Council of Ministers of Education. He is a member of many educational and social organizations, including the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, Phi Delta Kappa, the commonwealth society, and Rotary International. He is a churchman of note, having served as a leader in ecumenical youth programs and as a baptist minister.

Two previous Ministers of Education, the Hon. Lou Hyndman, and the Hon. Julian Koziak, join me in thanking Dr. Hawkesworth for his loyal service, his wise counsel, and his good humor. I'd like to welcome Dr. Hawkesworth, and ask him to stand to receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Municipal Affairs**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the government of Alberta will continue with a program of interest subsidies for municipal and school borrowings from the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation.

In 1974 the government introduced a program which provided interest subsidies from Alberta Municipal Affairs, and in 1976 from Alberta Education, on loans from the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation for general municipal and school purposes. The interest subsidy provided an effective interest rate of 8 per cent in 1974, which was raised to 9 per cent in 1980 and 11 per cent in 1981.

Since the inception of the program, most municipalities and school jurisdictions, as well as thousands of property owners, have benefited from its provisions. The interest subsidy for much of the past year has exceeded 6 per cent. Over \$100 million of assistance has been provided to Alberta municipalities alone under this program in past years, with the 1982-83 budget being in excess of \$86 million. On average, Albertans will benefit by a reduction in property taxes of more than \$40 per person in 1982, as a result of this program.

This program, with some alterations as outlined here, will continue for the next fiscal year, with the new program being effective on March 31, 1982.

1. The government of Alberta will provide interest subsidies on eligible funds borrowed from the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation when the interest rate on Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation borrowings rises above 11 per cent, the same as at present.

2. Interest subsidies will equal the difference between 11 per cent and the prevailing rate of interest charges by the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, to a maximum of 6 per cent.
3. On all loans approved and issued by the AMFC after March 31, 1982, interest subsidies will be paid by Municipal Affairs for five years from the date of a debenture being issued by the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, with the regular rate being paid after five years.
4. Interest subsidies will continue, as at present, to be available for all normal municipal capital purposes except electric power, natural gas, and telephone systems.
5. Effective March 31, 1982, the interest subsidy to be paid by Municipal Affairs will reduce the effective rate of interest — that is, the AMFC rate minus the subsidy — to a level equal to that which existed when the first funds for a project were drawn from the AMFC, provided the total funds required for a project have been approved by the Local Authorities Board and the funds for the project are drawn within three years of its approval.
6. Subject to the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation's authority and ability to raise sufficient funds, there will be no restrictions on amounts borrowed from the AMFC during the 1982-83 fiscal year, except as determined by the Local Authorities Board in considering repayment ability and the restrictions regarding borrowing for electric power, natural gas, and telephone systems.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that in no other province in Canada is a subsidy provided to interest rate on moneys borrowed by a municipality. Thus, Alberta municipalities and their property tax payers will continue to enjoy the lowest borrowing costs of any other municipality in the nation.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Oil Sands Development

MR. R. SPEAKER: Quite naturally, Mr. Speaker, today my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's with regard to the \$7 million to \$8 million grant provided to the Alsands consortium, for operating costs. Could the minister indicate to us the justification for carrying on the one-month operation of the present consortium? Is there a possibility of more partners for the consortium, a change in royalties, or the selling price going up, or is the government considering a larger equity position at this time? Are all those four criteria possibilities? If so, are some of them possibilities or none of them possibilities at the present time?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'd first like to state accurately the facts upon which the answer can be based. The facts are this simple: the government of Alberta has agreed to pay up to \$4 million, being one-half of the anticipated costs the Alsands participants will incur during the month of April. That is somewhat different from the way the facts were stated in the question by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Coming to the why, I think I can answer it this simply: our objective is to do everything possible to see this project proceed, and to see it proceed with the maximum possible private-sector involvement. Mr. Speaker, it is my

view that until the end of March, we were not able to do those things. Of course, we will also be pressing the federal government to make some changes, to enhance the prospects of the project proceeding. In my judgment, it was a very worth-while risk, for the people of Alberta to make that commitment to explore, during the month of April, all remaining avenues of having the project proceed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'd appreciate the minister being more specific. What changes or goals are possible in the month of April that won't be reached by March 31, to justify this \$3 million to \$4 million expenditure? Does the minister foresee adequate changes, to justify it? Are new partners waiting in the wings to join the consortium? That's one specific question. Can the minister indicate whether there are partners who are examining the matter but need time?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is really saying: could you outline the possibilities for the next month? I certainly can't do that in any detail. We're in discussions with the federal government, the present participants of Alsands, and others. During the month of April, we are going to explore all possible alternatives. Obviously, that exploration of possible alternatives means exploring changes in the earlier position. Whether they are in fact going to lead to additional partners joining the consortium is something we're simply going to have to wait for, and let events provide the answer.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister outline whether the government is considering its equity position as well, in terms of investment of moneys, resource dollars, from the Alberta government?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the government's position on an equity participation remains as has been described on a number of occasions in this Assembly. It is a possibility, but our preference would be to have the project proceed with private-sector participants.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Albertans want some type of assurance that there is some new possibility and that something real could happen. In the last two weeks, have some new types of negotiations come forward, some new factors, that are adequate evidence for saying that \$3 million to \$4 million must be invested in the ongoing operation of Alsands that could possibly bring about the implementation of the Alsands program?

MR. LEITCH: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it's our view that during the course of the month of April, there are possibilities. We want to explore them fully, because if this project doesn't proceed, we want to be in a position where we can conscientiously and properly say that we explored all the possible ways it might have proceeded.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. This is a message that the private sector of this province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's come directly to the question, without the preambles. I think the hon. leader will have to agree that there has been a very, very

considerable degree of latitude in these questions which, with the degree of speculation involved in them, are really not strictly the kind of questions intended to be dealt with in the question period rather than in debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I just want to point out that my remark certainly wasn't to be a matter of raising debate in the Legislature; I was just stating a fact. Many industries are on hold at the present time, in terms of contracts, construction, and many support services. In light of the government's decision to support Alsands during the month of April, could the minister indicate that those industries as well should sit in a hold position during the month of April, with some assurance that something might happen?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I can't give any additional assurances over what I already said during this question period. What the businesses that have an interest in Alsands proceeding may do is, of course, up to the individual business. I said in the Assembly — and I can't be any more specific — that we've made this proposal and arrangement for the month of April because we want to explore all possible alternatives. We think that in the exploration of those alternatives, we may find one that enables the project to proceed. Beyond that, I couldn't be more definitive.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly how long this government is prepared to prop up the Alsands project?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, one can never be absolutely certain about these matters. But I don't look for the project proceeding beyond April 30 this year unless, by that date, the decision has been made to proceed with the project.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister's department done any recent studies that would indicate that the Alsands project is economically viable, so Albertans can be assured that in keeping this project alive the government is not simply throwing good money after bad?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we certainly have been doing an ongoing review of the economics of the Alsands project. In our view, it is an economically viable project. We acknowledge that that view depends on one's perception of the world price of oil in the year 1990 and for the 25 or 30 years following that, because that will be the period during which the project will be producing oil. But there is no question in our minds that the project is economically viable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated that he didn't foresee any funding beyond April 30. However, in the agreement between Ottawa and Alberta that was alluded to, for sharing up to \$4 million of the operating costs with the federal government, is there any contingency plan to carry it beyond April 30?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister prepared to assure this Assembly today

that this government will not take an equity position in Alsands?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I thought we dealt with that at least a dozen times during these sittings of the Assembly. On each occasion, I said that the government was considering taking an equity position in the project, although our preference would be to have the maximum private-sector involvement. The answer I have to give to the hon. member's question is the same as I have given on the previous half-dozen or dozen occasions.

MR. KESLER: You didn't give the answer.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, with regard to the federal government's involvement in the discussions. Could the hon. minister indicate whether the federal government is prepared to co-operate with regard to royalty changes or an equity position?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, what the federal government is going to do will depend on the passage of time and the federal government announcing its decisions. In this Assembly today, I certainly can't say, this is what I expect the federal government will or will not do. As has already been commented on, we've been referring to the need for changes on the part of the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. minister indicate the sequence of events during the month of April, in terms of meetings with the federal government and with the consortium? What is the plan of the provincial government and the minister, or is it just to let things float during the month of April?

MR. LEITCH: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to let things float, and we haven't been letting them float. During April, we will undoubtedly be having a number of meetings with the federal government, with the participants, and probably with other companies. Today I'm not able to set out a particular schedule as to time and place of meetings, but undoubtedly they are going to occur.

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

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

MR. NOTLEY: The minister has indicated the government is convinced that the project is viable. He's indicated before that an assessment was done on the substantial increase in the cost of construction. When can this Assembly expect either a tabling of that construction-cost review, or at least a tabling of the summary, so Albertans and Canadians can also appraise whether the project is viable?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch all the words in the hon. member's preamble. So if there's something that needs a response or correction, not having caught it, I'm afraid I can't do it.

On earlier occasions, I indicated that at an appropriate time we would file one of the reports we've referred to in the Assembly regarding the cost of the project, or at least an executive summary of it. I don't think an appropriate time is while negotiations and discussions are going on. I think they have to be concluded before that can be filed.

The other reservation I had about filing the report arose from the fact that the detailed report may well impede the consortium's capacity to call for tenders in the ordinary way, since it might give an indication of the cost range of items being tendered. But I said I would give consideration to filing an executive summary that perhaps avoided that problem. Again, I don't think that should be done during the course of negotiations.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, one very short supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we can come back to the topic, depending on how much time we have in question period. We have had 11 supplementaries on that question.

#### **Municipal Financing**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in light of that, my second question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. My questions were in more detail, with regard to the announcement; however, the announcement has answered some.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions I would like to ask is with regard to the terms of loans to municipalities. I understand that the AMFC board of directors considered shortening the length of loans to municipalities. The minister indicated there will now be five-year loans at one rate, then loans at a different rate. Could the hon. minister clarify whether that is a significant change in the term of loans to municipalities?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, my comments in the ministerial statement dealt with interest subsidy. The responsibility for the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation rests with the Provincial Treasurer, so I refer that question to him.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, in previous years, municipalities have usually borrowed for beyond five years. In this case, looking at the entire situation, we felt that having the five-year provision would not only result in significantly more moneys always flowing, by way of shielding from and through the Department of Municipal Affairs, but would also have a reasonable parameter for the very quickly increasing loans going out to municipalities on a shielded basis.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Under this new policy, is it the intention of the government to tighten the flow of loans to municipalities?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the budget, I think it is very clear that this year — and I would probably predict next year — the amount of money provided by the government to shield property tax payers will again increase, as it has this year. It almost doubled, to \$86 million. There will be a continued increasing of that shielding, and this program will simply facilitate that. As well, I believe mention has been made of the fact that in the Bill before the House, the Legislature will be asked to approve a much higher figure: more than \$1 billion new dollars being made available to municipalities to borrow at this shielded rate, the only program of its kind in Canada.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In changing the loan format to five years, could the

hon. Provincial Treasurer indicate whether information is available as to the impact that will have on municipalities, in terms of repayment?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, that would vary throughout the province, depending on the financial situation and the extent to which there was borrowing, if any, as amongst and between the metropolitan centres, municipal districts, counties, villages, et cetera.

#### **Water Quality — Bow River**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Could the minister indicate whether his department is still monitoring the pollution level in the Bow River below Calgary?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether we're monitoring pollution as such, as the member suggested; we do monitor the water system. That information is available, if the member would like it. We work jointly with Social Services and Community Health, through the health units.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Apparently \$3 million is going to be added for phosphorus control. Could the minister indicate what portion of that will be used downstream from Calgary to control the phosphorus in the Bow River?

MR. COOKSON: The main source of phosphorus emission is in Calgary. The expenditure will be made to remove phosphorus at one or both of the plants in Calgary.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if they will be starting this phosphorus removal in the Calgary plants this spring?

MR. COOKSON: I'd have to check the timing, but they are well along toward completing the work. Our shared funding has gone to the city. I could perhaps report to the member as to the timing.

#### **Blackfoot Grazing Reserve**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. Can the minister indicate how widely the Blackfoot operational development draft was circulated in the affected area of the Blackfoot grazing reserve?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, this plan was circulated quite broadly when it was put out in April last year. Since that time, the department has had its planning people out meeting with the various user groups, as well as individuals. They're now developing a more comprehensive detailed plan, which is being reviewed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister assure this Assembly and the people in that area that before the government makes a final decision to proceed with the project, the people in the affected area will be given an ample opportunity to express their views once again?

MR. MILLER: Yes, I can give that assurance, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that they are now meeting with various user groups and interested individuals, and getting their concerns as to how best to utilize the Blackfoot grazing reserve.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if any consideration has been given to moving the main staging area, or the entrance area, away from the Islet Lake area, where it's been proposed at this time?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice. I'm not sure about that one aspect of the plan.

### Constitution

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. Could the hon. Premier assure the House that he and his government are satisfied that democracy in Canada is well protected under the new constitution, in view of the fact that the federal government has invoked closure 10 times this session of Parliament, passed the emergency planning order, and brought a major piece of destructive omnibus legislation before the Commons, that legislation being Bill C94?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is obviously a matter of debate. The hon. member is asking for the government's opinion. Expressions of opinion are of the very essence of debate. In view of the nature of the question, if the hon. Premier thinks it can be dealt with within the time in the question period, perhaps we should deal with it.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with it at some length. The constitution of Canada basically establishes the relationships, in a federal system, between the provincial and federal governments. Over these many years, we've operated under the British North America Act, which has served the country well.

The matters raised by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury are issues within federal jurisdiction and involve Members of Parliament and the House of Commons. The importance of the constitution of Canada and the new Canada Act, from the standpoint of this Legislature and the people of the province of Alberta, is the importance of the relationship between the provincial governments and the federal government.

Since 1976, this Legislature has had numerous debates with regard to proposals made by the Prime Minister of Canada with regard to constitutional change. These have particularly involved the question of how the constitution could be amended in the future, that may weaken the resources of this province. The most important part of this has been the proposal made by the Prime Minister, in which it would be possible to change the constitution without the concurrence of an individual province, with regard to the matters of provincial jurisdiction, including provincial resources.

On a number of occasions, it was the position of this Legislative Assembly that that should be resisted in the strongest possible way. When we initially became involved in this issue in '76, we were alone in that position; the so-called Victoria formula was one which was accepted by all the other provinces but Alberta. Over the course of time, we worked on that position, together with a number of other positions which were involved, but came

down to two fundamental questions on the Canadian constitution: the first fundamental question involved how the constitution could be amended; and the second one is assuring that the Alberta Individual's Rights Protection Act and the Alberta Bill of Rights could be adequately protected.

We were extremely pleased and gratified to hear the Prime Minister make a statement not too long ago that he had decided that instead of asking the British to hold their noses, he was going to hold his, because he was going to be supporting the Alberta constitutional proposals.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker. We've heard much about the abandoning of the spirit of the agreement of the national energy program. Would the Premier have any contingency plans for the province of Alberta in cases where the federal government contravenes the spirit of the constitution, while respecting its letter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we received great support and encouragement with regard to the concern, which I frankly believe is overstated by the Member for Olds-Didsbury, with regard to that matter. On October 2, 1980, the Prime Minister of Canada intended to basically — through his majority in the House of Commons — change the constitution of Canada without the concurrence of the provinces. This government led the way in appealing to the Supreme Court of Canada to have the issue of whether or not the federal government could in fact change the constitution without the concurrence or the consensus of the provinces. We led that battle.

The result was the decision of September 1981, which was a decision for all those who feel so strongly about the rights of the provinces, and encouraged us a great deal. I'm sure it had a great deal to do with the extreme reversal the Prime Minister took on November 5, 1981, with regard to constitutional proposals. Therefore, I believe that the Supreme Court of Canada is there and has shown, with its judgment of September 1981, that it accepts the federal system of this country, accepts the rights of provinces, and accepts the fact that there is a convention in Canada to assure that these constitutions cannot be changed unilaterally by the federal government.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of investigations that have taken place recently, concerning individuals who have had concerns about the constitution, and in light of investigations of an individual in Vancouver, has the Premier had any reports of security checks or questioning by the RCMP on Albertans who have taken public stands against the new constitution?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had anything done involving security checks with regard to that matter. Over the years, I certainly have had significant experience with the federal government in attempting to ascertain whether or not, on the issue of protecting the rights of the people of this province, they believe the citizens are behind the people of this province. On that security check, they've come up in a very affirmative way.

### Day Care and After-school Care Funding

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this ques-

tion to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It concerns the question of day care and after-school care funding, especially as it relates to the city of Edmonton and the question of cost sharing with the federal government. Has a claim been made to the federal government for cost sharing of day care and after-school care programs for non-profit centres?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Canada Assistance Plan, the province of Alberta is able to claim, as are other provinces, for community-based, non-profit day care operations. We have been doing that for some time. Keeping in mind that in Alberta approximately two out of every three day care centres are free enterprise, we are therefore unable to cost-share on those. However, we are able to receive some federal cost sharing for our total day care operations.

As long as after-school care was blended with the day care operation, those portions of after-school care operated by non-profit agencies were also cost-shareable. Once their funding was separated from day care, there was some question of their eligibility. Therefore, there were a series of meetings between officials of the Department of Social Services and Community Health and federal officials as to the availability of federal funds. I am advised that we are now in a position where we have received payment for cost sharing, retroactive to 1979. I believe the intent of the earlier discussions we were having with the federal government was for the retroactivity.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I understand the arrangement is a fifty-fifty sharing of 100 per cent of the costs of operating these approved non-profit day care and after-school centres. Because of the concern expressed by at least one of the Edmonton aldermen, is the minister in a position to assure the House that the government of Alberta would not be profiting at the expense of the city of Edmonton, as a consequence of this cost sharing?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, to clarify for the hon. member, the province is able to cost-share approved costs the province puts into such programs. In the case of after-school care, until the end of June 1981 the amount of support the province was putting into the program equaled approximately \$100 per child per month. Therefore, that portion of the program was cost-shareable, again only in those centres deemed to be non-profit, community-based centres.

Mr. Speaker, the real question is the cost of day care in the municipalities. Shortly I'll be very pleased to table in this Assembly a comparison of the costs of after-school care in the 10 provinces of Canada, which will clearly show how the costs in the city of Edmonton relate to other municipalities in this province and, more directly, to other provinces in Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question is not the comparison with other provinces but whether there is in fact no profit-making, if you like, on cost sharing with the federal government on those aspects of the agreement dealing with non-profit day care centres, including after-school care, and that the province shares its load in total with municipalities and is not short-changing municipalities in any way. Can the minister give that categorical assurance?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, obviously I did not explain myself clearly enough in my previous response for the hon. member to understand. The question is very clearly the areas the province is able to cost-share with the federal government, which fall under the Canada Assistance Plan. Those areas are very clearly enunciated. Some areas we can cost-share fifty-fifty; other areas we cannot.

We develop programs in Alberta to meet the needs in Alberta. We will cost-share wherever possible and practical to do so, because we believe it is certainly the right of Canadians who happen to reside in this province, where there is a cost-sharing program available, to receive the proper support.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to assure the hon. member that the support this province provides to the city of Edmonton in terms of day care and after-school care is unequaled by any other province in Canada to a municipality of equal size.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. As a consequence of the money he has just told us the government has received from Ottawa, pursuant to the claim being submitted — and some of it's cost-shareable; some of it isn't — is the minister in a position to assure the House that the provincial share of the after-school care program in Edmonton cannot go beyond the amount already allotted, which is \$700,000? Or could it, and — since we talked about the letter and spirit of other agreements — still meet the letter and spirit of the agreement on cost sharing?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question is difficult to answer, for this reason: we no longer have a separate agreement with the city on after-school care. An agreement was signed, which effectively transferred the responsibility for after-school care from the provincial government to the city of Edmonton on September 1, 1981. With that agreement, after-school care became an integral part of the family and community support service program.

In the program this year, we have provided additional funds to the city of Edmonton. For the first time ever \$10 per capita will flow, through the programming, to the city of Edmonton and all other cities in Alberta for family and community support service related activities. Mr. Speaker, that compares with approximately \$4.50 two short years ago.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The issue is not the comparison with other years or other provinces. The question is whether the funding made available by this Department of Social Services and Community Health, through the program the minister alluded to, meets both the letter and the spirit of the cost-sharing agreement with the federal government.

MR. BOGLE: It certainly complies with the Act this Assembly passed approximately a year and a half ago, bringing into force the Family and Community Support Services Act, which sees a substantial amount of provincial funding transferred to the municipalities, so programs may be cost-shared on an 80:20 basis — 80 per cent of the costs picked up by the province, 20 per cent by the municipalities — to provide much-needed preventive social programs in the municipalities.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm very delighted to hear that the actions of the depart-

ment meet the spirit of the legislation passed in this House. I would presume that to be the case.

The question, however, is whether it meets the letter and the spirit of the cost-sharing agreement with the federal government? I've put that directly to the minister on three separate occasions, and he's answered another question. I now put that question to him.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right, on three separate occasions.

MR. NOTLEY: Perhaps I need a fourth occasion to get an answer.

MR. BOGLE: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, programs are established. After-school care is one of a number of programs approved by the Edmonton city council. The city decides where its priorities are. Very clearly, after-school care is one of those priorities. We're able to cost-share certain portions of it, but only certain portions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister assure us, pursuant to both the spirit and the letter of the cost-sharing agreement from Mme. Begin that one of the Edmonton aldermen has just recently released, that the province is in no way profiting under the spirit and terms of that agreement?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we're certainly not profiting when we invest in a program and are able to cost-share a certain portion of that program. There is no way the province of Alberta profits in that kind of way.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Are we in fact cost-sharing in total with the city that portion we can collect from Ottawa?

MR. BOGLE: Would the hon. member like to phrase his question again?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can phrase the question by putting the figures on the after-school care costs. In the city of Edmonton, it's \$2 million. As I understand, the provincial share is \$700,000. However, the province is able to collect a portion of that from the federal government. Will there be any increase in that \$700,000 as a result of the information the minister just released in this House, that a portion of it is collectable from the federal government?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the amount provided to the city of Edmonton has increased substantially. Last June, the figure was less than \$400,000. As of today, as part of the family and community support services program, it's in excess of \$770,000.

#### **Motor Vehicle Registrations**

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Solicitor General a question. Will the practice of extending the time for registration of motor vehicles, in effect in previous years, be in effect again this year?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been a practice, as I recall. The legislation provides that the registration of a motor vehicle extends for one month after March 31.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. ministers of Economic Development, Environment, and Agriculture would like to deal further with previous question period topics.

#### **Petrochemical Development**

MR. PLANCHE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked if there were 15 petrochemical plants in active status. The answer is that 13 petrochemical plants have received industrial development permits. All are either under construction or expected to be under construction soon. Two major fertilizer projects are approved, one under construction. Seven other petrochemical projects and one other fertilizer project have been publicly announced.

#### **Water Wells**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Clover Bar inquired with regard to concerns about the water table in the Scotford area. In checking with the department, Shell/Nova is presently driving piles in that area. They have to drive approximately 6,000 to a depth of 35 to 80 feet. I guess there was concern with regard to drainage in the area, in order to achieve this massive undertaking. Essentially I can tell the Member for Clover Bar that under the environmental impact assessment, water levels and quality in the general area will be monitored. If action is necessary, it will be taken.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. Will he undertake to do a random sampling in the farm area to find out if many, or any, problems are occurring with surface wells in the farming community in that area?

MR. COOKSON: I think probably that point would be covered. I'll check to see. Likely the company will be responsible, as part of its undertaking, if there is any possibility of damage to surrounding wells. I think we would require that as a responsibility of the company.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister thinks. Will the minister assure this Assembly that the minister's department will make sure that the farmers' interests are well looked after. Never mind the company's interests. Will the minister assure this Assembly that he will ask his department to survey the farmers in the area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we work for everybody, so I can assure the member.

#### **Beef Imports**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, at the close of last week, the Member for Olds-Didsbury asked a question with regard to the amount of beef, both bone and boneless, imported into Canada. I would like to provide the information. For this quarter in 1982, total imports are down some 16 per cent. For that particular portion of boneless offshore imports, it's the lowest it's been in the last four years.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions

122 to 128 inclusive, and motions for returns 120 and 121, stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN  
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

204. Moved by Mr. Fjordbotten:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government of Alberta to give consideration to the establishment of a system which will ensure income stability for the livestock industry.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce Motion 204 today. I introduced it because of the deep concern I feel about the livestock industry. Those concerns are shared by the Premier, in his remarks that I will mention later on, and by the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Dallas Schmidt. Indeed, all members of the government are concerned.

There is recognition that a critical situation exists in the livestock industry today. In the absence of any federal policy, other provinces have stepped in and established programs of their own. Because of those factors, Alberta producers saw their natural advantage, their competitive advantage, slipping away. That all happened at the same time as the natural cycle of the beef industry was down. In addition, there was a reduced demand by consumers, because of high inflation and high interest rates. When you have high inflation and high interest rates, the end result is lower discretionary income. It certainly showed up in a reduced demand for beef. There is no doubt that those mortgage payments certainly have that impact, as all consumers look for ways of cutting costs. That reduced demand was bad enough. However, in addition to political action in other provinces and that reduced demand, a lot of other things were happening all over the world. The world economy was down, also there were problems elsewhere.

As has been the historic policy of our government, first of all we listened closely. In consultation with individual producers and producer groups in this province, we introduced the beef cattle and sheep support program. When we introduced it, we recognized that this one-time help for producers would help them through a critical period, but we agreed that it had to be done now. Action had to be taken, and action was.

Today I checked the applications from beef cattle and sheep producers that have been logged at the office here. There are 44,057 applications; 6,000 further applications that have been received but really haven't been logged in; approximately 10,000 applications in the district agriculturalists' offices or still in the mail. So there's an estimated total of 60,057 applications. The response from the producers of Alberta in this critical time in our industry has been excellent; in fact, overwhelming.

Mr. Speaker, livestock producers have always prided themselves on being free enterprise people. They believe in the free market, and they've ridden the ups and downs in the natural production cycle. When prices were low, they trimmed down their herds. When prices started to rise, they built them up again. Sometimes it hurt, but they rode with the market cycle and absorbed all those fluctuating prices. However, with beef consumption down from 113 pounds per capita in 1976 to 78 pounds last year, and the support programs in other provinces de-

stroying our natural advantages, and having free enterprise in Alberta basic to our life style, we acted, not by setting up a bureaucracy but by a one-time support program at a critical time in the industry, to give assistance quickly and thereby have some breathing room to look at longer term solutions.

It would be great if the market would turn around. No further action would then be necessary. However, that really doesn't seem as if it's going to happen. If the present trend continues, not only will our young farmers and ranchers not be able to get into livestock production but many of the established cow-calf, feeder, or lamb producers will disappear. No one can stay in a business if he continues to lose money day after day and year after year.

Inflation and high input costs have hit the livestock man hard. The producer has had to borrow significantly more money to operate, at a time when the market prices for everything he produces are down. We know he's borrowing more money, because the Canadian bank business loans increased. In 1979, they were up 30 per cent. In 1980, they were up 24 percent. And in 1981, they were up a whopping 37 per cent. So we know that producers are having to borrow more and more money at higher and higher interest rates. But when he went to borrow that money, he found that inflationary expectations had adversely affected the fixed rate of long-term debt.

Mr. Speaker, producers have had some difficulty borrowing long-term funds. Lenders really don't want to lend money at long-term rates, because higher inflation and the instability in the economy make them feel they could always get more. I know how those producers feel when they go to the bank. I remember back in 1969, I had wheat and barley piled everywhere, in all the buildings and outside. You could hardly give it away. It was 25 to 40 cents a bushel. The banks weren't interested in lending me money on that wheat, because we didn't know when we'd sell it. But if you had a cow — it could have a broken leg — they'd lend you money. A little later on they weren't interested in lending on that cow. But if you had a granary — it didn't even have to have hardly any wheat in it — they'd lend you all you wanted.

So those cycles have been there in the past. But right now the problem with borrowing money is different than it ever has been, because the input costs for the producer have gone up so high and the fixed long-term rates just aren't there. There is so much instability that the producer just doesn't know where he stands.

While all this is happening, the producers recognize that eastern producers, through government subsidies, can buy western grain as cheaply as we can. Live cattle can be shipped to the east cheaper than frozen beef. Hence you know where the packing industry went — to the east. Yesterday I heard that 40 employees of a Lethbridge packing plant were laid off because their freezers are full. The markets just aren't there, and they're not killing. You can guess the rest.

We all recognize that the overall primary position of Alberta in the livestock industry has to be preserved. We in government are committed to assist wherever possible in developing a strategy to restore stability to our livestock industry.

In the [state of the province address] on October 14, the Premier stated a number of things. I think people may have some difficulty remembering October 14, 1981, because things are moving so rapidly nowadays. On that occasion the Premier stated:

We have had discussion with a number of people in this industry. They've discussed some of their views with us, and asked us to concentrate not just on the short-term area but try to assist them more significantly in a number of other constructive parts of the beef cattle industry.

All producers recognize the fact that some action has to be taken somewhere.

In that speech, the Premier also stated some concerns:

The proposals before the House of Commons with regard to meat import legislation — it's a useful piece of legislation, but it's been significantly limited by the last GATT negotiations.

Something that's always concerned everyone in the industry is that with the amount of exports we have, we don't even get observer status at the GATT negotiations. The Premier has shown great concern about the GATT negotiations and the way import quotas were operated. I think all producers recognize that fact and share those concerns.

You might ask how important the livestock industry is to the province of Alberta. Did you know that livestock represents 44 per cent of our cash receipts in the province? In Saskatchewan, it's only 19 per cent; in Manitoba, 30 per cent. Alberta farmers market four times as many cattle as Saskatchewan, and five times as many as Manitoba farmers. Now those are pretty significant figures when you look at the amount of livestock we produce and what our receipts are.

The cash income sale from livestock in Alberta is two and a half times as large as the income derived from the sale of livestock on Saskatchewan farms. The three prairie provinces all have a large stake, but Alberta has one of the largest. We have the largest livestock population in western Canada. We have 50 per cent of the cattle and calves. We have 40 per cent of the hogs, and we have 55 per cent of the sheep and lambs. So we have a significant interest in the viability of our livestock industry.

In 1979, the combined cattle and calf slaughter was 757 million pounds of beef and veal. In 1979, pork production was 192 million pounds. In the same year, mutton and lamb were 15 million pounds. Poultry production stood at 110 million pounds. While that production was going on, Albertans consumed 220 pounds per capita of meat and fish. With all that we consume here, the largest share of our production is export. So you can see that the livestock industry makes a very significant contribution to Alberta, because it provides jobs.

We need to have more processing of the products within Alberta, from the production level up. The livestock industry has the potential to provide many more jobs. The livestock industry provides a market for our barley, because we are one of the largest producers of barley. Most of that barley is fed. So if the cattle industry is doing well, it helps our grain producers. It provides export, but it provides the best food for all of us. We tend to take that for granted.

We drive by a lot of cattle in the feedlots and in the field, and we don't pay any attention. But we go into the restaurant and expect to get the best steak. We do get the best steaks here, and the price is reasonable. If you were in Korea, steaks are \$9 a pound. In some of the restaurants in West Germany, a steak can cost \$40. In many foreign markets, beef is available only one day a week. We can go into the supermarket any day we like. We can drop into the different fast food outlets and always get beef. But in some places, that just isn't available.

So what do we do for the livestock industry? First of all, as always with our government in Alberta, we listen. It comes from the bottom up, and we respond and assist an industry. We have to work with the producers and producer organizations so we can work out a long-term strategy with them. I've been in the livestock business for a long time, and I'm opposed to any government intervention in my industry. I know that is a view shared by a majority of producers. However, there is an acknowledged problem, and we in this government must be prepared to assist the industry. We can't sit back and say that we can't do anything. We've got to be up front and do what we can to help them.

I'm convinced that one-time payments from government, important as they are — and how important it was to the critical state the livestock industry was in — is not a long-term strategy to strengthen the industry that makes such a contribution to the economy of Alberta. That one-time payment is important, but the strategy for the future and how we handle that is important. I believe totally in free enterprise and free markets. However, too many external factors are affecting the free market, and it's having trouble functioning. The importation of beef and the cattle support programs in other provinces have had an impact on us.

I'm totally opposed to supply management production controls. I think the ultimate answer in the beef industry is a national program, but with no elements of production controls. I think it should be voluntary. I think we have to come up with a solution that's operated by the industry and the governments involved, but has government involvement and support only until it becomes established and self-sustaining. With a little help, I think the industry is really quite capable of solving those problems.

I think all hon. members in this Assembly should be aware that today the industry is working hard to come up with answers and to address the issues. All cattle organizations are interested in the long-term stability of their industry, and they're looking at all the options. They know that more meats can be processed here. There's a great market in the Pacific Rim, in China. To get those markets and process the products here is important to the economy of Alberta and to the long-term benefit of Alberta producers. Alberta can increase its livestock production fourfold from the present level. We have a great job to do, and we have an industry out there that can provide a lot of things for us if we're willing to look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I put the motion on the Order Paper because I think a number of issues should be brought up in debate. I'm just going to touch on a couple of them and hope that hon. members who speak after me will step into some of those issues, because I think they're issues that have to be brought out.

Number one: what's happening in other provinces? What's happening in other provincial jurisdictions? What are they doing? Number two: the Crow rate, which really encourages processing of beef in eastern markets. How are we going to address that issue? Number three: the GATT agreement. What impact does that have on our producers and what steps can we take? What representations should we be making? Interest rates: I heard the other day that the total long-term, short-term, medium-term agricultural debt in Alberta runs between \$3.1 billion and \$3.4 billion. When you have the agricultural industry with that debt, how can we step in on interest rates just in agriculture? How about small business and all the other ones that come along with it? I think we

have to address the interest rate issue, because it's important to the livestock industry. The industry is out there working now, trying to look at that issue and what they can do.

I hope one hon. member will step in with point number four, and that's marketing boards, which seem to be an Ottawa preoccupation at the moment. What does that mean to our livestock industry in Alberta? Will high interest rates, escalating inflation, high production costs, and low market returns be solved by a marketing board? What are the advantages and disadvantages?

Number five: I hope some hon. members will address some of the ways this government has responded, on an emergency basis and an ongoing basis, by doing a number of things to stabilize the incomes of producers in this province. I really believe and am firmly convinced that solutions must be offered for debate now so we can end up with a policy direction which is best for the industry.

Today I'm really pleased that we're going to have nearly the full two hours for debate on this motion. I take my seat now and look forward to the remarks of other hon. members. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this motion. Southern Alberta basically started in agriculture in the ranching and livestock industry. People moved in and started bigger ranches. Later on, of course, a lot of the land was broken up and went back into grain. When you look at it, we still have some of the biggest ranches in Alberta down there. We have ranches like the MacIntyre ranch in my constituency, the Bar K 2, Knight ranch, and Palmer ranch. So it is still a big part of our income in the Cardston constituency. In fact, as far as sheep were concerned, at one time there were people running from 5,000 to 10,000 head of sheep in one herd. We had 40 per cent of Canada's sheep population in southern Alberta. So it is important to our area.

I think the Member for Macleod said it well when he said that we're all concerned. There are two figures we just can't get past. One is the fact that our consumption has gone down from 112 pounds to 87 pounds, and the other is the rapid increase in our cattle numbers in this province. I'd just like to give you a couple of them: in 1950, we had 400,000 head of beef cows in Alberta; in 1960, we had 827,000 head of cows; in 1970, we had 1,105,000 head of cattle; and in 1980, we have 1,380,000 head of cattle. In the last few years, our cattle numbers have kept increasing and, for some reason or other, our beef consumption has dropped. I don't particularly agree with the Member for Macleod when he says the cost of meat is too high. When you compare a pound of beef steak to a pound of lettuce, I really think you're paying way more for the lettuce; be that as it may.

When he put those figures out about how much of the cash receipts come from cattle, I think he did a very good job of explaining the impact of the livestock industry in Alberta. But I'd like to speak a minute on the importance of the cattle industry to the grain growers. I keep calling them cattle, but I really should be saying livestock. In Alberta we raise 55 per cent of Canada's feed grain, and we feed 65 per cent of that 55 per cent right here at home. Basically, over the years, we have built up a really integrated agricultural system, where we produce the livestock, feed the livestock, and export the meat. It's been traditional — and the Member for Macleod mentioned this — that when grain sales are slow or crops are large, or a combination of both, we've always used the livestock

industry as a safety valve to eliminate our grain problems. So there's no doubt in my mind that the grain growers and the livestock people are tied together, whether they like it or not. Lots of times they don't like it, but it's a fact of life.

Another thing I'd like to talk about in southern Alberta is the importance of the feedlots. Over the last 30 years, we have built up a large feeding industry in this province. In my constituency we have feedlots that run all the way from 1,000 head to 1,500 head, due to several factors. One, of course, is the climate. It's a little milder down there than it is farther north. Another is the availability of feed. We have a lot of grain, and we have a lot of irrigation. A lot of hay is raised there. So there's a big supply of feed handy. Of course, another thing is that a lot of cattle are available. With those three factors, it's been natural for the feeding industry to take a real hold down there.

The importance of that industry to our province, what businesses are involved: to start with, there are the auction marts. They employ quite a few people. There are the custom truckers. That not only takes in the grain truckers but also the livestock truckers. Quite an industry is involved there. Then, of course, you have the feed mills and the packing plants. Basically a lot of people outside of the ranchers and farmers are involved in this thing. Many, many people in southern Alberta are employed in the custom feeding of cattle. I think that's another reason we need a viable livestock industry.

So my recommendation is that if we come up with a program, I think it should be national in scope. I'll be very interested in hearing what some of the other people say on this subject. I think too many provincial programs are already floating around, and it's pretty hard for good old free enterprise Alberta to compete with provincial treasuries of other provinces. So if there is one, it should be national in scope.

Secondly, I believe it should be optional. I don't think any livestock operator should be forced to go into the program. I think it should be his own decision. It should be based on something like the hog program and the hail and crop insurance program. You pay a premium; it gives you a certain amount of insurance as far as price is concerned. You decide how much you want to pay into it and how much you want to gamble.

The last point, and probably the most important, is that it should not endanger our exports to the U.S. We always have to keep in mind that in 1980, we had a \$200 million trade balance in our favor as far as livestock crossing the border, back and forth. So it has been a real market. If we are going to make this a viable industry and increase it, I think our most natural market is to the south. We ought to protect that and see that it's still there.

I'm not going to say much about the Crow rate, because I don't think we can at this time. It's in a state of flux. We really don't know where it's at. Until there's a little more detail to look at, it's pretty hard to make any decision on it. I'd just like to make this one recommendation, though. If a Crow benefit is paid, I feel it should be paid directly to the producer. This not only helps the livestock operator, but I think it is basically in the interest of the individual grain grower.

Thank you for your attention, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise and take part in this debate on the motion put forth by the hon. Member for Macleod. I would like to stress

four things. I'd like to mention a little about the importance of the industry; the reason for its decline; some of the direct ways the government is helping the industry; and some of the suggested ways, directions, and policies that might further assist this industry.

It has been said before, and it bears saying again, that the livestock industry is most important to the province. Well it should be, for we have all the natural advantages. We have the advantage of an abundance of high-quality grass and feed grains, and a surplus of good water. In some parts of the province, there's the weather advantage of extended winter grazing. Alberta also has high-quality, hardy breeding stock. Perhaps one of the most important, Alberta also has a very select group of ranchers and feeders who are unequalled anywhere in this nation.

Mr. Speaker, livestock sales represent about 44 per cent of Alberta's farming cash receipts. But, unfortunately, the cattle sector continues to sustain significant losses. A number of factors contribute to this critical situation, and I'd like to list those. The natural cycle of the cattle industry coincided with the federal policy of high interest rates. This boosted the feedlot operating cost, weakened the consumer's purchasing power, and caused Canadian beef consumption to plummet from 113 pounds per capita in 1976 to about 78 pounds per capita last year. It is also said that vegetarianism and meat substitutes in diets also contributed somewhat to the decreasing demand for beef.

The import of cheap beef into Canada from the United States under the terms of the GATT agreement, when these high import levels were set during the top of the cattle cycle, was another factor. The inequities produced by the Crow rate allow only raw grain to move at preferred rates. Everything else costs much more, three or four times as much. Obviously this is to the disadvantage of the livestock farmers. Alberta feeders enjoy no advantage from their location. Through government subsidies, eastern farmers can buy grain as cheaply as the livestock men here. Freight rates allow easterners to buy Alberta calves for much the same price, f.o.b. Ontario, as those close to our own producers. Live cattle can be shipped cheaper than frozen beef. That's another reason for the eastern trend in the packing industry.

The absence of a national program saw other provinces establish support programs, and Alberta saw its competitive edge slip away. To combat this competitiveness the government, in consultation with the producer organizations, introduced the beef cattle and sheep support program last fall. That has been well explained here. In doing so, the government recognized that a one-time payment would help producers through a critical period but would not solve other long-term problems which brought about the crisis.

We forget that the government has helped in many direct ways. There's a water pumping program, with rental pumping equipment and trailers, for filling dugouts. There's a feed freight assistance program to meet problems with winter feed. There's also compensation to reduce losses of producers whose animals die of anthrax, rabies, or tuberculosis. There's also assistance to defray costs and encourage the exhibiting of livestock in some of the major shows in other provinces. There's also compensation for livestock loss due to natural disasters and predation.

Over a three-year period, our government has allotted \$3 million to promote beef consumption. The cattlemen who have made representation to me have made one thing abundantly clear; that is, they are not interested in

any central marketing agency which has a supply management authority. They say it is no answer to the problems caused by high interest rates, rising inflation, high-cost production, and low market returns. Many are opposed to any government intervention in their industry. They also know and recognize that a one-time payment from the government does not contribute to development of a long-term strategy to strengthen the industry. They recognize that poor demand is the biggest problem.

They have suggested directions the government might follow and policies which could provide assistance without interference. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to list some of those mentioned. They suggested that the federal government, provincial government, and producers work together for a national program. It was also suggested that they could provide taxation changes to allow livestock producers to defer income by putting it into trust accounts during years when prices are at the top of the cycle. As already mentioned, they ask assistance in beef promotion. We're already doing that. They would like to see the food processing industry expanded, especially that of boxed beef.

They suggested that producers pay into a fund in much the same way as with the hog stabilization program. These voluntary insurance premiums would entitle a producer to draw on the fund in years when the livestock market was on a down cycle. Of course, we could suitably fund such an approach. But in the absence of any national solution, or any hopes of one, I urge the government to plan, in co-operation with producers, a stabilization program in the very near future.

I urge all members to support this motion. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, as another rural member I welcome this opportunity to discuss something that pertains to agriculture. Certainly our livestock industry is one of our major ones in that regard. During this particular time in our economy, the livestock industry has been highlighted as one that has possibly suffered more than some of the others.

Mr. Speaker, I think we recognize that we produce export products in our livestock industry — beef, sheep, and pork — to ship to other markets in the world. Recognizing the fact that there's a downturn in the North American economy and, to a degree, a world recession, certainly this product has found it more and more difficult to be competitive and saleable in other markets in the world.

If we look at livestock production in this province over the last 20 years, we will recognize that it has almost become two industries. Certainly the cow-calf producer — since time began, the historical rancher in this province — is one of our primary industries. The cattle-finishing industry — and I will call it that in preference to calling it a cattle-feeding industry — has matured over the last 10 or 15 years, to where it has become a very important second industry from the point of view of agriculture. Geographically it has benefited many areas in this province and has brought together the raw products and produced a quality beef we can be proud of in any export market. I think the butchering and finishing of the boxed beef industry, and many of the processes that take place, are making this product saleable to markets that were not traditional. I'd like to believe that, as a finished product, it can be air-freighted to almost anywhere in the world. Because of its consistency in quality, it can find a ready market that was not traditional in the past.

I believe people in the industry have the fortitude and

initiative to develop and market this product, given a reasonable opportunity in what production and transportation costs are. Historically we've been plagued with the fact that freight costs for sending our product to eastern Canada have put us at a disadvantage. More expertise, and looking to the Pacific Rim countries with some of our products in a more developed manner, will create another opportunity for those new industries we've seen develop.

If we look at stabilization, we have to be very realistic about what that can ultimately mean. In its philosophy, the federal Department of Agriculture has felt that some type of national plan would not be successful without some type of production controls. As a province that depends so heavily on exports, we could only suffer the greatest from this type of program. I don't believe people in this province are prepared to accept a federal program that would have that type of stipulation.

Industry should certainly have control of its own destiny. I believe a lot of people have explored almost every avenue that would help the industry. I don't think that we as a government should look at the cattle industry in isolation from the rest of agriculture. In my estimation, any program that would favor the cattle industry today would be part and parcel of a government program that people who are not in the livestock industry would feel they should enjoy to an equal degree.

I guess if we as a province are really determined to see agriculture survive, we have to think about production costs and any manner that we can control those costs. Certainly people involved in agriculture have no control over their input costs. I believe it's one avenue that people not only in the beef or sheep industry but all people in agriculture can benefit from. Any program that will cut those production costs — and I'm thinking about the input costs in agriculture, such as our fuel and fertilizer costs, our cost of doing business in this province, and certainly the cost of transportation — and give our people in agriculture an opportunity to get their product to market in a more competitive manner because of the freight costs, will certainly have a long-term effect. I think it will ultimately be the deciding factor in how well agriculture does in Alberta.

We're competing with an oil industry that, as well as agriculture, is having a downturn at this point in time. Certainly we're at a disadvantage from a manpower point of view. Agriculture cannot compete in the market place for the numbers of people that may be required to ultimately give agriculture its proper place in the sun. But we've survived that for the last 30 or 15 years, ever since Leduc became the main focal point of the oil industry in this province. People in agriculture have recognized the fact that they couldn't compete with the oil industry when it came to dollars and cents for manpower. But agricultural production in this province has not suffered as a result. The technology we have employed has certainly made agriculture still our number one industry. If we're prepared to give it every opportunity to keep our production costs in line, I believe it will continue to be so.

As far as the free enterprise system is concerned, I think people in the industry recognize you're going to have ups and downs in beef prices. There has to be a curtailment of production at certain times, simply because there isn't a market for it. But with a good, aggressive marketing system and new markets being found, possibly we can even expand on what we are already doing. I hope people addressing this issue this afternoon will consider all aspects of agriculture and not recognize

beef production in isolation from the fact that the rest of agriculture is also suffering from the same problems as the beef industry. In some cases, we've got to recognize that the industry cannot be propped up in isolation from world conditions and cannot be artificially stimulated for any long period of time without having a detrimental result.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I look forward to the rest of the people who will participate this afternoon. I certainly feel that the opportunity of having agriculture discussed in this Legislature cannot happen too often for the industry. Any new ideas, and our show of concern, are certainly going to stimulate the people in the industry who are trying to resolve some of their own problems.

Thank you.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this resolution. I'm going to endorse most of the comments made this afternoon; that is, that we don't get into supply management and we don't have any long-term subsidy programs for the livestock industry.

One would certainly have to agree that the cattle industry in this province contributes a lot to Alberta. But whether you're in grain farming, the cattle industry, or whatever, it's the same as anything else. You're going to have your ups and downs. I've been in the cattle business all my life. I've seen many ups and downs in it. At present we do happen to be in a depression in the cattle industry. In the last two and a half years, we have taken severe losses. But it's not the first time we have experienced losses in the cattle industry.

At the present time, I don't see any daylight as far as coming out of the depression we have in the cattle industry. I can't charge it to the cattle numbers in the province. I have to charge it to the tough economy we have in Canada and on the North American continent. It's the economy itself. The last two years, the input cost in the cattle industry has been terrific. It is what has been taking the profit or making the losses so severe as far as the cattle industry is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest stumbling blocks we have in the cattle industry today is the high interest cost. In many cases, the interest cost is equal to the feed cost when you're feeding cattle in the feedlot. The interest costs are causing absolute havoc to the cattle industry.

I was certainly disappointed when I listened to the governor of the Bank of Canada, Bouey, the other day, standing up in public and indicating that farmers and ranchers were going to have to get better control of their management in order to exist. Certainly we have to have good control of our management. If I had anything to say about what was happening, I would make a leader out of a gentleman making this type of comment. He'd be leading a lot of other people, and it would be right out of office. I think it's a disgrace to say that it's the farmers and cattle producers who have to control their management, when it's nothing whatsoever to do with their management. It's the conditions. It's cycles we have been going through for many years. But the interest cost is something I don't think we should be going through, having something like this imposed not only on the cattle industry; it's the entire economy in Canada and the United States.

In my constituency, the cattle industry is one of the

most important we have as far as agriculture is concerned. I have three large feedlots in the area. One, Lakeside Feeders, was set up to feed 20,000 cattle. Now they're feeding up to 40,000 cattle. I can assure you that they're feeling the pinch, and feeling it hard. However, they still don't want a marketing board, and they don't want government interference in their operation. They're sure they'll be able to survive and come out themselves. They're not the only feedlot in my constituency that has had severe problems with the cattle industry. Several of the large feedlots in my constituency have.

Mr. Speaker, I'm against subsidies. I'm against marketing boards. As I said, I have to endorse the speakers who have spoken here today. I'm pleased to hear that we have the same feeling throughout our Legislature. I did agree with the subsidy put on the cattle industry. The reason is that we had a subsidy program in place for other red meats in the province. Other provinces throughout Canada had subsidized programs in the cattle industry that we in Alberta had to compete against. So I had to agree with the subsidy program, providing it was a one-shot deal, not a continuing program to carry on for a number of years or getting people into the cattle industry who shouldn't be in it.

It was well supported throughout the province. I talked to many cattle organizations. They agreed with it, providing it was a one-shot, \$133 million into the industry to cover approximately half the losses they had in 1980 as far as the cattle industry was concerned. The big concern most cattlemen had was that we would have a conflict with the United States. We've certainly got to keep a free market as far as the United States is concerned. We can't come up with subsidized programs where they're going to cut us off from exporting Canadian beef to the United States.

As I said, I still don't see any daylight as far as the cattle industry is concerned. If anyone has been following the cattle reports coming out of the United States — and they have 80 to 85 per cent of the cattle in North America. If you look at the last few reports, cattle-on-feed reports are coming up with 110 or 114 per cent over last year, over the last two or three months. So our cattle population is down. I have to agree it's down. But with the high interest rate, high feed cost, and the demand on some of the lending agents to get some of the money back into the hands of the lending agents, a lot of our ranchers and feeders in the United States have been putting their cattle on feed. So I think we're still going to have a surplus of cattle. But when we get through with that surplus, I think we'll be able to stand on our own two feet as far as the cattle industry is concerned. We're going to have our cattle population cut considerably after, I would say, six to eight months.

I can see some cattle markets in the very near future that are going to be depressed. At the present time, both the United States and Canada have a lot of boxed meat and a lot of beef in storage. They're not able to sell it, but the packers are still bidding fair prices for our cattle.

Mr. Speaker, I really think the only thing we can do with the cattle industry is let it come out on its own, let it work out a level where it's going to supply the demand of our consumers in this province. I certainly agree with the Cattle Commission in a lot of cases. They feel we should be putting all our emphasis on marketing. As far as the cattle supply is concerned, we're going to have to leave that in the hands of the producers themselves. They'll certainly control that. I'm hopeful that we will in western Canada. I can see marketing boards working for the

industry in eastern Canada, where we have a lot of small producers. But I certainly hope we'll oppose any marketing boards in western Canada or any management supply. We don't need to get into any of these areas.

With those few remarks, I would say that I think the resolution is good. We should keep on top of it. But I don't think we should have government intervention in any way.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say something about the resolution we have before us today. We've been hearing from the deep south and the mid-south in this province. Perhaps a voice from the mid-north would contribute to the debate.

As we look at the resolution, I'm thankful that the Member for Macleod introduced this here today, so we could have a discussion on it. It is somewhat vague:

... urge the government of Alberta to give consideration to the establishment of a system which will ensure income stability for the livestock industry.

Of course, there are some misgivings among a great many people as to whether the government of Alberta can, on its own behalf, introduce some sort of stabilization program in isolation from the rest of the nation.

I was very impressed by the remarks of the Member for Bow Valley, because I have a great deal of respect for his background and knowledge about the cattle industry, and the success he has had at times. He's mentioned this success, and he also mentioned the times he was not successful. He admits that the industry is in a state of fluctuation, and anybody who really wants to get involved has to be prepared to accept that situation.

All members who have spoken in the discussion of this resolution this afternoon have underlined something that is very apparent; that is, the deep concern this government and, I'm sure, all members of this Legislature have for the situation that exists in our red meat industry in the province. It was really something to hear the comments from the Member for Cardston, when he outlined the number of cattle in Alberta in 1950, 1960, 1970, and 1980, and realize the fact that we have more in Alberta today than we had 30 years ago, yet our packing industry in many areas of the province has practically disappeared. The reasons for that were given. But it is a very cyclical type of industry, subject to conditions outside the realm of the province itself.

As we travel around the province and meet with our constituents, the call and cry seem to be that the government should do something. When every hon. member of the Legislature hears that remark, I'm sure they say: what should we do? We get a variety of opinions and suggestions as to what could and should be done. We know our farm organizations have varying views on what could be done to stabilize the industry. In Alberta, Unifarm expresses support for a federal program, and the National Farmers Union is very strong on a national meat authority. The Hon. Eugene Whalen himself expresses the view that he would like to see a national policy. From the information I've received, on more than one occasion he has taken that proposed policy to his cabinet colleagues. Each time it has been shot down; he hasn't been very successful. Personally, I would very much like to see a program proposed by the federal government put out for consideration and discussion across the nation, so we could have input from our various organizations in Alberta, and other province's could do the same.

I've heard very definite statements from members here today that they are utterly and completely opposed to

supply management. I'm not too well informed on that situation, because I hear varying opinions about it in my part of the country. One of the apprehensions is that it would involve a quota system. One of the concerns expressed about a quota system would be what type of provision could be made for entry of new people into the system. Another concern is what type of condition could be set up to allow for expansion within that system. Those are interesting things.

Then of course I have brought to me the fact that the dairy industry is working under that type of supply management system. The turkey industry is working under that sort of national system. The broiler producers and the egg marketing people are under that type of system. I'm not too familiar with egg marketing or the broilers, but I have people in my constituency of Athabasca who are highly involved in the dairy and turkey industries. These days I'm not hearing anything from these people. They seem to be doing all right, and they seem to be managing. As far as the quota situation is concerned, I know that from time to time they have been able to increase their quotas, depending on the supply and demand across the nation, I suppose. They are not unhappy about the system they're working under.

I have not heard any really convincing arguments proposed today as to why there should not be supply management. I'm not advocating there should be, but I'd like to hear some very good, sound reasons why there should not be. That's the situation I'm in. When I hear these remarks in the Legislature this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I have to wonder. It's not sufficient to me for somebody to say "just because". I would like to hear somebody very positively point out one, two, three, four reasons we should not have supply management.

We have a different situation in the northern part of the province, because most of our producers number their cattle in the hundreds or maybe even less. A number of the people speaking here today represent producers, either ranchers or feedlot people, who number their cattle in the thousands. We have a different situation too, because a lot of those ranch cattle are being raised in an environment where they're on pasture for many more weeks of the year than in northern Alberta. Their feeding season when they have to supplement their pasture with the feeding of hay, silage, and whatnot, is considerably shorter than ours. As has been mentioned by some of the other people, that is probably a different type of attitude people have.

In talking to some of my producers in recent weeks, Mr. Speaker, a number that were utterly and completely opposed to any type of supply management are beginning to say, one or two years down the road, that it wouldn't be too bad if we could have provisions in it, work out the details, so our young farmers would have an opportunity to enter the industry, and an established farmer would have some means of expanding his operation if this became necessary in order to make it economical. These are the sorts of things I'm hearing from established producers today. That's probably important and actually deserving of pretty careful consideration in comparison to what is happening in other industries in the agricultural field. If any program of stabilization comes about, it certainly has to be worked out in conjunction and consensus with the people in the industry, the producers themselves.

I definitely support the views expressed today that the marketing situation has to be emphasized as completely as possible and expanded to the greatest extent. As a

province, we can get involved in the marketing situation and do a great deal, as we are doing, by spending money in this type of effort. The million dollars we've allocated for the Alberta Cattle Commission this year for promotion is a good step in that direction. Of course the money, some \$20 million, being allocated for marketing promotion overseas will help as far as the agricultural industry is concerned.

But as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Wainwright, for agriculture to survive we have to consider it not in isolation as far as the livestock industry is concerned. We have to consider all aspects, because our agricultural industry in Alberta is so interrelated.

Grain and livestock producers are so interdependent that whatever programs we work out and whatever decisions we make have to be something that will not be to the benefit of one segment of the industry and to the detriment of the other. Certainly we're going to have these kinds of cycles. If we can do something perhaps not to eliminate them altogether but certainly to modify them so they won't be so extreme as in this case, where all of a sudden we're faced with high interest rates and inflation of input costs to the industry, then we will be in a better situation.

In 1973 and 1974, when we had the problem with the livestock industry, we didn't have these other factors causing such difficulty; that is, the interest rates and the input costs at that time. I think the subsidization that we brought in in the cow-calf program was sufficient impetus at that time to put the industry back on its feet. It was able to survive until the 1979 period, when we really hit the downfall with interest rates and these other costs.

I don't think we can completely discount any program that might have attached to it some sort of supply management. Producers say to me: we want to be assured that we can get back our costs of production and a fair profit; that's all we're asking. Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't have any problem if our producers were getting a fair price for their livestock sufficient to do that. We wouldn't even have to have this debate this afternoon. That's the tragedy of the whole situation. Producers are working very, very diligently, very, very hard, and they'd be happy to continue if they knew that eventually they were going to have a type of industry which would produce and continue to produce that fair return. As I say, that's happening at present in the dairy industry and in other controlled industries. I think we have to give some serious thought to that. I'm not advocating it strictly as something we must do, but let's look at it very carefully and see if this does not fit in, in some manner, with a program which would bring some sort of stability to the livestock industry in this province.

Thank you.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's been an interesting debate so far this afternoon. I almost rose out of my chair a couple of times listening to the last hon. member speak. It's obvious that we represent very, very diverse constituencies. But I'll get back to the comments of the hon. Member for Athabasca shortly.

I think we need to ask ourselves what has made our agricultural producers the most efficient anywhere; I'm sure we could say anywhere in the world. Even on the credit side, for those of us who have to borrow, I understand that our record in agricultural borrowing in terms of payback is better than any other sector of the economy. So obviously we must be a fairly good risk.

Although some people may consider them to be subsi-

dies of some sort or another, I think our myriad of programs have really had a lot to do with the efficiencies that existed in the past and, in particular, our present agricultural economy. I would submit that those programs have been a benefit to our producers and, in particular, a benefit to consumers. I don't think the average consumer really realizes that, because a number of members today have been speaking about the number of programs we have.

For instance, I believe one member touched on some of our research programs. All those different research programs have been taken up quickly and implemented, because our agricultural primary producers certainly have to be the most practical people on the North American continent. If they see that somebody has, so to speak, built a better mousetrap, they'll be using it next year. They'll be incorporating it into their business and doing a job that benefits all of us in the long run, especially consumers.

So in the long term, those programs that exist to better facilitate the production of whatever kind of agricultural product we're talking about, have not necessarily made wealthy people out of farmers but certainly have provided for consumers the very best quality and the lowest priced products for consumption on the North American continent, indeed anywhere in the world.

It's interesting to look back a little at where we've been, in terms of the Canadian economy. I think that has been mentioned by a number of members. That has had a great deal of bearing on the eating habits of our consumers. Looking at some statistics, I note that in 1970 Canada had the third highest per capita income in the world. Only eight years later, we're seventh, behind Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, and the United States. At that time there weren't any stats to show what the oil revenues did for those people living in the Middle East, though one may suspect they weren't uniformly distributed.

To go back to my own and my husband's experience starting farming in 1956, we purchased our first 23 head of steers in the fall of 1956.

MR. ISLEY: That was the wrong kind; they don't reproduce.

MRS. OSTERMAN: For the hon. Member for Bonnyville: we got some heifers the next spring. We found out that steers didn't have babies, so we got to buying heifers.

We had just started farming that spring, and in the fall, on borrowed money — it wasn't many dollars, though it seemed like a lot to us because it put us very deeply into debt. We fed those 23 steers some feed wheat. It was very badly frozen wheat that I think we were getting about 60 cents a bushel for that fall.

The hon. Member for Macleod recalled when grain was piled up in the field. I can remember starting out farming in the Vulcan area. I've never seen so many Cadillacs in my life. I couldn't figure it out. If farming was that bad, how could all these people be driving these big cars? I discovered there was a very enterprising car dealer in the High River area, who, incidentally, had some tax problems later on, I believe. But we won't speak to that. This enterprising fellow took wheat in trade and was able to sell it. Somehow he managed to have a very large quota, but we can't get into that. With all this grain piled up, a number of farmers decided that rather than see it rot in the field, they would trade it on Cadillacs. I remember somebody saying to Joe and me: if your car breaks down,

we'll just lend you one any day or, alternatively, you can put it in our trunk and travel with us; if our car breaks down, we'll get yours out and use it. That's just a little history.

The following May and June, we sold those 23 steers for 18 cents a pound. We calculated that we had about broken even on that exercise. At about the same time, I remember we were selling 3 to 5 gallon cream cans for up to \$3.50 for one canful. That was a lot of milking, especially when you were milking eight cows by hand. You had no electricity, and it seemed as if you were always doing it in the dark, both morning and night. It took me a long time. It was spring before I finally found out what color our cows were, though they always seemed to walk into the right stall. So we made out all right. That's a little history.

You had to want to be involved in agriculture very badly, and I suppose the same thing applies today. That little production that started in the spring of 1956 — our friends from the city described it as embarking on a life-long camp-out. They said they'd seen a lot of people go camping for two weeks, but they really hadn't met anybody who was entertaining the idea of doing it permanently. That lifelong dream that Joe and I had about going farming — maybe we had more stars in our eyes and didn't really see what was happening around us — led us into probably the very best, most productive existence we could have hoped for.

But today I suspect that the young farmers don't approach farming in the same way. There certainly aren't the same stars in their eyes. The realities around them come home much more quickly because of the very fast pace of life. Our myriad of programs are going to have to continue. We're going to have to speak out very strongly that they're not subsidies. Indirectly they're helping each and every consumer in this country.

High interest rates: a number of people have gone over the litany of reasons why we find ourselves in this position today, given, as I stated before, that our producers are the most efficient in the world. A number of things have been put forward. I note some comments by economists that rate our problems and the kinds of things affecting our agricultural economy right now. They talk about:

1. Inflated production costs leading to profit margins that cannot sustain the industry for long.
2. High interest rates, together with inflated credit requirements have a multiple effect on total interest charges.
3. Widely variable rates which render effective production planning difficult.
4. Declining beef consumption.

That has been mentioned over and over again and has to do with our overall economy.

4. Farm Business management limitations.

I submit that the number one problem is high interest rates. High interest rates are causing the problem in every other sector of our economy, which eventually leads to the decline in beef consumption. I think that's a fairly simple proposition, but it's certainly not a simple proposition to start looking at a solution. A number of economists are saying that the high interest rates the Americans have endured for some time have helped immeasurably in reducing their inflation rate. Why hasn't that happened in Canada? I think the Premier put his finger on that particular bit of advice we're getting from the governor of the Bank of Canada. The hon. Member for Bow Valley had

some ideas on what he would like to do with that gentleman if he met him, but he really didn't go into detail. The Premier pointed out that the Canadian economy has a completely different mix. So the premise that high interest rates are going to cut or ameliorate our high inflation rate just hasn't held true, and indeed we need a made-in-Canada interest policy.

As a number of people, especially economists, point out that a made-in-Canada interest policy would certainly have an effect on our Canadian dollar. But I submit that the effect on the Canadian dollar would probably lead a lot of us to change our buying habits in terms of things we buy that are produced outside this country. In particular, those of us who depend on foreign markets for our goods would be well served by a lower Canadian dollar. I realize you can point to a number of individual costs that would go up as a result of this lower dollar, but overall I think we can show that that lower dollar would indeed help our exports.

The cattlemen have been making suggestions about alternative credit arrangements, for instance. I believe the agricultural community should have control over their own credit institution. I think they've put forward a number of good ideas in that regard. It's interesting that the commercial lending institutions in the province apparently account for something like 74 per cent of the dollars that are borrowed right now by our agricultural community. Our own lending institution, through governments, accounts for about 26 per cent. Apparently that is mostly land purchases. But that 74 per cent obviously accounts for a great deal of the operating money being borrowed right now. As we all know, for those of us who are using borrowed dollars — and I suspect most of us still involved in agriculture are — that operating money is far too high.

I believe there are other ways of putting capital together — as has been suggested by a number of the agricultural community, particularly the Cattlemen's Association — that could serve to reduce the rate at which we borrow and still offer a fair rate of return for those who put their dollars into a strictly agricultural type of bank.

We look at what has been offered today by way of the resolution before us. There's no doubt at all that a number of producers who are watching their enterprises almost go down the tube are saying, in what may be to some degree desperation: we'll settle for anything. If you throw a drowning man a rope or a life preserver, I think he or she is bound to grasp it. I suspect there are a number of producers across this province — and I'm sure some of those producers have been speaking to the hon. Member for Athabasca. I think they must be quite desperate to suggest that their interests would be well served by the kind of regulation the federal government would impose.

To some degree, the federal government is responsible for the situation we find ourselves in today. I don't know how many years we've been talking about some sort of Canadian policy for red meat across this country. But they haven't had the guts to offer anything. They keep throwing it back on the provincial governments. They don't consult the producers. So in their obviously well-placed desire to help their producers, the provincial governments have been 'ad hocking' their way through a number of programs. It has created absolute chaos in the industry. Given the cyclical nature of the industry, added to all these other sorts of artificial things that have been done, we find ourselves in the position we're in today.

The hon. Member for Cardston said we should be

looking to a federal program. It should be an across-Canada program. We all agree with that. But, my friends, I think we have waited as long as we can. I think there has to be a made-in-Alberta program for stabilization if the feds don't pick up something immediately. It has to be addressed to the whole red meat industry. I think it's very dangerous for us to embark — as we have to this point, because we've been trying to assist our producers — on *ad hoc* programs that don't address the overall red meat industry. I think we have to do it in Alberta. Most of the production is here. Surely if we put forward a good sound proposal that consumers will realize is going to continue to encourage our producers to be the best in the world, they will support those kinds of proposals.

But the proposals mustn't be made without the very realistic caveat that this world has changed. Our agricultural resources are finite. We can't continue to say, we've always had a red meat industry here, we've always had a certain percentage of the market, or we've always had X number of cows and therefore we should continue to. I don't think it's realistic. If I could just digress for a minute, I think it's realistic to look to a certain percentage of that market that Alberta should have consistently. But in terms of pumping up or building in this province an artificial level of production that takes land that would normally be far more productive, that right now cattle are grazing on — I look at the area we farm. My husband is breaking a lot of land. In the last year and a half, he's probably broken about 150 acres. We were probably pasturing about 50 cows. In terms of world food production, that was really wrong. It's morally wrong to pasture cattle on land that could be producing the pounds of protein, in grain, on that kind of land. We must look to the other very productive land we have in this province, but it's main carrying capacity in the gray-wooded area should be cattle. That's where the emphasis should be. We mustn't prop up the industry and do something artificial that would continue to have an expectation that cattle can be produced anywhere and somehow we have a right to produce them anywhere.

Basically I support the hon. member's motion. I have some caveats in terms of how we as a government actively facilitate the kind of program the agricultural industry needs to stabilize itself. We must look at that very closely, bearing in mind that a cattle program in particular should especially be geared to the production costs of those parts of the province that are, historically and in the future, best suited for that kind of production.

I congratulate the hon. member for bringing this motion forward.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a voice from northeastern Alberta to the debate on Motion 204. I don't purport to be an expert on the cattle industry, but after listening to the hon. Member for Three Hills describe her and her husband's experience starting farming, I take pleasure in saying that I've known since I was a young lad that to start a basic herd you had to have 23 heifers and one bull, not 23 steers. [interjections]

I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Macleod in putting forward Motion 204:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government of Alberta to give consideration to the establishment of a system which will ensure income stability for the livestock industry.

Probably we have to narrow the motion, to speak of the beef and sheep industry, because I believe we've adequately addressed the pork industry. Like many of the mem-

bers before me, I will be speaking mainly on the beef industry, as there is very little sheep industry in my part of the province.

I view the beef industry as very important to the province. I think a review of history will show that it's the industry which opened the province, particularly the movement into southern Alberta. A more recent review of history will show that it's an industry that is flowing northward. I believe I would be correct in saying that at this time, well over half the beef breeding cows in this province are north of Highway 16. For those who have read Dr. Horner's report on the meat industry, and his recommendations to government to bring an additional 10 million acres of land into production in this province, I don't think you have any difficulty deciding where that land is going to come from. It's going to come from northern Alberta. So I predict that continued shift of the beef industry to the north, at least the basic cow-calf industry but probably not the feedlot industry. There are various good reasons for that.

As the industry moves north, it faces two problems that people from the south do not experience. One is the type of grazing land available. There aren't public lease lands which have native grasses good for cattle production. All our public lands and grazing leases in the north tend to be covered with trees, and it's a rather expensive process to remove them. I think the second added cost the industry faces as it creeps north is longer feeding seasons.

Many producers in my part of the province are very thankful to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife for his rangeland improvement program, which is definitely improving grazing in the north, northeast, and northwest parts of this province. The grazing reserve program under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund is providing a secondary pasturing area for many farmers, both young and old, to expand their cattle herds.

This year in particular, and last year to a lesser degree, the ranchers in my country were very thankful to the Minister of Agriculture for the feed freight assistance program.

Normally we're an area that produces a feed surplus. But as a result of two dry springs, there was a terrible shortage of feed this year. Through that program, we've retained our basic herd numbers. The representations I've received from my constituents at this point are, number one, they are thankful the program was extended until June 1, 1982; secondly, they would like to see the minister raise the limits of \$5,000 per individual to something in the neighborhood of \$7,000 to \$7,500, because of the amount of feed they've had to move into the area.

I think I've touched on one thing I view as a dramatic change in the future in the industry; that is, a shift to the north. Before I come to my closing comments, I'd like to go back and review the growth of the industry over the years, where it's located in Canada, and a number of things. I believe the hon. Member for Cardston mentioned some of these numbers. The cattle on Alberta farms in 1950, 400,000 head, underwent a very dramatic increase of 106 per cent, to 827,000 head by 1960; in the decade of the '60s an increase of 34 per cent, to 1,105,000 in 1970; in the time period from '70 to '75 a very dramatic increase of 47 per cent, to a total of 1,620,000; then in the five-year span from 1975 to 1980 a decline of 38 per cent, to end up in 1980 with 1,380,000 beef cows on Alberta farms. If you look at total cattle marketings over the last 30-year period, including cows and calves, you again see an increase of about 43 per cent from 1950 through 1961, hitting a total of 677,000 head in 1961; a dramatic in-

crease of 44 per cent from 1961 to 1970, hitting 977,000 head; again that dramatic jump of 47 per cent in the first five years of the '70s, to 1,430,000 total cattle marketings; peaking in 1977 with [1,653,000] cattle and calves going to market, and declining in 1980 to 1,242,700. It's also interesting to note that — and I believe the hon. Member for Macleod expanded on this a bit — from 1961 through 1979, the amount of beef contributing to farm income increased significantly, from 29 per cent of total farm income in 1961 to 42 per cent of total farm income in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, it's also interesting to look at the statistics on breeding beef cows and heifers on farm by province as a percentage of the Canadian herd and see what has happened to our herds over the last five years or so. If you look at the time period from 1975 to 1980, we actually enjoyed an increase in the proportionate amount of the Canadian herd, from 36 per cent to 37.7 per cent. In actual numbers that's a decrease from 2.242 million to 1.75 million. The point I'm making here is that relative to the rest of Canada, the industry has held its own in breeding beef, cows, and heifers. In 1979, we peaked at 38 per cent of the Canadian herd, declining slightly in 1980 to 37.7 per cent. During the time span 1979-80, it's interesting to note that the only province that increased as a percentage of total Canadian herd was Ontario, which went from 11 to 11.5 per cent. But if you look back to the time period 1976, 1977, and 1978, you'll notice that they declined from when they were making up 15-plus per cent of the Canadian herd.

You see a similar pattern develop if you look at the proportion of cattle slaughtered in federally inspected plants. In 1975, Alberta slaughtered 40.51 per cent of Canada's herd in federally inspected plants. In 1980, we were still slaughtering 40.9 per cent. Again you see very few significant jumps in any of the provinces. If I'm attempting to make a point here, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's this: so far we've held our own as to our position in the Canadian cattle industry. Like many members before me, I agree that we are facing a critical time and, unless we make some moves, we could start to lose.

I look at the price received for steer calves in October 1973: an average of 58.38 cents. I look at it in October 1981, averaging about 74 cents. I apply an inflation factor of 11 per cent to the 1973 price. I'm not suggesting it was an ideal price, but just to run a quick comparison: if the price of the steer calves had gone up by 11 per cent over that time period, which is probably what our inflation factor was, last October they should have been selling for \$1.34 a pound. At that rate, I think our farmers and ranchers would be very, very happy that they were getting a fair return.

I look at fat steers going through Calgary in October 1973: 46.19 cents. I apply the inflation factor of 11 per cent to that base, and this past fall they should have been receiving \$1.06 for a fat animal. In reality, they were receiving in the neighborhood of 70 cents; a little higher, a little lower. Again, if the inflation factor that applies to the rest of our economy and society were applied to beef, those feedlot operators would have been satisfied with their returns.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we're seeing is a cost/price squeeze being put on the livestock producer. His input cost for fuel, machinery, fertilizer, and labor is going up at inflationary rates or better, yet his price at the gate for his products is not keeping pace. Add the dramatic increases in land costs, and your cost/price squeeze gets even tighter.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the need for some form of stabilization. While I agree with the hon. Member for Cardston, that that stabilization should be national in scope, I also agree with the hon. Member for Three Hills, in saying I have no confidence they're going to bring one forward. Hence, I think the responsibility to take some action is going to rest on the members of this House. Many members before me have expressed concerns with provincial programs that are growing, with the artificial subsidies in our freight system that tend to work against the natural competitive advantages of our western prairie beef industry. I have those same concerns. We went through the hog situation where the other provinces came in. The federal government didn't address the situation or accept its responsibilities. We finally had to come forward, and I submit we're going to have to do the same again.

I look at the programs of our neighboring provinces. Since 1979, B.C. has had a participating contributory program that applies to calves, yearlings, and finished beef, the province paying 50 per cent of the cost of that program. By all reports, it appears to be working very well. It's also significant to note that in the last five years, B.C.'s proportion of the Canadian average of slaughtered cattle has doubled, from approximately 1.05 per cent to 2.02 per cent, still not making them a significant producer but I wonder if their stabilization program has something to do with their nudging upward in position. In the past five years, their breeding cows have increased from 4.9 per cent to 6.3 per cent of Canada's total.

I look next door at Saskatchewan, which last fall announced its beef stabilization program, effective January 1, 1982. I would say that program has the basic components of a good program. Don't get me wrong. I'm not supporting this program in its entirety, but it does have some good components. I believe I said this before in this House. It has a six-year lock-in period. It's voluntary, but once the producer makes the decision, he's locked-in for six years. It's participatory in the sense that he must contribute 4 per cent of the gross price he receives on his cattle. I think those components should be in any stabilization program. It should be voluntary and participatory, and there has to be a lock-in period. Otherwise, you will have people jumping in and out.

Mr. Speaker, many details in this program will not fit the Alberta industry. If you read the program, it's definitely designed to develop an on-the-farm cattle industry in Saskatchewan. It's aimed at the basic producer, and he must retain ownership of those cattle until they're sold. It has limitations in terms of numbers that would be totally unrealistic in the Alberta cattle industry.

I think we must recognize, as this government recognized in its beef and sheep support program, that there are three basic components to the Alberta beef industry, which obviously don't exist in the Saskatchewan beef industry. We have the gentleman running the basic herd, the cow-calf operator whose goal is . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Or a woman.

MR. ISLEY: Or a woman? Some women run herds. I'm sorry. My wife has done it a number of times, because I wasn't there.

We have the cow-calf operator, where the goal of the male or female in charge of the herd is to produce the calves, probably wean them, and sell them in the fall. We have people in the background business buying those calves and taking them through until they're 700, 800

pounds, or more. Then we have the feedlot operators. I think any program we develop is going to have to recognize that, as opposed to trying to impose a new structure on the new industry, which I suspect our brothers to the east are doing.

What should we do, or what should we not do? I suggest to the hon. Member for Athabasca that we should not go into supply management. To me, supply management brings to mind quotas, a limit on what you can produce. You probably have to buy the quota to move into the industry. It brings in fixed prices. So we have things which I find rather amusing. The Public Utilities Board sets the price of milk. I have a little difficulty with that.

I look at what supply management has done to the dairy industry in this province, and I think back to when I grew up on a farm south of Vermilion. Basically we survived on a cream cheque. Any animal on the place that ate grass, gave milk — whether it had one to four teats — was run into the barn and milked. Mom, dad, and all eight of us kids were out there morning and night, and that's how we were raised. When we went to town Saturday afternoon, Mom shopping for groceries. The cream cheque terminated at exactly the same time, because that's all the money there was in the family. A lot of neighbors grew up the same way. Right across the pasture fence, the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking was doing the same thing with his family. The versatility of going back to that way of supplementing a farm income doesn't exist today. I'm told that 15 years ago in the Bonnyville area, enough cream was produced and went to the local creamery to supply the entire area and the Canadian Forces Base, Cold Lake, and they shipped the surplus out. Today they ship everything in.

The farmer who is running into a rough time with beef production can't diversify and say, I'm going to add 20 dairy cows to my herd, and use the old-fashioned way of supplementing his income. They're tied up with quotas and modern equipment. [interjections] Yes, the old-fashioned way. So I suggest that one thing we do not do is support supply management.

I suggest that we do three things; that is, work toward rationalizing the freight system in this country, so you remove some of the anomalies which make it as cheap to feed our barley in eastern feedlots as in western feedlots. We have to address the Crow issue and resolve it in a way that will benefit the total agricultural industry. So the first thing we must do is resolve our inequities through the freight system.

The second thing — and we should move with it rather quickly — is a voluntary, participatory income assurance program similar to the one Dr. Horner mentioned in his study on the meat industry, patterned after our pork producers' program. I'm not prepared to lay out all the details, but I suggest it could probably just apply to the finished animal, and the benefits should flow back through the industry.

The third thing we should be striving toward is the development of an agricultural development bank, similar in concept to the one being proposed and discussed by the members of the Alberta Cattle Commission. Once developed, this bank should provide short-term, medium-term, and long-term financing to Alberta farmers and ranchers. It should do it at an agricultural interest rate and at a fixed term. One of the problems that has hit many of our producers — and I realize this creeps into other businesses as well — is that people make certain plans on something that is operational and viable at 13

per cent. They borrow the money at a floating rate. Two years later they're paying 24 per cent, and it's no longer viable. I think it has to have fixed-term interest rates. I don't think we have to lay out subsidies to do it. [interjections] I think we're going to have to . . . Low interest rates are subsidies; there's no other way to cut it. [interjections] As soon as you don't start paying for a service . . .

DR. BUCK: Are you subsidizing the other provinces?

MR. ISLEY: I'll be finished shortly, gentlemen, and then you can have the floor. [interjections] I will repeat: when you step in and reduce an interest rate, it's a subsidy.

DR. BUCK: That's Albertans' money.

MR. ISLEY: The announcement the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs made in the House today on protecting municipal borrowing interest rates at 11 per cent is nothing other than a subsidy. Cut it by any stroke you want.

DR. BUCK: You tell that to the municipalities.

MR. ISLEY: They know it.

The easy way to do it — and this requires some federal/provincial co-operation — is instead of having a federal budget like we had on November 12, that takes a slice at free entrepreneurs and takes back in taxes a substantive amount of money that businessmen and farmers build up over their lives when they've given up some of the benefits of people working for salaries, it would be very, very easy through taxation law to redirect agricultural money into agriculture. In the past, we had income averaging annuities, where capital gains money was paid to insurance companies — I'm not knocking the insurance companies because I still sell those annuities, at least the watered-down version — credit unions, trust companies, et cetera, who could then give a tax certificate to the person who enjoyed the capital gains. They'd get their deduction, and that money went back into society. I'm suggesting that all you have to do is direct, through taxation changes, that capital gains money received from agriculture would avoid income tax if it went back into funding an agricultural development bank. I realize that's a pretty rough outline, but I think the direction we should be looking is the industry generating its own funds.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to congratulate the hon. Member for Macleod for bringing forward Motion 204. I urge all members of the Assembly to support it. Now I sit down with pleasure to hear the experts from the other side who wanted to get up a moment ago.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Okay, Walt, the floor is yours.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is crucial. But before I begin, I would like to know why the Member for Bonnyville milks with one hand when two hands are twice as fast. [interjections] We know something.

Mr. Speaker, 25 per cent of the cattle in the province are raised west of Highway 2 and north of Lacombe to Barrhead. I've said many times that this area, being predominantly gray-wooded, is primarily suited to the growth of forage crops. The main saleable product from that area is beef. I have to concur with the comments by

the Member for Athabasca, who said that in an area where you have a 100- to 200-cow unit and that is the only saleable product, the outlook and total dependence on beef is very different from an area where you have alternate markets and alternate saleable products, or a much larger operation.

I wholly endorse the comments made by the Member for Three Hills that areas of the province suited only to producing beef should produce beef, and maybe other areas should concentrate on producing high-quality protein. In fact, that's one of the major concerns I have with our so-called grazing reserves. If you look at the people who use them, they essentially cater to grain producers who need to get rid of their cattle for the summer. I believe it causes some problems in the areas where the only product is beef.

The cost of producing a calf has been calculated by some friends and neighbors at \$540, based on the cost of feeding the cow, the cost of interest for that animal, vet's fees and supplies, and an 85 per cent calf crop and return to the operator. Mr. Speaker, the figure doesn't include depreciation, interest on machinery, cost of money for land, or the cost of clearing the land, because it can be argued that is an appreciable asset and increases the equity.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The latest figures I have from the auction mart — and these were last week, Mr. Speaker — is that calves ranged between 66 and 72 per cent. Mind you, that's a good group of steer calves. So if you have a group of steer calves at an average of 600 pounds, the return would be \$420. That's \$120 less than the cost of production.

Mr. Speaker, there is really more at stake in this motion than a viable cattle industry. And "stake" is spelled s-t-a-k-e in this case. It's the sale for our feed grains. If we are able to feed those grains in Alberta, they don't have to be shipped through an already clogged transportation system. It involves 8,000 to 10,000 workers involved in secondary industries directly related to the primary industry of cattle production in this province.

The survival of small towns throughout Alberta is also at stake: machinery dealers, hardwares, feed companies, even groceries and clothing stores. These small towns depend on the surrounding agricultural areas for their business. High farm income has a snowballing effect on the economy of small towns. Conversely, low incomes have a negative snowballing effect on the economy of these small towns.

Mr. Speaker, there are three views about what the government should be doing. One is that it should do nothing; another is that it is not doing anything; thirdly, maybe they should be implementing marketing boards and regulating the marketing system.

Two situations must be considered. One is the short term; the other is the one we're discussing today. The short-term problem was reacted to by the introduction of the beef cattle and sheep support program. We must recognize that that's only a short-term program, and the long-term program has to be addressed. One of the long-term solutions proposed is a beef marketing board. There are inherent problems with marketing boards. While the egg marketing board and the milk marketing board, which have been mentioned here today, seem to provide a stable income, the producers have not even received the increases which have kept up to the population expansion of this province. If the same held true for a cattle

marketing board, where the province of Alberta already has 42 per cent of the share, the ultimate outcome would be that we would lose a portion of that segment of our industry. In my estimation, it's one of the most critical areas. We have to discuss and assess it, when we're talking about marketing boards.

Certainly Alberta cattlemen can compete on a fair and equitable basis with any cattlemen in Canada. But the implementation of subsidies in other provinces has eroded fair market competition. Since the government reaction on a short-term basis, with a once-only payment, only solves the problem today, it's fair that we now look at the longer term one.

The long-term problem is really markets. The beef producer must have markets available in order to ensure a return for his production. The importance of trade with the United States cannot be overemphasized. For years, the possibility of a west coast market has eluded us. It's questionable — and I think I've said this before — whether we can get into the west coast market, because it can be supplied by the United States' producers. They would see that as an infringement on their market territory.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is a vast market potential in Europe and the Pacific Rim. Those markets, by contrast to the U.S., cannot be totally supported by their own agricultural sector. This is one area we should look at. Yesterday, in the estimates of Economic Development, the minister indicated that there is a market potential in the Pacific Rim and Hong Kong. In fact, the Hon. Hugh Planche said:

Some other interesting side comments that might be important: there is a very high restaurant institutional demand for protein. Surprisingly enough, over half of it in Hong Kong is for beef.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an area we should really concentrate on, because we must have a market for that product.

Right now, according to the Hon. Horst Schmid, Safeway is negotiating with the European Common Market to export Alberta boxed beef. Mammoth amounts of red tape must be cut in order to achieve these markets. If someone wants to look at yesterday's Hansard [Blues], the kinds of red tape involved are in that discussion.

I believe that one of the problems we face in getting into the European and Pacific Rim is that we do not have a central selling agency in Canada or Alberta, which can take advantage of this opportunity and promote Alberta beef in European countries. It's critical that we somehow have a central selling agency and a concerted group which will zero in on the sales opportunities in those countries. I think we have a tremendous product, and we should promote and sell Alberta beef.

Of course, the problem is compounded by the fact that the federal government has jurisdiction over external trade. As the Member for Macleod indicated in opening this debate, in the GATT negotiations agriculture is used as a negotiating tool rather than a product to be marketed.

The other long-term problem which needs to be addressed is the cost of shipping beef to Montreal, which accounts for almost half our total beef marketed. Because of the Crow benefit, beef is more expensive to ship to Montreal than live animals. I really can't see why we want to ship all that excess product down there, but we seem to. The problem must be resolved so that the natural advantage which Alberta has or should have for feeding and processing beef is actually a fact. Maybe it

would be necessary to have some heritage trust fund refrigerator cars to replace the cattle cars which presently travel between Alberta and Montreal. In any case, the long-term goal of this government and of beef producers must be to ensure that feeding and processing beef in the province of Alberta is economical.

The cost of money and the need for reasonable rates of interest have been outlined elaborately. I won't go into it, except to say that I really believe that is one of the biggest problems in agriculture today. I have to agree with the Member for Bonnyville that it might be possible through the development of an agricultural trust bank, into which agricultural land sales could dispense funds in trust with a tax benefit accruing to the depositors and the bank lending at preferred rates of interest to the agricultural sector. Of course, this would be agriculture helping and supporting agriculture.

Another problem that's been outlined is the lowering consumption of beef. This is a consumer problem. I don't believe that the consumer has a choice. As a cattle producer, I'm always angry when we sell heifers, cows, and steers, and they're all priced differently at the auction market but the consumer never gets the benefit of that price differential. Maybe we need to educate consumers to buy and use frozen beef, because fresh beef is much more costly to process. The beef dollar is competing with fur coats, holidays, motorhomes, and motorboats. Beef is considered a luxury item, so it competes with other luxury items.

It's essential that the government work with industry in seeking long-term solutions to the outstanding problems, thereby enhancing the future of the Alberta beef industry. There must be a concerted effort to resolve the issue of a suitable national stabilization program, resolution of the negative effects of the Crow rate, improved farm credit and tax structure, and an assessment of the merits and possibility of a beef assurance program which creates an environment in Alberta where our natural advantage for beef cattle production may be realized.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening in Committee of Supply, it is proposed to deal with the departments of Culture, Education, and the Environment, in that order.

I move, therefore, that when the House rises, we return in Committee of Supply until such time as the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

## head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

## Department of Culture

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of Supply please come to order. We are continuing with consideration of the estimates, starting this evening with the Department of Culture. Would the minister want to make any preliminary remarks?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, 1982-83 is going to be a landmark year for Alberta Culture. Construction will commence on several major, exciting new facilities. These will provide Albertans . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you have to read it?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I have to; it's long. These will provide Albertans with the foundation for the finest cultural and heritage facilities in Canada. Alberta has historic resources which the United Nations have declared to be of world significance. After one year of planning in 1981-82, construction will start on the Drumheller dinosaur museum. Two hundred thousand will be spent planning and initiating the construction of a major tourist and information facility at Head-Smashed-in-Buffalo Jump.

I won't read it all, but I will go on because I think this is exciting. Government support continues to widen the rich cultural dimensions of the province. The literary arts program will be more than doubled to \$376,000 to benefit publishers and Alberta authors. Library grants will increase by 20.1 per cent to over \$9 million in 1982-83 to assist regional and municipal libraries. The library system will receive \$562,000 or a 51 per cent increase in funding to promote the sharing of library material.

Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to start.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to commend the minister for the activity in the past year and the increases we've seen in departmental support. I really believe it's important to Alberta and especially to Albertans.

The particular point I would like to make is on the historical publication assistance program. I recognize that throughout the province, numerous historical publications have been printed by various local communities and groups. I believe this is one method of preserving our heritage. I have the fortune of having eight, I think, within my constituency. All of them are absolutely terrific. I guess there never has been a point in the memorable history of any country when we can go back to the very roots of the settlement of an area. We have that opportunity in Alberta today.

I'd just like to congratulate the minister on this program. I know it has been oversubscribed, but you certainly have my support in additional funding, if that's necessary, in order to increase and support this very worthwhile program.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two comments and enlighten the hon. minister of the Crown on how I feel we Ukrainians are not getting our fair share in this province from this government. [interjections] I say very seriously that I am very disturbed about the lack of action in the Ukrainian cultural village out at Elk Island park. I say that very sincerely. First of all, that

project has the potential to be one of the cultural highlights in this province.

I've been to restorations in the maritimes, where they were doing something with them. That could be a centre that would be an attraction to all people coming into the Edmonton area, all people travelling down Highway 16, people who go to Elk Island park, to Al Oeming's Polar Park. That project should be doing more than just collecting dust and buildings. They could be looking at providing ethnic Ukrainian foods all day Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Now I know the government is slowly dragging its feet in having something happen, but how long are we going to have to wait? How long are the Ukrainian people in this province going to have to wait to make that triple A type of facility out there? I guess maybe the Ukrainian members of that caucus don't have any input. Maybe that's the problem.

I could speak in Ukrainian. I think the Clerk could understand. John couldn't understand my Ukrainian English quite as well. The chairman couldn't understand any of it. Of course, you've been raised in Athabasca. I'm sure you could understand at least the swear words, Frank — or Mr. Chairman.

But it has great potential, Madam Minister, and if we're going to make it happen, we have to get moving. It's ideally located. It has many, many positive facilities in there. I'm sure my neighboring M.L.A., the hon. Mr. Batiuk, knows what potential that project could have. It's just not moving fast enough.

Now, I'm not going to bring up anything about the infighting that goes on in different Ukrainian factions. That doesn't upset me too much. I guess we Ukrainian people have been known to fight a little with our neighbors. That's part of our cultural background. But regardless of the infighting, I just recommend as strongly as I can to the minister that that project has great potential. It's a project that could make all Ukrainian people in western Canada proud.

At the same time, while I'm on feet, I would like to say that after having gone to several Ukrainian days in Vegreville — at one time we thought Dauphin was the Ukrainian capital of western Canada. Now that has moved further west to Vegreville. The Vegreville people are putting on just as good or a better show than they put on in Dauphin.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. We've got a good thing going in western Canada. As a person of Ukrainian birth, I'm proud of my heritage and glad to see that we are preserving that heritage, but we could certainly be doing a lot better. Now I know this government doesn't have much money, but surely the people of Ukrainian heritage are entitled to a project that would make us all proud to be Ukrainians and proud to be Albertans.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I just have to stand up and speak to this very point. This year in capital funding alone, we'll have \$1 million put into the budget for the Ukrainian village. My priority in my B budget was the Ukrainian village. It will include 12 permanent staff and 10.5 man-years. In supplies and services, I'll have additional capital funding of \$757,000, and increased operating funds for the village will be \$53,000.

As you see, this really is a priority. I think you're going to be very proud of what's happening. We'll have two more houses opening this summer. We've got a master plan in place, my hon. colleague, and I think you'll be very, very pleased to see what's transpiring.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. First of all, I'd like to compliment the minister. I appreciate her new figure. She's doing very well and looking very, very attractive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that culture?

AN HON. MEMBER: Harrassment.

DR. BUCK: That's culture too. I think anybody who does that well should be complimented. I'd like to compliment the minister on her new look.

Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to make to the minister is that the physical facilities that are going in are fine. But I would like to know when we're going to be able to [see] at least three days a week in the summer months where you can go out there, and not only see the Ukrainian artifacts but have real, honest to goodness Ukrainian food, made by John Batiuk and some of his friends. That's what I want to know.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, that's going to take place this summer.

DR. BUCK: Very good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While we're on this specific topic, I think the Member for Vegreville would like to say something.

DR. BUCK: In Ukrainian, John.

MR. BATIUK: In Ukrainian? *Duzhe dobre*. Mr. Chairman, I guess it wouldn't hurt me to express a few of my own views. Not only the Ukrainian village, but this particular portfolio has meant very much to people throughout the province over the last number of years, particularly to rural Albertans. We knew what was happening some years ago; the mobility from the rural to the urban. That was not because the dollar wasn't here, but it was the quality of life that was lacking. Many of these people were moving into the larger areas because they couldn't provide the culture and recreation they wanted for their young children. I think our government has gone a far way in the last 10 years, and it's going even stronger in that direction.

Talking about the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village, I must say I'm glad that the hon. Member for Clover Bar mentioned that the Ukrainian festival in Vegreville has become what it is, realizing who the M.L.A. was there. But now that we've got that, the hon. Minister of Culture has asked me to chair the advisory board of the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village . . .

DR. BUCK: How much are you getting paid, John? Are you getting paid?

MR. BATIUK: . . . so hopefully in a short time the village will be just as successful as the festival in Vegreville.

Mr. Chairman, I must say this has been going at a good pace, and I would like to pay tribute to the many people who started that Ukrainian village without any money. It was all donations, and they went a far way. But when the dollars stopped, that was the end, and that's why the provincial government purchased it, to stay the way it is. There is already in plan a four year program. When that is finished, rest assured that just like the

Ukrainian festival in Vegreville has exceeded the one in Dauphin, Manitoba, it is predicted that the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village is going to exceed the Fort Garry museum in Manitoba, so I guess it's in the right direction.

I would like the minister to just break it down, exactly how much is going into whatever areas. But as I say, I can see there is a future for that village. As far as the food is concerned, it's still not bad if you can bring your own borsch, perohy, kubasa, and so forth.

DR. BUCK: And *horilka*, John.

MR. BATIUK: *Horilka*. There's plenty of good places for eating up there, and I'm sure that in due course there will be good food provided.

With that, I'd like to thank the minister for what she has done in this regard.

MR. KUSHNER: *Pan Buck, proshu siacley sluchajte*.

I'd like to compliment the Minister of Culture for the Ukrainian village at Elk Island park, plus I would also like to ask her whether she would consider a Ukrainian village south for the Calgary area. [interjections] Don't laugh, she has started one in Calgary in a small way. It's called the Ukrainian Cultural Centre, and it happens to be located in Calgary Mountain View. I have to compliment the minister, because that particular building has been a boon to the Ukrainian population of the city of Calgary. It has a library in it, with very many older books. It is attended by Ukrainians not just in one specific pocket area of the city, but is being utilized for social functions, weddings, dances, schools. There's a Ukrainian school and Ukrainian dancing in there, and the library is excellent and is growing.

I have to compliment the minister. She has provided numerous funds for the construction for that building. As a matter of fact, there's an application in right now for the completion of it. It has finally come, Madam Minister, from the city of Calgary. I was informed of that today. I don't foresee any problems with that.

However, I think we have to consider what the minister has also done for the other nationalities, particularly again in Calgary Mountain View. I seem to have quite a few of those types of individuals in my area. I'm referring particularly to the Italian Club in Calgary. The Minister of Culture has contributed to that. There are various other organizations in Calgary Mountain View and in my hon. colleague's area, Calgary Forest Lawn. We have been to a number of occasions together where we've seen very many ethnic cultures, weddings, and religious ceremonies.

Now that I've gone through that, what I'd like to do is ask the minister, particularly in today's times — there was a question brought up last year with regard to the Bill of Rights that was hanging on the wall in this Assembly. I think it's timely that we consider — and I understand that the reason that Bill of Rights was taken out of here is because the air is apparently too dry, and it was put into a tank for restoration and that sort of thing. I was wondering if the minister would please give consideration to reintroducing that Bill of Rights to this Assembly. I for one would really like to see it back in here if that's at all possible, Madam Minister.

Thank you.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister for her work in her portfolio. She's

doing a terrific job, I believe. But I have a couple of comments I'd like to make.

I was pleased to see the percentage increase in library services, especially with the increased grants to libraries last year and then the increase again this year. I think it augurs well for our libraries across the province. It seems to me that over the years, though, we have developed programs and grants for many centres across the province for sports complexes, arenas, ice surfaces, and those types of facilities. Unfortunately, I believe the cultural field has been left behind. We have a Jubilee Auditorium in Edmonton and Calgary, and that's as it should be because that's where your major population areas are. But I think there are other parts of the province that should have some of these facilities too, probably on a smaller scale, so that the rest of the people from the outlying parts of the province may enjoy some of these things.

The province just recently gave grants to two major coliseums, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary. This again is as it should be, but I still think the regional centres across the province should be having some sort of facilities for art galleries, auditoriums for shows, and that type of thing. I would like to see this program developed so we can provide these major cultural facilities in our regional centres, and so that all Albertans may have the opportunity to enjoy what our city cousins have.

I was also wondering if we might have some sort of update on what has happened to the Reynolds Museum equipment since the takeover. Who's going to run it, how's it going to be operated, and what's the status on that?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, it would almost be repetitive, or it would appear that we're in collusion with the Member for Grande Prairie, because some of my remarks are repetitive and very similar. I would like to congratulate the minister as well for some of the assistance we're being given in the Lac La Biche-McMurray region; in particular, one item that doesn't appear within her estimates for expenditure and approval, the interpretive centre that's going to be co-ordinated through the minister's department for the city of Fort McMurray. This is approximately a \$6 million facility, and will be operated through Culture. I realize there's \$1.8 million in funding through the Public Works Department for construction this year.

I would ask the minister, if she wouldn't mind, to give us an update on one of the projects that was under way within the 75th Commission, the *Canadian Encyclopedia* project. I would like to know where we're at, what timing, and when might we expect to see some completed books.

In particular to the library remarks made by the hon. Member for Grande Prairie, I am a little of the opposite opinion. While additional funding and assistance has been made, I feel we're a little lax in some of the rural areas. We should go beyond. The library is a key or focal point for many of our cities, especially in that we have a very diverse community in such areas as Lac La Biche and Fort McMurray. We have people coming from all over Canada and North America. While being a focal point, we find the library still isn't able to offer all the services we believe it should.

In our particular area, we think that perhaps closer co-operation and co-ordination could be made, for example, with the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and his department. Where we expand into the communities with such things as the Alberta Vocational Centre and the Keyano College, we think we have

the nucleus or the structure and facilities there with the capital expenditure, that we could incorporate a community library without having to put additional funding out when boards are having a difficult time as it is to raise the money for capital projects. In turn, they could have more funds for direct utilization for books.

I also refer to library services, where you point out an 18.4 per cent increase. I would like to hope and think we'd go beyond into some of the smaller areas. In particular I'm thinking of the community of Fort Chipewyan. Here we have the oldest hamlet in the province of Alberta, yet we have no library facility. Why shouldn't their children have that service and facility offered to them? I can appreciate what's going through the Minister of Education's mind at this point. He'd probably say we're providing this service in the school. I appreciate that we are, but through the Minister of Culture I think we could expand on this just a little more.

The Member for Clover Bar referred to the minister's looks. I'd like to assure him from this side that it looks just as well. I would also mention that I don't believe he has any firm hold on Ukrainian food, because in my German ethnic background pyrogys are known to be *kesnepfla*, and I had that for dinner last night. So I don't think he has anything on me. We're keeping the spirit of co-operation going.

In the rural assistance areas, I also think we are a little lax, Madam Minister. Every day we look up in the galleries, whether it be the members gallery or the public gallery, and see tour groups from surrounding communities. If one stops and looks, you'll find that the majority are from within a 100 to 150 mile radius. I've not had the privilege to introduce more than one group in the three years I have been here. The reason, Madam Minister, is the cost. They just can't come 300, 350, or 400 miles. I look over and see a minister who represents a rural area as well, and he knows the cost is not just getting in a bus, driving in for an afternoon, and coming into the Legislative Assembly. Sometimes it's having to charter an airplane and come in from a remote area.

Goodness know, we have the communities of Janvier, Conklin, Chipewyan Lake, Fort Chipewyan. The first three I mentioned have no roads. The cost of flying an airplane to this area would be utterly impossible or unfeasible. So when we look at providing assistance on a per capita or equitable basis, I would like to say that that shouldn't be the criterion. I think we should have to go by exception, and say that if it costs that much more to bring those children in, we should be able to consider that on an appropriate grant. I would appreciate some assistance and perhaps the department looking into that particular method as well.

The Member for Grande Prairie also made reference to the Stan Reynolds Museum. Mr. Chairman, I was going to mention to the minister that I too am concerned. We see facilities being developed for the urban members, and that's very gratifying. We realize that's where the populace is. While we only have 10 per cent of Alberta's population in the north, we have what I term a rapid growth area. I hope we would look perhaps to providing some assistance to develop our local museums in the communities of Lac La Biche, Fort McMurray, and areas such as this.

We have a lot of history, and our history is very young. The river systems have been used; we now have the tar sands projects, trapping. Some of the skills of the natives in particular have to be captured now and put into place. Madam Minister, we can't do it all through volunteer

help. I can appreciate it's out there; they're working very hard within our community. We have a heritage village in the city of Fort McMurray developed mostly through volunteer help, and I can appreciate there's been financial assistance as well. I think we have to look to expanding these areas and providing financial assistance as well.

I'm very please, Madam Minister, and I think you should be aware that Fort McMurray is a very diverse area. In our area, we have representation from many cultural groups from all walks of life. They're very culturally orientated. You've had the pleasure of being there and addressing some of them. We look forward to your return visits, and we hope you'll take our remarks not as complaint but rather as constructive criticism so we can work to make our community just that much better a place to live.

We don't want to think we always have to come from there to see what you have here. We hope we could reverse that trend, and that some of the members from this Assembly and people in Alberta would take the time to visit our areas as well, because we think we have a lot going and hope you can help us in that manner as well.

Thank you very much.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, as is so often said here, I never planned to get into this debate. I was surprised when I heard the Member for Clover Bar had an ethnic background from the Ukraine. I always believed he was born 2 miles outside Stockholm.

DR. BUCK: I never knew Stromberg was Ukrainian.

MR. STROMBERG: When I think of Vegreville as the Ukrainian capital of Alberta, if not Canada, I might remind the minister that Camrose is also the Norwegian capital of Alberta. We don't call pyrogys this and pyrogys that, we call it *lutefisk*. However, in Camrose I think we could also almost be a leader in taking care of our historic resources, our historic sites. If the minister will recall, I introduced a motion to this Legislature many years ago that we recognize the 62 ethnic groups in Alberta by highway signs. We have two of them now, the first one ever erected in Alberta was to the Norwegian settlers of the Camrose area, and not too long ago at Meeting Creek, recognizing the Swedish community that settled there.

In Camrose, we're very fortunate that your department has designated five historic sites. We really appreciate that the dollars are in place, especially for the restoration of those sites. In one case, the Duhamel church, the community has also contributed on cost sharing. I realize that money is always the problem in any department. With the historic buildings we have, that are perhaps rotting away in this generation, I sometimes wonder how many dollars it's going to take in your budget to save them while there's an opportunity. I think that if you could convince the priorities [committee] of cabinet that a dollar spent restoring an historic building is going to return many, many dollars . . . From my own experience visiting British Columbia and especially the United States, they refer to museums and historic sites as tourist traps, and they're darned good tourist traps. It's surprising how you can pull the traffic off a main highway if there's a sign stating historic site or museum.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the donation of the Reynolds collection to the people of Alberta, being an antique collector myself and very familiar with the Reynolds collection, I'd also like to bring up our government only

accepting 300 pieces. That collection is probably now in the neighborhood of 50,000 items. I wrote to the minister a year or two ago, suggesting that if the man has collected this from all over North America — the collection is recognized as far passing Pion-Era in Saskatchewan; recognized as the best in agriculture; not in transportation or planes, but in agriculture it's the best in North America.

Why can't we take some of the pieces, and I realize that we should not collect . . . For instance, say there are ten 15-30 one-lung Rumley tractors sitting there. We only need one. But we have a great number of museums in Alberta. We could say, okay, we'll send out the other 14 to these other museums. Tell them, go ahead, get your pioneers, get your membership to restore that machine, house it, and you really have something. And make recognition that it came from the Reynolds collection.

DR. BUCK: Haven't got any money for it.

MR. STROMBERG: It won't cost any money, Dr. Buck. That's the Swedish pronunciation of that. Reynolds is giving the collection. All we have to do is turn it over to the other museums. I have to mention that the funding has been adequate, and the small-town museums have certainly taken advantage of it. This summer, I had the opportunity to go through Hanna, and I was amazed at what that museum had done. It looked like a town. They had pulled in railroad stations, log houses, and schools. That has to be most outstanding. In our constituency, we certainly appreciate the funding that went into the Donalds museum, perhaps Alberta's newest museum, which houses the most outstanding lamp collection in North America, over 800 individual lamps. We're very proud of that.

I would like to bring to the minister's attention that I have a number of constituents who belong to a very unique club. These are Albertans from all walks of life who, at fair expense to themselves, have collected agricultural equipment, not only in Alberta but throughout the rest of Canada and the United States. They banded together as a club — they started from scratch — and have been operating at the Langdon corner, east of Calgary. They have approximately 60 machines on display each summer, that are in mint condition and operating. It is called the thrashermen's reunion. They have some tractors and follow the same thing that Pion-Era does in Saskatoon and many organizations in the United States.

They have made representation to your department that they need a quarter of land to house all this. Could there be some co-operation through funding to that tremendous volunteer group, to give them a little shot in the arm. They're doing a heck of a job saving that equipment and putting it back to work.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since we settled the Ukrainian pyrogys or perohy, I had a German and a Norwegian explanation for it. If any more ethnic communities are to be heard from, I suggest that they prepare their English spelling or sound for it for the *Hansard* people, to save a lot of mail back and forth.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to request the minister to respond to a different aspect of her department. Edmonton Belmont is a relatively young constituency, other than perhaps the Belvedere area. They have some preservation area, particularly one of the early mis-

sions established there. I would be interested in knowing whether, in fact, there is substantive assistance to preserve for historical purposes that particular area, particularly in book form, and the type of assistance available to communities. I was recently in communication with constituents from a parish. They were working on their 75th Anniversary book, a historical record.

It is one thing to restore buildings and establish sites for historical preservation. I think it's equally important, Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, to restore the culture, background, language, and various ethnic dances, within the area of young people, educationwise. I wonder what kind of participation your department might be doing, Madam Minister, in the area of assisting young people. I know that some young people who excel in the areas of ethnic dance, choreography, and the arts receive some assistance. But it would appear to me that the amount of time some of these young people are putting into not only attaining the skills in the ethnic arts but also translating that and teaching it to other young people — whether we're getting this type of support. I certainly would be interested in that, because I know some of my constituents spend a tremendous amount of time with young people, developing the arts of various ethnic backgrounds.

At times, it would appear to me that it's at their cost and economic burden. They are carrying it all. I wonder whether the minister has basically addressed this particular area. Perhaps it would require the Minister of Education as well, and others that the matter would have to be co-ordinated with. But this is basically the area I would certainly appreciate the minister addressing: the amount of funding available to those taking the ethnic arts and who are extremely proficient in them: the amount of assistance available to them, particularly to those who may go across the province or the country, teaching these skills to other young people; and whether in fact we have been responding to those areas.

Thank you.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Chairman, being from an area where we have all kinds of heritage backgrounds, I'm not going to tackle that. Since coming to Edmonton and sharing an apartment with the hon. Member for St. Paul, no one has fed us pyrogys, but we always try to arrange to be somewhere where there is food at mealtime.

I'd like to say to the minister that I'm extremely pleased for the things she has done in different areas in my constituency but, most importantly, in one. Through her department, she has done a lot for the town of Fort Macleod and for that particular area. Fort Macleod has more history than nearly anywhere in the province. Frederick Haultain, who was the first Premier of the Northwest Territories, came from there. The Frederick Haultain Building up the street is named after him. In the fort side in Fort Macleod, there is a replica of his former law office.

In that particular area too, right in the town of Macleod, we have the oldest newspaper in the province. It's celebrating its 100th Anniversary this year. I've already spoken to the minister to see if she could arrange to fill a couple of pages of a special anniversary edition for their 100th Anniversary. In addition, the oldest chamber of commerce in the province is in Fort Macleod. Realizing that many things in the province of Alberta started in Macleod, the minister came there last summer, walked down the streets with us, and looked at making the downtown area of Fort Macleod an historic site. She

showed interest and enthusiasm in seeing that happen. There's no better place that that could have happened than in the town of Fort Macleod. Some of the councillors who talked to me are concerned: does the minister still have that interest and, even though it's in the B budget, is she going to follow through on it? I'd like the minister to respond to that.

In addition to that, the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, just outside of Fort Macleod, is going to get going this year. I don't think hon. members can appreciate how important an historical resource the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump is. Over 5,000 years of history is there. The community and all Albertans — in fact, all the world, now that it's been designated a world historic resource — will have an opportunity to see the rich heritage there. The people from Fort Macleod with whom the minister has worked, like Hugh Craig, Mayor Wes Olmstead, and Jean Swihart, have really worked hard to see the reality come, and they're pleased with the minister's interest in seeing that resource developed.

I'd like to ask the minister if she could respond in some way about two particular areas. One thing happens in Fort Macleod that doesn't happen anywhere else, and that is the Fort Macleod mounted patrol, the North West Mounted patrol. They hire high school students each year, and it gets expensive when you have to take care of the horses and put uniforms on those young people. But it does something for the rich heritage in Alberta that isn't done anywhere else. They're having great difficulty keeping that alive. Any help that could come from the minister or any suggestions on how they could keep it going would be very worth while.

I'd like to make one other suggestion. Through the 75th Anniversary celebrations and everything, senior citizens were very involved in a lot of projects for some time. One thing senior citizens could probably grab hold of and do something with, if they had a little direction, is that throughout the province we have all kinds of small school districts where there were small schools. It might have been called the badger flats school district, or whatever, where there was a community at one time. Those communities are still known by that name, but it's being forgotten. It would be a great project for senior citizens within the communities if, through the senior citizens' centres, they could get involved in some way in putting something on a map or whatever that would be a long-lasting remembrance of where those different little community schools were. I think it would be something the department could get involved in that would have a rich and lasting heritage for all of us in Alberta, and something I know senior citizens would really like to get involved in.

Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the constituency of Cardston, I'd like to extend to the minister the fact that the people in that area really appreciate the historical site program and the fact that the court house there has been declared an historic site. It's a real landmark in our area, and we appreciate that.

We also appreciate the support given to the Remington Carriage Collection, especially the speed with which the decision was made. When you go to these departments, it doesn't always happen that you get something done that quickly. But it happened very quickly, and it was really appreciated there. One other thing I'd like to say to the minister: it's more a warning than anything else. We

haven't forgotten that we want a couple of those medicine bundles back. So with that, I'll sit down, Mr. Chairman.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, a number of comments to the minister with respect to the Calgary area and also with respect to the province in general. The first is with regard to the matter of additional funding through the minister's department to various types of additional schooling processes which take place within the city of Calgary as well as other jurisdictions. In particular, might the minister comment with regard to any possibility of increased funding of the Chinese public school. They are overcrowded, to say the very least, and have recently been forced to enlarge their whole instruction program to seven days a week. Perhaps with your own good graces and influence, you might also be able to convince the Minister of Education that other kinds of funding mechanisms might be put in place to help the Chinese community within Calgary in particular.

I would like to compliment the minister with respect to the renovations which have been taking place — and I gather there are others yet to take place — with respect to both of those fine facilities, the southern and northern Jubilee Auditoriums, bequeathed to us by our predecessors in government. In both instances, they are obviously very meaningful centres with respect to the performing arts in particular, but also with respect to all sorts of cultural activities that take place. I, for one, compliment the appointments with respect to the southern Jubilee Auditorium. I know it is of great assistance to know that the management is in good hands.

Would the minister be good enough to enlarge, in her comments, with respect to some of the programs she sees coming on stream this particular year? In the city of Edmonton, one is with respect to what I believe to be the exciting development of the provincial archives building: the location, and how soon we might see this building completed. I admit that I am in conflict of interest as an archivist. But I know that the program in the province has been most commendable, and I understand that the mechanism is in place to develop this new structure. I hope the minister will give us a bit more embroidery as to what the project entails, because I think she is to be commended for having gotten it into place.

With respect to the development of art galleries, I know that under the jurisdiction of the minister's department there has been the accumulation of various paintings and other pieces of art created by Alberta artists. I, with other members of the Assembly, commend the minister and her department for that approach and hope it will be continued. But I ask the minister to comment with respect to the whole area of the development of an art gallery in Edmonton.

The matter of major cultural facilities, of course, relates to the constituency of Calgary Millican but, beyond that narrow parochial boundary, to the whole matter of the city of Calgary and southern Alberta, the whole catchment area on a cultural basis. Obviously the development of the centre for the performing arts in Calgary is coming on apace. Perhaps the minister would be good enough to offer some comments as to whether all the funding is in place, whether construction is on schedule and, in effect, how soon we can look forward to the opening of that very fine centre for the performing arts. In that regard, of course, I speak on behalf of my colleagues in the Calgary caucus and also the citizens of Calgary, as to the value we place with respect to the development of these very fine facilities.

Mr. Chairman, three other brief items to the Minister. I wonder if any study has been done within the Department of Culture, perhaps in conjunction with the province of Saskatchewan and the federal government, as to a historical project which I think is of great interest to western Canadians. It would be along the lines of preparation in pamphlet form of a map and tour guide of the sites of the Riel Rebellion. A number of years ago, my youngest daughter and I took this tour. I don't really want us to upgrade the facilities in any sense. But I think it would be very helpful to develop a map listing such sites as Frog Lake — to impinge upon the constituency of my colleague from St. Paul. That is the only Riel Rebellion site that I recollect within this province. But it's a very interesting site, where the graves of the victims of the massacre are, and in terms of the rolling countryside and the lake nearby.

It's obviously of value to us as we try to interpret our own cultural identity in western Canada. It has spinoffs with respect to tourism. I think this is a type of project that could be developed in conjunction with the province of Saskatchewan and the federal government. I know full well that most of the other sites are in the province of Saskatchewan, and I know that the site of Batoche is under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Perhaps that's one idea that might be further developed, or perhaps the department has already developed it, for all I know.

In the absence of our colleague from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, could the minister offer a comment or two as to where things stand in the development of the interesting site of Lille? Mr. Chairman, my final comment through you to the minister: on behalf of senior citizens, we appreciate the various grants made possible through the Department of Culture to senior citizen drop-in centres. To follow up on a suggestion by my colleague from Fort Macleod, with respect to senior citizens and the development of our historical base, perhaps a small and very meaningful investment could be made in the form of audio tapes. A number and variety of our citizens presently in senior citizens' accommodation might be interviewed by high school students or by fellow senior citizens, in terms of developing their understanding of the history of various places, as our colleague from Fort Macleod mentioned. In that way, we can enlarge the verbal historical record we have within this province.

Thank you.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to get involved. As some of you may know, in the last six months I've been criticized by the press for not taking part in these, and I want to make sure that that's there. Anyhow, I would like to just stand in my place.

Most people have been talking about the physical attributes of our minister. I would like to say there's been maturity involved as well, that has certainly progressed a lot from the time when the minister was dealing with the Roloff Beny collection. I would like to congratulate her on the progression she's made in handling this portfolio.

I'd be ungrateful if I didn't stand in my place to thank the minister for the designation of the cultural centre in St. Paul as an historical building and, when it was destroyed by fire, for the assistance or reconstruction. I understand that money is coming from the federal government, and we've recently had approval from our Minister of Recreation and Parks for MCR funding as well.

Another group that benefits from your generous funding is *Les Bles D'or*, our French community and ethnic

group in St. Paul. I think they're doing a great job in presenting their heritage to Alberta and to the international scene.

I too would like to ask the minister to consider the Louis Riel Rebellion and the massacre at Frog Lake. Could the minister comment on where we are at as far as the Fort George and Buckingham House restoration or reconstruction? I know that was in your five-year development plan, but I haven't heard anything on it since. I would like you to comment on that.

Thank you very much.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, along with the other members of the Assembly, I wish to congratulate the minister on the many programs she is in charge of. Many Albertans across this province are very grateful for the assistance they received.

As chairman of the caucus committee on health and social services, it is my privilege to meet annually with many of the groups the minister is directly involved with. I'm thinking primarily of the Library Trustees Association and the Library Association of Alberta. These people work very hard as members of these associations, and contribute a great deal to improving the quality of library services in this province. On many occasions, they have expressed their deep gratitude for the contributions made in this area by the Department of Culture.

I truly believe that most Albertans would be very grateful. Maybe many of them are not totally aware of how fortunate we are to have the resources to be able to spend a lot of money with regard to culture in this province. As I said, the library associations are very grateful, at a time when costs are so exorbitant with regard to their particular needs. The cost of books alone and replacing books, and the added expense of various multimedia equipment are very expensive but of great value in our educational process and for our citizens in the communities.

Another group we meet with annually is the Alberta Council of International Cooperation. This group primarily looks after the substantial grants made by our government for international aid to many countries. The caucus committee recently met with Alberta church leaders. One point they wanted to make, although it wasn't an agenda item, was to commend the minister most sincerely, from their point of view, for the assistance we gave with regard to our international aid. I do believe the great contribution made by our province is well known in Alberta and probably throughout Canada. Another point that to my mind is extremely important is that we are willing to respond immediately when there is a crisis in the world. The two situations I can think of are the tragic earthquake in Italy and the money we gave for the Polish people. I am very pleased that we have the opportunity, as I said, to respond to these particular concerns when the need is immediate.

One other area that I realize your department is involved in, and I know it's very important locally in Calgary, is with regard to the heritage advisory committee that has been set up and is functioning in Calgary. It is very rewarding to see the endeavors of this committee and the identification of historical sites that should be preserved in Calgary. This was a particularly interesting area for me to become involved in and learn a little bit about, because Calgary North West, the area I represent, is a very new area in the city. There wasn't a lot of heritage, as we suspected, until one of our more recent housing developments was started. Lo and behold, they discovered a terrific archaeological dig there. It is of great

significance for the province of Alberta.

The artifacts, as I understand it, have been removed and fortunately have been saved, and will not interfere with this housing development. One concern has come to my attention from a constituent, and I wonder if the minister could comment on it. Are the artifacts still primarily located in Calgary, or have some of them been removed to Edmonton? There is some indication that this has happened, and I don't know if the minister could comment on that this evening, or would check that out for me.

Lastly I would most sincerely commend the minister for the cultural grants that are given to many constituents of mine and throughout this province, be they members of an ethnic community or be they individuals. I know this is greatly appreciated when a new ethnic group is starting to become organized and setting up their objectives, primarily to assist members of that particular cultural group as they move into a very complex, rapidly growing, ever-changing society like Calgary. The money they receive is of great benefit to them.

The others that I have particularly enjoyed meeting are the individual young Albertans we are able to assist through our program. Normally these grants are given for study in the field of music. But it's of great help to these young people and also to their families.

Thank you very much.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd first of all like to start off with the Reynolds collection. A contract has been signed. We now have a committee in place, headed up by — just a minute; I had the name right here. It is under way. My hon. colleague from Camrose talks about only 300. It is a minimum of 300 items. I'd like to clarify that point, if you don't mind. Right now they are addressing themselves to going through the various pieces. As you well know, seeing as it's such a vast collection, this will not be done easily or lightly.

The *Canadian Encyclopedia* will be finished in approximately the year '84-85. Within the very near future, all the Members of the Legislative Assembly will be receiving a complete update of where we are.

The libraries are something that I think is very special and an area that, as you well know, I was really concerned with when I first became a member of this Assembly. Now that we have been able to really address ourselves to the southern part of the province, I do have a great concern for what is happening in the northern part of the province — the Peace River area, et cetera. It is an area that is completely different from any other part of the province, due to the vastness and space. It is an area that we are going to have to spend a lot of time in addressing, due to the expenses that will occur. It's not something we can follow any of the other patterns [on]. I'd like hon. colleagues to know we are addressing ourselves to this area.

Culture and education in the school children — and I'm sure my hon. colleague the Minister of Education will be addressing the subject also. It is a concern that we both have. I'd like to point out that in the last year, in the schools alone, we spent \$37,175 on various languages for the cultural component in the schools.

My hon. colleague from Edmonton Belmont was talking about books. I'm sorry he's not in the House to hear my answer, but I'll say it anyway. We do have a program. It is called our historical publication assistance program, where grants are available in the amount of 10 per cent

for the printing cost and 50 per cent of the editorial costs, to a maximum of \$5,000. The hon. member was also asking about the dance and cultural aspects. I'd like to inform the hon. member that in this past year, we gave grants to 184 ethno-cultural organizations to maintain their dance, languages, and culture in the schools, to a total amount of \$279,045.

The hon. Member for Macleod was requesting about the area's designation. Our department has been working very closely with Heritage Canada. The formal presentation will be coming forward soon. The mounted police musical ride is supported through our museum program, to the tune of \$12,200.

To my good friend from Calgary Millican: as I said before, the Chinese community has certainly grown in Calgary. That is an area we will certainly have to look at in the very near future. The new provincial archives will be situated on the corner of 111th Street and 99th Avenue. It should be complete within the next four years. The hon. member was also asking about art galleries. At the present time, we are not contemplating a new gallery. But I would like to assure my colleagues that beginning in the very near future, we will be having an art exhibition at the museum on 102nd Avenue, so that the public will have the opportunity to see some of the art we have in our possession.

The CCPA is coming along fairly well. We've had a setback due to weather, et cetera. But there is a problem with the CCPA, because we're not constructing on an open lot. We're having to contend with the Burns Building and the federal building. Consequently it is not moving along perhaps as fast as we would [like]. It probably will have a year's delay.

The Alberta Historical Resources Foundation is taking the lead in the Louis Riel Rebellion project. We are working with Saskatchewan and the federal government. There will be pamphlets, et cetera. We are considering that aspect of it. So we are taking care of that area for you.

Crowsnest Pass, Frank Slide, and Leitch Collieries are in this year's budget. Frank Slide: we'll be putting an interpretive centre in, to the tune of \$195,000, just as a start; the Leitch Collieries, \$82,000. As far as Lille is concerned, the site development is still being planned. Active initiation of the project is still several years away.

The hon. Member for St. Paul: Buckingham House/Fort George is still on our master historical preservation list. Although it was one of my B-budget items this year, I was not successful. As far as the audio tapes are concerned, we are already doing this. They are being funded through the Historical Resources Foundation. It is a very worth while project. We have been able to record a great amount of history from our pioneers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I haven't left anything unsaid. If so, perhaps they'll question me as we go through the votes.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$203,580
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$296,134
1.03 — Financial Services	\$814,017
1.04 — Personnel	\$197,540
1.05 — Communications	\$179,468
1.06 — Department Library	\$117,925
1.07 — Records Management	\$73,370
1.08 — Executive Director for Finance and Administration	\$109,264
1.09 — Special Programs	\$606,226

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,597,524
2.1 — Program Support	\$220,617
2.2 — Visual Arts	\$1,664,248
2.3 — Performing Arts	\$5,973,880
2.4 — Film and Literary Arts	\$717,481
2.5 — Library Services	\$10,555,459
2.6 — Cultural Heritage	\$1,218,924
2.7 — Cultural Facilities	\$1,342,667
2.8 — Film Censorship	\$206,097
2.9 — Major Cultural Facilities Development	\$29,406,110
Total Vote 2 — Cultural Development	\$51,305,483
3.1 — Program Support	\$360,070
3.2 — Archaeological Survey	\$874,803
3.3 — Archival Acquisition, Preservation and Storage	\$674,104
3.4 — Financial Assistance for Heritage Preservation	\$3,907,472
3.5 — Historic Sites Preservation	\$3,789,046
3.6 — Historical Resource Facilities	\$6,823,384
Total Vote 3 — Historical Resources Development	\$16,428,879
Total Vote 4 — International Assistance	\$7,090,531

#### Vote 5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations

##### 54 — Cultural Programs

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could very briefly indicate what projects are not completed under this particular vote. I see that four man-years are authorized. Will some permanent help be staying with the 75th Anniversary celebrations? Will this be a continuous program, or will it be winding down as time goes on?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, the only project we have left is the *Canadian Encyclopedia*. That won't be finished until '84-85.

MR. GOGO: As chairman of the cabinet committee on the 75th Anniversary, I want to ask the minister: the pioneer pins the government gave out to our pioneers during the 75th Anniversary were very highly treasured. I've had a couple of reports from citizens who have lost them and would pay dearly to receive new ones.

Could either the Minister of Culture or the Minister of Government Services respond if there's any provision whereby a supply of those could be obtained even on a purchase basis. These citizens value them very highly and, as you know, you only receive one. It's become a real keepsake to them. If there's any guidance you could give this member, I'd sure be interested.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. colleague would like to reply. Would you?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure it is appropriate for me to reply, but I will anyway. I have some left over, and would make them available to members on request on a very selective basis.

Agreed to:	
54 — Cultural Programs	\$886,000
Total Vote 5 — 75th Anniversary Celebrations	\$886,000
Department Total	\$78,308,417

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Education

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister wish to comment?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure for me to have an opportunity to make a few brief remarks. It was only inadvertent that I emphasized the word "brief". Don't take it seriously.

Provincial support for education, as represented in this budget, reflects the value that the community generally places on education in this province. Figures reveal that in 1980, Alberta's contribution to basic education on a per capita and per pupil basis was second in Canada among the provinces. While figures are not yet complete for 1981, it is likely that those figures, when compiled, will demonstrate that Alberta is first in Canada on a per capita and per pupil basis in its support for basic education. It is almost certainly the case that that position will be maintained with this budget for the fiscal year 1982-83.

Education in this province will require an investment, in this year, of almost \$1.6 billion. Of that, the provincial contribution voted by this Legislative Assembly will be approximately \$1.040 billion. An additional \$144 million will be raised by the School Foundation Program Fund levy on commercial and industrial property throughout the province. We expect that approximately \$410 million will be raised by means of the supplementary requisition.

As I said, this reflects the value that the community places on education. I would like to recognize the contribution that is made to this task, particularly by classroom teachers but as well by local administrators, by school trustees, by the staff of the Department of Education, by the faculty of Alberta's universities, by all the Members of this Legislative Assembly, and I would especially like to recognize the important contribution made by parents, in terms of their interest, in terms of their assistance at the school, in terms of the close way in which they follow local school board activities, and particularly of course, in terms of their tax support.

Mr. Chairman, this province has a good educational system. And in everything we do, we attempt to make it better. We want to take a good system, as someone has said, and make it a great system. We want to build on the notable accomplishments of the educational system in this province, of which there are many. We want to recognize and respond to exciting challenges that face us. The budget reflects our response to the challenges of the day.

With respect to early childhood services, this budget contains a 20 per cent improvement to the basic grant, over and above the 14.1 per cent increase allocated throughout the system. In addition, for the first time this year, we will have a small centre grant to provide financial assistance to very small early childhood services operations which might not be able to continue operating without this additional assistance.

Mr. Chairman, each year we receive a considerable number of migrants in this province from other Canadian provinces, and notably from outside the country. Our support for the teachers of English as a second language will finance 151 such positions in the schools of the province, an increase of 27 over the number we supported last year. These are the teachers who take our new Canadian students, and give them sufficient knowledge in the English language that they can learn in our system and contribute to our community.

The budget contains \$1.2 million for new initiatives with respect to the introduction of computer technology into the school. It contains provision for funding 55 community schools throughout the province, an increase of 20 over the number supported last year. It contains support for the extension of an energy conservation program in the schools. It contains support for contracts recently signed with the Edmonton Public School Board and the Calgary Board of Education, to operate programs in those two cities for the sensory multi-handicapped. It contains \$4.7 million to provide services to the dependent handicapped; a figure, I might say, which represents a 141 per cent increase over the estimate of the last fiscal year.

At the same time, as we make improvements in our program from year to year, we also want to acknowledge an undiminished will to make further improvements. More remains to be done. And with respect to that recognition, I would particularly like to mention the work of the task force on educational finance. We have under way a major review of the educational finance system in the province, and it is charged with three particular tasks as well as with a number of other tasks. It is first of all charged to attempt, at least, to specify the parameters or the descriptors of a provincial educational plan. What is it that we want to have happen in our classroom? To what extent is that the same in Garden River as in Edmonton, and to what extent is it different?

The second important task is to address the challenge of how we can appropriately share between the provincial community and local community the investment we make in education. How much of the investment in education should come from the General Revenue Fund of the province? How much of it should come from the supplementary requisition? The third important task of the task force is to recommend the means by which we might achieve greater equity throughout the educational system. Particularly by that we mean that we would provide provincial support unequally, in order to ensure equal access to education for all children, irrespective of their community and their circumstances.

What is the aim of all this? What is the aim of the investment of \$1.6 billion this year? It bears stating the obvious: there will always be a need for education in the community. The structure by which education is delivered may change. The structure may even change radically. But there will always be the need for education in the community, and access to education must always be available to every child in the community, irrespective of their circumstances. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I might add that there will always be an honored place for teachers, there will always be an honored place for those who love children and want to provide them by means of education with the opportunity to become truly human. As the system may change, the job description of teachers may change, but there will always be a place for teachers.

Education is essential to the community. It is the means by which we provide communication to our chil-

dren, it is the means by which we teach them the use of the tools that are important to us, and it is the means by which we transfer our values to our children. It is the means by which we give children self-knowledge, self-confidence, and a sense of personal effectiveness. It is the means by which we give them tools so that they have the capacity to act, and it is the means by which we develop in them a conviction that their action will count. It is the means by which, hopefully, we develop in them a sense of responsibility, and it is the means by which we give them the knowledge of what it means to fail as well as to succeed.

Friday was the third anniversary of my being sworn in to this portfolio. So, close to my third anniversary, I would like to say to my colleagues, and to the public generally, that I love what I'm doing, and I hope that all my colleagues recognize that I love what I'm doing. I enjoy it, and I value it. I respect the people with whom I am working, whether they are in the classroom or in the Devonian Building.

In three years, I've had the opportunity to visit more than 100 schools throughout the province, from Garden River inside Wood Buffalo National Park, to Blairmore in the Crowsnest Pass, and from Kitscoty to Banff, or to Grande Prairie or to Canmore. [interjections] Most of my colleagues are offering me suggestions from their own constituency. I've visited more than 100 schools in more than 50 jurisdictions. As some of you may recognize from the time that it takes me to answer memos, the fact of the matter is that I'd rather be in the schools than in my office. [interjections] I get around to them eventually.

In the past six weeks, I've had the opportunity to speak, in one forum or another, to more than 3,000 of the teachers in this province, as well as having had the opportunity to talk to trustees, parents, and the community generally. In the course of this, Mr. Chairman, I am sometimes accused of being provocative, critical, or frivolous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who would say that?

MR. KING: I much prefer the look of astonishment on the face of the hon. member from Edmonton Millican, to the whole-hearted agreement coming to me from the benches behind.

DR. CARTER: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to be a part of the Edmonton caucus sometime, but we haven't moved Millican this far north yet.

MR. KING: I apologize to the hon. member for whatever error I committed, which has escaped me.

The question is sometimes asked: why do I fly kites or float trial balloons? [interjections] I'd like to digress for just a moment, and comment about change. I believe very strongly that this community is in the midst of change that is likely to be profound. I don't mean Alberta, although certainly it will occur in Alberta. I don't mean Canada, although I hope it will occur in Canada. I mean North America, the western world, probably the world as a whole. Changes in the demographic outline of this province . . .

DR. BUCK: A new word.

MR. KING: Would you send *Webster*, please, for the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Changes in demographics, technology, the economy,

and in the values of the community, are going to effect change in the community generally. We see it happening. As politicians, we more than anyone else should be aware of the extent to which change is imposing itself on the community. The school is not going to be isolated from that. The school cannot continue into the future as it has operated in the past, and it cannot rely upon the expectation that because it wants to continue in the future as it has in the past, that that will be sufficient. That won't happen. When the community changes, the school system will change in response to that.

The question is whether the school system is going to change in reaction to forces beyond itself, or change by deliberate initiative developed within the system. Are we going to have change imposed on us, or are we going to control change ourselves? If that's an important question for the province, it is particularly important for the school system of the province, because the way the school system responds to change is going to determine the way the province itself responds to change in 10 or 20 years when the students in the classroom today are the leaders of the community. I believe very strongly that change is going to have that major impact on the community and the school system, and I want the school system to have the means of responding creatively to change.

I hate to go into the last century to take my directions for the future, but if I could paraphrase a famous British Conservative of the last century: the community that is without the will to recognize change, is without the will to survive. If we can't recognize the impact change is going to have on us, we are not going to survive. It is because I really love the educational task, because I really believe in the importance of what education is all about, that I feel obliged to encourage people, however I can, to consider the implications of change for education. Teachers have to consider the implication of change as well as administrators, parents, and my colleagues in this Legislative Assembly.

It is also because I love education that I feel the need to be constructively critical when I see something that is less good than it might be, less well done than it might be, less beneficial to the child than it might be. If someone suggests that I should still my criticism because it isn't good for the image of education, I say very simply that I cannot accept that. In the long term, it is the substance of education that is more important than the image of it. To improve the substance depends upon constructive criticism directed toward improvement. Education is a large, complex, and important task. It deserves and requires integrity, imagination, drive, and co-operation. In this province at this time, those qualities are being brought to bear on the educational system and the educational challenge.

We always want to improve the educational opportunities for our children. In the end, that is the only goal we can state. The system in place is dedicated toward doing that. This budget supports that activity, and we are going to make a good system a great system.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments on the Department of Education. As part of Education Week this year, the ATA suggested that MLAs should attend some classroom sessions during that week. The only problem was that that happened to be the week of the opening of the Legislature. So as part of my pre-session tour of the constituency, I attended several classes and talked to those classes taking the new social studies program. I found it very informative. I believe

grades 5, 6, 10, 11 and 12 are studying governments in Canada. I think it's long past due. The Department of Education and those involved in putting the majority of those programs together should be applauded, because I believe it's a step in the right direction. I know the classes I visited and the teachers I talked to were very involved with their program and looked forward to working together to develop that program in those classrooms.

In talking to teachers and students, I think one thing that would be useful at the present time — and I believe the ATA has it — is a legislative handbook or something similar to that. The majority of teachers have found it useful in answering questions related to the Legislature. I think the Department of Education should look at some similar program, in consultation with that association, and constantly update that material. It appears to be the best available outline on the make-up of the Assembly, the government, and the various activities of the Assembly, et cetera. I think we could well look at something like that in the Department of Education, to fill in that gap in the social program

I would like to echo the minister's opening remarks about good, dedicated teachers and their feelings toward their classrooms and students. I know many very dedicated teachers, who are really involved in and enjoy their work. They should be commended for it because, in many cases, many of the things they do, the extracurricular activities, et cetera, especially in the smaller communities, are above what is really part of their job. They become very actively involved in that community. We also have some very dedicated trustees, who work hard to bring the best possible education to the students in either the county or the town, or whatever the area. I think these people should also be commended, because they give much of their time and efforts to see that the best of education is brought to the students in their area.

One question I have brought up at other times in the Legislature is the loading factors related to school bus transportation. My understanding of the loading factor is that the bus must be 80 per cent loaded in order to qualify for maximum transportation grants. In some cases, this may be easier to operate when the county owns all the buses and can move the buses around from route to route, in order to use various sizes and accomplish the same. But in an area where the school district has decided to go to private operators, it makes it very difficult to accomplish this. Sometimes a 30-passenger bus may be running with 28 or 29 students. To achieve that factor, you're not allowed a bus one size bigger. One family moves in with two or three children. You're overloaded. The bus driver may have to get a new bus, and the family may move again in a short while. So you're stuck with a bigger bus, without the payment on the load factor.

I don't think it would cost the Department of Education very much if they agreed upon the size needed, that was the rate paid, and the operator was allowed, in a good business sense in a free-enterprise system, to get a bus one size bigger than what was needed for any future expansion of the route. I would like the minister to comment on that, because I think it could solve a lot of problems and wouldn't cost us very much extra funds, if any, in transportation grants.

Also, I'm not sure of the distance, but I believe it's 1 or 1.25 miles. No busing is paid for students beyond that distance from school. That may be full and well in a major metropolitan area, but it creates some problems in a rural area. Those distances with no funding for students and these students not being part of the numbers for the

transportation system, in many of the rural communities, when you're 1.25 miles away from the school, you're beyond the town limits. There's no sidewalks for the students to walk on, so they walk down the road. It creates a hazard. Especially in the winter, when the ditches are full of snow, there's less room on the road. I would also like the minister to comment on that.

Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, just a few short comments to the Minister of Education. In his remarks, the minister is very descriptive of himself and his actions. I wouldn't want to take away from him or better him, but I'm sure there are words to describe him in this dictionary as well. I hope he will continue to fly kites. I guess you can't understand a little boy unless you are one. To get down to their level is certainly an understanding way of putting it. If it weren't for your flying kites, Mr. Minister, I wouldn't have the opportunity to say thanks to the department officials and yourself for the opportunity to see a new school going to the small rural community of Anzac, and possibly further schools to be developed in the Conklin, Chip Lake, and Garden River communities.

This is a result of what some would term the minister's problem with reference to the Northland School Division. I think that wasn't a problem at all. The minister has turned it into a very constructive decision-making situation, and I'm very pleased and gratified, in the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency, to know that that Northland school problem is no longer a problem but an ongoing situation from which we'll see benefits and long-term benefits.

I would like the minister to comment on the hot lunch program, in particular in the rural and native areas. I think we have to compliment the department and the officials, but I think it's an area we could expand on once again. I believe the minister made a comment a year or so ago that he would be looking to expand that program in the area of Lac La Biche, if at all possible.

One area in particular that I feel involves the Department of Education is the area of day care. We've had many comments about the lack of day care facilities, the organization, the running of it, the cost sharing. My main concern is the lack of a day care facility in the city of Fort McMurray. The community is a very rapid growth community and, over the years, we've had commitments, misunderstandings, and disagreements about who is responsible, where it should come from, how it should be funded. I guess I have to go back and say I can't accept that as a fait accompli. I think we have to put some responsibility on the Department of Education to assess that individual problem.

It is the only centre I know of, with the exception, I believe, of the Red Deer area — a city of that size that still lacks a proper day care facility. We have many people working in volunteer groups as well, to try to keep this program going. With as many young people — an average age of 22.6 — in the community, the children are very much in need of a proper facility. With our cost factors and high mortgages today, we also have both husbands and wives working, and single parents. We just can't get by without that much-needed facility.

In the minister's opening remarks, he referred to a major review in finance. Once again, I'm very pleased to have the opportunity this year, as I mentioned in [previous] years, to refer to the need for interim or bridge funding, especially in rapid-growth or new communities. Of the three areas the minister has specifically referred to.

I hope that would fall under item number two: how to share this investment between the provincial and municipal sectors. I hope it would be an area they would seriously address. I ask the minister to comment on that, Mr. Chairman, and hopefully give some direction to the committee that would be conducting that review.

I also ask that the minister respond with regard to the controversial computer program. I've had some representation made to me, Mr. Minister, that have made reference to the fact that they could go out and buy individually, on a per lot basis of six computers, for a better price than the Department of Education was able to respond to. Perhaps there was some misunderstanding, and the minister would like this opportunity to clarify that, whether it was with regard to the software, the equipment, or the materials, goods, and services.

Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks I close by saying that I'm very pleased overall with the department, the officials, and the facilities we have within our communities. In particular in the Lac La Biche-McMurray region, I would say we have good facilities. We have new modern school rooms, and I'm very pleased to think that a high priority within the government is that we recognize education as the most important point. In particular, in my remarks expressed in the Assembly the previous night, in our community of oil-based resources, we're not overlooking the most important facet. That resource, as we say, is the children. I'm hopeful that the minister, through his department, will be able to address some of these other concerns and assist in the way of bridge financing and others.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few brief remarks and ask a few questions of the minister with respect to this particular estimate. First of all, let me congratulate the minister. I think his department is run effectively. He has addressed himself to a number of concerns that have plagued schools and education in Alberta in his term of office and has dealt with them well. In particular, in my constituency there is a great deal of gratitude over the support that has come for early childhood services programs, particularly the community operators. Indeed I'd like to express that thanks to the minister, on behalf of the operators in my constituency.

I'd also like to say that in terms of innovation, openness, and imagination, I think the minister has well led this department, which needs those qualities. I urge him to continue to do so. With respect to his various forays into the field of non-automated aviation, I agree with the hon. member who spoke prior to me in saying that I hope those kites still fly and that controversy evolves from time to time, though I place on it the caution that at the end of that controversy, I hope there's an understanding of the goal the minister was trying to achieve among those people concerned with one side or other of the issue.

I would like to deal with a couple of issues. I too would like to get some response to the question of computers. That question has been raised with me. I know the minister would like to deal with that issue, so I look forward to his comments in that regard.

I have a few specific areas of concern, though, that I'd like the minister to deal with in more depth. He alluded to the community schools concept. I know that the department, under the minister's leadership, has favored the development of community schools. At this time in our government's history, I guess I'd like to know what specific approaches the department is taking to encourage the concept of community schools. How is the minister at-

tempting to involve people in the general area, to encourage local boards to utilize space that's no longer utilized, particularly in the inner core areas of Calgary and Edmonton? What programs or resources are being made available to local boards to encourage police departments, social organizations, any group that a student could learn from, to be involved in our educational system?

It's always been my belief, and still is, that a student cannot learn in the vacuum of the school and needs very much the stimulation, the imagination, and the abilities of the community at large. I hope the minister would continue to go after that goal, which I know he's been in favor of. So I'd like his comments on what steps the department is specifically taking in that regard. A related issue is the school building formula and what is being done in that area to encourage utilization of space for the community schools concept.

Just a couple of other quick issues. One is with respect to the style of education I happen to favor for at least some students in our system. That's the concept where in the educational system a student learns at his own speed, rather than on a yearly basis. In the separate school system in my constituency, we have Bishop Carroll school, which I have always been impressed with. I think it is operated well and effectively. It has a fair bit of internal discipline, but allows the student to progress at his own rate of speed and to develop some personal discipline in dealing with issues.

It has always been my opinion that only a certain number of students can deal with that system at a high school level, because through the elementary school system, we have generally used the other approach, telling a student how far he can progress, when, and at what times. I wonder if the department has done any sort of analysis of this educational system and how we might progress the cause of helping to evolve individual discipline in our students, rather than the collective discipline which the school system generally has proceeded with.

The only other issue I'd appreciate a comment on is the long-standing one of pupil ratio. Is there any new information with respect to what the optimum pupil ratio is, and what the government is doing with respect to that information, if indeed it does exist? With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the minister's response and again congratulate him for what I think is, in general, an excellent educational system in Alberta.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I really haven't such great concerns. I don't know whether the minister gave recognition to his staff earlier, but I think the success of education in this province is because of a dedicated staff. For a good number of years, I had communications from time to time, and I think there are some very good people in the department.

Just a few days ago, the hon. members for Lloydminster and Redwater-Andrew and I attended a meeting in the county of Two Hills. They expressed some concerns, and maybe those concerns are legitimate. Having the enrolments and the support they have been receiving, from 1970 to 1981 the school enrolment dropped from over 1,700 to 987. There is nothing much I can say, because the budget for education this year exceeds \$1 billion, more than the entire budget of the province only 11 years ago. I guess the support is as good as one can expect. But along with the school committee and the ATA in Two Hills, I wonder if maybe they had some

good ideas that funding should be distributed in a different way somehow. They appreciate that over the last while, there has been small school assistance and declining enrolment for small school jurisdictions. But that does not seem quite enough. Their student/teacher ratio is under 15 at present; in 1970, it was approximately 20.

The thing is that some of those classrooms have considerably over 20 students, but some classes have only about 4 or 5 students. They must carry on that way, otherwise the students would never be able to continue their education after completing high school, if they finish. I think there was a report not too long ago that maybe they should be looking at greater centralizing. I can see that people hate seeing their children, at age 14 and 15, go away for a week from home to a school. At the same time, it is very costly. They are concerned that every child has the right to an education. Because of this, they have such small classes. I was wondering whether the almost 50 rural jurisdictions in this province have the same problem. Maybe those closer to the cities where the enrolment is better, don't have such a problem. Maybe the minister could look at a little redistribution to provide greater support for these schools that are quite a distance from the cities, that have no chance of having their children attend the school, other than by going to a boarding school. Maybe the minister could take a look at this area and without much additional cost, or with redistribution, could help these small jurisdictions.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. I wonder if, in his comments, he might make note of any ramifications which might take place with respect to established program financing. I realize the cutbacks from the federal government level are apparently directed at advanced education. But are there any spinoff effects that we need to be concerned about with respect to education at the primary and secondary levels?

On another matter, with the excitement over the past number of months with Northland School Division, I was in conversation with Elmer Ghostkeeper recently, and he raised the matter that he was concerned that local elected officials were being by-passed with respect to future plans for grass roots parental input to the education of their children. That is a contradistinction to my understanding of the situation. Would the minister be good enough to clarify that situation?

Another matter which is very much part of the whole aspect of change in our society, which the minister referred to in his opening comments, is the sheer impact and the speed of the impact of word-processing devices and computers. Perhaps the minister would be good enough to make some comments, especially as to whether the computers we're going to have in place in the educational system in this province are going to be able to talk to each other in compatible languages; whether various school boards are taking advantage of the generous offer for the purchase of computer and word-processing equipment; and whether the department has a fair number of computers and word processors in storage waiting to be purchased by the various school boards.

One other matter is with respect to native education in this province. I know that in the last 18 to 24-month period, the minister was having difficulty trying to engage in meaningful dialogue with any counterpart at the federal level. Has he had success in recent months in discussion with federal officials as to whether they are prepared to get involved in new fiscal arrangements with respect to additional dollars, or for the exchange of dollars for

services, with regard to his department and the education of natives, whether it be on reserves or in smaller communities, or with respect to the large urban areas, particularly Edmonton and Calgary? Again, that relates to the special funding that the minister was very supportive of getting in place with respect to the educational opportunity fund, with a particular focus on alternative schools for native students, which has been built up in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary.

Mr. Chairman, two quick comments through you to the minister. Perhaps the minister might be able to wax eloquent for a few moments on his understanding of the phrase "humanistic existentialism". Could he also give us his own personal assessment as to whether there are unnecessary overlaps between his department and that of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, with regard to early childhood services?

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister for his part in the reorganization of the Northland School Division. Once it's reorganized, I think it's going to be considerably better for those students in that school division. Will the two-year transition period that was expected by those working towards that, be met? Will all departments that have to pick up the slack in those communities where Northland was so heavily involved, be able to take over by that time?

I would also like to mention a small school in my constituency, which falls under the Spirit River School Division. The school division asked for some extra room to be built on to the school, or a new school, because of increased enrolment. The increased enrolment is because Woking was starting to be used as a bedroom community of Grande Prairie. Much as you might not believe that, it was. They were told there was no money for capital, but there were funds for repairing an old building and moving in an old school. I was up there not too long ago to look at it, and the school that was moved in was a total disaster. When the school gets completely finished, it's probably going to end up as the most energy-inefficient building in the north. I know the minister probably won't have any of this information on hand, but I would appreciate a note from him as to what might be done about this school.

In our travels around the country, and as chairman of northern development, many municipalities present briefs to us because of the cost of education and the foundation program. I know the foundation is being reviewed. Would the minister be able to give us any further information on when that review will be completed, and when we can look forward to any changes that might come?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks. One of my remarks relates to looking at the estimates and grants to private schools, versus grants to public and separate schools. In comparing the '81-82 forecasts relative to the '82-83 estimates, I noted that the increase in the basic grants to the public schools was 1.2, whereas the grants to private schools were on a 1.4 index. That was just a simple calculation I had done.

That brings me to the concern with regard to the growth of the private school relative to the public schools. On one hand, we see the public schools being asked to take on the education of the handicapped and to assume the integration and mainstreaming of slow learners. For example, I could take the absorbing of Winnifred Stewart school within the public school systems in Edmonton. On the other hand, we have private schools

setting up, where they may choose, to some degree, their clientele. There is a concern in the public with regard to this growth, because there is a fear that they could become elitist.

Are the two being compared on the same rule? Do the same rules apply? If the public schools were allowed to choose their clientele, would we see quite a different interpretation of how they are performing, relative to the public perception? It's very much like a minor hockey league situation. If the community pyramids their teams, and have an A team and the others play at a different level, with a different objective, certainly that A team is going to have quite a different visible perception with the public than if the community were to integrate the more proficient players in a different way.

I think there is a concern with the growth of the private schools being held to the same rules. I'm sure that the public schools will be able to respond to the challenge. On the other hand, if the custodial role is being assumed by the public schools, are they playing on the same basis as the formation of the private schools?

Another area I would like to raise a question on has to do with supplementary requisitions. We know that they have become a greater share of the local education budget. As a result, corporate assessment has become a much greater factor in providing equal opportunities, especially in the large urban areas. The difference is growing to the extent that it could amount to around \$200 to \$300 per student between the public and separate schools in cities such as Edmonton and Calgary.

As a result, school boards are expending a great deal of time having business firms and corporate entities declare their assessment for separate or public school purposes. I wonder if an arrangement could be found, notwithstanding the Alberta Act, where all corporate assessment could be divided on a per pupil basis, thereby eliminating the time, effort, and dollars that are spent on the procedure of declarations; simplifying it to a per pupil ratio and, that way, try to serve all pupils in an equitable way. I know this has been a constant source of aggravation to some corporations, whereby they have to make declarations each year. I wonder if there is a way of eliminating this, and giving it some thought in terms of coming up with a new scheme. It is my understanding that the Alberta Teachers' Association endorses the concept. I also understand that the School Trustees' Association is looking into the matter, and they are discussing the issue.

Another area I would like to touch upon is business education at the secondary level. There are two purposes behind business education. One is where students elect business education courses, such as typing, as a matter of interest. On the other hand, we have students selecting it on a career-oriented basis. Is the department giving consideration to funding business education on a similar basis to vocational education, where there is a grant over and above the per pupil grant?

There's a high cost involved in terms of equipment. It's necessary for the programs to get out of the '50s. Certainly I would deem some of the equipment that exists in the schools in this area to be of that particular vintage. It's about time we got into the '80s. In order to do that, we need an infusion of capital for some of the equipment. We need to look at developing some programs whereby we re-train the teachers in this area. It certainly would be a very valuable program for many of our students who go directly into the work force from this type of high school education. I think we are short-changing this group, because they do not access the universities or the insti-

tutes of technology. Certainly we could make an effort at trying to update and bring ourselves into the 1980s in this area, so that these people are not working at a disadvantage in terms of what they have derived from their education.

Mr. Chairman, another area I would like to direct to the minister deals with the simplification in department procedures and regulations. One area that comes to mind immediately is the formula for new schools. Einstein might understand the formula, but I certainly feel that the general public doesn't. I wonder if there's a way of trying to simplify in a meaningful way, how capital funds are derived for new schools.

Another area where I suggest we could simplify procedures is in terms of accessing grants. Smaller jurisdictions don't have the expertise in working with all the formulas. Could this area be simplified, so it is readily understood what moneys are available to each school jurisdiction, in relation to the types of programs they're offering?

I would like to offer some commendation to the minister with regard to the in-service program, the initiatives taken with the new social studies program. I have always argued in this Assembly that when a new program is instituted, there should be some front money with regard to equipment and materials, and also in the area of in-servicing the teachers. While there might be some areas where the program has not met immediate success, certainly it has been an excellent effort. I suggest that this particular initiative of in-servicing a new program be continued as a model.

Another area where I think we could apply it is in computer technology. Getting the equipment — the hardware, software, and so on — is just one aspect of introducing computer technology into the schools. But I don't think we should get the cart in front of the horse. We have a great deal of work to do with regard to in-servicing and retraining our people, in order to make this a viable proposition in our schools. If we don't, I fear that once again we have gone into another area of gimmickery, and it will not succeed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those are my brief remarks.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In following the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, I'm reminded of the comments yesterday by the Member for Three Hills, after listening to the Member for Athabasca with regard to philosophies dealing with cattle. I had always associated the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar as one who's uppermost thoughts were value and quality. Here he seems to have talked at length, and all he's attempting to do is trying to get the Education budget of \$1.04 billion — he's already passed Social Services and Community Health, \$1.027 — up to Hospitals and Medical Care. They say you never cease to be surprised in this Assembly. Clearly it was a wise choice to make the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar chairman of that committee. I had no idea he was so anxious to continue to spend money.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment or two, recognizing the time, and put a question or two to the minister. It's very interesting, as I look around the Assembly, that we have 11 members who at some time or other were schoolteachers. I'm trying to recollect when we had a group of professionals who exceeded the number of lawyers in the House. We have it in this case. The teachers exceed the lawyers. Although six of the lawyers are on the front bench, there's only one teacher. Maybe that tells us something about relative weights. I think

we're very fortunate in this House to have 12 or 14 per cent of the members with teaching experience, and around 10 members who have been school trustees. There's a good balance in this Assembly. If we get into difficulty, of course we always have those eight or nine lawyers who can sort it out.

Mr. Chairman, the minister made reference to Alberta being the highest per capita in terms of support in all Canada. Although he didn't mention them, the figures probably come out around \$2,500 per student. Naturally one begins to wonder about the relative value, when we look at Newfoundland at \$650 or \$680. There's not much doubt in my mind that we get extremely good value for the dollar. As a father of five, I have my last youngster in school, and there's no question that that youngster is far superior in terms of her ability to understand issues and assimilate instruction. She'll probably make a better citizen in many ways too, in that she does as she's told more often than the others ever did. I try to attribute the responsibility for that, and I can't come to any conclusion other than the school system in this province.

I think we have some excellent school teachers in this province. I think of the number of times I've had the opportunity of visiting the schools. I find that the young teachers today are exciting. They're interested, keen, even politically aware. Whatever the reason for that, I think it's a system that should be commended. I happen to think that much of it is due to our university system of turning out these teachers.

I had the good opportunity this past weekend of attending a Catholic separate school trustees' convention in southern Alberta. I was very interested in the topic of one of their workshops. It was media and values, and how they interacted. I vividly remember a comment that studies have shown that in the average family the parents spend about 10 minutes a day in a one-on-one situation with their youngsters, yet youngsters today spend six to seven hours each day watching television.

Isn't it strange that we continue to debate the merits and the quality of education, and yet we seem to have no say, because we believe so strongly in free enterprise, that no one owns the airwaves. The airwaves can flood every home in the country, certainly in Alberta, with whatever, and these kids are just saturated with that. For some reason, we seem to think that we as legislators should have no say as to what goes over the television airwaves, even so far as to stand up for cable and say, cable is the be-all and end-all, and should be able to do whatever it wants to do, as long as it sells enough soup and so on to pay the bill. I sometimes wonder if more couldn't be done with regard to television broadcasting, from the point of view of education.

We just got through the estimates of the Minister of Culture, Mr. Chairman, and I think we see the value of culture more and more in our school system today. The minister mentioned he had just experienced his third anniversary as Minister of Education. True to form, as I recall when I congratulated him the day he was made minister, he said that he hoped to do something over the next four years, something each year. Sure enough, he's somehow managed a bombshell every year since he's been minister. He sure can attract attention and alert us to the fact that education is indeed one of the challenging issues of the '80s, certainly during the four year term.

I would like to comment, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the regional offices. I'm only exposed to one, but I'm indebted very much to the staff of the regional office in the constituency I'm fortunate to represent. I find that

when it comes to any matters or questions of education, the people in the regional office are not only knowledgeable but indeed very helpful.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, two points. One is the priority we have given to those in Alberta who are handicapped, either physically or mentally, who fit in the category of the elementary school system. I wonder if the minister would comment with regard to those schools for the mentally retarded that have come under the public system. Instead of being quasi-private, they now come under the public system. I think we must recognize more and more that, just as people who go to prison must return to society, people who are disadvantaged, either physically or mentally, are certainly citizens of our province and should have access to every opportunity with regard to education.

Reference was made by the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar regarding the funding in the public school, and so on. I often wonder why anybody in their right mind would choose to pay \$1,800 or \$2,000 in the Immanuel Christian school in Lethbridge. Why on earth would they pay that, in addition to their property taxes for a school system? As much confidence as I have in the public school system — and I'm sure that when the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar talks of the public system, he is referring to the separate system as well, because really they're one. I think we should sometimes wonder why parents are prepared to pay that kind of money. I'm sure it's based on values. Either they've lost confidence in the system and are prepared to pay out funds in addition to the normal taxes — and that's not referring to rural parents; there's another \$500 for busing.

I, for one, am very proud that we've seen fit to accommodate all the citizens in the province who choose to send their children to those different schools. I think it's a commitment on behalf of the parent to see, as they perceive, that their children are going to get good education. It's also a commitment on the part of this government. I think the minister would agree that our commitment is to about 85 per cent of the per pupil funding. We're now at about 75. I hope we would get there very quickly. Sometimes opponents of the private school system say, well, you're already getting 75 per cent per pupil grant in your private school. In fairness, that's with regard to teaching, not busing or all the infrastructure that goes in. I think if the truth were known, it's about 54 per cent. But even with that, these private schools are managing, and turning out a good product.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I make a practice of meeting with the school boards in the constituency I represent. I think we're indeed very fortunate to have those people seek office and serve their citizens and constituents the way they do. They have the best interests of their constituents at heart, just as I'm confident most of us do. The superintendents who work for them are always extremely open, prepared to discuss any problems they have. I think that by continuing to work together the way most of us do with our school boards, the ultimate benefit and winner of that system has to be the one we're all interested in, and that of course is the student.

Thanks very much.

MR. PAHL: I have just a brief question. Perhaps I can get it in before the minister makes his remarks.

DR. BUCK: He's going to close the debate.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, my quick question: it was becoming apparent that the child of an acquaintance of ours wasn't going to pass grade 2. The teacher consulted with the parents to ask them whether they wanted the child moved to grade 3. It actually shocked me to think that the department doesn't set standards that the pupils within that system must meet in order to progress in the system. I'm afraid I'm way behind the times, because I think that's a sure recipe for failure that the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar addressed too. Maybe that's why the private schools are competing more favorably.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, that question constitutes an excellent reason for me to adjourn for the evening, so that I can think about a good answer.

I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution and reports as follows.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, sums not exceeding

the following for the Department of Culture: \$2,597,524 for departmental support services, \$51,305,483 for cultural development, \$16,428,879 for historical resources development, \$7,090,531 for international assistance, and \$886,000 for 75th Anniversary celebrations.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House, I would like to advise that the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor will attend upon the House tomorrow in order that Royal Assent may be given to certain Bills, following which there will be further consideration of Committee of Supply, in which will be considered the estimates of the Department of Education, followed by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, and/or the Department of the Environment.

[At 10:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]