

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, March 11, 1983 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## Statement Concerning Official Opposition

MR. SPEAKER: Election day, November 2, 1982, is the starting point for the first item which concerns this House today. As hon. members know, the election gave rise to two questions. The first was: what adjustments should be made to the four opposition budgets which were passed by the previous Legislative Assembly in the spring of 1982 for the fiscal year we are now in, April 1, 1982, to March 31, 1983? That was solved by, in effect, reallocating funds the Assembly had authorized for an opposition member who was not re-elected and other funds authorized for the former Leader of the Official Opposition. By this means, it was possible to increase the per-member opposition funds substantially for those elected last November 2, so that each would have six and one-half times the amount allotted to each government member. The amounts allotted were less than what had been sought by the newly elected opposition members, but the amounts allocated to each of them represented very substantial increases over what they would have had if the Speaker had not changed the allocations made by the House last spring.

The continuing Speaker, myself, chosen by the previous Legislative Assembly, Alberta's 19th Parliament, could and did deal with the funding question. The recognition of an Official Opposition for this present Legislative Assembly, Alberta's 20th Parliament, is an entirely different matter. The opposition members and I have accepted that until this present Legislative Assembly, which opened yesterday, elected a Speaker, no one could lawfully deal with the question of an Official Opposition in this House. Anyone pretending to make such a decision would have been wasting time. Giving recognition to an Official Opposition in any parliament simply cannot be done until after that parliament is in session.

I am grateful for the helpful and excellent briefs provided by the hon. opposition members. Six of these have come from the Independents; four others, plus a supplement, have been provided by the NDP members. It is plain that none of the hon. members of the opposition regard the matter as being simple. Two of the NDP briefs submitted were each over 120 pages long, including supporting material.

The excellent and thorough research done by the opposition members and their research staffs was augmented by careful work of the research section of the Legislature Library.

A review of over 500 pages of material thus provided shows that no directly applicable precedents or compelling answers have been found in the experience of any of the parliaments of the Commonwealth or in any of our rules or statutes.

In fact there are precedents for not recognizing any Official Opposition. In such a case, of course, there

would be no Leader of the Official Opposition. The first question then is: does there need to be such a designation made for and in this House?

There are five reasons why the answer is "yes":

The Legislative Assembly Act does not in any way make it obligatory to have such a leader, but it assumes that there will be one and provides, for example, for a special salary. Of course, if for any reason there is no such person recognized, then it is impossible to pay the salary. However, to have such a leader can be an advantage to the opposition, or at least to that part of it that may be recognized as the Official Opposition.

I am assuming that during the term of this Legislative Assembly, an electoral boundaries commission will be appointed. The Electoral Boundaries Commission Act requires that two members of such a commission be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition.

Our rules of procedure, which we call the *Standing Orders*, also mention such a leader several times and imply that there will be a person holding that office.

Under our *Standing Orders*, the time limit for speeches by the Leader of the Opposition is 90 minutes instead of 30. If no one is recognized as holding that office, the opposition will lose that additional debating time.

The Leader of the Opposition has the right to designate some items of Assembly business for special attention or priority. Without such a leader, the opposition may lose those opportunities.

It is clear that if any reasonable basis can be found to recognize an Official Opposition and its leader, that should be done.

All opposition members agree that the question of recognition is a duty of the Speaker. It is not a government matter, nor a political or party matter. It is true that in Alberta prior to 1970, once or possibly twice the government seems to have become involved when there was a question of amending the Legislative Assembly Act to divide or change the amount of the opposition leader's special honorarium. Apart from those very rare exceptions, it appears that whenever the question has arisen, it has been a matter for the Speaker to deal with.

It is a question of a status within a parliament. Hence a determination should, if at all possible, be based on circumstances within the Assembly.

No precedent or rule has been discovered or given to me where the designation of an Official Opposition has been based on circumstances outside a parliament. However, given the need to make such a decision, it does seem advisable that if factors within these four walls do not provide a solution, one must go outside for an answer based on well-known facts.

Our hon. colleagues the Independents have emphasized that the decision must be made mainly on the basis of incumbency and continuity. Their argument says, in effect, that since the hon. Member for Little Bow was Leader of the Opposition in the 19th Legislative Assembly, he is now an incumbent. Hence, the Independents conclude that where no other opposition group is larger than the one a former opposition leader leads, there is no one to replace him and, on the basis of continuity, he is still to be recognized as Leader of the Official Opposition. However, no precedent shows that incumbency or conti-

nunity has been the deciding factor, or any real factor at all, in recognizing an opposition leader.

There are, of course, examples where an opposition leader in one parliament has been recognized in the next. In each such example, there were reasons other than incumbency or continuity for the renewed recognition. The briefs and research do not show that a person became leader of an opposition by reason only of having been the leader previously.

If there were an incumbency rule, it would have to apply to individual members and the positions they previously held. However, we are dealing with recognition of a group. That is so because all the Speaker can really do is to recognize an Official Opposition; it is up to that group to designate its own leader. Hence, the incumbency or continuity argument would have to be stretched to say that an incumbency held by three members of a party in the last House continues to be held by two members who are not of a party in this House.

Another argument by the Independents that may be said to be in-House goes under the name of seniority. The reasoning under this heading is that where there is no other way of deciding who may lead the opposition, one must count the number of years of service as a member and give the nod to the member with longer service. This overlooks the essential that group recognition comes first and leader recognition is the decision of that group. Longer serving members are often given special deference in our parliaments, but that deference is not a basis for rights. Seniority does not, in our parliaments, confer the acknowledged rights or pre-eminence that it may command in elected Houses south of our border.

A third in-House factor could be the declaration signed by the two Independent members that they will work as a team. At the most, this could have the effect only of making the two opposition teams equal in the Assembly.

There is an argument submitted by the hon. members of the NDP based on a section of the Legislative Assembly Act which deals with a "recognized party". However, the recognized party concept does not apply at all. Firstly, the Legislative Assembly Act requires that there be a minimum of four members in a recognized party. Secondly, a recognized party is a second opposition group, over and above an Official Opposition.

Then there is a further argument by the NDP members based on the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act. The NDP organization, outside the House, is a registered party under that Act. However, that Act says absolutely nothing about what goes on in the Legislative Assembly. Instead it regulates the collecting, donating, and spending of money for political purposes.

None of the research has indicated any Act or rule which would provide a reasonable basis for a decision in the present circumstances.

A still further suggestion by the NDP members is that customarily an Official Opposition is composed of elected members of a party. That does indeed appear to be the case. During the period of service of my predecessor in this Chair, the Rev. Peter Dawson, some Independent members did in fact constitute the Official Opposition in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. Their leader was recognized as the Leader of the Opposition. A great deal of material from the *Journals*, newspapers, and other sources was submitted to help establish whether or not the Independent members in those days were in fact members of a political party. It does appear that in many ways the Independent movement, as it was sometimes called, acted as a political party. The NDP argument,

then, is that where there is an equality in numbers, as there is here, between two groups each claiming the designation, it should go to that group whose members belong to the same party.

It does seem that the limited validity of that idea must be recognized. It is limited because if there were within this House a majority team in the opposition composed of Independents, there is simply no question that that team would have the right to be designated as the Official Opposition, regardless of whether its elected members belonged to any party.

One ought to hesitate to make a decision in this matter on the narrow point just mentioned. There is, however, a circumstance outside the Assembly which also has some significance in relation to work done inside the Assembly. It is this: party organizations outside the Assembly are known to assist members with their work in the Assembly. In the present case, that also must be taken into account because of the equal numbers of the two opposition teams in this House.

Then there is the so-called popular vote argument. It can be verified by the figures published by the Chief Electoral Officer that the NDP candidates throughout the province garnered in the last election almost as many votes as all the other non-PC candidates combined. This argument is somewhat overstated, however, when a claim is made that all those who voted for the candidates of a certain party throughout the province are represented by the candidates of that party who were elected.

It must be recognized that many voters vote for a candidate rather than for a party. Obvious examples are the members of this House who were elected as Independents, without party ties. Another very clear example is that of our former colleague Mr. Gordon Taylor. He has retained his support and has been successful whether he ran as a Social Creditor, an Independent, or a Progressive Conservative.

If as MLAs we represent only those people who voted for us or for our respective parties, then that must necessarily mean that no one represents those who voted for parties that elected no candidates: the Liberals, Social Credit, WCC, or ARM. There's little doubt that every member of this House would reject the notion that she or he does not represent all of his or her constituents.

Nevertheless it must be acknowledged that in many instances, voters who belong to or support a party may prefer to go with their concerns to elected members of that party.

Given the need to designate an Official Opposition so that its leader may serve as Leader of the Official Opposition, and given also the equality in numbers between the teams seeking the designation and for the reasons mentioned above, I recognize the hon. members for Spirit River-Fairview and Edmonton Norwood as the Official Opposition, at least for the time being, in this 20th Legislative Assembly.

I say "for the time being" only because this choice stands on a narrow base. A significant change of circumstances within the House could easily compel a change in that recognition. The hon. members I have just referred to have fairly acknowledged, in their brief of November 15, 1982, that a change in numbers might necessarily require a change in designation. They said: "Numerical superiority would provide adequate argument for a group of Independent Members forming the Official Opposition". Clearly this is so.

Just as the Independents have indicated that their leader would be the hon. Member for Little Bow, so too the

NDP members have indicated that their leader is the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Therefore, I have the honor to recognize now my colleague the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview as the Leader of the Official Opposition.

It has seemed necessary, in this statement and in reaching this conclusion, to deal somewhat at length with the reasoning given by both sides and to indicate that their seriously and carefully worked out briefs, the last of which is dated February 15, 1983, were given serious and careful consideration. In fact, material prepared under neutral auspices reached me as recently as a few days ago, and a review of all the material prior to writing this statement was completed less than 72 hours ago. For reasons given above, and apparently accepted, it would have been quite wrong to have made a ruling earlier and before having been re-elected Speaker of this Assembly. Yet it was essential to prepare beforehand to make this statement early in this new period of service in Alberta's Parliament.

The statement I have just read does not diminish in any way the high regard and respect I have for the hon. members for Little Bow and Clover Bar. Their dedicated and impressive public service to their constituencies and our province are well known. I am sure that all of my colleagues in this Assembly share with me these sentiments of high regard and respect.

#### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity today to table for members of the Assembly a copy of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops' Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis. I have copies for all hon. members.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to table the annual report of Alberta Disaster Services for the year ended March 31, 1982.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to table today the ninth annual report of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to file with the Legislature the Klufas Report on Services to Disabled Persons.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the manifest of Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services aircraft, with respect to air travel of the Executive Council and government agencies for the 1982 calendar year.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table annual reports for the following: the Department of Culture, the Glenbow museum, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation, the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation, and the Alberta Art Foundation.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file an exchange of correspondence between the presidents of the Metis associations of Alberta and the Premier of Alberta, regarding aboriginal rights issues.

#### head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of our distinguished former colleague Mr. Robert Clark.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, members of the Lethbridge-Coaldale 4-H Beef Club. Nineteen eighty-three marks the 60th anniversary of continuous service to the community by this club. Although other clubs were established earlier, no club in Alberta has provided continuous service longer than the Lethbridge-Coaldale 4-H Beef Club. This is due in part, Mr. Speaker, to the very dedicated support and interest shown by parents of the club members. That's exemplified today by the fact that many of the parents are accompanying their sons and daughters to our Legislative Assembly.

The leadership provided to the club has also been drawn primarily from parents, as well as other interested parties in the community. I would like to pay special tribute to the leader, Mr. Jerry Kuejer, and the assistant leaders, Arnold Bodie, Mrs. Joyce Gergely, Ted Gergely, and Hank Koot.

I now ask members of the club, their leaders and parents to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the Alberta Legislative Assembly, a group of 37 young and bright grades 6 and 9 bilingual students from the J.E. LaPoint school in Beaumont, located in the Wetaskiwin-Leduc constituency. They are seated in the members gallery and are accompanied by their group leader, Mr. Sherban, and Mr. Plamondon and Mr. Lavigne. I ask that they all stand and receive a welcome from this Assembly.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly a group of 48 grade 6 students from Westboro elementary school in the hamlet of Sherwood Park. Accompanied by their group leader, Josh Carlson, and by teachers Brenda Smith and Edna Dach, they are seated in the public gallery. I now ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this House.

#### head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

##### **Department of Agriculture**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I have an important ministerial statement, on a most complex issue, which I would like to present to the Assembly today. The Hon. Hugh Planche, Minister of Economic Development, and I generally accept the federal government's understanding of the need for a comprehensive approach to action on western rail capacity, grain handling, and transportation. We view the federal policy proposal as a necessary first step towards continued agricultural growth and economic development in Alberta. However, there are a number of key issues that have yet to be satisfactorily resolved and must be in the legislation.

We are concerned with the federal government's future cost-sharing arrangements on inflation. It is not reasonable to expect farmers to commit, in 1983, to being

responsible for the first 6 per cent of inflation in future years without consideration of the farmer's ability to pay. We have pointed out that Dr. Gilson's recommendation of a maximum 4.5 per cent producer share of inflation was more appropriate, given the uncertainties of national economic conditions.

We are also concerned about the limitation placed on tonnages of grain shipments eligible for the Crow benefit. We are concerned about the fact that farmers have to pick up all the future costs for grain shipments above the [31] million tonne level. Projections are that we will exceed that amount in this crop year. Where is the logic in charging more for extra production when the goal is to increase export sales?

We note that the railways are now to receive full compensation for moving grain, and it is our desire to see the federal government take action to compel the railways to live up to both investment and performance requirements. It is imperative that the railways be obligated to invest in sufficient rail capacity and to provide an efficient grain transportation service. We are of the view that legislation should include provision for full disclosure of rail cost data to grain shippers, including an annual statement of source and application of funds. We want to be sure that the grain farmers' money is used to build rail capacity and not hotels.

Referring to the proposed review process in 1985-86, we are concerned that the original intent of the Gilson recommendations may not be carried out under the proposed review process. Alberta believes it is important that the payment method allows us to maximize the potential for economic and agricultural development in western Canada. We believe that the results of last year's meetings in Winnipeg between the railways and the farm groups demonstrated the resolve of western Canadian farmers to ensure that they have a grain handling and transportation system that would allow them to take advantage of future opportunities. We hope that the same positive attitude and resolve will prevail as the final steps are taken towards legislating a new grain transportation policy.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the position of this government on a very complex topic is clearly understood, I am filing with this Assembly a document which outlines that position in detail.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to respond to the ministerial announcement today by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I should say at the outset that my colleague and I do not support the so-called Pepin initiative at all. We feel that this proposal, which will soon be put before the House of Commons, will spell disaster for western Canadian farmers.

But before adding several other comments, Mr. Speaker, I do want to note that we agree with several points the hon. minister raised: first, the inflation factor of 4.5 per cent as opposed to 6 per cent and, secondly, the question of the tonnages. In my judgment, the proposal of 31.4 million tonnes and everything above that defeats the whole purpose of expanding our export market. So on those two points, we do agree with the government. But, Mr. Speaker, I would have been much happier to stand in my place and respond to the hon. Minister of Agriculture had he supported the position taken by the government of Saskatchewan — a position, incidentally, which was debated in that particular House and unanimously endorsed by both political parties represented in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly.

I believe there are some serious flaws in the Pepin proposal which will defeat some of the objectives that may seem to benefit western Canada. The first flaw, as I see it, is that this money is not going to go directly to the railroads. Half of it will go to the railroads; half of it will go to the individual producers. The problem with that kind of approach is that individual producers have no bargaining power at all with the railroads. The only way there is going to be the slightest chance of performance guarantees being lived up to is if there is a direct link between the subsidy and the railroads.

The second point I make, Mr. Speaker — and I say this to rural members in particular — is that any idea of individual payments to 150,000 producers in western Canada assumes continued political support for that kind of proposition in a Parliament where farmers represent a very small percentage of the total number of electors. Frankly, I have my doubts as to how long that kind of system is going to operate.

The third concern I express is that in the Pepin plan there is no commitment to the principle of equal rates for equal distance. What is that going to do to rural life, to the smaller communities in western Canada?

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of major concerns that have been expressed by organizations such as Unifarm, the wheat pools, the National Farmers Union, and others, which in my judgment should have led the government of Alberta to join with the Saskatchewan government and the government of Manitoba in saying very frankly to Mr. Pepin that the time has come to go back to the drawing board. We have other excellent documents. We have the Hall royal commission document, which is perhaps the most extensive investigation and thorough analysis of western transportation in the history of the country, that gives us the basis for a better approach to transportation in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, while there are a couple of points on which my colleague and I can agree with the Minister of Agriculture, I say frankly to the government that on this particular issue, it would be wise to join arms with our colleagues and friends in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and ask the federal government to reassess its position. [some applause]

Mr. Speaker, I must welcome the opportunity to have at least one person who applauds me. [laughter] How long that will continue will perhaps depend on how successful I am in my responsibility.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Energy Agreement

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question, if I may, to the hon. Premier. I preface it by saying that although I don't usually agree with the hon. Premier, I don't think there should be rollbacks on July 1. But my question is with respect to the energy agreement of 1981 and, more particularly, with respect to a news release dated September 18 by the then Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Hon. Marc Lalonde, which appears to imply that the government of Alberta agreed to a 75 per cent pricing arrangement regardless of what the price is. Why was no objection taken to this particular release at the time, in view of the Premier's statement of several days ago?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that first of all by noting for hon. members that Schedule A of the energy agreement, section 5(d) — and I should read it into the record — provides, with regard to the definition of old oil, the following statement:

- 5(d) In the event that any of the above checks of the 75% limit reveal that the conventional old oil price has already exceeded the 75% limit, there will be no rollback or retroactive adjustment, but no further increases will be implemented until allowed by the check as described above.

In short, there will be no rollback or retroactive adjustment in the event that the 75 per cent situation with regard to the present price of old oil at \$29.75 per barrel is adjusted by other circumstances. There will be no rollback or modification. That is the agreement I signed; it is the agreement that stands today. There was no amendment made to that agreement.

There was reference by the hon. member to a document, which was a news release issued by the federal government on September 18. That news release referred to the fact that Schedule A would be amended in due course to clarify this intention. Schedule A was not amended. The document stands as I have described it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. As I read this release, the question on page 2 seems to relate to what appears to be an apparent contradiction. The release suggests that in fact Alberta had agreed to what appears to be a reconciliation of two positions. The Premier indicates there was no formal signing of any accord or an addendum to the agreement.

My question directly to the Premier: was there any informal agreement by the then Minister of Energy and Natural Resources with his federal counterparts concerning this document, prior to its release on September 18?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there may have been some informal discussions involving the former Minister of Energy and Natural Resources which had to do with an interpretation of a degree of some adjustments that might occur. But there was no follow-up to those discussions, and nothing was brought forward formally. Certainly nothing was brought to me as the signatory to the agreement. The position of the government of Alberta on section 5(d) stands.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. This particular document says:

The statement was issued with the concurrence of the Honourable Merv Leitch, Alberta Minister of Energy.

Is the Premier telling the Assembly that the then Minister of Energy and Natural Resources did not consult with the Premier before agreeing to a release which would seem to support the position that Alberta might in fact find itself in a rollback position if prices drop?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that would be accurate. There was no discussion with me, as the signatory to the agreement, with regard to any view held by the then Minister of Energy and Natural Resources on the matter. If it had been brought forward to me as an amendment to Schedule A, which it was not, I certainly would have insisted that the basic thrust of section 5(d), which is no rollback, be continued and sustained.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. During the discussions which led up to the agreement in 1981, what emphasis was placed on the possibility of a price drop? Or was the government of Alberta totally convinced that prices would go up forever and that a price drop was just a hypothetical possibility but one not to worry about?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, obviously all concerned at the time of September 1, 1981 — and I believe with almost no exceptions — anticipated increases in prices for crude oil. There certainly were different views as to the rate at which prices would increase. But our view, and my reading of the document before signing it, was the clear provision of section 5(d): the recognition that there will be no rollback or retroactive adjustment of the 75 per cent price that may be reached, such as the \$29.75 price which may be reached in the course of the agreement. So section 5(d) was the position that recognized that point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the importance of this agreement, could the Premier explain how it is possible that a minister could in fact agree to a statement such as this without consulting with the Premier of the province, who is a signatory to the agreement?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the fact should be noted that that press release was a document that was issued by only one party to the agreement. That party issued that document, and issued it after discussions with the then Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. That matter, therefore, was a matter of discussion. It is certainly not a matter of the agreement. As far as we're concerned, the agreement stands and will continue to stand.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier, in light of the fact that this release was sent to the industry and to universities from one end of the country to the other. In view of the widespread circulation of this information, why was there no discussion between the then Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and the Premier concerning a major aspect of an agreement that is worth literally billions and billions of dollars?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member dealt with that matter in his earlier question, because the contemplation was obviously for rising prices. But the protection in the agreement was for no rollback. That's the position that was there when I signed the agreement. That's the position where the government stands and which I think is fully accorded to by others that are involved, such as the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question to the Premier. In view of the Premier's interpretation, has the government of Alberta obtained outside legal advice with respect to the standing of that particular section? And is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly clearly that there are no obstacles whatsoever to the Premier's interpretation of that section 5?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be unrealistic to say that there are no obstacles to an interpretation, when obviously different views are expressed

by others. I think the important point to present to the Legislature this morning is the interpretation of the agreement with the legal advice we have from our people that are working on this matter of the position of section 5(d). I think section 5(d) is very clear.

MR. MARTIN: Just one supplementary, Mr. Premier. Forgive me, but I just want to make this clear. Are you suggesting — and I find this rather amazing, with your reputation for being on top of everything — that almost everybody in Canada knew about this memorandum but you? Is this what you're saying, that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources did not consult with you on this memorandum?

MR. LOUGHEED: When we speak about who all was aware of the memorandum — the memorandum was released by the federal government; there was discussion about it; there was no discussion with me. As far as I'm concerned, the provision of section 5(d) applies. I think our research into this subject indicates that the intention and the interpretation we have with regard to this matter was developed by officials of the federal government and is supportive of our view. If the hon. members wish to do further research, it was a news conference of September 2.

#### Alberta Economic Conditions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the hon. Premier as well. In view of the often-repeated comments on and about October 1982 of the imminent turnaround in the Alberta economy, and since that time we've had another 40,000 thrown out of work, could the Premier advise the Assembly what empirical, objective evidence the Premier and his colleagues used to tell Albertans that there was a turnaround last October?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I could go into it at some length. Let me just deal with some highlights. The first one was the Conference Board quarterly provincial forecast, which referred to the Alberta economy as follows:

Alberta's 1983 economic outlook is more encouraging: it will be, once again, the fastest-growing province in the nation. The economic recovery anticipated by the end of this year will bring a 4.7 per cent growth in the province's 1983 GDP in constant prices.

We had the report of the economists of the Royal Bank of Canada in October of that year. That report refers to the Alberta economy in a very positive way, including a very important supplement, by the senior vice-president of the Royal Bank of Canada's global energy and mineral group, about the oil and gas industry poised for turnaround, and refers to the positive position that's taken there. In addition to that, we had the reports on economic forecasts by the economists involved at both the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Bank of Montreal. There are others I could supplement as well that shared the view that provided we were not subjected to international events, particularly in the energy situation, Alberta would have the strongest economic growth of any province in Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Now that the banks and even the

Conference Board have been proven disastrously wrong, could the Premier advise the Assembly why in yesterday's Speech from the Throne there were no major new initiatives to reduce unemployment, in view of the fact that according to the figures this morning unemployment is now 136,000, which to my recollection is a record number of Albertans out of work, walking the streets?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier will no doubt wish to answer this. But as the hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows, we haven't yet started the throne speech debate, and I'm sure any of the merits of that speech will be given ample attention outside the question period.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of unemployment, I believe it is important for us to realize here in this Legislative Assembly that it is not, except in a limited way, going to be actions of governments that are going to be involved in reducing the degree of unemployment in Canada. It's going to be the private sector, and it's going to be world economic conditions. In Alberta, it is particularly going to be a revival of the base industry, the conventional oil and natural gas industry, that will create that revival.

There are a number of things governments can and will continue to do. They've been set out in the Speech from the Throne and include the priority employment program, the large stimulative capital budget that we've had over the course of this past winter, and a number of other things. But I think it should be made clear as well that in terms of the unemployment situation in this province, Alberta continues to have the highest participation rate of any province in Canada and continues to have more people employed in relationship to the population than any part of Canada. The key for economic recovery and jobs will stem from policies that encourage the private sector, particularly improving investor confidence in Canada and the province of Alberta. Those involve policies that are encouraging, not discouraging, to the private sector.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Bearing in mind the Premier's answer, what changes, if any, will be made in the economic resurgence program as it relates to the oil industry, in view of the fact that there is a greater difference between revenues and expenditures this year than last year? In other words, revenues have gone up and expenditures have not kept pace — there's a difference.

My question to the Premier is: what consideration is this government giving to attaching performance guarantees to incentives to the oil industry, just as the minister's colleague quite properly suggests that we have to have performance guarantees with respect to the railroads? What performance guarantees is this government looking at to ensure that the very substantial sums of money which we are putting into incentives are in fact spent in Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's very obvious from the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question that what he proposes is a second phase of the national-energy-program-thinking towards an industry, a thinking that involves the fact that you can take a freewheeling industry like the conventional oil and gas industry and put them in a strait jacket by providing incentives, red tape, and bureaucracy, and that something will happen. I'll just be very interested in that approach working in the front-

er areas of Canada.

We now hear the Leader of the Opposition proposing in this Legislature that what we need is phase two, an Alberta energy program with all of the red tape, bureaucracy, and limitations that are involved. If that's the view he is presenting to get the basic conventional oil and gas industry and jobs going in this province, he's sadly mistaken. And most Albertans will agree with me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Premier look at the most recent figures from *oilweek*, which show that in fact our money is being spent in the arctic.

Is the Premier telling the Assembly that a \$5.5 billion program that is financed either by direct incentives or by money foregone, that is entitled to the people of Alberta, is not going to be based on a serious set of performance guarantees? Is that the position of this government? In view of the fact that the figures show that for the third year in a row, expenditures in Alberta are down — not in the Northwest Territories, where they're up; not in Saskatchewan, where they're up; not in Manitoba, where they're up; but in Alberta, where they're down — are Alberta taxpayers to finance this kind of program without performance guarantees?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious to me that despite the time the hon. member has been here, the nature of the oil and gas industry has escaped his view. We start off with the fact that the base of the servicing of this industry is here in the province of Alberta, in a multitude of ways. If activity occurs in Saskatchewan, in Norman Wells, or in other areas, to a very significant degree it develops out of the service base we have here within the province of Alberta. So overall activity in this industry is certainly important and positive for the people of Alberta.

With regard to the question of the incentive systems, we look at the view that what's crucial is cash flow and netbacks. What we've seen involved is a situation which is a very high debt position by the conventional oil and gas industry. To a fair degree, they are improving on that debt position and getting themselves in a position to develop in terms of exploration and development.

The difficulties in the oil and gas industry primarily revolve around the matter of markets. With regard to oil, they involve the question of shut-in oil and the uncertainty of world oil prices. With regard to natural gas, they involve the marketing of natural gas in the United States. Those are the key factors that will ascertain and determine the degree of exploration and development in the western sedimentary basin.

The artificial movement of some activity into the frontier areas involves these very overloaded provisions of the national energy program. In my judgment, they're going to be increasingly questionable if the view of world oil prices continues with the same high degree of uncertainty as exists today. I do not want to disparage the need for that to continue, but it should be recognized.

Finally, it should be recognized by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the key in any particular situation is the geological potential. We have good geological potential in our province to find more oil and more natural gas. That's what will revive the oil and gas industry: the geological potential, the markets, and a government philosophy and approach that is encouraging to the private sector in this province. And that means many, many jobs. The approach and suggestions made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition will clearly not do that, and have

proven so many, many times in so many parts of the world not to do it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The facts unfortunately seem to indicate, Mr. Premier, that the very industries we're giving money to are investing elsewhere. But I'd like to direct . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's get back to the question period and away from the throne speech debate, which I am sure all members are anticipating with some interest for a beginning later this morning.

MR. NOTLEY: My initial question related to the economy, so I would just ask a question of the Premier, dealing with a crucial issue and industry in this province, the lumber industry, where there has been serious unemployment. Why was there no official ministerial representation from Alberta, as there was from Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia, with respect to the import duties proposed by the United States? Why was that industry not considered important enough that the appropriate minister go to Washington on this issue, as did other provincial ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: I'd like to refer that question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the province of Alberta was intensively involved in those discussions, which occurred over a period of some months. We had delegated senior representatives from the department to work with industry, with the Canadian Softwood Lumber Committee. We had communications and ongoing contact from the ministers who were involved from the provinces of British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec.

The fact of the matter is that a majority of provinces in this country are involved in the lumber industry. However, it was felt that the most appropriate representation in Washington would be a small group of ministers attending and representing all the provinces of Canada, and that's exactly what occurred. We were confident about the outcome of those deliberations, and circumstances have certainly proved that to be the case.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister telling the House that in view of the importance of the lumber industry in this province, representation in Washington would be left to three other provinces as opposed to this province participating?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member isn't listening to the answer. The fact is that the three ministers who were delegated to attend those meetings in Washington were not simply representing their provinces but were in fact representing all the provinces involved in Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Did that delegation come as a result of a formal agreement among all 10 ministers? Did all 10 ministers get together and say all right, the three who will be going to Washington will be the ministers from Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia? Or in fact are we now just riding on the coattails of what three other provinces achieved?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, this government has been intensively involved since the beginning of these countervail actions in the United States. We were well aware and well informed as the discussions progressed and as the strategy was developed. That strategy was developed in concert amongst the various governments, and it was on that basis that the ultimate representation to Washington did occur. We were well aware of it and concurred with it.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary on the economy, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this to the Premier. It was very refreshing to hear his brand of R.B. Bennett and Hoover economics.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize that the Chair should be somewhat relaxed, shall we say, in regard to members who are asking their first questions. But the experience of the House is a matter of record. It's there, and it's discoverable. Perhaps the hon. member might have some regard for the rules which are ordinarily observed in the question period; rules, I might say, which in some of the other parliaments are sometimes adopted and not followed. Perhaps he might just come back and deal with this as a question period. I am sure that if he has any other comments, he'll have his opportunity in the throne speech debate.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll rephrase the question. Does the government share the position expressed by the Catholic bishops that unemployment rather than inflation should be the first priority? I'd like the Premier to comment on that, if he shares that position.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have some very serious questions on the document the hon. Leader of the Opposition tabled today, with regard to its economic credibility. It's our view that the key for economic recovery is, first, investor confidence and, then, consumer confidence. It's to get the private sector in Canada convinced that they have government policies that are not going to alter and distort their position, that are encouraging to the private sector. The key for economic recovery for Canada will be government policies that encourage the private sector in a multitude of ways.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest to you, Mr. Premier — and I mean this in all seriousness — that that was the argument that was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member's suggestions are very appropriate for debate. This is a period for questions, rather than suggestions. If he has a question, would he kindly proceed with it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to qualify my question. Because he made reference to the economic views of the Leader of the Opposition, I thought that was only fair.

Let me put the question this way. The Catholic bishops also brought up the point that when you tackle inflation, the first people that are hurt are the poor and the middle income. It seems to me that our 5 per cent guidelines, that have already been announced, are going directly against the the bishops' report. I ask the Premier if he really feels that in a time of recession, what is in fact a cutback —

when you deal with 5 per cent, it isn't keeping up to the inflation rate — is really the way we should tackle the problems of the unemployed and the poor in this province in tough times.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the key, from the standpoint of people on moderate incomes and also with a view to recognizing the importance of having an improvement in the economy, has to do with the strength of the economy in terms of the private sector and in terms of inflation. If the public sector takes an ever-increasing share of the gross national product or the gross provincial product, has continual deficits, and involves itself in that particular approach to public policy, we will find the position in Canada trailing well behind most of the developed world in getting inflation under control. We have to get inflation in Canada and in this province under control. Some progress has been made.

It seems to me that it is very, very clear, therefore, that it is not appropriate public policy, and will not resolve the problem of those on limited incomes, to get involved in a program of massive government expenditures. I want to take the point, and I'm sure we'll have the discussion in the budget debate in due course, that the important phrase "cutback" is an interesting one. If the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood asks for 20 per cent and ends up getting 5, I don't believe he's got a cutback. It may be from his expectations but not from what he previously got.

I'm sure we'll have a good, lengthy debate on the question of developing a budget that meets and responds to the needs of citizens on limited incomes. I could point out that compared to the rest of Canada, Alberta leads the rest of the nation in terms of total family income.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest, just in a quick answer, that if people are being . . . I take it the Premier is asking me a question. I refer to that.

Perhaps this should be directed to the Provincial Treasurer or the Premier. Has the department looked into how much money you lose when there are 136,000 people unemployed, in terms of money you're paying out — in welfare and unemployment insurance — that hurts the economy, plus less purchasing power? I would suggest to you that if that were instilled in the economy, there would be over \$5 million.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that although the Provincial Treasurer will be dealing with it later in the session, he would like to respond to that point in a preliminary way.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think those are choices we will want to assess between all sides of the Legislature, not only in the throne speech debate but in the upcoming budget on March 24.

#### **Energy Agreement** (continued)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is with regard to the Premier's comments on the energy agreement. It also relates to the July 1 increase of \$4 per barrel with regard to conventional oil. I wonder whether, in light of the comments with regard to the section of the agreement, the government plans to forego all or part of



that \$4 per barrel increase to maintain that 75 per cent level of world price.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to try to be clear on that important question. The present price we're selling our conventional old oil for in the province of Alberta is \$29.75 a barrel. This has been estimated to be about 72 per cent of the world price. If events, that we're being advised by the Agent General in London, are occurring today or in the next few days result in a drop in the world price so that the 75 per cent ceiling has been exceeded with conventional old oil, our view is this: pursuant to section 5(d) there should not be any rollback of the existing price of \$29.75 for conventional old Alberta oil unless and until we're in a situation where the price of \$29.75 could in fact exceed world market prices. We don't think that's likely, but that's the position we hold.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Is the government considering the re-evaluation of the 75 per cent position and going to a world price position in future agreements?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Little Bow, because he was here in the Legislature, will remember many discussions on this matter and that over the whole period from 1973 on into 1981, Alberta was always of the view that the fair answer to the question of the pricing of oil in Canada was to have it priced in relationship to the market place, take it on the up and take it on the down. But it always seemed to us that when it was on the up side, Alberta was put under the pressure of the central Canadian provinces and the federal government, supported by other political groups, that we should somehow not be entitled to get the full value on the up side. That is a view we resisted and never found particularly acceptable.

However, when the federal government unilaterally moved with the national energy program in October 1980, it was a matter of extracting ourselves from what was then a federal budget, and reaching an agreement. We took the position with regard to new oil that we should be getting essentially the world market price. With regard to old oil, we were prepared to accept an anticipated upward rising market to a ceiling — we were then only getting 45 per cent — of 75 per cent of the value of oil in the market place.

I'm trying very hard here to make sure that I'm not misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. The position of the Alberta government is to stay with the agreement of September 1, 1981, on the position that there is no provision for a rollback of old oil. As we have always said, though, our overall view is that the best answer for Canadians is to let oil move with the market place and we, as the owner of 85 per cent of Canada's production, are prepared to take the market place up and down. But it seems to me so clearly unfair that we should be subsidizing on the way up and then should be asked to be subsidizing on the way down; that isn't fair. I think a growing number of Canadians, as they continue to hear our point of view, will find that acceptable.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I applaud that position and want to say that as Independents, we have been consistent with the free market position and continue to support that matter.

In a follow-up supplementary question, I want to ask

whether the Premier will be discussing this matter with the Prime Minister in the coming week.

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, that will not be on the agenda. When we had our meeting on February 28, the Prime Minister and I, with the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources here in Alberta and the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, it was left that this matter would monitor events in the international area and that in a number of weeks the two ministers of energy would meet and review the matter. It would not be something that I would anticipate would be raised at the meeting. I guess it's a Tuesday evening dinner at which we're discussing the economy. I'm sure there will be discussion of some of the other matters that have been raised in this question period.

### Hospital Construction

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to send this question over to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is the minister in a position to clarify whether or not the government intends to proceed with the construction of the northern Alberta children's hospital?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that question was made public some time ago, and there are two parts to it. Number one, the consultants that studied this matter recommended against the concept of a freestanding children's hospital but suggested alternatives. Secondly, I have met with the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation representatives and indicated to them that it's highly unlikely, with other health and hospital priorities that are probably higher up on the list, that an early start could be made on a pediatric centre of any kind in the next few years.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Was the minister in communication with the Premier in regard to this matter during the October 1982 election period?

MR. RUSSELL: The answer to that question is yes.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, so far I'm as clear as mud here, but I would not be so crass as to suggest the government made an election promise that it didn't intend to keep. So I will ask the minister ...

MR. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] question period, perhaps we might as well get it straight now as later. If we're going to debate the election over again, then in all fairness other participants in that election may want to have their say too. The question period doesn't provide for that, so let's leave that for another occasion.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I won't be crass.

I want to know why the government made a commitment. I think it was clear to everybody that they had made a commitment that they would be building the hospital. I wonder why they're not following up with that promise now.

MR. RUSSELL: The hon. member is referring to a news release that was put out or a letter that was written to the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation that

said if a hospital was recommended, one would be built. We stand by that. We've never said that is not the case. The recommendation was not that a hospital be built. Furthermore I think the indications are clear that down the years a pediatric centre of some kind will be built. But if we're going to manage the economy and public affairs of the province, that has to be prioritized. The same people that came up with that recommendation are being asked to prioritize the need for that pediatric centre.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can we look forward to some sort of children's hospital being built before the next election, Mr. Minister?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'll be talking at some length with respect to my department's capital program for the coming year and the commitments that will be ongoing. I would be very hesitant to put any time limitation on any hospital capital project during the coming months. I've said publicly many times that it's going to be very, very difficult to meet our commitments and manage a reasonable cash flow with respect to capital dollars. I wouldn't want to fool anybody by saying there's a promise of yet another capital project layered on top of what is already an incredible capital construction program unique in Canada.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. NOTLEY: I rise pursuant to Standing Order 29 to beg leave to adjourn the Assembly to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. Therefore I move the following: that this Assembly do now adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, that being the state of the provincial economy and the measures required to effect a recovery thereof, the upcoming first ministers' conference including discussions of the economy, and the bearing on both of the document tabled in the Assembly this morning, titled Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis.

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing *Beauchesne*, the definition of an emergency debate is quite clearly set out. It must relate to a genuine emergency. With 140,000 people out of work, the impact of that serious unemployment, and the fact that this Assembly has not met for some 10 months, I don't think there's any doubt that the program of action to put the economy back on track is very crucial. The question that has to be ...

MR. KING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 29 says "after the daily routine and before the Orders of the Day". I believe Orders of the Day has been called.

MR. SPEAKER: That is true, but I thought that perhaps we should give effect to the spirit of the standing order rather than to its strict text, as you might say. Perhaps the standing order should have some change made to it. If we were to do otherwise, it would mean that an hon. member who wished to make a motion for emergency debate would have to try to guess when the Speaker was going to call Orders of the Day following the conclusion of the question period. That's often not easy to tell, because we don't know when another member may get up to ask a question at the last moment.

Perhaps the fault is mine. I did get notice from the hon.

member, as required by the *Standing Orders*, and perhaps I should have called on him before I called Orders of the Day. I don't think the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be put at any disadvantage because of any slip of mine, if that was a slip.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to draw the attention of the Assembly to Citation 287 in *Beauchesne*. It's a definition of urgency.

"Urgency", within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

Mr. Speaker, in very briefly stating the reasons I think we should have an emergency debate on this issue, the question of that definition, urgency itself — it could be argued, of course, that we're into the Speech from the Throne debate and that will give members ample opportunity to discuss unemployment in the province. But I think the point that must be drawn to the Assembly's attention is that next week we have a very important conference in Ottawa. During the course of that conference, consideration will be given to the state of the Canadian economy. Mr. Speaker, one of the advantages of an emergency debate is that before the Premier goes to the conference in Ottawa and speaks on behalf of all Albertans, he will have an opportunity in an emergency debate to hear from many members of the Assembly.

As things stand, with the rules being what they are, we will have a mover and a seconder today, but that will be two members out of 79. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when one looks at the citation from *Beauchesne*, if the emergency of debate does not fit today with the oncoming conference next week, then, in great respect, very seldom would the occasion arise — indeed if it ever would arise — when we could have an emergency debate.

I'm sure the Government House Leader or the deputy House leader will say in responding: but of course they've brought in the bishops' report, we've just had it tabled, and members don't have the opportunity to review it. I say, with great respect, if that argument is presented I would find that hard to follow. This is a major document that most members of the Assembly should have already read by this time, probably one of the major documents of a moral and economic nature that the country will see during this decade.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier meets the other premiers and the Prime Minister next week, in view of the fact that we have record unemployment in this province, it is our submission that the test of an emergency debate is met and that the matter should be open to members of the Assembly this morning so their views could be presented in the form which the emergency debate provides, prior to the Premier attending the conference in Ottawa next week.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, rising to participate briefly in this debate, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has correctly pointed out to the House that the question is dealt with very effectively in rule 287 in *Beauchesne*. If ever there was a clear opportunity for debate on the subject, it was engendered as a result of the throne speech yesterday, which made specific reference to the economy. Indeed the debate can and will take place in this Assembly as soon as this matter has been dealt with.

It's true that there will be a mover and seconder. I am

sure there is no question whatsoever that the hon. Leader of the Opposition can find adequate time this morning to address his remarks to the Premier as to what he thinks should be done with respect to the economy. Therefore we on the part of the government would welcome his views this morning. He may not wish to participate, for whatever reason, in the debate this morning, but there's certainly plenty of time to do it.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to make reference, if I may, to the subject that has been addressed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition relative to the fact that the Premier will be travelling to Ottawa next week to take part in the first ministers' conference. That is quite true. But that first ministers' conference has been called pursuant to section 37 of the Constitution Act, and it's to deal with the issue of aboriginal rights. Our government shares the concerns expressed by every other province and by all native groups represented at that conference, that the purpose of the conference not be undermined by dealing with issues that are not directly related to the subject matter of the conference itself.

It is true that the Prime Minister has requested participation and some discussion of the economy at a dinner meeting which will take place during the course of that conference, but we wish to make it absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the conference is not to deal with the question of the economy. All other provinces have shared the concerns of Alberta, expressing to the Prime Minister that while there may be some preliminary discussions as to developing a conference on the economy at an early time, it is certainly not appropriate to consider the conference which will be taking place next week to be a conference on the economy. In any event, as I have already indicated, there will opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to bring forward his views in the time available this morning.

I should say that, while he has just assumed his new responsibilities as Leader of the Opposition, I'm sure that like most prospective brides, he came with an answer. We will welcome his participation in the debate on the subject this morning or later in the course of the throne speech debate. Mr. Speaker, that is when the debate should take place.

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to rise to participate in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I think there are three or four major points that have to be made. Number one, this House has not sat for almost a year. The unemployment rate was approximately 65,000 people; as of today, the figure is 136,000 people. The reason I believe it is an emergency debate — and we have to make this point clear. The hon. member is correct that the Constitution is the main thing to deal with native rights, but it is my understanding that the Prime Minister and the premiers are going to talk about the economy. The Premier will not be in the House again, so we want to give him some direction before he goes to discuss the economy with the other first ministers.

I think even my hon. colleague would agree that there are more members than just the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There are 79 members here, and I know they're dying to get into the emergency debate. I think they should have a chance.

The other major thing at this time is the bishops' report. It's been a major document across the country. People are discussing it. I think we should have a chance to discuss it here.

The fourth point I would make is that people are looking at the relevance of this institution. People are

suffering. As we've pointed out, there are people unemployed. We know all the psychological problems that go with that; we know the economic problems. Surely the first day we're back after a long time off we should be discussing this in an emergency debate, because to those people it is an emergency. It would show how irrelevant we are if we don't get into the major item of the day on the first day.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I must confess some surprise at this request for emergency debate coming even before the throne speech debate has begun. I respectfully suggest to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood that in looking around the House, I don't see any impending fatalities among members who are anxious to get into the throne speech debate.

It's very well known that motions for adjournment before the throne speech debate has pretty well run its course are simply not accepted. It's true that, especially for those directly involved, the fact of unemployment is an emergency. It's a continuing emergency. It's a most serious matter — should be and, I'm sure, is — for every member of this Assembly. But the emergency debate rule is not intended to be used to debate an ongoing condition, and that has been demonstrated many, many times. In fact, I think I hadn't been in this Chair for more than a few hours before a motion for emergency debate came along with regard to a shortage of box cars that had been going on for possibly a year or more. Every day after an earthquake is an emergency.

The argument that has been made out of the hon. Premier's forthcoming visit to Ottawa doesn't rescue the situation at all. If the hon. member or members who are supporting this motion have speeches ready, as anticipated by the Deputy Government House Leader, I suggest they send them directly to the Premier, because if they put them in *Hansard*, that won't come out till Monday.

A Speaker has scarcely any business to conclude that a premier or a prime minister is inadequately informed about the state of the economy in his province or country. However, I suppose that the attempt to move the motion has achieved its intended effect and that we can now proceed to deal with its substance in the throne speech debate. We'll revert to Orders of the Day.

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

Moved by Dr. Elliott:

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

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

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

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start my comments by congratulating you on being reinstated as the Speaker of this Legislature. Although we've just recently met you, we in the Grande Prairie area feel we've known you for some time. We know you for your reputation, fairness, and knowledge, and you have served this Legislature very well. I look forward to working here, sir, under your direction.

I'd also like to recognize His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and thank him for the speech he read to us yesterday. We appreciate his contribution to this province, and I'm sure we all wish him well and wish him health.

I also wish to thank our Premier for the great honor he has bestowed upon us in the Grande Prairie constituency by asking us to move the acceptance of the throne speech.

This is an interesting time in our constituency because, first of all, this is the first time that a member from the Grande Prairie constituency has been asked to perform this function. It's also an interesting time because our city, our major population centre, is celebrating its 25th anniversary. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, we include this function as part of that celebration.

Another reason it's a particular honor to me is that as an agronomist, I find pleasure in moving the acceptance of the speech because of the repeated reference to agriculture in the speech and because this is Agriculture Week in Alberta. In my opinion, these things all fit together.

I'm particularly honored for personal reasons to be asked to do this because I have a very strong personal love for this province. Along with that, I've had a fascination for the political processes that have guided and directed the growth of this province over the years.

This fascination and respect for our province and our country, I think, is something that goes back to the kitchen table in our home in our little town of Busby, just 40 miles northwest of here. My home is a rather political home, and it was not uncommon to have politicians visiting our home. These people would stop by, and they would pick my father's brains for local political tidbits. But I was never sure whether that was the real reason for visiting our place or whether it was my mother's cooking, because it seemed like all the action took place around the kitchen table. Anyway, they were out there, supposedly on fishing and hunting trips, and they were always welcome guests.

Being not that far away, Mr. Speaker, we were frequent visitors to the Legislature, coming as school groups like we saw this morning and also as family groups. It was always interesting because my father came to this city as an eight year old in 1902, and he had an opportunity to watch certain changes take place. As we visited the Legislature, he would make reference to his early days in Edmonton and to playing games with Indian boys in the old fort which stood nearby at that time. These particular stories I always found of special interest.

Then there were many subsequent visits to the Legislature and to this building, visiting with ministers during the period when I served as mayor of our small town of Beaverlodge and, again, as chairman of the board of governors of our Grande Prairie Regional College. This contact did nothing but increase my interest in our political process and had quite a bit to do with my being here today.

I believe yesterday's Speech from the Throne had many important topics, important not only to all of Alberta but to our constituency of Grande Prairie. I would like to reflect on these and, with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a brief progress report of the situation in our constituency and relate the throne speech items to it.

Before I do that, I would like to make reference to two MLAs from our area with whom I have had close contact, Mr. Elmer Borstad and Dr. Winston Backus, who worked well for our constituency and have proven to be real sources of support and strength to me. I recognize

their efforts.

Our Grande Prairie constituency, for those who haven't been there recently or have yet to visit us, is one of the few constituencies that borders the west border of our province, where we have active communication with British Columbia. This has a bearing on our constituency because of this act of communication back and forth.

Our constituency was settled at the turn of the century by people travelling through and claiming land in that very fertile valley which has made the area so famous. Some of these people came to claim land, and I have had the opportunity to visit with these people over the years. Some of them admit that they were actually Klondikers that got lost; none the less, they made good pioneers.

Our total population in the area is about 45,000 people; that's about one-third rural and two-thirds urban. Our area is characterized by five population centres. In addition to the city of Grande Prairie, we have the four towns of Wembley, Beaverlodge, Sexsmith, and Hythe.

I made reference to agriculture. It was our first industry in the Grande Prairie area. It was also one of our major industries, others notwithstanding, in recent years. Our economy has always been based on the production, processing, marketing, and transportation of agricultural products. As we saw in the throne speech yesterday, there are many programs relating to the types of things we're talking about. I can refer to our purple gas and natural gas programs, our interest rates, and many others, and these have all had a vital impact on our agricultural community and the economy.

Reference was also made, Mr. Speaker, to an item that is very close to my heart. That is the topic of agricultural research. Our Alberta Department of Agriculture, through its Farming for the Future program, is vital because we have at Beaverlodge in our constituency one of Canada's research stations. Much of the funding that has supported the programs at Beaverlodge has come from the Farming for the Future program. Needless to say, this has had a bearing on those programs and their immediate application to the agricultural production of the area.

Reference was made to the canola breeding program, and Beaverlodge is very much part of that program, on both a provincial and national basis. We are also putting out at that station new barley varieties, being funded primarily by this program. Of course, that is a vital crop to Grande Prairie and in fact all of northern Alberta.

I have to make reference also to the NARP plant at Sexsmith, the canola processing plant which is a product of the actions of this government and has served the area very well.

Our farmers are also very aware of the importance of the Prince Rupert terminal, Mr. Speaker, and look forward to seeing our product going out in that direction. There are those in our area who also have imagination and look forward to seeing a rail link from the Grande Prairie-Beaverlodge area straight west to link with the rails that now come into the Tumbler Ridge coal program of British Columbia. That would cut off several hundred miles of rail distance between our constituency and the port of Prince Rupert.

We have in this province a very active international marketing program for agricultural crops and other items. The agricultural program is of importance to us. Because of a personal experience I have had, I would like to make reference to one, Mr. Speaker. It was my privilege in 1982 to be part of the agricultural forage crop seed mission to Europe. Our constituency is a major producer

of these small seeds, grasses and legumes for pasture and hay as well as for turf, for the international market. I would like to compliment our government on the very positive and aggressive way in which these international marketing programs are put together. We were a small group — there were only four of us — and we did sell Alberta and Canadian forage seeds, in addition to other seeds which were not part of the assignment.

There is one other item that relates here, and that is the very important topic raised in the throne speech yesterday with respect to the Alberta Water Resources Commission. Again as an agronomist, I have a very strong feeling and appreciation for the importance of water and its requirements for the production of our field crops and the important link in the food chain. It is with real pride that I say that I've been asked to sit on this commission and work for our province in that area. I think we have a tremendous yet a potentially short-lived resource there, and I think our government's action at this time is most timely. I look forward to working on that.

I might also mention at this point that our Northern Alberta Development Council was also referred to in the speech yesterday, and I am on that program too. I sat through the first meeting, when the public came with their presentations and briefs, and this was in the little town of Manning in northern Alberta. It was really exciting for me to sit there and see the enthusiasm and vigor with which northern rural Albertans would come to a meeting of that type and have such far-reaching questions and proposals with real depth that would have real impact on all sectors of our economy and our way of life. I think that reflects what we are trying to do with the Northern Alberta Development Council, in that we provide a forum where these people can come forward with these proposals. We had 40 briefs that evening, and that meeting ran rather late.

I would like to make reference to our lumber industry, which is also an important one in our constituency. It is almost as old as agriculture because, as the people in the forestry business say, the day the farmers arrived and started to cut fence posts, the lumber industry was also given birth. It is characterized in our area by an interrelated system of sawmills, a plywood mill, and a pulp mill, and these industries have traditionally provided a lot of off-farm employment. As this industry matured and gained sophistication, it actually gave a permanent work force in our constituency, which has been extremely important. Indeed, there are those in the lumber industry today, Mr. Speaker, that say it's the lumber industry that has provided a major work environment for our community for the last few months. They take major credit for their contribution to our economy. One of our leading businesses is Canfor, with their plywood plant which was built in 1953. Canfor added a sawmill in 1964. Together, these items provide full-time employment for 355 people and part-time for another 240. Canfor is contemplating a new sawmill on land which has already been purchased adjacent to the city of Grande Prairie.

Nineteen seventy-one saw a major boost in our economy when Procter & Gamble came in with their pulp mill, the largest in the province. This pulp mill was to process the pine and spruce which we have in the area, for their fibre for pulp. Our research in that area was most encouraging because apparently — for whatever reason; we're not sure yet — the quality of that fibre is superb. Procter & Gamble added a sawmill in 1980. At this time, their employment program is in excess of 1,000 on permanent staff. They have an additional 400 people

through contract services. When their public relations officer tallies up the total impact of their payroll, they say they are reaching something in excess of 4,000 people in our community.

There's an exciting new thing happening with Procter & Gamble, Mr. Speaker, a project in co-operation with our Alberta forestry officials. It's an experiment that was conducted at the pulp mill in Grande Prairie to develop techniques for that mill to process our native poplar. They have had considerable success. Just this week, we were treated to a sample of craft pulp from the fibre of our northern Alberta native poplar. Samples are certainly available to anybody wanting to examine the craft pulp more closely. This is truly an exciting thing because the aspen, or the native poplar as we know it, is primarily a forest weed and grows very well in this province. If we have the capability to produce fibre and pulp from our native poplar, we indeed have a winner. The poplar is also one of those crops which will regenerate itself very easily. I find this exciting enough that, besides having this declared Agriculture Week, I wonder if we should also call it forestry week, with this week being the discovery.

Going on to energy, Mr. Speaker, we have in our area many energy resources. In fact Grande Prairie is right on the doorstep of the largest natural gas resource accumulation in all Canada. This is known as the Elsworth deep basin and was designated so by Canadian Hunter. Our energy people pay real tribute to our government for its participation in the energy programs in this province. As one leading official said the other day, it was the royalty arrangements in the early 1970s that truly gave birth to the Elsworth deep basin. For this, I think our government should have recognition. In fact, these people tell us our government has been responsive and responsible in listening to the needs of the industry, and has provided the necessary incentives and work climate to get this industry rolling.

The optimism in the energy program in our area looks like this. Chieftan Development tells me that they are planning a \$28 million expansion program in their Hythe-Brainard plant. Then they're planning on drilling seven wells. Shell Resources people are planning a \$50 million extraction plant just northwest of Grande Prairie. Dome Petroleum tells me that they have a 15-year export approval on liquified natural gas for Japan. All of these things have a very important, positive impact on our constituency.

In the area of transportation, the fall and winter works program referred to in the speech was one of major importance to our constituency because we have many gravel trucks and people involved in the trucking business. Our fall and winter works program and transportation was, for some of these people, their only source of income during the winter months.

Reference was also made, Mr. Speaker, to the deregulation of trucking. This I find encouraging and, at the same time, I'm hoping that when the work is done in that deregulation, some effort will spill over to providing uniform regulations with our trucking industry and that of British Columbia, for reasons I've already mentioned. Of course all of us in our Grande Prairie constituency are looking forward to an early and successful completion of Highway 40 from Grande Prairie south.

In the education area, we boast good schools with good programs. Reference made yesterday to the use of computers is something which we are already working with, and we are looking forward to more activity there. In our school system we have what we call our Grande Prairie

Regional College, which I consider the crown jewel of the system, an institution which is providing education opportunities to everybody in the region, which extends far beyond the boundaries of our constituency. Courses include everything from job readiness training to trades, the technologies, visual and performing arts, and university transfer. We boast about our first-year nurses' training program that just came in, and I understand that the second-year training program is on its way.

We have a major construction program at our college. The student residence, being the top of the list, is rapidly nearing completion. In discussing this, the people at the college say that a very warm thank you has to be extended to the Department of Advanced Education for the guidance, co-operation, and encouragement they have had all the way through these programs. It's my pleasure to extend those comments.

There are also those among us, Mr. Speaker, who feel that our Grande Prairie constituency is just about ripe for a university. We'll be looking forward to more work on that.

The area of government commitment for the handicapped is something that was recently given more support in our area. In the city of Grande Prairie, they've just had approval for major construction of a school for the mentally and physically handicapped, offering kindergarten through grade 9. This is going to be a major breakthrough in Alberta's education system, Mr. Speaker, because this particular facility and the program being planned is the first of its kind in Canada.

In health care I can really boast about our Queen Elizabeth II hospital, to be completed in September 1984; 460 beds, Mr. Speaker, and it's going to be a beautiful building. It will be the major health care and referral centre for the entire region. But it saddens me to have to say that one thing we are very deficient in, and a problem we have, is a need for an alcohol and drug treatment centre for the north.

In the area of parks, we have many good parks but they are overcrowded and overused. I was very happy to hear that the government plans to rebuild, at least for day use, O'Brien park, that was destroyed by the floods of 1982. We have in our area two items that I'd like to make reference to now. One is called the Saskatoon Mountain Provincial Park. The place and item is not well understood even by people living there. Saskatoon Mountain is an outcropping of rock which received very little, if any, glaciation and, in geological terms, can be considered a full sister to the Cypress Hills of southern Alberta. The other is the sand dunes south of Grande Prairie, adjacent to Grande Prairie. These sand dunes and Saskatoon Mountain park are both geological relics, and they deserve the attention and protection of this government for those of us who live there and for Canadians yet to be. Both of these items are used as outdoor laboratories for geology students from around the country and as far away as Europe.

In the area of culture, I have some exciting things that I'd like to refer to. We are blessed, Mr. Speaker, with a rich cultural heritage in both the visual and performing arts. We have many people who are capable of taking part in this activity, and we also are blessed with those who will teach and help foster. In the area of music, in a recent visit to our area Tommy Banks said that he'd like to understand what it is that makes the Grande Prairie area and the north so rich in this type of culture. He would like to bottle it — I'm assuming he's referring to transport. Well, we have news for him; we would like to

keep it there and watch it grow.

The other thing in the arts, we are very proud of Betty McNaught, our artist, who in 1982 received the Sir Frederick Haultain prize from this government for her work with her art. In that area, Mr. Speaker, I have to make reference to the fact that in this province just this week, there was a book published on the art and the life of our Betty McNaught. With your permission, I would like to read a short sentence, prepared by Mr. Grant MacEwan, from the back of the book.

I salute the people of the land of the mighty Peace and congratulate all on two counts; first on strides of artistic achievement as exemplified by the works of Euphemia McNaught and, second, on the fine and timely gesture of honoring one of the region's distinguished artists.

Mr. Speaker, this little project was just terminated this week with the arrival of this book, which brings me around to suggest that in addition to this being Agriculture Week and possibly forest week, maybe we should call this cultural week for northern Alberta.

Cultural facilities are always a concern in our society. There has been a group in Grande Prairie that has been very active in promoting a civic cultural center. This project is presently delayed with the economic position, but optimism is strong and prevails as usual.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have to make reference to the kind of people we have in the north. I refer to our senior citizens, and reference was made to them many times in the speech yesterday. These are the people who are the true pioneers. It's so rewarding to visit with these people to determine and learn how they react to things today and how they recall things that have happened earlier. It's the optimism that I find is so refreshing.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt it's a matter of record that the economy in our area was very, very hot and active in the recent past, because Grande Prairie is right on the doorstep of all our energy resources. With the rapid expansion of those resources, of course, our community was growing very rapidly and in many directions. For these reasons, when the economic pendulum started to swing, Grande Prairie was one of the first areas in our province to feel it. And there's no doubt about it, some people were hurt financially. However, when I go around our constituency and visit with people who have gone through this particular situation once, twice, three, or more times, I never cease to be amazed at their optimism and confidence.

I have a short story to tell that explains what I'm referring to. On a recent Friday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I was invited to visit with a businessman in his office, and all he wanted to tell me was that in his opinion there were certain things that our government and our province should consider doing that would help the growth of the area, help direct the development of the province, and indeed all of Canada, and bring this country closer to what he thought it should be. He felt that he hadn't had an opportunity to express that to his MLA, and he invited me to his office that afternoon to make sure I understood how he felt. It was a discussion of optimism; it was a discussion of expansion and growth. And it was a real experience for me. What he didn't tell me was that as we left his office that Friday afternoon, he locked that door on that business for the last time, and that construction business of 30 years went out of business.

Another person I was taking to just recently put it in a briefer way and said: I have been through good times and bad times and good times and bad times; right now we

are in smartening-up times. These people are not bitter. These people have optimism, hope, and faith, and they are the people who are prepared to take hold of the reins of activity and take advantage of the opportunities as they come in the future. These are the people that I am so proud to represent in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move the Speech from the Throne. [applause]

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, as a new member it is with a deep feeling of pride in the honor bestowed upon me that I stand to second the motion of the hon. Member for Grande Prairie, thanking his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for the Speech from the Throne. Since the Member for Grande Prairie, too, is one of the 19 new members to this Assembly, let me be the first to congratulate him on his insight and his excellent delivery of his first contribution to the debate in this Legislature. I'd also like to express my thanks to our Premier for honoring the constituency of Calgary Foothills in this way, by giving me the opportunity to do this today.

Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of your skill in conducting the business of the House in the past. As a new member, I am extremely happy that you have again been elected to guide us in the House in meaningful and constructive debate.

As the Member for Calgary Foothills, I've had the privilege of knowing all of the previous representatives sent from the constituency to this House. We're also one of the very few constituencies in the province that has consistently elected members of the same party, yet who have sat both in opposition benches as well as in the government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the first member from Calgary Foothills, the hon. Len Werry, was often reprimanded by one of your predecessors. On February 15, 1971, he kindly asked Len to refer to the members opposite — or, for that matter, on either side of the House — as hon. members, not this guy or the other guy. Len was respected and represented us well until his untimely death in a car accident in 1973. Today, I can't help thinking of his work here in this House and of his family — Eleanor, Charlene, Brian, Bruce, Sheldon, and Spencer — and of his inspiration to me.

The hon. Stewart McCrae, the former Minister of Government Services, was then nominated and won the by-election against the leader of one of the other provincial parties. He too served his constituents faithfully and capably until the last election, when he decided to return to his career. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to follow these men, and I'm grateful to the people of Calgary Foothills for this privilege. I appreciate the attendance of some of the people from Foothills today.

I feel very much a part of the building of our constituency. Capitol Hill, Collingwood, Charleswood, and Brentwood were part of the building boom in Calgary 20 years ago that saw Calgary begin to expand to the north and the west. They were new districts then and only 15 minutes to downtown and five minutes to a great walk out on the prairie farmland. We were part of Calgary Bowness initially and didn't become a constituency of our own until 1971. Since that time we've added Foothills Estates, University Heights, North Haven, part of Dalhousie, and part of Edgemont, and most recently MacEwan Glen, named after a former Lieutenant-Governor and long-time resident of Calgary.

Our constituency now has about 30,000 people. All races and creeds are represented, and the people in the constituency are mainly working in jobs related to the oil

industry, education, and health care. I'm sure there is representation from every profession, every kind of small business, and many large businesses. We have subsidized housing; we have high-rises; we have condominiums; we have single family dwellings, that range from modest homes to mansions.

We're so proud of Carroll Place, our senior citizens' residence, and we're pleased that Alberta Housing Corporation is building 50 more new units for senior citizens in North Haven. We're proud of the Brentwood Sportsplex, the Triwood arena, and the many volunteers that support the six active community associations in our riding. Calgary Foothills indeed has benefited in many, many ways from opportunities this government has created to provide incentives to improve the quality of our own lives.

It became evident during the campaign that the average age of the population in our community in Calgary Foothills is steadily rising. The bulge of the children born in the '60s and '70s was accommodated by creating thousands of new jobs in education and the social services. More children of course meant more homes, more schools, more roads, more stores, and generally all the services needed to build our new neighborhoods.

This has changed now, and we're facing an older population with different needs. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the assistance being given to our senior citizens to enable them to stay in their own homes. The home repair program, the home heating protection plan, tax reduction and rental assistance plans, to say nothing of the health services and leisure opportunities offered, are all designed to encourage independence and continued participation in their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, we have two outstanding features in our community, possessed by no others in Calgary. Flying over Calgary, I'm sure all of you have seen the familiar landmark of Nose Hill and how it rises out of the prairie land like a nose on a face, delineated by the Bow River on one side and Nose Creek on the other. Long before Calgary was established, Nose Hill was recognized as a strategic outlook for Indian bands and a retreat for buffaloes in the hard cold of the winter. From the brow of the hill, you can see for miles up and down the valley of the Bow and as far south as Elbow Valley. Many teepee rings and even a buffalo kill site have been discovered, even though the configuration of the hill does not lend itself to mass slaughter of the animals. As late as 1873, a traveller in the area reported that for the whole distance to the Bow River he had never in any pasture seen cattle thicker than the buffalo herds he saw from the top of that hill. There must have been tens of thousands of them.

Now, of course, homes cover the valley, have circled the hill, and are gradually creeping up the hillside and offering phenomenal views of our city and the mountains to the west. Several north Calgary communities have banded together to try to preserve the natural state of this hill for visual and recreational purposes, and city council has responded in recognizing the need for parkland. In 1974 a modest plan for the park was developed, and the residents of Calgary Foothills and adjacent communities hope to preserve this open space in its natural state so that we may all share in the beauty of the hill and the magnificent view of Calgary.

A second feature in Calgary Foothills is the distinction of having the University of Calgary within its boundaries. Back in 1942 this Legislature passed an Act allowing for multicampus universities, and a Calgary branch of the University of Alberta was established. In 1966, the University of Calgary became autonomous. Between 1957

and 1966, while enrolment at the University of Alberta here tripled, enrolment at the University of Calgary multiplied by 10 times and, since that time, has more than tripled. It's now approximately 13,000, and that is 10 per cent over the previous year.

At the University of Calgary it's not uncommon for students to line up, even in the middle of the night, for time on computer terminals. Many classes are filled to overflowing, and therefore are conducted by closed-circuit TV. This increase in demand may make it necessary to introduce limitations on registration, because there is going to be increased competition for the spaces available. But this overcrowding is a good sign too; it also indicates confirmation of the second priority outlined in the Speech from the Throne yesterday, supporting job training and retraining. There appears to be a surprising number of students returning to their education. In these times of tough competition in the employment market, it seems the youth of Alberta, and mature students too, recognize that jobs are going to those best qualified in a given field, those who are prepared. They're wise enough to work seriously toward improving their qualifications so that they're ready when opportunities do open up.

It seems there's always building construction, too, at the university campus, and this year is no exception. Recently the completion of the civil engineering addition was noted, and it indicates the awareness of this government of the increasing demand for research and development in skilled and technical trades. The building program at the University of Calgary also acknowledges the need for additional student accommodation that will not only serve our students now and in the future but will be the athletes' village when Canada hosts the Olympic games in 1988.

Mr. Speaker, while grant increases to postsecondary institutions over the last nine years have increased by 170 per cent, it's also important to recognize the leadership and encouragement of this government to initiatives from the private sector to support special projects in secondary education that have led to donations — to the University of Calgary, at any rate — of about \$16 million in the last year, over double the amount given in 1979. At the same time, the student contribution by way of fees to the cost of operating our university has declined from 50 per cent in the '50s to less than 9 per cent today. In addition, our aid to students has increased by 50 per cent. In 1981, improvements in the student financial assistance program equalized the opportunity for Albertans to attend these institutions.

Mr. Speaker, as the 18th woman to be elected to this Legislature since 1905, I would be remiss if I didn't recognize the fact that 40 per cent of the work force is female, and that 60 per cent of these women are married and between the ages of 20 and 44. These statistics represent a marked social change in the traditional roles of women. The typical working wife can no longer be said to be working to make up the shortages in the family budget nor limited by her role as wife and mother. Changing life styles have opened up opportunities in male-dominated professions such as engineering, law, high-level management, and even politics. Men, too, have widened their options into careers of nursing and secretarial work, and people generally are demanding greater personal satisfaction from their careers. For this reason, I'm extremely pleased to see this government's emphasis on the expansion of postsecondary programs in trades and technology, and the health service professions. We live in a time when the men and women best equipped to

handle the future are going to be well trained in a specialty, and yet have a broad enough background that they are confident enough to adapt to new methods and move into new fields of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, may I also compliment this government on two examples of interdepartmental co-operation that have enabled important ideas in education to develop in Alberta. The first is the early childhood services program enabling every community to institute preschool programs where parents can take an active part in their child's education. Educational research confirms the link between achievement and the child's perception of the importance of education to their parents. The departments of Education, Social Services and Community Health, and Recreation and Parks work together to administer this program.

The second educational principle that this government has supported and carried into action is that of lifelong learning. The community school concept seeks to integrate the services available to the community to promote the fullest possible utilization of school facilities year-round, to co-ordinate the resources in education, recreation, and governance at all levels of the community.

The reason I feel this concept is so important — enough to mention it at this time — is that according to a recent study of Canadian students, 30 per cent had no idea what they wanted to do when they left high school. They could see no point to education or to planning a career, because what was the use, where were the jobs? With such a large proportion of the labor force unemployed, their pessimism is real. Nevertheless in a community school, embedded into the curriculum each day, are examples, models, and inspiration in the form of people and resources that exist in our community that, first, assure the student of the importance of education; second, offer concrete alternatives to students by using the full resources of the community; and, third, support the family unit and encourage students and their parents to exert positive control over their fate and think hard about what they want to do with their lives.

Life-long learning is important to us when we realize that experts say over half of the 7,000 occupations existing in Canada will be eliminated or changed beyond our recognition in the course of the next 24 years. This program, again an interdepartmental program, is administered by school boards and city councils in co-operation with the departments of Education, Recreation and Parks, Advanced Education, Social Services and Community Health, and Culture. We can do a lot when we work together.

Mr. Speaker, as you have likely surmised, the constituents in Calgary Foothills will be pleased with the thrust of the Department of Social Services and Community Health, outlined in the throne speech yesterday, to decentralize services and decision-making. This department particularly is called upon to be increasingly responsive to local needs. This move may initiate more creative solutions to these needs, perhaps along the lines of community self-help programs, where people that can do so are given the opportunity of helping others less fortunate. This intent is also exemplified by the Alberta widows' pension program recommended to this Assembly yesterday. The intent of the legislation planned in this department and in Native Affairs seems to be to help people learn how to help themselves and, in so doing, preserve the dignity of the individual and foster their confidence and independence.

The work of this department also illustrates the impor-



tance to this government of ensuring input from people that we as members represent. The Klufas report, filed today, and the Cavanagh Board of Review are typical of the way our plans are made: the views of the public are thoroughly surveyed, recommendations presented, and reactions invited before final decisions are made in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that government can no longer do everything that was once done by neighbors and the community. We have a tradition of helping one another. If we were to take stock, I know we already have a veritable army of volunteers in action in our communities in Alberta. We depend on them more than we even know, and their involvement benefits them as well as us. Without their initiative and effort, perhaps the employment opportunities offered by the construction of the Calgary Centre for the Performing Arts or some of the facilities that were prepared for the Western Canada Games that bring Calgary up to Olympic standards may never have happened.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, over the past months we have admittedly experienced a blow to our self-confidence as a province and, indeed, as a nation. If we consider the economic situation as a crisis, we automatically accept the present as a turning point where things can get better or worse. A philosopher observed that the Chinese write the word "crisis" with two characters: one means danger; the other means opportunity. If we can grasp the opportunity given to us at this time through the

throne speech — all the things surrounding the work we do in this House — to reappraise what our real needs are here in Alberta and free ourselves to look for alternatives to redesign our delivery of services so they are more in tune with the fiscal and economic realities of today, perhaps we can introduce an order to our lives that emphasizes sufficiency rather than abundance, co-operation instead of rugged individualism, and enlightened self-interest and confidence instead of materialism.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I listened to the address of the Lieutenant-Governor outlining our plans for action, and I look forward to our deliberations. I'm proud to be an Albertan.

Thank you, sir. [applause]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the newfound flexibility of my time period, and having regard for precedent, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion to adjourn, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is adopted.

[At 12:15 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

