

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, March 14, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Commonwealth Day

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw to the attention of hon. members — and I'm sure most of you are aware — that today, the second Monday in March, is Commonwealth Day. As far as I know, the only member of this Assembly, other than ministers, who has taken part in a plenary conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and is still serving in the Assembly is the hon. Member for Camrose. He and I have discussed the observance of this day and, if the House so approves, he has kindly agreed to read the message of Her Majesty for Commonwealth Day.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to bring the Commonwealth Day message, 1983, from Her Majesty the Queen, Head of the Commonwealth.

In the seven years since the second Monday in March was adopted as Commonwealth Day by all the independent nations of the Commonwealth, their number has grown from 35 to 47 and hundreds of thousands of young people have started, and indeed completed, their formal education.

It is worth reminding ourselves, therefore, that the day was chosen because it was likely to be a school day in every Commonwealth country. The choice reflected the desire of governments that their young people should learn about the Commonwealth and, once a year, should be given a special opportunity to think what it is all about.

First and foremost, it is about people, and particularly about the young. In many countries they make up nearly half the population. At its most spectacular and exhilarating it is about athletes such as I saw last year competing brilliantly in the unique atmosphere of the Commonwealth Games; at its most enchanting it is about the children who gave me such a welcome on my first visits to some of the island nations in the Pacific Ocean; but fundamentally it is concerned with all those who in their early years have to learn how best to meet the challenges of living in the world today.

This is why, through its youth program, its technical and professional programs and its work in the fields of health and education, the Commonwealth helps to tackle the problems of underemployment and undernourishment and to provide opportunities for millions of families to achieve the fulfilment in life which is their natural right.

The Commonwealth cannot of itself solve all the problems of the human race but as a worldwide community it works for peace and for the elimina-

tion of poverty. It does care about the lives of individual men, women and children. Through the ready sharing of ideas, experience, skills and resources between governments and between people in all walks of life it seeks year by year to enrich the world in which its young people are growing up.

Elizabeth R.

MR. SPEAKER: In addition to thanking the hon. Member for Camrose, it may be in order to recall that the Commonwealth of Nations has a special importance for us quite apart from other associations of nations because it consists of a group of nations which share our own traditions of parliamentary self-government, and also to recall the potential which the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has for all of us to enrich that sharing of parliamentary ideas with our colleagues in, for example, Australia, the United Kingdom, India, and other areas of the Commonwealth.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 15****Department of Transportation
Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 15, the Department of Transportation Amendment Act, 1983. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to increase the amount of the advances from the General Revenue Fund to the stock advance fund of the Department of Transportation.

[Leave granted; Bill 15 read a first time]

Bill 204**An Act to Amend the
Legislative Assembly Act**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move first reading of Bill 204, An Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

This Act would clear the criteria on which the Official Opposition and the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition may be designated in future Assemblies.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

Bill 14**Attorney General Statutes
Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 14, the Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1983.

This Bill would amend four statutes which are the responsibility of the Attorney General: the Alberta Evidence Act, in respect of the addition of school boards to the number of institutions which are not required to provide original documentary evidence in certain situations; the Arbitration Act, to establish a time during which a challenge to an arbitration board award must be

made in a superior court; the Court of Appeal Act, in order to provide for more than one registrar of the court; and the Fatality Inquiries Act, in order to enable the Attorney General to require fatality inquiries in certain circumstances to be reopened or reconvened and, further, to provide that in certain circumstances a fatality inquiry might be stayed in the light of investigation going on in respect of potential criminal offences.

[Leave granted; Bill 14 read a first time]

Bill 18
Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 18, the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1983. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the two major purposes of this Bill are as follows: firstly, to enable a transfer of all the income of the heritage fund to the General Revenue Fund from September 1, 1982, till August 31, 1984, a period of 24 months; and secondly, to enable the special heritage fund Act, which will be introduced shortly, to include a 15 per cent transfer of non-renewable natural resource revenues for 24 months, beginning April 1, 1983. These amendments, of course, relate to the September '82 announcement with regard to funding for the economic resurgence program, the interest rate programs, and to reduce the deficit.

[Leave granted; Bill 18 read a first time]

Bill 7
Department of Economic Development
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 7, the Department of Economic Development Amendment Act, 1983.

The main purpose of this amendment will be to allow the government to guarantee lease agreements and other obligations, in addition to the loans which the Act already permits.

[Leave granted; Bill 7 read a first time]

Bill 10
Rural Electrification Revolving Fund
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 10, the Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Amendment Act, 1983. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of this Bill is to increase the maximum funding available to the fund from the current \$45 million to the proposed \$55 million.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

Bill 11
Department of Utilities and Telephones
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 11, the Department of Utilities and Telephones Amendment Act, 1983.

This Bill will reflect the title and responsibilities of the minister and provide for the transfer of the administration of the water and sewer municipal grants program from the Department of the Environment.

[Leave granted; Bill 11 read a first time]

Bill 17
Health Occupations
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being the Health Occupations Amendment Act, 1983.

The Bill has two features. First, it provides that health professions and occupations may choose to give up particular legislation in favor of operating under the terms of the Health Occupations Amendment Act, 1983. And second, it identifies the first three health occupations to be designated in this province upon the recommendation of the Health Occupations Board. The three proposed for designation are emergency medical technicians: paramedics, respiratory technologists, and medical radiation technologists.

[Leave granted; Bill 17 read a first time]

Bill 3
Registered Music Teachers' Association
Repeal Act

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 3, the Registered Music Teachers' Association Repeal Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to repeal the 1982 Registered Music Teachers' Association Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 read a first time]

Bill 13
Water Resources Commission Act

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 13, the Water Resources Commission Act.

The primary purpose of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is to establish the Alberta Water Resources Commission. As hon. members may recall from the hon. Premier's announcement of the commission last December, the functions of the commission will include the review of long-term water resources planning by the government, the evaluation of short- and long-term water resource projects, the monitoring of related interprovincial negotiations, and advising the government with respect to water resource policy.

DR. BUCK: Good stuff, Bill. Henry needs the pension.

[Leave granted; Bill 13 read a first time]

Bill 21
Alberta Games Council
Amendment Act, 1983

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 21, the Alberta Games Council Amendment Act, 1983.

The purpose of the Bill is to establish an Alberta sports council and to expand the functions of the said council.

[Leave granted; Bill 21 read a first time]

Bill 8
Professional Statutes
Amendment Act, 1983

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 8, the Professional Statutes Amendment Act, 1983.

Alberta was the first province in Canada to permit medical doctors, dentists, chartered accountants, and lawyers to practise their professions using companies incorporated under the Companies Act. Responding to requests from these professions, this proposed legislation will remove the bar in the existing professional Acts and allow these professionals to incorporate under the new Business Corporations Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 8 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 8, the Professional Statutes Amendment Act, 1983, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 202, An Act to Amend the Blind Persons' Rights Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. If we might just get leave of the Assembly to revert.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**
(reversion)

Bill 202
An Act to Amend the
Blind Persons' Rights Act

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 202, An Act to Amend the Blind Persons' Rights Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide to persons dependent on hearing ear dogs the same rights as we previously provided for blind persons dependent on seeing eye dogs.

[Leave granted; Bill 202 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**
(continued)

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the annual report of the Alberta Opportunity Company for the year ended March 31, 1982. I should point out that copies of the annual report were sent to members on June 22, 1982, and copies will be made available to the new members.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table copies of the 1982 annual report of the Legal Aid Society of Alberta. Copies for all members are in the hands of the Clerk.

I would also like to table copies of the annual report of the Attorney General's Department for the year ended March 31, 1981. Copies were forwarded to members prior to the Assembly assembling, Mr. Speaker.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 1980-81 annual report for the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1982. Copies will be made available to all members of the Assembly.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file the annual report of the advisory committee on wilderness areas and ecological reserves for last year.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to table the 16th annual report of the Ombudsman of Alberta for the year 1982.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission for the year 1981-82.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you to the Assembly two special guests, young students from the Blackie school. Both are excellent honor students. As one of their rewards because of their hard work, they have been able to visit the Legislature. Wanda Lowrey and Aimee Willoughby are accompanied by Wanda's father. Would they stand and be recognized by the Legislature.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Hon. Tom Chambers, the Member for Edmonton Calder, I would like to introduce 58 grade 5 students from St. Lucy school. They are located in the members gallery and are accompanied by their group leader, Mr. Magliocco, and additional leaders Mrs. A. MacLeod and Mr. Arendt. I ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 10 students from the Mill Woods campus of Grant MacE-

wan Community College. They're here with their instructor Miss Powell, and they're studying political science. Would they please rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you to the members of the Assembly two people: Miss Rita Moir of Valhalla, B.C., who is a founding member of the *Images* women's magazine [collective], which is the oldest continuously publishing rural women's magazine in Canada; and Miss Wendy Hurst of Thrums, B.C., an instructor of geography, anthropology, and women's studies. I ask that they stand in the public gallery and be recognized.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Drayton Valley — well, you all had somebody else — it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you, 64 students in two classes from the St. Anthony school in Drayton Valley. They are here with their teachers Miss Rita Steele and Mr. Szatkowski and with parents Mrs. Olive Goertzen, Mrs. Betty Marchi, Mrs. Julie Strocher, Mrs. Muriel Hartley, Mrs. Toni Lord, Mrs. E. Vanden Oetelaar, and Mrs. D. Clark. They are in the public gallery, and I would like them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Oil Pricing

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. What process has the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission adopted to review changes in the international price of petroleum?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, let me respond by saying that in the aftermath of the determination in London today by the OPEC membership, in the weeks ahead we will be assessing the adherence to that arrangement that has been arrived at. So I suggest to the Assembly that it will be a period of some time within which we will be able to come to some conclusions with respect to world prices. If the member is looking for a more detailed response with respect to precise mechanisms, I would have to take such a question as notice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the last several days, has the minister held discussions with the chairman of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, and has that commission undertaken any consulting studies, beyond in-house studies, on the international pricing situation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I [confer] with the chairman of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission on a regular basis. I have no knowledge of any specific studies by consultants that have been contracted or undertaken through the auspices of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. The work that the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission is doing is on an on-going basis in assessing world prices and the implications and policy impact here in the province of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What discussions has the minister had with the chairman

of the marketing commission concerning the vulnerability of the Alberta producers' position in the Canadian market place should there be a dramatic fall in the price of oil, and particularly the problems of some of the producing countries; Mexico is a good example. What assessment has been made of the danger of the Canadian market place being flooded with cheap offshore oil?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, while the manner in which the hon. member has framed the question is not beyond the limits of this Assembly, in fact the substance of his question is somewhat hypothetical, given the accord that was arrived at today in London. That is of course assuming that that arrangement is adhered to.

Certainly there have been ongoing discussions with the chairman of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. However, I would suggest that given the Alberta/Ottawa energy agreement, under which there would be no rollback from the \$29.75 Canadian price unless we had the incidence of a dramatic fall in world price beyond that level, we anticipate no difficulties in that regard, provided that the accord in London is adhered to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister advising the Assembly today that in discussions with the federal government, it is the view of the federal government, as well as the provincial government — notwithstanding the \$29 American price set today, the federal government is of the view no rollback should occur?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the subject matter of the question was dealt with by the hon. Premier in his remarks in the Assembly last Friday, when he acknowledged that it wouldn't be appropriate to suggest that there were no difficulties whatsoever with that view, because in fact another interpretation of the agreement has been publicly stated. I would simply reiterate for the benefit of the House that Alberta is strongly of the view that there are no rollbacks, in accordance with the agreement.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Beyond wishful thinking, what specifics has the minister got to give the Assembly today to assure that there will be no rollbacks?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I simply encourage the hon. member to read the agreement.

MR. NOTLEY: I have. And I have also read further information which would lead one to be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what review has been given by the government to the impact of declining oil prices on the international scene for the last several months now on the feasibility of heavy oil development, in particular the Husky project?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that while the government has certainly been assessing the overall situation, in the absence of a determination of world oil pricing it's extremely difficult to postulate on the feasibility or otherwise of specific projects, be it the Husky project, which the member has alluded to, or any other projects which are being contemplated and considered. I simply say that with that accord in London having now been announced — and once it becomes clear as to

the adherence to that accord — certainly the would-be participants in such undertakings will now be in a position to assess the feasibility of those projects. There have been discussions involving the government and various industry proponents. Now that a pricing scenario is firming up, those participants will be better able to assess the feasibility of specific projects.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has there been any discussion between the minister, or any representative of the government of Alberta, and federal ministers — in particular Mr. Lumley, in view of his statements over the weekend — concerning the possibility of, if not megaprojects, at least significant investments in the heavy oil industry?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, no there has not.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What consideration has been given by the government to redefining new oil and seeking an adjustment of the agreement with Ottawa concerning the date at which new oil comes into play, which I believe was 1980, if my memory serves me correct. Has there been any discussion on that possibility?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as has been clearly stated by the Premier, the policy of this government with respect to the pricing of crude oil is a policy and a principle of market pricing, and that continues to be our principle and our long-term position. The fact of the matter is that on every occasion when it's appropriate, we have been working in conjunction with industry on encouraging the federal government to take whatever steps are positive in terms of reaching that goal of market pricing and world pricing. So it's fair to say that there have been representations on an ongoing basis by the provincial government to the federal government with respect to redefining classifications of oil and of our position of principle in favor of market pricing.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Further to the questions regarding continuity of demand, what information has the government obtained regarding the necessity of the refiners taking the nominations?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very important question, that of being able to determine, first of all, what surplus we may have to Canadian needs. Under the existing nomination system, there is no obligation for refineries to take what they nominate. As a result, we have been encouraging the federal government to work through the National Energy Board with our Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission to use the contract with the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission as the basis for the National Energy Board nomination and, in that way, encourage refiners to take what is nominated and, as well, be able to determine in advance what we may have by way of surplus in crude oil, the light and medium varieties in particular, and therefore be in a position to look for alternate sales in respect of [inaudible].

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer. It ties into this. We will be having a budget coming in. Is today's price going to be used for computing the budget?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the assumptions which will be made in the budget with respect to revenues will be in that document. I think it's important, because it's a complex and interrelated issue, that they all be set forth at once.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. With the price that was announced today, and saying that it holds, do you have a quick analysis as to whether this will add to our deficit?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that quick, off-the-cuff analyses are appropriate when dealing with important matters of public finance down the road.

MR. MARTIN: Yes or no, Lou?

Hydro-electric Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my second question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. Can he advise the Assembly what the position of the government of Alberta is with respect to several major hydro-electric proposals — one is the Slave and the other is the Dunvegan? Can any more definitive information be given, particularly with respect to Dunvegan, at this time?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, there was reference to both the Slave River proposal and the Dunvegan project in the Speech from the Throne. A more detailed explanation of financial considerations will have to await the budget, which will be brought down by the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What assessment has been made by the department of the relative merits of the power grid as opposed to major investment in hydro-electric development, particularly the Slave as opposed to the power grid?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member is referring to the proposed western electric power grid, which was under consideration for some time between the governments of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta. I draw to the hon. member's attention that in July of 1982, an agreement was reached in Calgary by the three ministers representing the three respective governments, that this matter would be put on hold for a period of two years and reviewed after that period of time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to outline to the Assembly at this stage whether it will be the minister's intention to table in the House at the earliest possible opportunity the costs of power from a western power grid, compared to the relative costs of power produced on the Slave?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to that question. First of all, with regard to studies which have been undertaken on the feasibility of a hydro-electric project on the Slave, a number of documents have been filed with the Legislature Library. On the second matter, with regard to the grid itself, Alberta does favor the release of information prepared on behalf of the three governments involved. Once the concurrence is obtained from the other governments involved, the material will be made public.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Since the announcement was made, I believe last summer, about the government's interest in the Slave project, what specific discussions have occurred between representatives of the government of Alberta and either of the two private power companies — or any power company, for that matter — concerning the proposed construction of a dam on the Slave?

MR. BOGLE: Since the announcement this past summer of the proposed hydro facility on the Slave River, Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of discussions with the private-sector companies in this province. I'll be pleased to go into those in some detail once the budget is brought down.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In view of the fact that in 1980 the Premier of the province himself announced the imminent, not construction but at least moving ahead on the Dunvegan dam proposal, what is now the holdup on Dunvegan, as outlined specifically by the Premier in April of 1980 of this House?

MR. BOGLE: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should refresh his memory by reading the Speech from the Throne. He'll see reference to that project and the fact that we will continue to examine its feasibility.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What are the obstacles, at this stage, to achieving the timetable the Premier so clearly set out in 1980?

MR. BOGLE: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, an issue on which I'll welcome questions from the hon. member once we get into the estimates on the various votes.

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

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

MR. NOTLEY: Is the minister in a position to tell the House whether or not there have been any subsequent discussions with the government of British Columbia, pending the last time this matter was discussed in the House, way back in April or May of last year?

MR. BOGLE: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker. Although I'm not aware of any recent discussions, I would like to check.

Drilling Activity in Alberta

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, with regard to drilling activity in the province. At the present time, it's at a seven-year low. I wonder if the minister could indicate what kind of initiatives or steps are going to be taken by government to try to increase that drilling activity, and whether the minister still feels as optimistic about the 1982 well servicing and drilling incentive program as he did just a few months ago.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, there's no question about the fact that the development drilling incentive and well servicing program was an effective program which

was fully subscribed to in the latter half of 1982.

In responding to the question, Mr. Speaker, I might mention to the Assembly that there are a number of initiatives the government has taken with respect to the oil and gas industry. As a matter of fact, just last Friday we were criticized, to some extent, for the magnitude of those endeavors. Without wanting to go into too many of the specifics, in addition to the oil and gas activity plan, which significantly reduced royalties and provided further incentives for exploration, we've got the exploration drilling incentive program, the geophysical incentive program, the Alberta PIP or petroleum incentives payment program, as well as an enriched royalty tax credit program. All in all, Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say — and the industry would concur — that the netback position in the province of Alberta is as favorable as anywhere on the North American continent.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the fact is that the level of drilling activity in Alberta far exceeds that activity in any other jurisdiction in Canada, notwithstanding some remarks made in this Assembly last Friday by one of the members of the opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I think we all recognize that oil and gas is in Alberta, and that's where the drilling should be. So comparing it to other provinces really doesn't mean anything.

Could the hon. minister indicate what steps will be taken to stop the continued decrease in active drilling wells in the field? Each day more drilling outfits are closing up shop and stopping. What is the minister doing specifically with regard to that deteriorating situation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the question, it should first of all be pointed out that there is little doubt that the development drilling and well servicing program to some extent caused a moving ahead of drilling activity back into late 1982, activity that would otherwise have occurred in the winter drilling season of 1983. That's simply a reality that has to be recognized.

I also point out that while there are rigs that are not working — and there's no question about that fact and the fact that it's of concern to us — if one looks at the most recent statistics for Canadian well completions, and specifically Alberta completions, the figures to date for 1983 are significantly ahead of well completions to this date in 1982. I draw that to the hon. member's attention.

We're closely monitoring the situation. We feel there is a reasonable system of incentives, a very rich system of incentives. If the hon. member is suggesting that the government should increase the size of the anticipated deficit by funnelling more dollars to the industry, then I would like him to make that specific representation.

DR. BUCK: Now you're speaking like a lawyer, John.

Petroleum Exports

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I clearly understand that there isn't any clear plan in the minister's mind or the government's. What specific steps is the minister taking to open up more U.S. markets for the export of surplus oil and gas, specifically gas?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, one of my priorities as minister, since having assumed the responsibilities of this

portfolio, has been with respect to the very important question of shut-in oil. In that regard, we have made strong representations to the federal government that they must adopt a different policy of allowing export of light and medium crude to the United States. As hon. members will recall, since approximately 1977 there has been a prohibition of exports of light and medium crude. Since our having made those representations, first of all back on December 20, 1982, the National Energy Board has announced that for the first time since 1977, they will permit and will receive applications for export into the U.S. market.

We believe there is additional work that still has to be done. One of the steps necessary was alluded to in the question by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, namely tightening up our nomination system so we have a good fix, a good reading, on what our exportable surplus will be months in advance — some three months in advance — so that we will have some time to arrange contracts in the United States. We're also pressing the federal government to have a more flexible pricing arrangement in terms of the price that can be fetched for our Canadian crude in the U.S. market, and also flexibility on the export tax calculation, to ensure that we are price competitive in the U.S. market.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister, with regard to natural gas. I understand that the price of natural gas into the United States from Canada is deteriorating our market continually. Could the minister indicate whether there are any steps with regard to that matter, such as letting some of the market forces dictate the price of gas rather than having this artificial price we have?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the member raises another very critical issue on the energy scene in the province at the present time. There's no question about the situation in the U.S. market, caused by essentially three factors: one, the economic downturn; secondly, some significant conservation; and thirdly, some substitution that has occurred from natural gas to other energy fuels.

With respect to dealing with that situation, on September 24 last year the Alberta government came forward with the initiatives document, which advocated a flexible approach to marketing as opposed to the rigid one-price arrangement that has been in place for some time now. Since that September 24 initiatives document, meetings with industry have been held, involving the provincial government and industry, to come forward with some very specific proposals to deal with a very delicate situation. In addition, there have been meetings involving the British Columbia government, the federal government, and Alberta government officials working along the same lines.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the subject of natural gas marketing in the United States has been a topic on the agenda of meetings of Mr. Chrétien, my federal counterpart, and myself. We are moving forward in this very delicate area and will continue to do so.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister indicate whether meetings have been arranged with Mr. Chrétien by the minister himself, whether the Premier will be meeting with the minister or the Prime Minister with regard to this subject during his present trip to Ottawa?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware whether or not the Premier intends to speak with the Prime Minister on this subject. With respect to my own involvement, I have now had four meetings with Mr. Chrétien, and I believe at each one of those meetings natural gas has been a topic. I expect there will be subsequent meetings in the weeks ahead.

Athabasca University Relocation

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate to the Assembly the status of the physical move of Athabasca University from Edmonton to Athabasca at this time. Is the process going ahead and, if so, can the minister indicate to the Assembly what that status is?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, two points. First of all, we have to complete the construction of the university before we can make the physical change, and that construction is proceeding.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I can see why he's not in Ottawa holding the Premier's hand. I guess he got demoted.

Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Look who got demoted, Walt. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: I see we've got a new bunch of Charlie McCarthys in here now, Dick.

Mr. Speaker, from his discussions with the staff association, can the minister indicate to the Assembly what percentage of the staff now in Edmonton will be going to the new facility?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to the Assembly if, in his discussions with the staff, he has made any arrangement to assist staff move when they are asked to move from Edmonton to Athabasca?

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker. A combination of government policies will work in that direction. First of all, as you well know, in anticipation of the decentralization of government services to Athabasca, we anticipated many needs that community would have. In particular, the need for human accommodation was established; the need for those kinds of facilities was put in place. In that sense, we anticipated and clearly moved as a result of the decision to decentralize Athabasca University. At the same time, those people who do not wish to make that transition obviously will have some consultative processes with the government, in terms of job relocation. Those are only two of the key items which will be worked upon. Naturally the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation is available to provide housing. All these other services, which are a combination of policies, will be available to those people moving to Athabasca.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate the status of the construction of the projects in the town of Athabasca to house Athabasca University?

MR. JOHNSTON: I would have to refer that question. I can't give an update in terms of housing specifically.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, not the question of housing but the facilities that will be used for the university itself.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be more appropriate during the estimates, when we talk about capital expenditures on behalf of the Department of Advanced Education. At that point, I'd be prepared to give some percentage judgment with respect to how far that project is. I think it would be appropriate to leave it to that time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if he or anyone in his department has had consultation or meetings with the people in the area as to the availability of local people being involved in the construction of the project? Can the minister give this Assembly assurance that that factor will be considered?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the MLA from that area has made major contacts with various members of government to ensure that the government services, the kinds of activities which governments are normally involved in with such a substantial move of this type, are being properly effected.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister indicate if he has had any discussions with his colleague the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, or if his confrere the chairman of the Northern Alberta Development Council can meet with unions that will be involved in the construction, to assure local people that they can participate in the construction projects?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm not too sure if that's a question or a speculation, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask clarification of the question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any discussion with his colleague the chairman of the Northern Alberta Development Council, who publicly stated that local people should have preference, in consultation with unions? Has the minister done that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd imagine that would be a discussion between the Minister of Labour or another minister responsible — perhaps Public Works, Supply and Services — as opposed to my discussion with the chairman of the northern development committee.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for the building and supervision of these facilities, will the minister consult with his colleagues so that the people in the local area will be assured of participation in the projects?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have always operated on the principle of an appointed board of governors, and those governors have the responsibility for carrying out the kind of function you talk about. We believe in the autonomy of those boards, and we respect their judgment in these matters. Frankly, I think it should be up to them to ensure that that does take place. Moreover, I can assure you that given the demand for skilled work in that area, I would imagine that those people who are resident

in that area would have a natural preference. That in itself should be enough to ensure their participation in that contract.

DR. BUCK: In other words, what he's saying is he doesn't care.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Mandatory Comprehensive Examinations

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education, and it concerns the mandatory comprehensive examinations announced in the throne speech the other day. When he talks about meeting with various groups and revising the policy regarding this, could the minister advise the Assembly if one of those groups would be the Alberta School Trustees' Association?

MR. KING: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. A week or two ago, the two members for Lethbridge met with school boards, and there was a very high degree of interest shown, not in a very positive way. Could I have the assurance of the Minister of Education that indeed he will meet with school boards throughout the province, but specifically with the Lethbridge school boards?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I stand ready to meet with any school board at any time that is mutually convenient to us. I have had no request from a Lethbridge school board for such a meeting. If they're interested in it, I'm prepared to do it.

Job Creation

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Manpower. Has the minister had an opportunity to study the proposals for job creation that the city of Edmonton presented to him on February 2? I have it here.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. MARTIN: A good answer.

MR. NOTLEY: What are you going to do about it, Ernie?

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the intention of the government to proceed with all the projects presented by the city, or some of the projects presented by the city?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I might point out that currently we're involved in a number of job creation programs. The priority employment program has already been mentioned in the House. The new employment expansion and development program, which is a federal/provincial program, is in the process of getting initial projects approved. That's about a \$22.5 million program. [interjections] We're currently looking at the summer temporary employment program. Those announcements will be made in due course. The suggestions from the city of Edmonton, with many other suggestions, went into our

assessment of job creation this summer and into the future.

I again remind the member in the House of the statements made by the hon. Premier on Friday, which you can read in *Hansard*, and that is that this government, although very concerned with employment levels, cannot itself, or even with the co-operation of the federal government, solve the problem. We can minimize some of the impact, but the problem is going to be addressed and solved when we get our private sector moving again.

MR. MARTIN: I take it the answer is no.

I ask a policy question of the minister. They talk about job creation projects that have a high labor content and a short lead time, and use the example of LRT. Is the government prepared to look into that as a matter of policy?

MR. ISLEY: I suggest your question of policy with respect to LRT should probably be directed to my colleague the Minister of Transportation. With respect to your initial suggestion that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the minister please use the ordinary parliamentary form.

MR. ISLEY: I'm sorry.

I think the original suggestion that that type of work is highly labor intensive and low in capital is open to debate.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is it the intention of the government to release any special funds for municipal job creation anywhere in the province?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to that question will have to wait till after the budget debate and the supplementary estimates.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is the government planning to do anything for the 136,000 unemployed in the province, other than the token measures already mentioned in the throne speech?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. member, and again to remind the House, I believe the government has under way some rather dramatic programs to address the employment situation in this province. For the new member's benefit, I would remind him of very substantive capital works projects that this government has been carrying on over the past two years. I would remind him of the Alberta Transportation winter works program, which put a lot of trucks and equipment to work during this current winter.

I would remind him of a greatly increased priority employment program to the tune of \$26.4 million, which is under way at the moment, and our matching participation with the federal government in the new employment expansion and development program which is currently going into place and will accept projects that can run until June 1984. I would also remind him of the senior citizens' home improvement program, which is having a very positive impact on putting a number of carpenters, plumbers, carpetlayers, et cetera, to work.

So I would have to say, in answer to the question, that so far I believe the government has made some rather dramatic moves in addressing the problems of employ-

ment levels, and again remind the hon. member that government is not going to solve the problem on its own. We need to build some confidence back into our private sector.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the 136,000 unemployed will be glad to know.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is a question, could it please be revealed.

MR. MARTIN: Let me phrase it in a different way. Can the minister advise of a single permanent job, other than his own, that has been created since his department has been created?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Glenarry, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The minister, the government, and the Premier finally found free enterprise again, which is nice to hear. My question to the hon. minister is in building the confidence . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I want to ask the question.

MR. SPEAKER: If we're going to deal with this matter further — I didn't anticipate that the hon. minister wanted to deal with that last sally, but perhaps he does. Since it got by the Speaker, it would be less than fair if the minister didn't have an opportunity to deal with it.

MR. ISLEY: I would remind the hon. member that the priority employment program in itself created 10,935 jobs over the last three months. I would suggest that many of those jobs are probably being enjoyed by his constituents, if he would check.

MR. SPEAKER: Could I ask if this might be the final supplementary as well — or just about the final supplementary on this topic — since there are two other hon. members who'd like to be recognized before the time runs out.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question then is requesting the minister to give some concrete steps as to the type of incentives that are being provided to the private sector of this province to provide jobs. In his new responsibility, what steps is he taking to give encouragement to the private sector for that production?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, with respect to what the Department of Manpower is doing specifically to encourage . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'm not talking about handouts.

MR. ISLEY: No, I'm not either. Under the priority employment program . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's a handout.

MR. ISLEY: ... we worked jointly with the private sector in creating jobs on a matching, dollar-for-dollar basis. The types of applications given approval were those that we hope will move into full-time permanent positions. We also had a very extensive industrial training program which the private sector responded to very positively to the tune of 4,000 applications, to upgrade employees, maintain higher levels in their particular companies, and so on. I'm not sure, but I gather by the comments that that isn't the kind of answer you were looking for. I would remind you that on Motion 204 on the Order Paper, I will be very glad to sit and listen to you gentlemen give us all the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. minister kindly lapse into the ordinary parliamentary form.

Environmental Litigation

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the Minister of the Environment, and I'd like to ask some questions relating to the Suncor prosecution last year. Could the hon. minister tell us how the choice of prosecutor for that case was arrived at, how the department selected that individual?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the choice of Crown prosecutors is at the direction of the Attorney General. He may wish to supplement the answer.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to. The prosecutor in at least a number — and there are quite a series of charges, some of which have not yet been finally disposed of and would therefore not be a matter that we would speak of in respect to the charges themselves. But with respect to the prosecutor, staff of the Attorney General's Department, operating within guidelines of their employment, are employed in all prosecutions.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Environmental law is a very complex body of law. Has there been some thought given to trying to develop a body of expertise within either the Department of the Environment or the Attorney General's office so that, in future, prosecutions can be handled by staff who've developed some competence or special skills in this area?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, that has been undertaken, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. I would not say it was apparent from the progress of the prosecutions that members of the department lacked in skill, ability, or experience in respect of the work undertaken. Even so, there has been some additional planning, which has already proceeded beyond the planning point to the implementation point, to acquire a higher degree of expertness in this particular field. We've acted on that.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the Department of the Environment's organization chart, there is a slot designated for departmental solicitor, if you like. That position has been unfilled for about three years now. Has there been some thought given to assigning a member of the Attorney General's staff to work, much like a public affairs officer, in conjunction with the department on a day-to-day basis, preparing prosecutions and also helping the staff develop an attitude toward enforcement, instead of consultation or simply holding

the hands of some of the companies, as we've done in the past.

MR. NOTLEY: Good point, Rollie.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, once again, in most areas of the law, whether it be in civil or criminal law, over the period of the last two or three years the department has developed teams of lawyers who work in specific areas of expertness. I don't know about any vacancies in the Department of the Environment. Legal services to all departments are handled by people that, with perhaps a very, very few exceptions, are on the staff of the Attorney General.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This question will be directed back to the Minister of the Environment. What kind of back-up was given to the prosecutors for this particular case? I'm particularly interested in contrasting the level of back-up with the Mannix prosecution, where a lot of departmental staff were assigned to that prosecution. How many staff were seconded to the Suncor prosecution? What kinds of staff were they? What levels of expertise did they have to bring to the prosecution.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, as he goes on with a question that asks for that much detail, it seems he's getting closer and closer to qualifying for the Order Paper.

MR. COOK: I will put that on the Order Paper. But one last question: what is the department's philosophy on enforcement? How many prosecutions have there been, vis à vis infractions of the law? How do we handle, on a normal case basis, trying to enforce departmental standards and regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member's question includes how many prosecutions there have been, perhaps we should deal with this on the Order Paper.

We have just barely enough time for one further member, the hon. Member for Calgary Currie.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time and the depth of the question before me, I'll await tomorrow's question period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[Members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1984, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to section 6(1)(a) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta but which will not by their nature yield

a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums, not otherwise provided for, required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1983, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to Section 6(1)(a) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta but which will not by their nature yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the Assembly adopt the following amendment to *Standing Orders*, to be effective until the prorogation of the Fourth Session of the 20th Legislature:

1. Standing Order 8 is amended by striking out suborders (2) and (3) and substituting the following:
 - (2) (a) The order of business for the consideration of the Assembly on Tuesday afternoon shall be as follows:
 - Written Questions
 - Motions for Returns
 - Government Designated Business
 - Motions other than Government Motions
 - Private Bills
 - Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders
 - Government Motions
 - Government Bills and Orders
 - (b) When Government Designated Business is called, the Assembly shall consider any item of business that the Government Whip has designated, by written notice to the Clerk prior to 12 noon on the previous Friday, from those items on the Order Paper for that Friday under Motions other than Government Motions, Government Bills and Orders, or Government Motions, which may be followed by any other government business.
 - (c) The Clerk shall cause any designation pursuant to clause (b) to be printed in Votes and Proceedings for that Friday.
 - (d) A motion that has been designated under this suborder may not be designated a second time.
 - (e) Debate on Government Designated Business shall not continue for more than one hour.
- (3) (a) The order of business for the consideration of the Assembly on Thursday afternoon shall be as follows.
 - Written Questions
 - Motions for Returns
 - Motions other than Government Motions
 - Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders
 - Government Motions
 - Government Bills and Orders
- (b) On Thursday when Motions other than Government Motions is called, the Assembly shall consider the next such motion on the Order Paper unless the Leader of the Opposition has designated, by written notice to the Clerk prior to 4 p.m. on the previous Monday, a motion from those set down by other than government members on the Order Paper for that Monday under Motions other than Government Mo-

tions, in which case the Assembly shall consider that motion first.

- (c) The Clerk shall cause any motion designated pursuant to clause (b) to be printed in Votes and Proceedings for that Monday.
- (d) A motion that has been designated under this suborder may not be designated a second time.
- (e) Debate on Motions other than Government Motions shall conclude at 4:30 p.m.
- (f) At 4:30 p.m., Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders shall be called, and debate thereon shall be governed by the standing orders that are applicable to private members' motions.

2. The following standing order is added after Standing Order 36:

36.1 Notwithstanding any established precedent to the contrary, a member not being a government member may have two notices of motion in that member's name on the Order paper at the same time.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this motion would provide for the temporary *Standing Orders* that are familiar to numbers of hon. members who've been members of the last Assembly. The changes propose amendments for the term of this Legislature in respect of subsections 2 and 3 of Standing Order No. 8. What is achieved is that it introduces the idea of government designated business being a specific item for Tuesdays and clarifies the way in which that can be designated. It provides a designation opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition in respect of the resolutions debated on Thursdays and, by the addition of Standing Order 36.1, it allows members of the opposition to have two notices of motion on the Order Paper at the same time, something that is not possible without an amendment of that type.

Mr. Speaker, I think the opportunity is always before us to consider other changes to the rules. Getting a new Assembly under way may provide the opportunity that all members would welcome: in committee some time during this spring, to look at what other possible changes could be made. I hope that will be possible to do. In the result, I think it is wise to proceed with re-establishing the familiar standing orders 8 and 36.1 in the form, as I've indicated, that many hon. members are quite familiar with.

[Motion carried]

2. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that pursuant to Standing Order 50, Frank P. Appleby, Member for Athabasca, be elected as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

[Motion carried]

3. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that pursuant to Standing Order 50, William F. Purdy, Member for Stony Plain, be elected as Deputy Chairman of Committees.

[Motion carried]

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.

[Adjourned debate March 11: Mr. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate this afternoon, first of all, to congratulate you, sir, on your re-election as Speaker of the Assembly, and to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. Member for Grande Prairie and the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a couple of observations about the constituency of Spirit River-Fairview before joining in the debate on issues that I think are relevant to the province as a whole. But there are some particular issues in the constituency that has been kind enough to send me to the Legislative Assembly.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was pleased today to accompany the hon. Minister of Housing on a new air schedule that goes from Grande Prairie to Fairview to Peace River to High Prairie to Slave Lake and to Edmonton. Wapiti is not exactly international airways, but it is an excellent service and, incidentally, one of those unusual circumstances where, regardless of our political affiliation, members can work together. For the last year, all five members of the Peace worked very closely in helping to facilitate that particular service. So this morning was the first run. It wasn't a champagne run. I think both the Minister of Housing and I are in good form without any help from a champagne run. It's a long run, but it is nevertheless an important addition to northern Alberta service.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the major areas of concern that is particularly important in northern Alberta is the question of roads. In no area of the province is there a stronger case for expanded road commitments. We had all kinds of money spent on roads all over the province last year. I listened with interest to the hon. Minister of Manpower talk about these programs. Of course, these were programs announced so generously before the election, and I guess the test will be whether or not we're going to have the same kind of commitment to our transportation program after the election. Rural Albertans will be looking with great interest on the highway program announced for 1983-84, but nowhere with greater interest than in the north Peace where roads are a very serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, last fall during the election campaign, the Premier was in a very optimistic mood. According to the Premier, we had turned the corner; we were on the road to economic recovery. In those sunny days of October, as Conservative candidates scampered from one door to the other bringing people the good news, indeed it may have looked to some Albertans that perhaps the sun was going to shine forever on the Alberta economy.

Unfortunately, through skilful campaigning before the onslaught of economic difficulties, the government was

re-elected handily. But we now find record unemployment. We see that the concerns of many people, expressed as long as a year ago, about the international oil outlook in fact were correct and perhaps even a more gloomy result than the predictions suggested. We find that the forestry industry, notwithstanding the decision of the United States the other day, is in a very sluggish state at this point in time. There is no question, when one travels the province, that the concern in our agricultural community about the future of the most basic industry in our province is a matter of real trouble to every farmer, particularly younger farmers who find themselves heavily in debt.

When one sees the huge turnouts at meetings of cattle producers, for example, requesting a stabilization program, when one sees the growing interest in a matter that I'm going to debate a little later at greater length — the question of the Crow rate and transportation costs — there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there is a good deal of concern among farmers over, at best, sluggish prices and in some cases declining prices on one hand and higher costs, costs that in some respects this government has at least a capacity to deal with. For example, last summer I remember we had a meeting in our little municipality of some several hundred people, and the major concern at that meeting was school requisitions, because the school board had to increase the requisition. Why did they have to increase the requisition, Mr. Speaker? Because this government is not properly funding education in an equitable manner.

Throughout rural Alberta, wherever I travel in the province, I have farmers coming to me and saying: one of the areas that we can deal with as a province in terms of costs is this question of requisitions. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I note that not only does it look rather gloomy that this government is going to do anything about properly funding education, but we have the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care flying new balloons, kites, or whatever he flies on a regular basis, that we have to have some kind of user-pay system in the hospitals, or perhaps a requisition there. So the farmer who faces higher requisitions than ever before to finance schools for his children may this year find that he has to pay five, six, or who knows how many mills in order to pick up the hospital costs, because this government doesn't want to properly fund its share of some of the basic social services which in 1971, with all kinds of piety — but let me say, I thought at the time at least some conviction — the government said, when they sought office in that election, that they were going to assume the cost of education, health, and social services. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that as more and more of this is shuffled on local taxpayers — this is particularly difficult for the small business man and devastating to the farmer who finds himself in the cost-price squeeze.

Beyond the matters that I've talked about, we have to look at the grim statistics that exist in this province: 136,000 people out of work. We have, of course, the theory of some that if we provide incentives to large companies, the trickle-down theory will work; that as the rich and powerful become richer and more powerful, somehow there is going to be a recovery: Reaganomics. Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem with Reaganomics is that supply-side economics, whether practised by Margaret Thatcher, President Reagan, or the federal Liberal government, really doesn't work. The problem is, as most people know, if you are going to sell something, you have to have a market. That market is, at least in large part, a domestic market. The price of unemployment is that you

shrink the domestic market and make it impossible to sell goods and services to the people who are your most natural clientele.

In the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, Franklin Roosevelt said that we know that heedless self-interest is bad morality. We now know that it is also bad economics. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen in the western world for the last two or three years has been an effort to try to fight inflation by cutting government programs, by throwing people out of work, in the hope that the whole system is gradually going to right itself. But the problem, as is obvious as one looks at the industrialized economies, is that the system simply isn't working.

The other day in question period my colleague and I raised the issue of the bishops' statement. I know that some people — and I was sorry to see the Premier suggest that somehow he didn't think this was a very practical document — have said, the document from the bishops is not very workable. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that long after the people of Alberta have forgotten most of us who sit in this Legislature today, this particular document is going to be a major work the people will study in the years ahead.

There are times when people of moral conviction can have an impact far greater than might be apparent at the time. Members of this Legislature who have gone to see the movie *Ghandi* could not help but be moved by the tremendous impact of that man and his life. Yet people during his entire life said: you're not a very practical individual; you don't know what you're doing; you haven't crossed your t's and dotted your i's in the right place. For those of us who are in the House today — some of the members of my age category, I suppose — the battle for civil rights in the United States, led by the late Dr. Martin Luther King, is another example of moral leadership. People would say, but he's not very practical. Yet, Mr. Speaker, who could argue for a moment that the world has not been fundamentally changed because of the life of these two very key people in the history of our world?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that contained in the Catholic bishops' document there is a tremendous amount of common sense. No matter how we may dismiss the conclusions with sophistry or whatever, the fact of the matter is that the observations they bring to the attention of the people of Canada must be assessed by members, not only in the federal House of Commons but also in provincial legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'll just summarize five points.

First, unemployment rather than inflation, should be recognized as the number one problem to be tackled in overcoming the present crisis.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, that makes sense, not only from the standpoint of the gross provincial product and all the goods and services and even the tax revenue that is lost by having serious unemployment, but there is the human toll of serious long-term unemployment.

Secondly, they suggest:

... an industrial strategy should be developed to create permanent and meaningful jobs for people in local communities.

Third, a more balanced and equitable program should be developed for reducing and stemming the rate of inflation. This requires shifting the burden for wage controls to upper income earners and introducing controls on prices and new forms of taxes on investment income ...

Fourth, greater emphasis should be given to the

goal of social responsibility in the current recession. This means that every effort must be made to curtail cut-backs in social services ...

Fifth, labour unions should be asked to play a more decisive and responsible role in developing strategies for economic recovery and employment. This requires the restoration of collective bargaining rights where they have been suspended, collaboration between unions and the unemployed and unorganized workers, and assurances that labour unions will have an effective role in developing economic policies.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the record of this government against those five assertions contained in the bishops' report. "Unemployment rather than inflation": at best, we have the Minister of Manpower telling us today that apart from programs that were announced before the last election campaign, when unemployment was much, much lower, and a hope that somehow the private sector is going to put us back on the road to recovery, and apart from funds which are largely transferred from that hated Ottawa government, quite frankly there seems to be very little in this Speech from the Throne which is in fact going to mean jobs now for the 136,000 people out of work.

Let's look at the question of an industrial strategy. Mr. Speaker, that's one of the worst jokes one could come up with now. I remember 16 or 17 years ago, in 1966, when Mr. Lougheed was not even a member of the Legislature but was the leader of the Conservative Party. He went down to Pincher Creek; there was a by-election that year. We're told that the Premier learned a good deal in that by-election about campaigning. In any event, one of the speeches that the now Premier made was an excellent address in which he warned about the overdependence of the then Social Credit government on non-renewable resources. At that time, 40 per cent of our income came from oil and natural gas sales. Mr. Lougheed thought that was a terrible situation: we've got to diversify the economy. In 1974 the same person, this time Premier of the province, said we have a decade in order to diversify the economy. Today, Mr. Speaker, we observe a Speech from the Throne in which the dream of diversification has been set aside. It would appear that diversification is no longer any major goal of this government. So the second objective of the bishops is set aside.

"Third, a more balanced and equitable program should be developed for reducing and stemming the rate of inflation." This means shifting the burden to upper-income people. Mr. Speaker, while we have all kinds of new unemployed, we have an incredible array of people who have entered the blissful heaven of government patronage appointments since the election: former bag people, former organizers, all joining the new hallelujah chorus; comfortably off paid for by the taxpayers of Alberta. Is this the way to meet the objective of this third approach? Mr. Speaker, that really is a rather interesting response.

"Fourth, greater emphasis should be given to the goal of social responsibility." This means dealing with the issue of providing basic services for people. Instead, what we see in this province is one example after another of cutbacks. I don't know if a day goes by that someone from a school board, a community health organization, or any group dealing with people problems doesn't write a letter or call one of the four of us and say: we're facing real problems because of cutbacks. The Premier can say, with all kinds of fanfare, that a 5 or 6 per cent increase is not a cutback. But if the rate of inflation, the cost of

utilities, and the cost of services are going up by greater than that amount, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that local people who are given the responsibility of providing the service have no choice but to see a cutback. So the fourth objective of the bishops is being set aside by this government.

Finally, "labour unions should be asked to play a more decisive and responsible role." Mr. Speaker, we hear we're going to be dealing with fundamental changes in the arbitration system because the government doesn't like the way the arbitrators played by the rules this government set. Rather than working hand in hand with the trade union movement to put Alberta back on the road to economic recovery, it would appear to me that we are doing exactly the opposite in this province and creating the whole atmosphere of confrontation which really will not help in putting this province back on the road to prosperity.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bishops' report has been set aside by the front and middle benches across the way. Diversification, the dream of the Tory party in opposition, has been abandoned. We have, instead, an interesting approach of double standards. Friday, when I raised the question of performance guarantees on a very, very expensive program, the Premier in indignation suggested that somehow that would be shackling the freedom of the oil industry. This was the party that proudly talked about all the restraints we were going to put on little people. This is the party that is going to change the arbitration process where we don't even have free collective bargaining. We're going to shackle even more the system of arbitration; we can have all kinds of rules there. This is the party that apparently doesn't like bureaucracy when it comes to oil companies but is in favor of the most ridiculous, half-baked program, the Pepin plan, which is going to have 150,000 cheques sent out to individual producers in a bureaucratic foul-up that I can imagine will defy description by the time it's worked out. But we'll get to that in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting to see the double standards. Why should we have some kind of reasonable performance guarantees for the oil industry programs in this province? The first why is that over the next four years, the economic resurgence program is going to cost \$5.5 billion, a \$5.5 billion program without any clear-cut set of definitions as to what the money is going to be used for or performance guarantees to ensure that Alberta money is in fact used right here in this province. That's a little rich for our blood, especially when we find ourselves facing, for the first time, a very serious provincial deficit.

Mr. Speaker, all one has to do is look at the figures — not figures compiled by the New Democratic Party, by the nasty Liberal government in Ottawa, or even by the Independents, but figures compiled in *oilweek*. I don't think anyone would suggest that *oilweek* is somehow a socialist magazine that has been taken over by crypto-communists. It's the kind of magazine I'm sure every Tory could read comfortably. You look at the facts and find that as each year goes by, but particularly in the last two years, the difference between the revenues of the industry and the expenditures in Alberta has grown greater. More money is being taken out of this province than is being ploughed back in. Despite what the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources may like to suggest, or the Premier on Friday, that isn't the situation right across the board. While things aren't going so well in Alberta, if you look at Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Manitoba and, most important of all, northern

Canada, you find that exactly the opposite is true.

What's happening, Mr. Speaker? Because of programs that are in place — federal incentive programs in part, without doubt — money is being shifted away from Alberta to other parts of the country, particularly to northern Canada. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is not unreasonable that if the taxpayers of Alberta are going to have to forego or, in the case of direct subsidies under this program, dig up some \$5.5 billion over four years, between concessions of one kind or another or direct money, it is not unreasonable to say to the industry that there must be reasonable performance guarantees that that money be spent in Alberta. What's wrong with that? Even the government members are saying that the railroads have to live with performance guarantees. And you bet they should live with performance guarantees if we're going to make any changes in freight rates in this country.

But, Mr. Speaker, if that's true of the railroads, why is not also true of the energy industry? I just don't accept the proposition that what one might described as this kind of continual, massive, corporate free lunch should go on without being challenged. My colleague and I, particularly during the course of the estimates of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources this year, will be quizzing that minister in some detail over the entire economic resurgence program as it applies to the industry, and asking where reasonable guarantees can be incorporated in that program. Over the last year, I've met with a number of people in the energy industry, and they aren't as upset about performance guarantees as the members of this House. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the people of Alberta have to look at perhaps the largest deficit in the history of our province, it isn't good enough for this government to say, we won't bring in performance guarantees — even suggesting that is an evil, bureaucratic, Alberta version of the national energy program. That kind of name-calling isn't going to answer the simple question that if we are going to make available billions of dollars, then we have a responsibility as the guardians of the public trust in this province to ensure that that money makes its way to achieve the purpose for which it was designed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word or two about the energy agreement, because there is certainly no doubt at all that this government got itself into what one must describe as a completely ridiculous situation in 1981. When the Premier has to stand in his place and admit that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources had apparently not advised him of an agreement over what would happen if prices drop, that is really quite mind-boggling. This is a government that claims that it's businesslike; this is a government that's proud of its corporate competence. But how could one be proud of that kind of massive breakdown in communication?

Three years ago, the now Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications got into something of a controversy over the then minister's department. One of the major issues in that controversy was communication within the department, and rightly so. This Legislature even debated a motion to reduce the minister's salary because of the failure of communication within the department. Are we as members of the Legislature to sit back and accept at face value the proposition: shucks, nobody told me? Are we to accept at face value that the government of Alberta went down and signed an agreement in 1981 and didn't take into account the possibility that prices could drop?

In 1973 I remember the then member from Wetaski-

win, the hon. Jim Henderson, who at that time was an Independent, standing in the Legislature and saying, the day will come when prices drop. Are we to suggest that this government is so unmindful of what was going on in the world that in 1981 when the federal government knew what the fine print was, a major admission as to what would happen if prices dropped was not brought to the Premier's attention? What kind of way is that to run a government? Mr. Speaker, I say with great respect that that is not any demonstration of competence at all.

We have some real problems now. The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources can try to put a sunny side on this issue, but he hopes that the OPEC price will stick. You bet he probably hopes the OPEC price will stick. But what happens if it doesn't? What are the contingency plans? Are we to presume that other Canadians — and we don't have to single out one political party, all three political parties — if prices drop dramatically in the world oil market, will not flood the eastern Canadian market with oil from Venezuela, Mexico, or other producing countries. With a surplus of oil in the world, if that price begins to drop, the bargaining power of this province in dealing with Ottawa is extremely weak. The members in the House know that, basically, whatever fine point we may wish to point on the agreement. The Premier interprets it one way; federal politicians of all parties will quickly interpret it another way. The fact of the matter is that the reality of the world economic market place will jeopardize our position.

I remember standing alone in the Legislature in 1980 and voting against cutbacks. One of the concerns I expressed at the time was if we cut back oil when there was a scarcity in the world, what kind of environment are we going to be creating when there is a surplus? Mr. Speaker, this government is going to find that all the bravado of 1980 will be very, very hard to put to work in the concrete, difficult challenge of negotiating oil prices over the next year.

I want to deal with another issue that may at first not seem related but in my view is rather fundamentally related. That is the question of western transportation and the Crow rate in particular. Let me first of all tell members of the House why I think there is a clear relationship. The position of the New Democratic Party of Alberta has always been that, in a nation like Canada, there have to be trade-offs. If we were going to shield energy prices at a time during most of the last decade when prices were moving up — whether that shielding is 75 per cent, 70 per cent, or whatever the final figure may be — it's not unreasonable that we should expect a trade-off in return, a *quid pro quo*, if you like. The fact of the matter is that in 1977 we had our opportunity to seize a *quid pro quo*. It was the report of the Hall royal commission on western transportation. For years, western politicians had talked about freight rates and tariffs, and it was such a general discussion. I remember the discussion in 1973 at the premiers' conference with Prime Minister Trudeau. It was really so general as to be almost meaningless because the federal government could look at the western politicians and say: if you're talking about freight rates, what do you mean by freight rates; what kind of mechanism are you going to bring in that would allow lower freight rates?

In 1977, after the most comprehensive review of western transportation in the history of the country, Mr. Justice Hall came in with a proposal which would have given us the basis for a new national policy. That was that we extend the Crow rate to everything that is produced from grain so that some of the so-called prob-

lem barriers that the Crow rate on export grain and agricultural processing caused could be eliminated. It was a good proposal, Mr. Speaker. It would have been an expensive proposal. It would have cost all Canadians a lot of money — no question about that — but it would have been the basis of a trade-off: shielding energy prices in return for an historic agreement on getting our products to market at a competitive price. I have no quarrel with the theory behind that. One looks at the tremendous subsidies we have in our airport system, the St. Lawrence Seaway. We look at our competitors elsewhere in the world: the great Mississippi River system in the United States which reduces the cost of getting American grain to market; the fact that Australian grain is grown just a few miles from the coast; in Argentina no freight rates at all, it's considered part of the national approach to get grain to market in that country.

Here was a possibility of a trade-off, but we chose not to pursue it. Mr. Speaker, now that we are losing our competitive position on oil, as oil prices begin to falter and we see a growing surplus in the world, we have the staggering possibility of this government being accomplices — if you can believe it — in throwing away the one little card we still have: the Crow rate. I would say to members of the House, even if you're the most militant free enterpriser there is, I would ask you whether or not it is wise to throw this card away.

Mr. Pepin, who is a very charming man, can charm anybody into thinking almost anything. And I think he's used his charm and skill with great ability in dealing with ministers of this government. In any event, he says: don't worry; we'll just make a few changes in the system, be much better for everybody; why, the railroads are going to improve the system; you'll have all kinds of agricultural processing in the west, and it will just be great. Of course there are a number of unanswered questions about Mr. Pepin's plan. The first that I would think this province, that is concerned about provincial rights, should be asking itself is: why did we sit silent when the federal government began the approach on the Pepin plan and deliberately by-passed the western provincial governments? We all know that if the Crow rate goes and there are major changes in the western transportation rail system, somebody has to pick up the costs. Who is the somebody? It's going to be the ministers of transportation in the three prairie governments. But they weren't asked to be part of this whole process — totally left out.

We have member after member, including rural members, who would rise in righteous indignation about being left out of energy discussions, about federal unilateral action on energy. I agree with them, because co-operative federalism means that the federal government has to work co-operatively with the provinces. But on this issue of the Magna Carta, if you like, of western transportation, all of a sudden our rural members in particular are silent, lost their voices. No protests here. Well, Mr. Speaker, I really wonder how credible that is.

Then we have the proposal itself: the Gilson report and then the proposal that Mr. Pepin has come up with. Half of the money is going to be paid to the farmers. All one has to do is read the Hall commission report. It dismisses that proposal in one sentence and says it would be a bureaucratic mess, really little more than a joke. The idea of 150,000 cheques going out is the most monstrous suggestion. I understand it's going to be based on some form of acreage payments related to crop insurance figures, that the price is going to range from \$5.60 an acre in the areas where elevators are close together, to as low as

\$1.50 or \$1.70 an acre. Guess where that will be: northern Alberta areas. I wonder where our northern Alberta MLAs are standing on this question of acreage payments.

I'm told that Mr. Pepin has come in and said, we'll come in with a little system here and try to equalize it a bit. But I understand it's not going to equalize it totally, Mr. Speaker. So farmers who already have to haul their grain further are going to get a smaller acreage payment. But you can imagine the potential for bureaucratic foul-ups and problems when you bring in a system that is based on acreage, taking in crop insurance figures as the basis of computing what a farmer receives. The basic argument of the pools and others is that if you are going to provide a subsidy, you pay it directly to the railroad so that you can insist on performance guarantees. If they don't bring in the changes they promised, they don't get the subsidy. What ability do 150,000 permit holders really have to bargain with Jack Horner and the CN or the president of the CPR. Really, Mr. Speaker, the idea is so silly, so completely absurd, that one wonders how this kind of argument could even float at all.

Another aspect of this program that I think has to be noted is: how long does any member of this House really think that transportation subsidies paid directly to farmers will continue? Past the next election, undoubtedly past the next federal election — but how long after that? How much support is there going to be among other industries that feel they would like a little cash too, or other Canadians who are going to be paying this out to individual farmers? You can just imagine what will happen the first time a national television network gets hold of a farmer cashing in his Crow benefit cheque to go to Hawaii. It's going to be splashed from one end of the country to the other. Then, faced with a \$30 billion deficit, I wonder how long it will be till Mr. Lalonde, or whoever is Minister of Finance, stands up and, in a very serious way says: we've got to draw the line some place, and we're going to draw it at 150,000 individual producers. Really, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are politicians owe it to our constituents to be honest about how the political system is going to work. Anybody who thinks that this system is going to be in place for very long is the classic example of a group of turkeys voting for early Christmas. It's not going to last very long indeed.

Another thing that's rather interesting in this proposal is no performance guarantees. In real fact, if the railways don't live up to their agreement, they go — if you can believe it — for three years before any penalties are applied. Then we bring in the army of lawyers. As the hon. member from Edmonton pointed out today, with the problem of certain lawyers holding hands with certain companies, after three years where you don't get fined at all, where there's no prosecution, no enforcement, then what happens.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, that's not what I said. I wonder if the hon. member could make a correction. I was not suggesting that government lawyers were holding hands with companies.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I may have misunderstood the hon. member. If so, I would certainly retract those comments. I wouldn't want to destroy his position and get him in trouble with his colleagues in the caucus at all. I want to make it clear that my colleague and I do not want to see any Conservative members thrown out of the caucus for the next while. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, we might rescind that depending on the intentions of the

hon. member, but we'll leave it for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that for three years there won't be any way of enforcing failure to live up to performance guarantees.

But I think the best argument of all on this entire issue is the suggestion: do away with the Crow rate; it's just going to be great because we're shipping all this unprocessed grain to export position; the only way we're going to develop value-added industries is to have higher rates. The only problem is, what happens to the price of your processed commodity when you try to get it to market? Let's take, for example, the question of pork, because we're told that we want to revive the packing industry, ditch the Crow rate, cheap feed grain; going to be far more competitive than producing pork and beef; we'll take all kinds of additional markets. That's naive mythology. I think the best person who spoke on this issue with a good deal of common sense is the Hon. Grant Devine, Premier of Saskatchewan, and I quote from the February 22, 1983, *Hansard* in the province of Saskatchewan. He's talking about the so-called processing opportunities, by ditching the Crow.

It is debatable if increased pork production in western Canada...

And then he makes an aside:

I'm sure Alberta would like to hear this if they haven't read it...

Then he goes on to say:

... and I'm sure they haven't read it.

It's debatable if increased pork production in western Canada would compete with Quebec's pork exports to Japan. The Japanese market is product specific, and Quebec is geared up to serve it. Transportation costs from Japan to Quebec are currently less than transportation costs from the prairies to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, that unfortunately is correct. It's one of the reasons why the Hall commission report made so much sense. We could have extended the Crow rate to everything produced from grain, and we'd be able to get our meat products into an export position at a reasonable price. But now, because of the geography of central Canada, it's absolute naive nonsense to believe that by wrecking the financial position of the grain producer we're somehow going to make it better for the beef producer, and somehow we'll have our packing industry strong, active, and vital and all kinds of people employed. That simply isn't true.

Mr. Speaker, for Tories who have now decided to embrace this new alliance between the federal government — I might say the Ottawa government — and the provincial government here, it's very interesting to look at this advertisement taken out in the *Montreal Gazette*, February 21, 1983, to talk about the Crow rate as it applies to Quebec farmers. The big, full-page ad, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, says *The Crow Goes Without a Flap* — and it appears that it does, as far as Alberta is concerned. It goes on and makes a number of points, but I think this is particularly interesting, and I'd like hon. members to listen carefully:

The introduction of the new plan to replace the Crow Rate will have no adverse effect on the dairy, poultry and egg industries, all of which are protected by their own marketing boards.

Then it goes on:

The higher transportation costs will prevent western pork and beef producers from becoming more

competitive with their eastern counterparts in their traditional markets.

That's what the federal government is saying about the Crow rate in Quebec, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada. And we have this provincial government coming out with, of all things, support for a program which I think is just mind-boggling.

The hon. Deputy Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Bertson, made a number of observations in that Legislative Assembly on the Crow rate. I'd just like to quote one observation he made:

No matter how you slice it, Mr. Speaker, the Pepin plan, the answer always comes out the same. Western Canadian farmers are guaranteed to pay more to haul their grain. The railways are guaranteed to have their costs paid, to have capacity added, and must give no guarantees to perform despite massive inflow of public funds.

The benefits of the Pepin plan go, in the most part, to the railways, to central Canadian agricultural producers, and to central Canadian manufacturing plants. The farmers' present statutory ... guarantee is to be replaced, Mr. Speaker, with guarantees to the railways and central Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, against this background, what in heaven's name are we doing listening to the kind of observation I heard from the Minister of Agriculture, whom I like very much as a gentleman but who has to represent a muddle-headed policy from this government, which is going to throw away something that farmers have achieved over decades, without any guarantees? Oh, the minister registered a couple of caveats, and I agree with those caveats. But do you know what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker? That most persuasive of all people, Mr. Pepin, is going to come out and say: well, with a little change here and a little change there we'll patch it all up, and we'll try to meet our deadline at the end of June. The hon. Minister of Advanced Education, who was our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in the past government, knows perfectly well that's going to happen, how skilfully it will be done. And once we do it, as the Deputy Premier of Saskatchewan so eloquently said, we will have betrayed western Canadian producers.

That's why it's important that we send this thing back to the drawing board. Hon. members of this Assembly will know that in Saskatchewan politics, things can sometimes be quite rough. You know, they throw everything but the alley cat into the legislative debates, and I suppose that really doesn't hurt. They really have rigorous, strong debates. But on one issue, Mr. Speaker, the two political parties in Saskatchewan, the Conservative government and the New Democratic opposition, are as one. That is in their opposition to the Pepin plan, so much so that in an event which frankly was unique in the history of the Saskatchewan Legislature, a motion was presented that basically called upon the Saskatchewan Legislature to affirm its opposition to the Pepin plan and, after an extensive debate, it was passed unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest to members of this House that it's important to ask ourselves where we stand on this crucial issue, because there is a timetable involved. We all know that if Mr. Pepin meets his objective of getting it through the House of Commons by the end of June, it will become law and that's it; it's game over. Farmers are going to be forced to pay five times Crow; it's going to come right out of western Canadian producers' pockets. There isn't going to be the diversification of

the industry that they we're led to believe. The federal commitment will be qualified and reduced. The railroads will not have to live up to performance guarantees. We know what will happen if the government of Canada succeeds on June 30.

Mr. Speaker, there is a large number of farmers — I would think the overwhelming majority of producers — saying to us in the western legislatures: no; you've got to stop this program; you've got to ask the federal government to go back to the drawing board; you've got to ask the federal government to sit down and discuss with the three provincial governments and the farm organizations a new transportation program for Canada, not this flawed Pepin plan.

But there is a very definite element of time involved, and if we are mute or sit on the fence or look the other way, and the Saskatchewan Conservative government has to do battle for farmers in Alberta or the NDP government in Manitoba has to do battle for farmers in Alberta, one really has to ask where the members of this Assembly stand on the most important transportation issue of our generation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by moving an amendment. This motion is amended by adding the following after the words "present session":

and, in the absence of any specific reference in the Speech from the Throne to the Crow Rate proposals advanced by the Minister of Transport for Canada, we further beg leave to note our approval of and support for the motion adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan on February 22, 1983, being:

"That, because the proposals advanced by the Minister of Transport for Canada to replace the statutory Crow rate;

- 1) do not recognize the principle of a statutory rate for grain;
- 2) do not provide cost protection for farmers;
- 3) do not recognize that grain must be sold in a competitive international market;
- 4) do not remove the distortion in rates by including all prairie crops and their products under the new structure;
- 5) do not deal with unacceptable high taxation levels on farm inputs such as fuel;
- 6) do not provide sufficient performance guarantees for the future growth and development of all facets of prairie agriculture;
- 7) prescribe an unacceptable limit of 31.1 million tonnes for subsidized shipments;
- 8) provide central Canada with further artificial processing and livestock incentives; and,
- 9) are not supported by a consensus of Western Canadians;

And, because these fundamental concerns must be dealt with in any plans for the western rail transportation system. This Assembly therefore rejects the Pepin Plan."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment incorporating ... I have copies for all hon. members at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't suppose it's going to affect to any large extent the scope of the debate on the motion for

the address and reply to His Honour, and no doubt whatever motion comes out of the initiative just taken by the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be voted on. But having heard the motion and not having read it yet or given it the careful consideration it should have, I have some misgivings as to whether it's in order.

As hon. members know, our *Standing Orders* require that a motion be put without a preamble. It perhaps sounds like a contradiction in terms, but a preamble that comes after the motion may none the less be a preamble. The reason for the prohibition against a preamble is to ensure that motions are put without a great deal of debate being included in the motion. It would appear to me from just having heard the motion read by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there is in fact a great deal of debate included in the motion. Therefore it would seem to me that it might infringe the rule against preambles, at least in spirit, but I'll withhold further comment until I've had a chance to consider the motion.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on the question of the proposal of the motion before us, I note that it appears to be a very complex motion as it is worded, and I haven't had the time to study it thoroughly. I do note in the motion a reference to the actions of another Assembly, which leads me to some doubt. But that may be acceptable. I draw it to your attention.

The question of the amount of detail I would suspect is going to make any debate, upon the amendment a very narrow debate, because there are nine restrictions or problems advanced. I gather, Mr. Speaker, that that is the concern you were raising, that in fact there are that many details before we get to the essence of the motion itself. Is that what I'm understanding from your reading of it?

MR. SPEAKER: My concern is simply this and, as I suggested, I don't propose to deal with the matter conclusively at the moment. This motion could easily be the same in substance if it were to say: "whereas the proposals advanced by the Minister of Transport of Canada to replace the statutory Crow rate, one, do not recognize ..." and so on through nine; "therefore be it resolved that" That's clearly a preamble. As I say, I'm not suggesting that the hon. leader is trying to disguise the preamble, but that is my problem with the motion. I'd like to give it some further consideration.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking briefly to the amendment prior to your ruling as to whether it's indeed in order or not, it would be my feeling that the issue is indeed a ...

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member now discussing the point of order, or is he entering debate on the amendment? I'm not sure yet whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition has concluded.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my remarks on the debate by moving the amendment. If there is to be a discussion on the point of order, I'd be glad to do that. If you're going to defer a decision for a while, then I'll await with interest the discussion of all other hon. members on the amendment, I presume including the hon. Member for Calgary Currie.

MR. SPEAKER: In the meantime, naturally I'd welcome any advice or suggestions from hon. members in regard

to the amendment, whether they're given on the floor here, by memoranda, or personally.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it would not be my intent to debate the content of the proposed amendment. However, in response to your suggestion that we might participate in the decision you'll be making, I would just agree with the suggestion that indeed to me this seems like a resolution in full with a preamble and a conclusion. This would seem much more suitable for the Order Paper in terms of a debate in designated motion form on private members' day or in some other possible way, of course excluding the whereas clauses that seem to be implied by this particular document.

I'm not in a position to debate the contents of this proposed amendment. I've not seen one before of this length or this nature in terms of debating the Speech from the Throne. I would feel that this is not in keeping with the normal direction. Perhaps the hon. member has a reworded one; I don't know. It would be my suggestion that this would not be in order and that we should proceed with the debate on the throne speech.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might offer several comments on the points of order. I would say to hon. members that while there might be some debate over the issue you advance, sir, in actual fact what we are dealing with is a resolution in its entirety. While it may be a complex amendment, it's important in my view that these points be there because they are basically part of the amendment as apart from argument. Indeed several of them were even referred to by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in his ministerial announcement on Friday. I suppose one could argue that what you have are nine arguments. You could also argue that you have nine basic components of a position which together represents the amendment. I would argue that that in fact is the case in this instance.

I'm not aware of any rule in our Assembly — and you might correct me if I'm wrong — that because something's been debated in another Assembly it's out of order in this Assembly. Indeed, as members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, there would be frequent occasions where in fact similar resolutions would be put and debated. The resolution is modelled very closely on the Saskatchewan resolution. I don't think the fact that it was done there would make it out of order here.

It would seem to me that we have every right as a Legislature, sovereign in her own jurisdiction, to choose, if we wish, to pass a resolution exactly identical to another Legislature's should we pursue that. We may be barred from further discussions on issues we've already dealt with in this Legislature, but I don't think we are restricted, as I understand the rules, from debating what has been dealt with by another Assembly in its own jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER: The standing order I'm referring to, of course, is Standing Order 39, the one dealing with preambles. I might just mention in passing that it seems to me it's a very practical standing order, because if you were going to give reasons, either before or after stating the motion at length, we could have whole speeches in the Votes and Proceedings and on the Order Paper while the matter was awaiting debate.

May I suggest then that it might be in order for us to continue with the debate on the throne speech and, as I

say, I'd like to have a chance to consider this motion further. As I mentioned in the beginning, it seems to me it doesn't really inhibit the direction or scope of the debate. We are in a throne speech debate. The ordinary motion of non-confidence which arises in a throne speech debate simply regrets that it lacks certain things, and this, I think, is an example of that sort of motion. So it's quite open to hon. members to say, yes, but it's a good throne speech debate, you know, and it doesn't need that particular thing, and so on. I think we are not restricted by this proposed amendment in the way we would be were we not in the throne speech debate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Do I understand your ruling, that you were going to defer consideration of this amendment until some later point, or . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps tonight.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on that point, just to be absolutely clear. My understanding of your comments to this point arises out of Standing Order 39 and the appropriateness of the wording of the preamble, as it were, in this particular motion. However, the motion has been moved, as I understand it, and I guess I'm in a quandary because I understood your comment to the effect that the amendment or the observation — I'm not sure which it is — proposed in the conclusion could still stand if the preamble were removed, in the event that that's necessary to conform to section 39.

MR. SPEAKER: That's so, and we might as well, if I may suggest, carry on with the throne speech debate. I don't think we're in any difficulty as a result of this proposed motion.

MR. MARTIN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. If I understand that you agreed with what the hon. member said, you're saying, that if the preamble weren't there and simply said, "the Assembly therefore rejects the Pepin plan", that would be okay?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure what that point of order is.

MR. MARTIN: You were suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member said if there wasn't what he called a preamble there — I gathered that you said you thought it would be in order if there was just the one statement. I'm saying the key to it is that this Assembly reject the Pepin plan. The others are reasons for doing it, of course. It was passed through the Saskatchewan government. But I'm asking just for clarification. If all the other things weren't there and it just mentioned that the Assembly rejects the Pepin plan, in your mind would it have been in order then?

MR. SPEAKER: The situation as I see it at the moment is that I would have less difficulty with the amendment if it were to end after stating February 22, 1983. If there were a period there, I'd have less difficulty with it, but I still would like to examine the whole motion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I'd like to offer this for your consideration. When we look at the original motion — as I look at the Monday, March 14, Legislative Assembly routine and Orders of the Day — we are actually moving, first of all, that the

"humble address be presented" and then that the Legislative Assembly, now Assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech . . .

Our purpose in speaking here is either to thank the Lieutenant-Governor as such and give the speech approval or not give it approval. So in making the amendment, if we clear all the rest of the details away, that is the specific thing we're doing: either agreeing to it or not agreeing to it. In the final analysis, we will have to.

In the amendment here — at this point, speaking of it very objectively rather than any other way — we talk about rejecting the Pepin plan, which is not really related to the main motion. I offer that for your consideration, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would like to see the amendment discussed, but I offer it in terms of trying to assess how this fits in with our House rules.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order, I wonder if the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would entertain the proposition of having the motion end with a period at the end of the date 1983. The reason for that would be that it would free you, Mr. Speaker, from having to, if you like, defer your decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd still like to consider the first part of the motion. Ordinarily I'd bite the bullet now if it were going to hold up debate, but since I don't see it as having that effect, I respectfully suggest to the Assembly that they might allow me an opportunity to just think about it and look into it a little further between now and this evening, then perhaps deal with it this evening.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, could I ask if in your earlier comments on this proposed resolution and in the light of the comments you have just made, you have taken into consideration annotation 170 in the fifth edition of *Beauchesne*, in which it is stated that a general debate may take place on the address, but when an amendment is proposed, the discussion should be strictly confined to the subject matter of the amendment? I took it from you, Mr. Speaker, that you might have earlier expressed a view which differs from that in *Beauchesne*.

MR. SPEAKER: I had not taken that into consideration, and possibly without having given this the further consideration I suggested, I've already said too much.

MR. KING: Then, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I would draw the attention of hon. members to annotation 170, which I think is quite clear in stating that the tradition of the House with respect to amendments moved to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne is that the debate must be very strictly limited to the subject matter of the proposed amendment. Perhaps at the same time I would draw the attention of members to sub 5 of 170, which makes it quite clear, I believe, that the House, having given its judgment on the subject matter of this amendment — we are precluded from any further discussion of this matter at other times in the course of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that we just continue with the throne speech debate and not be too concerned about the inhibiting effect of the amendment for the brief time that is available for the rest of this afternoon, and I'll deal with the matter further this evening.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. WEISS: As I rise for the 32nd time, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to reply to the throne speech presented at this First Session of the 20th Legislature. I had a few misgivings for a while whether I was going to have that opportunity or not, and I hope I won't be inhibited as you had indicated.

I would like to compliment the hon. Member for Grande Prairie, who moved the speech, and the seconder, the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills, who have set high standards for me and others to follow. Also, I would like to thank His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, Frank Lynch-Staunton, for his delivery of the throne speech. We look forward to the grace he brings this House.

Mr. Speaker, sincere congratulations to you on your reappointment as Speaker of the House. I trust that your acceptance bore some measure of willingness and that you did not suffer any undue physical persuasion. We want you to know that we appreciate your guidance during the long hours of debate, such as was just shown now. We need it, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Congratulations are also due to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview on his designation as the new Leader of the Opposition. Although we may seldom concur on the issues at hand, I look forward to his diverse views and their contribution to this House. Although I was somewhat dismayed on Friday last, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member introducing a motion for adjournment for an emergency debate and then, having the time allotted, failing to speak on the issue. I trust this will not be indicative of future requests.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a warm welcome to all of the 19 new members as they join us in the Assembly for the first time. We look forward to your participation. May it prove rewarding to each of you personally, as well as to your respective constituencies that have given you their confidence. I can well understand the fears and trepidations felt by new House members, for it was at this time and on this day, four years ago, that I was first elected, as well as various other members. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that all of us here today can vividly recall the very first time we sat in this House with our colleagues.

To pick up on the previous speaker as he referred to the honor of speaking, while I do recognize the honor of the privilege to speak, there is a little irony here for my present circumstances. The honor, for the order of speaking now, is really the luck of the draw.

To my constituents, a personal thank you for the trust they have placed in me by re-electing me to this Legislative Assembly of Alberta. I renew my pledge to represent them earnestly, with honesty and integrity, and to make their voices heard.

From the trapper's trail to modern twin bridges, remote hamlets to urban sprawl, expanse of muskeg with wild game to fertile green fields and dairy herds, fishing nets to giant bucket wheels and drag lines: all this and more describes the constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray. I am proud to have the privilege of representing this constituency, and it is an honor indeed to present to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Assembly her profile.

I would like to begin by thanking our government for the concern and caring leadership it has given to Alberta and her people. All decisions have not been popular. All programs and services have not been seen to meet the needs. But there is no doubt in my mind that our

government has accepted its commitment responsibly and realistically, Mr. Speaker, and with the courage, foresight, and wisdom so necessary to meet the challenges of the present day. I thank you for that.

Within my constituency there have been many benefits during this past year which will be shared by much of the province: the small business and farm interest shielding program, widows' pensions, home improvement grants for seniors, and the rural home heating program, to mention only a few. The mortgage interest reduction program has provided substantial relief to many constituents facing the burden of mortgage payments. Thanks is due, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Housing, whose special consideration allowed employees of both Suncor and Syncrude to receive like benefits through the housing arms of their respective companies.

Through the Department of Municipal Affairs, long awaited land tenure programs are now a reality for communities such as Conklin and Anzac. Crown lands have been made available for private purchase at Wandering River. Acreages will soon be available near Fort McMurray, as well as residential lots in the Timberlea neighborhood.

I would like to add at this point, Mr. Speaker, a thanks to the Alberta Housing Corporation. They responded to the need for community housing in Fort McMurray with a commitment to purchase up to 75 units. Their commitment will greatly relieve a most stressful situation. As well, the Department of Municipal Affairs has launched a current study which will address new land for housing in Fort Chipewyan.

The five-year improvement tax transfer of \$1 million per annum has provided a substantial tax relief to the residents of Fort McMurray. While this program expires in 1984, discussions to consider the possibility of a gradual phase-out are now under way with the department. I am hopeful that those efforts will be successful.

Residential choices and life style alternates are being offered through all these programs, and I would predict that the requirements will increase as our constituency matures. Some of these items, Mr. Speaker, are just an indication of the government's response to meet varied and localized needs. I have appreciated the interest and co-operation I have received and look forward to continued support in the future.

Because of the approximate 53,000 square miles of this constituency — and I refer to it in miles — transportation becomes a major concern. Our northeastern location within the province is also a weighty factor in this regard. The department has met many of our needs through internal road upgrading in areas such as Plamondon, Anzac, Conklin, Kikino, and Caslan. Over \$9 million has been spent within the city of Fort McMurray alone. Phase 1 of Highway 63 improvement from the Gregoire Lake turnoff through the Fort McMurray corridor is now under way. Its completion is anxiously awaited in view of this avenue being the only access road to the heavy industrial sites of the tar sands. Road paving from Highway 63 to the Gregoire Lake Provincial Park and recreational areas has been greatly received and has relieved safety concerns within this region.

Although a portion of Highway 36 has been upgraded, I will continue to strive for a southern extension to bring it up to paving standards in 1983 and, hopefully, 1984 will see pavement accomplished. The road through Fort MacKay has raised several areas of concern recently, Mr. Speaker. I have appreciated the personal involvement of the department responsible for native affairs, the hon.

Milt Pahl, and meetings with Chief Dorothy McDonald to resolve the issues.

A meeting between an *ad hoc* committee from the Conklin area and the Department of Transportation is scheduled to review the well-defined need for an all-weather road to preclude this community from their present isolated status. As in several communities, Mr. Speaker, their need is real.

Real also is the need to push road travel through to Fort Chipewyan and Fort Smith. Being an old Muffalo Trail blazer, I have long been aware of the inaccessibility of this vast expanse, its small communities, untapped natural resources, tourism and recreational possibilities.

As outlined in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, economic expansion and diversification will be a major thrust in the coming months. Again I draw this to your attention. Mr. Speaker, accessibility is a key and a requirement I will continue to keep before this House. I trust that in my efforts to achieve these regional goals, the hon. Minister of Transportation does not remove his office welcome mat or replace my favorite chair within his office.

Approval for new schools at Anzac, Conklin, Garden Creek, and Wandering River is significant to our constituency. Mr. Speaker, young children travelling long distances to and from schools located outside the home environment is an undesirable mix we all understand. Present community school concepts which are functioning effectively and productively throughout our constituency can be anticipated to produce beneficial interaction between these new schools and their communities. In light of declining elementary school enrolments across the province, I would like to thank the department for recognizing the needs of our educational growth in the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency.

Student housing for the Alberta Vocational Centre in Lac La Biche is now under construction. I was pleased to participate in the sod-turning ceremony on March 8 for the first phase of expansion for the main campus itself. Until this recent break in the weather, Mr. Speaker, I was fearful of a snow-turning ceremony. The total cost of the complex will be in excess of \$30 million, but the facilities are certainly justified by AVC's expanding programs and student enrolments.

The additional student housing project near Fort McMurray's Keyano College nears completion. It will certainly help relieve the accommodation strain resulting from rising enrolments and taking advantage of the variety of quality programs being offered there. The Keyano College foundation was established last fall. Our Premier, the hon. Peter Lougheed, has graciously accepted the role of patron, and we are indeed honored. The financial goal of the foundation is \$50 million and, although ambitious, is indicative of the aspirations and drive of the people in our area.

As indicated in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to the opening of a school of nursing at Keyano College in September. Just this morning on the news broadcast in the city of Fort McMurray, I understand some 53 applicants have submitted their names for this new facility. This new educational venture will utilize the excellent facilities of both the college and the Fort McMurray regional hospital. I envision the attraction of many young people across the constituency, not only because of the professional opportunity but because of its proximity. Students embarking upon the road to independence for the first time will find many advantages in

Fort McMurray for this traditional phase. We certainly welcome them to this community. Fort Chipewyan is the site of a Keyano satellite campus. The proposed facilities will bring much needed programs to enhance employment opportunities for the residents of this remote community. And they are responding, Mr. Speaker.

The closure of Lake Athabasca to the fishermen last year had a severe impact on Fort Chipewyan. However, I am confident that early biological tests by the department of lands and wildlife will permit the 1983 season to succeed and proceed. Lake closure, Mr. Speaker, is an incident which serves to magnify the dire need for economic diversity in this region.

Through the opportunities offered in these centres, we have taken action in the areas of job training and the advanced qualifications of manpower as mentioned in the throne speech. The efforts within our constituency have been reflected in the broadening programs and increasing enrolments I have just mentioned. We have recognized and accepted that a wide range of programs is mandatory in order to expand our economic base with a skilled, well-prepared task force. Resurgence in the oil, natural gas, and agricultural industries is desperately required in our constituency, Mr. Speaker. A renewed thrust in these areas will find us ready and waiting.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce another topic within the field of education. Although it may leave us feeling somewhat uncomfortable, it must be addressed. The topic is adult illiteracy. Through the Department of Advanced Education, the pooling of local resources, and groups of caring community volunteers, this fact of life is slowly being withdrawn from under the proverbial bushel. I am grateful to those who are purposefully, albeit quietly, attacking this problem in our constituency. With current emphasis on job preparation and further education, is this not the starting place for many? The response by the Department of Advanced Education in meeting our needs has been ongoing and encouraging, despite the variety of requests which are usually accompanied by an expensive price tag.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I failed to note some of the major capital projects newly serving our constituency. Impressive provincial buildings in Fort McMurray and Lac La Biche are complete and occupied. They are functional and working. As well, these two communities now enjoy modern library facilities. We were honored earlier this month to have the Minister of Culture officially open the Fort McMurray library. Her presence added significantly to this long-awaited occasion.

A water treatment plant is now operational on Wandering River; and a major water and sewer project nears completion in Fort Chipewyan. The cost of the latter, Mr. Speaker, is over \$12 million for that community. Residents of Lac La Biche and vicinity look forward to improved medical services through new hospital facilities which are now under construction. The unique interpretive centre in Fort McMurray progresses too. The site has been determined, plans are in the finalization stages, and the local advisory board has now been struck.

Senior citizens have also benefited, Mr. Speaker. A new lodge in Fort Chipewyan has been completed, and facilities at Plamondon have been expanded. Current statistical trends warn of increasing requirements for seniors throughout the province. The constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray will not be an exception.

A \$39 million study has begun in the northwestern corner of our constituency. It is a preliminary engineering study into the development of a major hydro-electric

project on the Slave River. I would like to emphasize that it is a preliminary study, Mr. Speaker. This will allow expressions of concern regarding such issues as the environment and hunting and trapping concerns from regional people. I do believe that there is a mutually beneficial balance of issues which is attainable.

The throne speech draws our attention to the Northern Alberta Development Council. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged to have been appointed chairman of this council, and look forward to its service to northern Alberta. Public meetings will continue to be the communication vehicle between the people and this House. I accept the responsibility of bringing issues and concerns to the government in the coming months. I welcome the addition of the Member for Grande Prairie to the council, as do all council members. I hope to have the opportunity to address this House further with regard to this council. Changing yet increasing needs accompany the struggle to maturity, especially during these present times. The constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray has appreciated government's past recognition of our struggles.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment and strained social services are issues which will require serious consideration and action. Environmental and pollution controls also need to be addressed. Concerted effort is vital in removing isolation barriers within our constituency, as well as the entire northern Alberta region. I will continue to strive diligently to keep this House apprized of our constituency's concerns, individual and collective. I will earnestly seek the guidance and support of our government in meeting our needs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the greatest resource of the constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray: her people. I've made the statement on many, many occasions that our most important resource is not the tar sands but the people. The collapse of Alsands last spring dealt a stunning blow, the ripples of which are still being felt. Despite this traumatic addition to the effects of economic recession and the unsettledness of what lies ahead, stout hearts and strong minds emerged to face reality.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to take a few minutes to advise the Assembly of some of the examples of people programs that are taking place in the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency, such as band offices in Kikino and Beaver Lake leading their people toward self support. Troubled youth will find love, a home, and training in a rural setting of the Surmont Creek project near Anzac. A garment factory bustles in Casland and Beaver Lake. The Fort McMurray band at Anzac strikes a profit-sharing and work agreement with Amoco. Camp 3F near Plamondon ensures summer fun, fresh air, and fellowship for handicapped youngsters. Sister Brady's newsletter from Fort Chipewyan keeps people in touch. I enjoy it. Keep it up, Sister Brady. Dedicated community cultural groups keep our cosmopolitan heritages flourishing. An ambitious group of young people from Fort McMurray stages a run to Calgary in a bid for the 1985 Summer Games. And, Mr. Speaker, they succeed. Nineteen eighty-five will be the home of the Summer Games in Fort McMurray. The list of people's accomplishments in service is too long to share in its entirety, Mr. Speaker. But I would like to point out to the sceptics that the Alsands bridge does lead somewhere. It leads to vast regional oil leases in the active Canterra test plant site. It also leads to a year-round haven for the outdoors enthusiast. You can trust a northerner to find a hidden bonus.

It's people, Mr. Speaker, with imagination and creativi-

ty, resourcefulness and a strong sense of responsibility toward each other and their communities — talented, caring people who put the capital G into give. It's people with determination and vision for the future who can see today's adversity for what it really is: a mere phase of history. Herein lies our strength and the ability to meet challenges. A quote from Robert Service, as he wrote about the Yukon so many years ago, is certainly applicable today as well:

This is the law of the Yukon,
That only the strong shall thrive
That surely the weak shall perish
And only the fit survive.

Small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that I am such a proud representative in this Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: I hadn't anticipated putting the question this soon.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in the throne speech debate today, along with the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I would like to start out as is traditional, in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your reappointment as Speaker in this Legislature. It is my opinion that had we failed to re-elect you it would have been one of our greatest losses. I've had the opportunity to watch the Mother of our Parliaments in London, to watch legislatures operate throughout our country. And indeed I've had the opportunity to see the operation of the House and how the Speaker operates that organization. The hon. Member for Little Bow, who's spent almost 20 years watching the operation of the House, seems to have difficulty determining who speaks when, but that, Mr. Speaker, is no reflection on your abilities to control this Legislature. [interjection] I appreciate the assistance of the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness though I do want to congratulate the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, he's not here at the moment. As was mentioned, I won't always agree with him and have been known to disagree with him in the past, but indeed he's worked hard in the Legislature. He takes over the position of Leader of the Opposition, and I wish him well in that important role in our Legislature and indeed in the parliamentary system of government. I also thank the hon. Member for Little Bow not only for his participation in the initial remarks of my speech but for his service as Leader of the Opposition. I think he added a great deal to this Assembly and will continue to do that, and it's a role he fulfilled well.

I have to add my thanks to the new members of the Legislature, in particular the mover and seconder of the speech. Seldom have I heard new members indicate in such a definitive, clear, concise way their feelings about the province and their own constituencies, and their feelings about how this government should continue to operate in what it's doing now. With all members here I know that we welcome you to the Legislature in all ways. You indeed gave us a warm welcome from new members as you moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne.

It's going to be an interesting Legislative Assembly. I have the honor again of representing the constituency of Calgary Currie. I say the honor because I think the first time it's a privilege, the second time it's indeed an honor. For those in this Legislature who have been so honored several times since, that says even more for their rapport with the constituents in their given constituencies.

Calgary Currie, for those of you who aren't familiar with it, is really a microcosm of large urban communities

in the province of Alberta. It consists of a military base of some 2,000 Canadian soldiers, a college — a very important college in the province — Mount Royal College. It has significant employers in the southern part of the riding; Lakeview Village, where there are more employers than only employees; and a good number of employees as well as employers in other parts of the riding. There are people in the riding who earn a considerable amount of money and those who earn less than average in this province. There are citizens from all ethnic origins and from all parts of our country, as well as many who originated in other parts of the province. So when I speak in this Assembly on behalf of the constituents of Calgary Currie, I'm always reminded that I must keep in mind the diverse nature of not only the province but indeed my own constituency.

The throne speech given by his Honour on Thursday last had two messages for the citizens of Calgary Currie, as it had two messages for the people of Alberta. One was that it made it clear that relatively speaking Alberta is still in an economic position superior to that in the rest of the country and in a good part of the world. The other point that was raised in that particular speech really was a sober one, and that is that immediate expectations that we may have had in terms of rapid growth and increases in our economy are somewhat dulled compared to the 1979 era in which we experienced and paralleled growth and massive increases in the population as well as in the general operation of the economy. For Calgary Currie there are two sides of the coin, as there are for the rest of the province. Noting the time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get into those two sides of the coin perhaps after the break. At this point, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members may recall that this afternoon we were discussing a point of order, and I said that I'd like to have some opportunity to review it. Since then, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has suggested that perhaps I might postpone dealing with it until tomorrow, since he is unavoidably absent this evening. Of course, I can't do that without leave of the Assembly, especially since I said I would be doing it this evening.

If the Assembly were to agree that that might be done, my suggestion would be that in order to be practical, members continuing in the debate on the motion for the address in reply might simply indicate whether they're speaking on the amendment or the main motion. In that case, there'll be no procedural difficulty about anyone speaking twice.

I'm assuming that the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, who adjourned debate, would then be continuing to speak on the main motion.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, regrettably, perhaps, I missed part of this afternoon's proceedings and wasn't able maybe to come to some of the same conclusions other hon. members might have, but I became aware of the proposal. I don't know if the Leader of the Opposi-

tion's colleague wants to speak to it, but I for one would not be prepared to agree to having the matter laid over until tomorrow.

MR. MARTIN: Just a point of order. If that's the case, I would like to speak to the amendment. I could do that after the hon. Member for Calgary Currie finishes his, if that would be the way he'd like to handle it.

MR. SPEAKER: If that be the case, may I suggest that as soon as the hon. Member for Calgary Currie has concluded his speech, I'll deal with the point of order.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to continue the remarks I began before the supper break. I note that the *Standing Orders* prohibit me from giving my three and a half hour speech, so we're likely to get to the amendment that has been raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Before the supper break, I was indicating that in Calgary Currie, as I believe is true in the rest of the province, our current economic circumstance really has two sides to it. I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the negative side, the side that has given many of the businesses that have managers in my community difficulties, a side that has caused a certain amount of unemployment in the riding. Indeed, it has extended to my own family: a brother and a sister have been unemployed for some time. There is some hesitation on the part of our communities who have in the past received a great deal of funding for expansion of facilities and for improvement of their programs, but who now face the possibility of being limited in those growth directions in the coming years. Perhaps for all of us, there is some misgiving about our being able to achieve the social goals that we as a society try to work toward as quickly and effectively as is possible.

On the other hand, however, it's my belief that this current economic lull, this point in time when we've seen many things slow down, has a positive side to it, too — a positive side for Calgary Currie and for the province of Alberta. Businesses will begin — and I believe have already begun — to cleanse themselves of some of the fat, some of the difficulties which are encountered when we are too affluent, when indeed it's too easy to hire more employees than are needed, to become inefficient in operations. So I think all businesses that are going to continue to operate will learn to be cost effective and highly productive.

Indeed, our personal expectations are becoming much more realistic. In 1979-80, we saw the future as growing by leaps and bounds, month after month. While I still believe we can look to growth potential, we can realize the individual goals of families and communities, we now can more realistically pace that.

In my city of Calgary, we have faced significant growth problems as a result of the rapid influx of people over the past few years and the rapid increase in social difficulties that inevitably accompanies that. In that respect at least, many of us are happy that there's a time to think, to plan, and to deal with those difficulties in an atmosphere that is not quite as crisis-oriented as it was a few years ago. Most important, though, I think our current lull gives us the opportunity to be innovative in our approaches, to delve into the abilities we have and to look at the resources — how best to deal with them and how best to initiate ideas and concepts without expending funds in great amounts without the need to be accountable for them to any great extent.

I feel there are opportunities. To outline a few specifically, in business this government has started a venture capital fund, which I believe is not a superfluous expenditure in the face of an economy not as active as it was a couple of years ago, but one that will plan to further strengthen the strong economy and deal with diversifying our economy in the future. The Alberta Opportunity Company continues to be a boon to small companies.

I believe the Alberta International Trade ministry, in which I recently had an opportunity to participate, is one of the most far-sighted and far-reaching approaches this government has taken. Before I had the opportunity to visit several African countries with our colleague the Minister of International Trade, I knew it was a good P.R. move, that in some areas there was potential for Alberta companies. But I had no idea to what extent Alberta had developed its technology, its abilities and, most of all, its people resources, to be of importance and need to nations of the world. Through Egypt, Sudan, and Kenya, despite the poverty prevalent in some of those countries, it was evident that what we had, they needed to a very great extent. There wasn't one member — one private-sector member of 15 companies — of that trade mission who in any way would have suggested that the trade mission wasn't successful for them. Some were signing contracts on the spot, or near to that. Others, it will be a couple of years before that takes place. Regardless, the potential is there, developed well. The hon. Minister of International Trade does an excellent job on behalf of this Legislature and this province in presenting what we have in a most clear and concise way. He's to be congratulated for the tireless dedication he spends in that regard.

In the area of education, I note that the Minister of Education is investigating the possibility, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, of mandatory achievement tests. I think that's the kind of approach we need to take in education now, to try to make sure that what we have is operating efficiently again; to make sure that we are getting the most out of the dollar spent, the most out of the people resources available, and the most for the community and students that are to be affected. I also applaud the move taken by the Minister of Education over the past number of years that he's been in office in the area of community use of schools. I think that is a direction that must be encouraged more. Coming from a part of the province where we have a number of schools that are empty as a result of a depleting child population in the inner city or semi-inner city core, I support an even more aggressive move in that direction.

In the field of education, I think we also have to look at ways to make the local school jurisdictions even more sensitive to the people they serve. It's my personal opinion — and I emphasize "personal" — that in the city of Calgary we have a school jurisdiction so large that it's difficult for trustees to comprehend and properly deal with all the issues in the community. Perhaps we should look at the possibility of several school jurisdictions, or two, in Calgary. Perhaps Edmonton would have the same problem, though I wouldn't presume to speak for that city.

As well, I think we have to look at the possibility of a ward electoral system in cities like Calgary, where the people can relate directly to a representative with respect to school circumstance. They're having difficulty, at least in my constituency, knowing where to go, who to talk to, how to deal with the very crucial problems that face their children and their families today.

In the area of social services, we have to continue to

look at innovative ways of helping those people who need help in grasping their goal in life and working toward it to do that as soon as is possible. We need to expand programs and look at new approaches to employing the people who've been traditionally unemployed, even those with difficulties in the community, to make their life fulfilling and also to take tax burdens off the community as a whole.

Indeed, in social services, as with health care, I think we have to look more at the in-between: between total treatment of, say, individuals with handicaps or in hospital settings in the case of, say, psychiatric patients in a primary care facility — we have to look at what's between that and being at home back in the environment they come from, the halfway approach, the halfway house, the less expensive but perhaps in many ways more effective use of facilities, individuals, and talents in the community to make smoother that transition from difficulty to realization of individual goals, from very costly programs to programs of less cost. I believe we have to consider that kind of direction much more seriously than we have in the past. Despite the fact that we have the best of health care in the country, the best of social care facilities, we still have that transition difficulty. I've noted that to some extent in my recent responsibility as chairman of the Health Facilities Review Committee.

I think there, too, we're beginning to, and have to continue to, look at how to deal with integrating nursing homes, auxiliary hospitals, and lodges in such a way as to allow individuals who enter a facility to follow through the latter part of their lives in the most coherent and positive way and to deal with it in a cost-effective way, so that as our community ages — and we know that the average age of Albertans is continually increasing — we have an opportunity to face that problem and deal with it without to a very great extent dislocating individuals in our society.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of labor, too, I think we need to look at innovative approaches. We've reached a stage in our development where large salary increases, large amounts of money to be spent on benefits, are no longer practical or possible in many areas. We have to look at how we can enhance the worker's position, the employee's position in a company, while at the same time giving the employer the benefit of the knowledge of that individual, the benefit of the best productivity that can be achieved. During this sitting of the Legislature, I plan to present a couple of ideas in that respect. I won't elaborate on them further here, but I think there are innovations that can be looked at and approaches that can be taken. In light of economic circumstances and for the betterment of our society as a whole, again we have to look away from the confrontation method of labor/management negotiation and toward the innovative involvement together, as a team, in keeping our industries viable, our public service active and interested, and generally to be of benefit to the people of the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other topics I could go on to deal with. Indeed, I was happy to see in the speech from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that the government dealt with the issue of continuing to press for Alberta's rightful place in Confederation. We achieved a great deal last year with the signing of a constitution which guarantees those rights we have in this province and which allows for an amending formula that recognizes, perhaps for the first time in history in writing, our equal position in Confederation. But I note as well that the government still commits itself to continuing to

work for Senate reform, in my opinion a major necessity in our country, one that will eventually perhaps allow us an answer for the imbalance in population and the distances between one coast and another that we have to deal with.

In short, I believe that despite the negative comments about the current economic circumstance — which, I underline, is still greater by far than any other place in the country, and indeed in most of the world — we have opportunities; we have challenges. We have finally now, in many respects, time to sit down and look at what we've developed and make sure it's working properly, make sure that we've used our minds as well as our dollars to deal coherently and actively.

In the constituency of Calgary Currie, I believe what most of the citizens there would want me to say to this Assembly is that I will work with the government in enhancing the excellent programs that have been otherwise developed, in trying to develop new alternatives and new suggestions, and in trying to better our province generally in the future. I look forward to working with all of you on that goal, one which I think all members from all sides of the House share.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members will recall that this afternoon the hon. Leader of the Opposition moved a motion, copies of which I think have been distributed and which, incidentally, was also read. At that time, I expressed some misgiving as to whether the motion was in order. I have had a chance to review the matter since then. I realize it's somewhat unusual to postpone that long dealing with a point of order, but I felt it might not be as critical because of our being in throne speech debate, which of course is very wide-ranging. I find that the motion is not in order because of the preamble, which follows the text and doesn't precede it. I find that it would be in order if it were to end after the date it mentions, February 22, 1983.

With regard to debate on the amendment, we have of course our Standing Order 19, which in an ordinary case requires that once an amendment has been moved the debate be confined strictly to the amendment. The fourth edition of *Beauchesne* extended that principle specifically to the throne speech debate. I believe that reference is absent from the fifth edition of *Beauchesne*. What the reason is, I don't know. But on giving the matter thought in regard to our own *Standing Orders*, we have a fairly clear provision for the time limits in debating an amendment and a subamendment to the motion for the address and reply. It would seem to me that that would really not be a very effective standing order if the debate were wide-ranging and could continue with an amendment like that before the House in the way that I had previously thought. Therefore I believe, and it's my opinion, that if an amendment like this is on the floor, even in throne speech debate, subsequent speeches until the amendment has been voted on must be confined strictly to the terms of the amendment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order for clarification, if I may. As I understand your ruling, you're suggesting that if a subamendment were proposed that would strike everything after February 22, 1983, that would be in order. As I recall, earlier this afternoon one of the hon. members from the government side suggested that, My colleague could move a subamendment, striking 1 to 9 in the last part of it. That would not do offence, in my judgment, to the basic purpose of the amendment.

But with unanimous consent, perhaps the members would also allow me to move the amendment, deleting everything after February 22, 1983. That's certainly an option, too, which would not do offence.

The reason I itemized the nine points is that they were contained in the Saskatchewan resolution. I thought it would provide information for hon. members as they address the merits or not of the issue, but it's not essential to the basic purpose of the amendment.

So I am in the hands of the Assembly. I'd be quite prepared to re-move the amendment on the basis of everything being struck after February 22, 1983, or my colleague could move a subamendment.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the judgment of the Chair on an amendment that has not yet been put to the House is hypothetical. But since a hypothetical point of order has been raised, I'd like to respond to the hypothetical situation and argue that if we look at Annotation 203, also in the fourth edition of *Beauchesne*, the amendment just proposed by the hon. member would itself be out of order even if he deleted the words contained in the present amendment. I would like to argue that it would be out of order because it is not relevant to the question on which it is proposed.

The address in reply to the Speech from the Throne expresses the opinion of the House on the content of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Or the lack of same.

MR. KING: What is being proposed here is an amendment which does not express any opinion of the House on the throne speech, the contents of it, or the omissions of it. The amendment proposed doesn't regret the absence of this position from the throne speech and doesn't deplore the absence of this position from the throne speech. It only notes that something having been omitted from the throne speech, the House wishes to express an opinion on a different matter; that is to say, the resolution recently adopted in the Saskatchewan Legislature. I would argue the rule of relevance in Annotation 203, that the amendment does not express an opinion on the contents of or omission in the throne speech, is not relevant, and is out of order.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I offer an observation on the unique point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Education. I trust that his future political campaigns will be undertaken with a little more close observation of the facts than his recent comment. As I understand the point of order of the minister, because the amendment does not deplore, somehow it is out of order. Now, Mr. Speaker, what the amendment says is that:

in the absence of any specific reference in the Speech from the Throne to the Crow Rate proposals advanced by the Minister of Transport for Canada, we further beg leave to note our approval of and support for the motion adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan of February 22, 1983 . . .

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the rules of our House, the throne speech is the opportunity, first of all, for all hon. members to discuss those issues of relevance to the jurisdiction. It is the widest ranging of all the debates — deliberately so. It is even wider ranging than the budget, in theory, because in the budget one has to restrict oneself at least to the provisions of the document presented in the

House. But historically, over the years, the Speech from the Throne has been an opportunity for hon. members to raise issues that relate to their constituencies, among others.

Now during the course of the debate, hon. members in this House will raise issues that are not related to this document. If we were to take the Minister of Education's proposal, and every time an hon. member talked about something in his or her constituency I were to rise on a point of order because it wasn't referred to in the Speech from the Throne, we would destroy the whole purpose of the Speech from the Throne. Let us not tie up with minute legalisms the basic purpose of the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, if this Assembly is not able to amend the Speech from the Throne by regretting the absence of a statement on one of the most important transportation initiatives in the history of our country, then what we are doing is allowing rules to bar the open expression of debate.

I say to the members and to the Minister of Education, with great respect, surely he isn't serious. If the argument has been presented — and I'm quite prepared to accept the concern of the Speaker and others that the nine points are not necessary, that they are argument. I would suggest that they expand the opportunity to discuss, but it could be argued that in fact it's a preamble. Fair enough. But in my view, the basic amendment as it's worded to February 22, 1983, is quite within the rights of this Assembly. If the government doesn't want to pass the amendment, vote it down. Take the consequences of voting it down. Fair enough. Nothing wrong with that. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we don't like to vote on things in this House that would be much more comfortable to rule out of order.

But if this amendment is not accepted, then I suggest what we are doing is limiting the rights of all hon. members to debate. If we are going to pounce on the rule book, then I say with great respect that I will watch with enormous interest the rule of relevancy in this debate for every member. I don't say that in a punitive or vindictive way. But I say to the members of this House that what is at stake here is the freedom of speech of members in the most wide-ranging debate of all. If the hon. Minister of Education chooses to oppose it, that's his right and privilege. But surely it is in order and should be allowed to be debated accordingly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, one of the advantages of being Minister of Education is that you learn what teachers refer to as the use of different learning strategies. If one doesn't work, you try another one. Let me try Annotation 191(3).

MR. MARTIN: That's only the bad teachers, Dave.

MR. KING: I thought it was the good teachers who could recognize the need for different strategies and adopt them.

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point, if I may, I would draw the attention of hon. members to Annotation 191(3):

... by its resolutions the House declares its own opinions and purposes

Then I would draw your attention to Annotation 203(5):

An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

I suppose I should say as well that the House has adopted

the principle that there are different standards of relevance for debate as compared with amendments to resolutions.

I would restate my position of a moment ago in this way. The address in reply to the Speech from the Throne is an expression of the opinion of the House on the contents or the omissions of the throne speech. While this may be and, indeed for all of us as Albertans, is an important issue — that is to say, the Crow rate and the modifications of it — the wording of the amendment does not express an opinion on the throne speech or the omissions in the throne speech. It makes note of an omission, and it then expresses an opinion on a different matter. But it does not express an opinion on the contents of the throne speech. I say again that in my view — and it is not a petty legalism, I don't believe — it is out of order.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could make a few observations. I think we have heard a most interesting and spirited exchange between two hon. members. I want to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition — and he may well know where such a reference would come from — that he reminds us very much of a steamship: he makes the most noise when he doesn't know where he's going.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and I think my hon. colleague the Leader of the Opposition will have perceived, that the arguments he made have no merit whatever. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the position put forward by the Minister of Education is certainly in accordance with the rules, the *Standing Orders*, and precedent. Even so, I would suggest that by unanimous consent we simply agree to the change that was suggested when you, Mr. Speaker, made your remarks a few minutes ago, and that members indeed be allowed to speak in respect of the amendment, whether it is one or not.

MR. SPEAKER: There isn't any question or any doubt, it seems to me, as to how wide-ranging the debate on the motion for the address in reply may be. I don't think that is affected by the validity or lack of validity of the amendment. My understanding is that the amendment was in fact moved. I didn't think we were dealing with a hypothetical question, unless the hon. minister was thinking about the proposed subamendment.

Incidentally, he has a number of us in the House at a considerable disadvantage because he is citing from the fourth edition of *Beauchesne*, and most of us are now using the fifth. If this is going to continue, I'm going to have to dig out my fourth and bring it back in the House, because all I have here is the last edition of *Beauchesne* and the last edition of *Erskine May*. But I will bring the old editions in if we're going to start going back to those.

MR. KING: I should have thrown the fourth edition away.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment, as I say, was moved. I realize that the language, like all language, is open to interpretation. But it seems to me that the spirit of the amendment is that it does in fact regret the omission of this matter from the speech read by His Honour. It is perhaps not as direct as it might be if it used the word "regret". It is perhaps even more courteous than if it used the word "regret".

I note that the hon. Government House Leader has

offered to remove any obstacles I might have in dealing with this further. But my view is that the amendment, if it is agreed by the Assembly that the text following the date be deleted, is in order and that we may now proceed to debate the amendment, with debate being limited strictly to the amendment. In other words, that means to say that debate from now on should deal with whether or not this amendment ought to be made as an expression of regret in sending the message to His Honour in reply to his speech.

Now, going along with the suggestion kindly made by the hon. Government House Leader, may I then ask: is there unanimous leave of the Assembly to delete from the motion that part of the text which follows the date; in other words, those nine paragraphs which were read this afternoon by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition? Have I the agreement of the Assembly to do that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: In that event, the debate may now proceed on the amendment, and anyone who has spoken on the amendment of course is free to speak on the main speech once the amendment has been voted on.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, since five o'clock I wasn't sure whether or not I was going to have an opportunity to make some comments. So between my colleague the Minister of Education, the hon. House leader, and your final ruling, I hope that when I rise to speak on the amendment and the Crow rate I'm in order. [laughter]

It's always interesting to get the Leader of the Opposition's new posture on serious economic issues. I remember the NDP's position on energy was "the hell with Shell", and now their sort of posture on the most serious initiative Alberta has to consider is one of support of something that happened in Saskatchewan.

I'd like to begin by taking them back a little bit and indicating that as early as about three years ago, it became apparent that by 1985 there was going to be a shortfall of some 8 million tonnes a year in the railway's capacity to handle shipments west, and by 1990 that figure was going to develop to around a 20 million tonnes a year shortfall. The CNR announced that there were around 10,000 trains a year going through Jasper, and that was approaching 96 per cent of that rail line's capacity. It was also evident that there was a capital expenditure program in excess of \$17 billion over time that was going to have to be serviced by the railways, and there were only two options in the way it could be serviced: one, from fares for things handled or, two, some manner of government subsidy.

While this was happening, around 70 per cent of Canada's rail freight was in the western half of Canada, and around 30 per cent in the east. Of the 70 per cent, some 26 or 27 per cent was grain and agricultural products travelling at a statutory rate.

I think there was general agreement that if the railways were going to be able to service the debt required to make the capital expansion to get our products to market, somehow or other there was going to have to be a compensatory rate established for the railroads to haul grain; that is, the grain that was travelling under the statutory rate, which was barley, oats, and wheat. It was also clear that if this wasn't done in a reasonable time before the anticipated shortfall of 1985, we were indeed going to be in trouble. I think anyone without any particular knowledge of the grain transportation system can see

that if in fact there was a shortfall, things that were not travelling at a compensatory rate simply were not going to move, and Canada, as a serious supplier to the world trade in grains, was going to be left with one of its primary products in jeopardy.

It's further interesting to notice that the statutory rate, the Crow rate as it's generally called, was superimposed unilaterally on the railways by the federal government in the late 1920s, and that they had no part in that decision-making and had suffered a half a cent a tonne mile revenue for hauling this grain trade for some 50 years.

Some of the people who complained that the farmers were going to be struck with serious increases in freight rates neglected to mention that those who elevate and store grain are now presently charging twice as much per tonne to elevate it and store it as it is to move it to Vancouver. Indeed you can now move a tonne of grain to Vancouver at the same price as about eight letters.

Having said all of that, I think there was general agreement between all the governments and between all the grain fraternity — that became more evident at Gilson — that it was time that the railroads were compensated, and the responsibility to compensate the railroads fell with the federal government because it was their unilateral decision that set the rate.

In a perfect world for Alberta, it was important that a compensatory rate was published. The compensatory rate published would then take care of the anomalies that were precluding our involvement in meat processing and the development of the seed business into oils and mash, and a variety of other things that had really been taken away from us by this anomaly in freight over time.

So I don't think there was any general disagreement that the railway shouldn't be compensated. The disagreement seemed to come about who should be paid. There were clearly two options: one was that the railway should be paid, and the other was that the producers should be paid, who in turn could afford to pay the compensatory published rate that the railroads would provide.

There are a couple of things that need to be said about that. First of all, some in the farm community were of the judgment that the railway should be paid because somehow or another they didn't have the political clout to sustain a subsidy or a Crow benefit that would be paid to them and through them to the railroad. Frankly, I find that argument ludicrous, because there is nothing that tends to sway politicians more than 60,000 or 70,000 grumpy farmers on almost any issue. They continually surprise me with their capacity to extract grants from reluctant governments at all levels for a variety of issues.

The second thing is that if in fact a compensatory rate was not published, the people in the Leader of the Opposition's constituency would then be confronted with no ability whatsoever to have off-track elevators, or over time have the ability to have unit trains and other varieties of compensatory discounting for service that would make them able to better compete in a world grain market. It comes with some surprise to me that the Leader of the Opposition should take that particular tack.

In any event, to work our way through this nine-point issue that we have in front of us, the first one says that the Pepin formula does "not recognize the principle of a statutory rate for grain". In fact the Alberta position was that the formula for that rate should appear in legislation.

It does "not provide cost protection for farmers". We have consistently said that there should be some measure

of ability by the farmers to pay for inflationary costs. It seems to me that if you are dealing with a cost of freight of \$12, \$13, or \$14 a tonne on a product that is \$150 a tonne, the inflation relationship between the two is fragile and indeed should be negotiated, and as a position in generalities is dangerous to farm income. Secondly, it was never clear to us that the 4.5 per cent was based on any kind of national indices, and it was never clear to us either that it should apply to both fixed and variable rates in the railroad. So in our judgment the 4.5 per cent was a fair start, and a Gilson compromise indicated that was acceptable to most farm groups. We have expressed our serious concern about 6 per cent, notwithstanding the fact that, in our judgment, 4.5 per cent on \$13 or \$14 a tonne on a \$150-a-tonne product is not excessive.

It says that Pepin does "not recognize that grain must be sold in a competitive international market". On the contrary. What the Pepin formula does, at the end of year five, is provide the opportunity to review it. In the shorter term, however, it does provide an ability for the railroads to put infrastructure in place so the farm community can deliver its products securely and competitively to the international grain trade, and it recognizes the reality of the situation in Canada, where compensatory rates must be covered by all commodities. Particularly in view of the fact that we are a commodity province and a commodity nation, it's important that all of the full spectrum of activities are delivered fairly and equitably at tidewater and competitively in international markets.

It says it does "not remove the distortion in rates by including all prairie crops and their products under the new structure". Well, I don't understand that remark. What's happening is that it will deliver, or should deliver, at compensatory rates barley, oats, and wheat. The rest now travel at compensatory rates. It's a reality that things must pay as they go. Nobody is quarrelling with the issue of whether or not food should be subsidized, because in a variety of ways it is. Nobody is quarrelling with the fact that the farm community and the agricultural sector in Alberta are key, and we have always responded to difficulties as they've presented themselves. But surely the freight factor is not one that's in dispute on that issue.

I don't understand "... do not deal with unacceptable high taxation levels on farm inputs ..." That's got to be a Saskatchewan position. Surely it's obscure in the Alberta we live in.

"... do not provide sufficient performance guarantees for the future growth and development of all facets of prairie agriculture". The railways are interested in hauling for profit. The railways are interested in servicing the debt required to make this a contemporary grain transportation system. There is no question in my mind that they'll deploy their resources where the activity is. The railroads have consistently indicated that if we want a letter of guarantee, they're happy to give it. It's not unlike anything else. The more tightly articulated the guarantee required, the higher the freight rate will be. But I've had nothing but assurances from the railways and from other business people that it's obvious they'll deploy their funds where the revenues come from. I see nothing unreasonable about the request and, in fact, the railways have agreed to facilitate whatever kind of guarantee is appropriate.

"... prescribe an unacceptable limit of 31.1 million tonnes for subsidized shipments". The Minister of Agriculture has said that we would like to remove that cap. The only debate will be on whether the government funding for the total grain system will be finite and

spread over an increased number of tonnes or whether it will be fixed and cause them a larger draw on their treasury for an increased number of tonnes over 31 million. In any event, the Alberta position consistently has been that that cap should be removed.

"... provide central Canada with further artificial processing and livestock incentives". That's what they have now. Surely it's clear that if there is an increase in the freight rate from Alberta to Vancouver, the price of feed grains in Canada, in Alberta, will decrease. It will give our farmers an opportunity to compete with the relative feed costs south of the border for agricultural processing and, over time, it will serve to direct farm economics to maximizing their investment in land and property and whatever other direction is appropriate in a competitive world.

Finally, it's "not supported by a consensus of Western Canadians". Well, I'm not persuaded about that. What we've got here are some people who have a very real and continued interest in storage and elevating in a system built at the turn of the century, who have a vested interest in not changing it in the realization of economics that are coming in world trade in food and grains, who won't accept the fact that unit trains are going to become essential, that central elevators are going to be a very real part of what's going to happen economically to farmers, that until a compensatory rate is established, trucking versus rail will not be an economic alternative, and finally that there won't be any possibility ever of having off-track grain elevators as long as there are half a cent a tonne mile hauls to compete with.

So having said those few things about the Leader of the Opposition's kind of cursory examination of the issue and understanding that our options are limited, just to recap: we've simply got to pay the railroads a compensatory rate for hauling grains, or grains will not be moved. We have to understand that Canadians alone, and western Canadians in particular, don't either control or direct the grain trade. They are responsive to international economics. We should have every opportunity to revamp our system without anomalies in the rate, to respond to the realities of 1985 food processing and food distribution worldwide.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and recommend to my colleagues that we summarily dismiss this amendment.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I know the Leader of the Opposition has an understanding and appreciation for a complex issue and knows how important it is to the producers in this province. However, the motion put before us today is really inappropriate and, I think, should be defeated. The motion is basically a Saskatchewan motion and speaks to Saskatchewan's concerns. It doesn't cover the concerns of Alberta, even though there are similar concerns in part of the statement that I certainly would agree with and are comparable to what we have.

Basically the motion presented really rejects the proposal the federal government has put forward. After very serious and careful consideration, we've looked at all the aspects that could affect western transportation. It's an issue that's vitally important to the province of Alberta. I think I would like to share with the Assembly a couple of statements made to me that highlight it. Major national and international secondary processors of agricultural products in this province, who now have a presence here or who are looking, say that they wouldn't locate in the province of Alberta as long as the Crow rate is in place. Coming from people of that calibre, that's really some-

thing to think about. They're major companies in Calgary and Edmonton that are looking to expand into some of our rural communities. If they're not prepared to locate, I think that's vital.

Another one is that if we don't have an improvement in our system, if there's not any improvement in rail capacity, if no changes take place and we continue on the present road — I'd just like you to stop and think about a scene of high grain prices but no capacity to move it to export. We can talk today that grain prices are down, so we're concerned about what our input costs are. I have a real concern about the producers' ability to pay increased costs, but we also have to balance that by looking down the road at high grain prices which I know — I feel confident — are coming. The capacity of the system just isn't there. As long as grain is moving at a significantly lower rate — as a businessman, if I can haul something for my neighbor and at least break even or make a little bit of a profit, and I can haul for my other neighbor and get only a fifth of the cost, guess whose I'm going to work on first? I'm going to work on the one that pays the way it goes. Grain will be sitting on sidings while the other traffic moves. We've got to have a rationalization or improvement in our system.

If you look at hopper cars, if we could decrease the turnaround time on our hopper cars by one day — just one day, which would be dropping it from 19 days to 18 days, or 18 to 17 — that's the equivalent of adding 1,000 hopper cars to the system. We don't have to buy more; they're there — \$73 million worth of hopper cars and just a reduction in turnaround time. Those are some of the benefits we can get over the longer term.

We looked at all the initiatives that have come forward, and we have some concerns. We would be, I think, negligent in our duties on an issue that's this vital if we didn't take our time and try to look at them and address them, and raise those concerns and put them out there as clearly as we possibly can.

The other Friday, March 11, I made a statement in the Legislature and indicated that we generally accept the federal government's understanding of the need for a comprehensive approach to action on western rail capacity and grain handling and transportation. We viewed their proposal as a necessary first step. I think it's important to emphasize "necessary first step" toward continued agricultural growth and economic development. As I said, we had a number of concerns, and we spelled them out clearly.

The motion before us tonight is a Saskatchewan motion. As well as it is, they have addressed the Saskatchewan concerns, and we share some of them. But the motion presented now is inappropriate, and I ask all members to defeat it.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise to support this amendment. I must say that I am rather surprised by the hon. Minister of Economic Development. It's very touching to see his concern about railway profits, but it's the farmers of this province that we're talking about. He does not seem to like what the Saskatchewan government has done. I would remind him, as much as we weren't happy about it, that there was an election, and they are the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. They support this resolution. I suggest to you that the reason they're supporting it is that because they're a new government they're probably listening to the farmers rather than the Minister of Economic Development who's probably lis-

tening to the CPR.

He went into a little history. Might I suggest to him a number of the marginal farmers that I know, and the Minister of Agriculture has talked about this. The input costs are driving many of them into bankruptcy. I'm sure that when the latest figures come out it will be staggering, especially in certain parts of the province. With the security of the Crow rate going, that will be the final straw for many of our farmers, especially our young farmers.

He also talked ... [interjection] Speak up, Hugh, I couldn't hear you.

MR. PLANCHE: Supposing they can't get to market.

MR. MARTIN: Supposing they can't get to market. Let me explain how they can do it. You just stand back and listen; I'm sure you'll learn something.

You talked about history. Let us go back in history and see why the Crow rate came about. In 1897, to finish the railway, the CPR agreed — this was an agreement between the railways and the federal government at the time — to reduce freight rates on certain commodities between eastern and western Canada. The most important, of course, were grain eastbound to the lakehead for export, and farm implements westbound to the prairies. In return, the government — and this was a lot of money at the time — agreed to subsidize the CPR to the extent of \$11,000 per mile, which worked out to a total of about \$3.5 million. At that time, it was a lot of money. But the catch to it at that time, because it was an agreement — that was the bad part of the agreement for the railways, but they agreed to it because they were to get land grants of 36 million acres. That land today is some of the best land, the most important property in most western cities. It's downtown property, worth millions and millions of dollars.

There is more. In regard to that agreement they also got the mineral rights on all the lands. Even if they sold it, they kept the mineral rights. As a result of that we have Cominco, which is one of the biggest resource companies in the world. We have the PanCanadian Petroleum company, Fording Coal, which is one of their smaller ones but last year, even in the recession, it made \$150 million.

My point about all this is: a deal is a deal is a deal.

MR. PLANCHE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the member is referring to a contract to finish the railroad or a contract to continually haul grain at half a cent a tonne mile.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question. At the time, it was a deal to finish the railroad; it was to go on forever. As you know — because you talked about the 1920s — that was brought up again and it was decided again to keep the Crow because it was an historical deal.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information. Again, the hon. member is in error. The railway was already finished. It was to build a spur line, not to build the main line.

MR. SPEAKER: It's quite in order to ask a speaking member to yield the floor, if he wishes, to answer questions. Those are not points of order. But if an hon. member wishes to debate what a member who has the floor is saying, then of course that hon. member's turn may come later.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To go back in the history lesson, my point is that a deal is a deal is a deal. If at this point they want to give up the Crow rate, which is the only thing they've been losing money on — and the government has been subsidizing them, admittedly not enough. If all of a sudden at this point they want to give that up, let's negotiate the whole thing. We'll take back that land in the cities, we'll take back Cominco, we'll take back the oil companies, because that was part of the deal.

The point is that at this particular time, it's not going to break ...

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I still don't understand. Could the hon. member explain to me, is he talking about all of these concessions to finish the railroad or to haul grain at half a cent a tonne mile?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, what I'm talking about is an historical agreement in 1897. Surely the member knows that. What I'm talking about — and I'll say it slowly so he can watch my lips — is that a deal is a deal is a deal. It was an historical deal at the time, and we are asking them to continue with this deal.

The argument that is beyond the history, the point that we would make — I think one of the most telling arguments that the people on the other side talk about when they want to abolish the Crow is the idea of the meat packing industry. Certainly in this province we need help in the meat packing industry. There's no doubt about that. But as my hon. colleague said, this is still not going to make us competitive, even if they get the cheaper grain here. We go back to the example that if a Quebec farmer can send his produce to Japan cheaper than we can, we're still not going to be competitive. So we're still not going to deal with that problem.

There are two major problems. I'm not going to go through the nine points; but I think the two major things I would like to talk about and reinforce here is the fifty-fifty sharing. I, as my colleague, think that this might be as good as the next election. In other words, it might look nice at the time to hand out 50 per cent to the farmers. But you and I both know some of the problems we faced in the west. We also know that the population is especially in central Canada, Quebec and Ontario. When all of a sudden they have a deficit because of supply-side economics that keeps reaching more and more, how long is this agreement going to be there when they can outvote us by sheer numbers the next time, unless it's written down? That's one thing I think is very serious.

The second is the whole thing about performance guarantees. It's my understanding with the Pepin plan that they're going to establish a new bureaucracy. It's called, I believe, the grain transportation agency, which essentially will monitor the railway performance. For three years, there are no penalties on the railways. If they don't do anything, there are no penalties for three years. After that, we could be into a new election. There might not ever be penalties. I say to people, honestly, what kind of guarantee is that?

In conclusion, I really cannot understand the reluctance of the government not to speak with a unified voice throughout western Canada. We have the Saskatchewan government, which is a Conservative government; we have the Manitoba government, which is an NDP government; and we have most of the farm organizations in western Canada saying the Pepin plan as it now stands is wrong. We would ask this Assembly, let's get on board

with the rest of the western provinces and the farmer groups in this province, and support this amendment instead of being in bed with the federal Liberals.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise this evening to comment on some of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood with regard to the Crowsnest freight rate agreement of 1897. In his remarks this evening, there were several inaccuracies in terms of exactly what was in the 1897 agreement. I think he tended to confuse the land grants which were given for the building of the Canadian Pacific railroad up to its completion in 1885, with what was actually provided in the terms of the 1897 agreement. That agreement was to construct a line from, I believe, Lethbridge west through the Crowsnest Pass to a point in the interior of British Columbia, basically to develop the mineral resources of that part of southwestern Alberta and southeastern British Columbia. There weren't any 36 million acres that, I think, the hon. member referred to that were given to the CPR in terms of pursuing to construct that ...

MR. NOTLEY: They'd already got that, Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: True, and this is the myth that you'd like to continue to have the people of Alberta, and perhaps the people of Canada, believe: that the Crowsnest agreement and all the land grants which were given to build the CPR were somehow attached to the guarantee of the statutory freight rates. That's incorrect.

As I recollect, what was given in terms of that agreement was that land was provided by the government of British Columbia as an incentive to the CPR to construct the line. The only grant that was given by the government of Canada was some \$11,000 per mile, if I remember correctly, to construct that particular piece of railroad. In fact the federal government received from the CPR approximately 50,000 acres of coal-bearing land in southeastern British Columbia.

So let's get our facts straight on what was received in terms of the actual Crow agreement, which became statutory in 1927. Let's not confuse it with land grants which were previously made for the construction of the intercontinental railroad, which was part of the bargain to bring British Columbia into Confederation. Let's not confuse it with mineral rights of Cominco, and let's not confuse it with lands in urban cities, because that has nothing to do with the Crowsnest Pass freight rate agreement as I recollect it.

I think we have an opportunity here in terms of resolving the Crow issue and moving forward in terms of transportation bottlenecks which we see coming forward in the mid-1980s. We have this opportunity today. If we don't address these questions, we are certainly going to have bottlenecks. The question I would put forward is, are we even going to be able to get our grain to market? If we don't address these issues today, are we going to be able to get our coal — a particular interest of constituents of mine — and our sulphur to market? I think we have a unique opportunity, and we should move forward with it today. I think we should defeat the amendment of the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two remarks on this amendment. First of all, I think we've argued the historic participation of CPR with regard to its involvement in land, oil, and mineral rights,

using those acquisitions to contribute to hauling our grain at the present time. In all of my research, I have never found anywhere that there is any kind of agreement that those land grants, those mineral rights, were to subsidize the rates at the present time. So if there is clear definition that that should happen, then we as farmers in this province should be rewarded with that kind of subsidy. But I haven't found that. I've talked to CPR people and many people with regard to that question.

The other item that I raise with regard to this amendment is that there's no question that there are a number of concerns with regard to the input cost farmers face and the lack of guarantee with regard to an agreement that may or may not be signed with Ottawa. We don't know that. I think to take the Pepin plan and reject it in total prohibits us from continuing in terms of discussion and negotiation with Ottawa on a very important subject.

We as farmers, over the years, have been concerned about getting our grain to market. Other countries have criticized us in Canada because when the other countries wanted our grain at the coast, we couldn't have it there because the railways couldn't deliver the goods. We are trying to do something about it, I believe, in terms of the negotiations. I as a farmer know that when I grow my produce, I want to market it so that I, in turn, can maintain a cash flow. Over the years and a number of times, I could not market that, not because the elevator company didn't want it but because the railway couldn't move it to the coast. We the farmers lost thousands and millions of dollars just because of that fact, and I think it is time it has to stop.

We must look at the current situation. We as farmers must face the fact that we will have to pay more to market our grain in the world market. We can be subsidized or protected by government handouts, as I call it, but somewhere along the line you must move to a point of greater maturity, and that's today.

I know my constituents and farmers in southern Alberta are concerned that costs will get out of hand, that we will have no control. Let's hope we use some common sense in determining that rate of growth of cost and that we do have some kind of legislation in place to act as a disciplinarian with the railroad companies that will haul our wheat. I think we can do that as reasonable people, whether it's in the House of Parliament or in this Legislature. We as farmers have said that we are ready to open up the agreement. We are ready to take the Crow rate and say, look, we'll dispense with that and look at a new agreement.

I attended a meeting in Champion, in my own constituency, just about three years ago. There were close to 800 farmers in that meeting. The focus of discussion at that time was MAP. They rejected MAP in total, which we did in this Legislature. But they said, we want the railway to haul our goods to market, and we will compete, produce and, hopefully, make a profit as farmers. That was the objective at that time. That was the time that governments, not only here in Alberta but across Canada, were given the direction to have a serious look at the Crow rate and to look at opening up and changing that Crow rate. That's when this discussion started; it wasn't today.

Sure, today we are under financial pressure as farmers. Certainly the anxiety of what's going to happen with regard to our markets in 1984 is something we are concerned about. We are concerned about the price. We don't know what it's going to be. We hear all kinds of notes with regard to the grain prices dropping. All of us

as farmers are trying to protect ourselves against that change in pricing and the quantity that we're going to market. Well, that's the free-enterprise system; that's the way it works. If you can't sit down and run your business in a sensible way and protect yourself at the downtime of a market, then you shouldn't always have the right to enjoy and appreciate the hump in the market, which we have in the last few years. That's when you can redistribute some of your income. I think that's the way we have to look at some of these things.

Every time we get a downturn, which we are facing at the present time, we talk about subsidization, protection, and retrenching back into a lot of traditional approaches to aspects such as marketing and transportation of grain to the coast, east or west, whichever it is. I think we have to look, in a mature manner, in a contemporary way, at where we're at and what we're doing. That's my point of view. That's the point of view that I will discuss with my farmers, and discuss the Pepin plan accordingly.

Certainly the details of the program have got to be watched closely. I have been a supporter of the subsidy going to the producer. I know the difficulties in administering that type of thing; I recognize that. But that's the man that's producing his product and putting it on the market for sale. So as you market more, then you're going to receive a certain greater benefit, but in turn, you're going to pay the railway for the goods you produce. Supposedly, that is fair to all. That's the position I have at the present time with regard to that matter.

I'm not sure how to control the uncertainty of how high the transportation cost will rise in the next few years. But that is an anxiety of the farmers. The Alberta Wheat Pool meetings that have been held through my constituency in the past year have raised that concern with a number of my constituents. They have come to me and said, you know, be careful of that plan, because in — I forget what it was — five or 10 years, we will be paying \$2 to \$3 a bushel to ship our grain, so sit on top of that and watch that detail of the plan, which I will.

Hopefully I echo this message to the Minister of Economic Development, that Albertans are asking you to watch that point. Don't let it get out of hand. Don't let the federal government dupe us into believing that they will control that cost or that there is some kind of a governor on it. It isn't there; we get into trouble, and all of a sudden are then leaping back to great subsidies to the agricultural industry to compensate transportation. So I think there's some common sense that must prevail.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's how I feel about this thing. I think this amendment as such just doesn't do that. We would stop progress, stop discussion and, I think, would be putting our heads in the sand, with all due respect to my few colleagues on this side of the House that sit as opposition. That's my philosophical point of view and, I think, my practical point of view with regard to this matter at this time.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to express a few comments on this. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't want to condemn the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the stand that he has taken. I know that if we all agreed on the Gilson report immediately, it would never pan out properly. I am quite to glad to see the different organizations have their expression. However, I feel that this amendment came at the wrong place. There are other areas and times during the spring sittings when probably a motion of this type would be more appropriate.

The federal government, some 100 years ago, saw in its wisdom the need to open up western Canada and provided the Canadian Pacific Railway with large tracts of land and mineral rights for this purpose. When this was done, it was not good enough. The federal government saw that just a plain railway would not be enough. Because of that, they provided tracts of land, 160 acres, which are called homesteads, for \$10 for a quarter section of land. I think this had a real incentive for many people to come west, people from other areas of the world to come to take up tracts of land.

But in 1897, when the Crow rate agreement came into effect, it may have been all right and good for many years. Maybe it was not anticipated that inflation would go at this rate. However, at a time like this we have to look. There was no demand on those people who picked up their quarter sections of land for \$10 that if they sold them, they must sell them for \$10. Some have been selling them for \$100,000 and much more. The same with our railroads; we can't expect them to be hauling grain across the country at 14 cents or 22 cents per hundredweight when you have to pay 32 cents for a three-ounce letter that will go only 10 or 12 miles, and sometimes it take a whole month to get there.

I mentioned earlier that there are areas — and I don't totally agree. When the minister made his announcement Friday on the stand of Alberta on the Crow rate, he himself stated that he did not agree with everything in the Gilson report. But if we do nothing, we're going to be in the problem we were 10 years ago, 30 years ago, and 50 years ago. I know that even with this change in the Crow rate everything won't be just perfect at once, but there'll be place for amendments and change. As long as we don't do anything, I think the farmers of this country are going to be fewer and fewer, as they are already. I think we may have to pay just a little more, but I'd rather pay a little more than having my grain stand out and buying a new granary every year.

Maybe the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to see nothing done. If things go bad, there's a good enough reason to keep complaining all the time. If you don't do anything, it's no good; if you do anything, it's wrong also.

So I am going to oppose this amendment. If it were brought at another time of the session, maybe I would give it some consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: While we're waiting for the time to elapse, hon. members may be interested in a detail in relation to recorded votes. As you can see, we use this timer with the sand in it. It takes about four minutes, and that is the way it has been over the years. Now that there are a substantial number of members in the Agriculture Building, we thought we would change the system a little by turning the timer over twice. That gives eight minutes.

There's nothing in the *Standing Orders* about it, but it's a custom that has worked reasonably well over the years. If, however, members in the Agriculture Building take to scooters or roller skates, we might revert to the four minutes.

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:
Martin

Notley

Against the motion:

Alexander	Harle	Pengelly
Alger	Hiebert	Planche
Anderson	Hyland	Purdy
Batiuk	Isley	Reid
Bradley	Jonson	Russell
Campbell	King	Shaben
Carter	Koper	Shrake
Clark	Kowalski	Sparrow
Cook	Koziak	Speaker, R
Crawford	Lee	Stevens
Cripps	LeMessurier	Stiles
Diachuk	McPherson	Thompson
Drobot	Moore, R.	Topolnisky
Elliott	Musgreave	Trynchy
Embury	Musgrove	Webber
Fischer	Nelson	Weiss
Fjordbotten	Oman	Woo
Fyfe	Paproski	Zip
Gogo		
Totals:	Ayes — 2	Noes — 55

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to speak for the first time in this Assembly and in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I'd like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your reappointment to the position as Speaker of our Assembly. I think it's fair to say it's confirmation of the high regard that you are held in by members of this House, of both present and past assemblies. I'd also like to congratulate my colleagues from Grande Prairie and Calgary Foothills in moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I'd like, if I may, to speak a little about the constituency of Olds-Didsbury, that I have the privilege to represent. It lies squarely in the rich black-soil zone of south-central Alberta on the Edmonton-Calgary corridor, running as far west as the Banff park boundary in the high foothills of the Rocky Mountains. It runs from the south, starting at a point south of Crossfield on No. 2 Highway, to the north to a point roughly between Olds and Bowden.

It's one of the oldest established areas in the province. The black soil attracted settlers in the early days of the opening up of the west, and the productivity of the area has resulted in a very dense population. In the area that is developed, in the rural area, there are from six to nine people per square mile, which is a high density of population for Alberta, many areas running only in the one to one and a half people per square mile, if that. We have six urban centres, five towns, one village, and several hamlets and rural residential developments. The total population of the urban development of the constituency runs in the order of 12,500 people.

Agriculture is the first industry of our constituency, as it is in the province of Alberta. The rich soil and favorable climate attracted, as I said, settlers in the very early days of the development of this province to the Olds-Didsbury area, where they established farms well before the turn of the century. Many of those farms today are being operated by the third and, in some cases, fourth generations of those early pioneers. It's a mixed farming region, and that lends itself to the density of population — smaller farms, not the big tracts of land that you find further to the east. Many livestock-intensive operations and many purebred operations are in this area. In the eastern part of the constituency the farms run more to grain production, and in the west to cattle ranching. But

there are also intensive hog and poultry operations.

The importance of agriculture to our province is something that is often overlooked. It's unfortunate that members of the press are no longer present; they might learn something about the importance of this very high-profile industry in this province. It's important to the small towns of the province in the sense that they were established in support of the agricultural industry and continue to perform that function. They are the suppliers of goods and services to the farmer. It's an incredible thing, but I understand from information given to me that approximately 50 per cent of Alberta's labor force is engaged in one way or another in the agribusiness sector. That's a very large proportion of our labor force, and it's an indication of the importance of agriculture to Alberta.

Agriculture is a steady influence in our economy in the sense that when there is a downturn, as we are experiencing at the moment in the oil and gas sector, as in central Canada they are experiencing in the manufacturing sector, these kinds of downturns have a very detrimental affect on the economy as a whole. But in the case of the farmer, no matter what the circumstances and no matter what his experience the year before, the crop always goes in the next year. In order to do that, the farmer must spend, and he does. He buys seed, fertilizer, chemical sprays and, of course, machinery. That ongoing year-to-year business activity on the part of our farmers is what keeps our economy relatively stable in these rural communities and, I suggest to you, in the province. Some of the hon. members who represent city ridings are perhaps not aware of the importance of that agribusiness sector to their ridings and to the economy of the cities as well as the small towns. I must move on now, though; I don't want to bore you with agriculture.

Olds-Didsbury is not unique in Alberta in this area, but certainly oil and gas is a very important factor in the economy of this constituency. In the '50s oil was discovered in the constituency, and virtually all the area east of the Red Deer River has been developed by the oil and gas industry in producing oil wells. Simultaneously with the oil wells, of course, came the discovery of natural gas. At the present time, anywhere you go in the constituency, you will find the gooney birds bobbing up and down, bringing that oil to the surface.

Of course, the natural gas industry resulted in a construction boom in the '50s, in the beginning of the processing industry and the extraction of sulphur. We now have five major plants in the Olds-Didsbury constituency producing and processing natural gas. In addition to that, of course, we have the pipeline gathering system and a tremendous amount of activity in the area of pipeline construction and related activities: pumping stations, compressor stations, and that sort of thing. So there are many people today who earn their living in our constituency from the oil and gas industry in addition to the agricultural industry.

The development of oil and gas, of course, brought people to the constituency, and we had a population explosion in the '50s and '60s in Olds-Didsbury as a result. Another spinoff is the development of a service industry in our major towns. That's a key factor, too, in the economy of the region. One of the things about oil and gas in this area is that it's a production situation. We're producing oil and natural gas. As a result those are permanent jobs, and that work goes on from year to year. That, too, has a steady influence on the economy in this area of the province.

Unfortunately, when it comes to oil and gas develop-

ment and agriculture both located in the same area, there are always conflicts. Certainly it's welcome news to the people in the Olds-Didsbury constituency that we'll be looking at revising the Surface Rights Act in the coming session of this Legislature, something they've been looking for for a long time.

There are concerns also, of course, with sour gas in this region. Many of the wells are sour. Many of the gas plants are processing a lot of sour gas, and these problems will keep coming up. My friend from Edmonton Glengarry referred earlier today to the problem of enforcing the standards. We have good standards in Alberta, but one of the criticisms I have heard in travelling around our constituency is that perhaps those standards aren't enforced enough.

Certainly, in the area of the oil and gas industry, the people of Olds-Didsbury were pleased to see the moves by this government in the oil and gas activity plan and, later, the development drilling program. Last fall, after the announcement of the development drilling program in August, the almost instant effect that that had on the exploration industry was evident. Everywhere we drove west of No. 2 Highway, we saw new drilling rigs coming in and setting up, drilling new wells. So that development is still going on and still contributing to the wealth of that region.

I don't want to ignore tourism and recreation in these remarks, because certainly the Olds-Didsbury constituency is an area that lends itself to tourism and recreation. In the western area of the constituency, we have excellent opportunities for camping, fishing, hiking and, of course, in the proper season of the year, hunting. Hunting has produced some problems recently, and those are problems that we will have to address in terms of the conflict between hunters and some of the occupiers of the land being hunted on.

Over in the forest reserve to the west of the western region of the constituency, there are some excellent hiking trails, and rivers and streams for fishing that are unsurpassed in Alberta, I think. Ram River Falls, in the west part of our constituency, is also a little-known attraction but certainly one well worth visiting. I understand that the height of the falls is just slightly less than Niagara Falls; maybe not quite so spectacular, but there you are. They're certainly an interesting spot to visit, and you don't have to travel to central Canada to see them, and you don't have to get married.

One other point I should make: in the area just west of Sundre on the Red Deer River, probably some of the finest white water canoeing in the province, if not in Canada, can be found.

Transportation is a key issue for our constituency. For agriculture, for oil and gas, and for tourism and recreation, transportation is obviously important. We have a fine system of highways in this province, and certainly in the Olds-Didsbury constituency that is also true. We have a good secondary road system. The 1982 program for development and paving highways in the province, that was a special program by our Transportation ministry, had its results in our constituency. Many miles of new paving were completed in the fall of 1982. The Sundre highway, Highway 27, has been enlarged, widened, and improved. We now are looking forward to the completion of Highway 22, the highway that — in our part of the province, at least — runs from the No. 1 Highway in the area of Cochrane north along the foothills, connecting through Cremona and Sundre up to Rocky Mountain House. I understand that in the future it will go further

north, providing Albertans and visitors with an alternate route along the foothills of the province, in the parkland. Certainly that will be welcome when it is completed. I understand portions of that will be worked on this coming summer. It's been something that has been long called for by the large number of people who live in the area between Cremona and Sundre and further north towards Caroline.

From the point of view of the agricultural sector, transportation is key. I appreciated the comments tonight by some hon. members with respect to the Crow dispute. I don't want to bore you by going into that again. But certainly with some of the rail line abandonments that have been going on, the trucking industry is an essential factor here, because now it's necessary for farmers to engage the large trucks to move their grain. I think one of the problems raised as a possible concern with respect to the Pepin and Gilson recommendations was that the railways would not remain competitive. But as long as there is a compensatory rate, I suggest that the trucking industry will be able to get involved in the movement of grain, and that will provide the edge that will keep the railways competitive, to some extent at least. Certainly if we move to a compensatory rate, it will provide the farmer with an alternative and a choice in how he moves his grain, and that's important.

The other feature, of course, where the Crow rate is so important is the development of a processing industry in Alberta, something we've been losing to central Canada over the years and something we simply must get back if we're going to develop the agricultural industry to the degree that it can be in Alberta, to open new markets and maintain the old ones.

The Olds-Didsbury constituency is situated on the Calgary-Edmonton railway line. As a matter of interest, I understand that that line has carried more tonnage per mile than any other piece of railway trackage in Canada. It's certainly an indication of the economic vitality of this province, but it is also a matter of concern to the small communities located on that line. One of the concerns they express is the movement of passenger traffic. Passenger traffic has been discouraged over the years. I like to think of the attitude of Via Rail and, earlier, the CPR as being that of the man convicted of murdering his mother and father and standing before the judge asking for mercy on the grounds that he's an orphan. Passenger travel is a means of moving people by rail that we need to address. Certainly the communities close to Calgary and Edmonton are looking at large numbers of commuters today, and we should be looking at the possibility of moving commuters by rail instead of enlarging our highway system.

In the area of health care, our constituency is well served. We have three hospitals. Two of them are to be replaced in the coming months with new hospitals. At Didsbury, that was announced in the Speech from the Throne, and the one at Olds will be replaced soon. It's not quite as far along in the planning stages, however. Costs of providing health and hospital care are rising. That's a concern we all have. It points up the importance of preventive medicine. In that regard we in the Olds-Didsbury constituency are served by the Mountain View health unit, who provide us with nursing, family counselling, and assistance with babies — the well-baby clinics and so forth. I was proud to be involved in the opening recently of the health unit's new premises in the new provincial court building in Didsbury.

So far as our senior citizens are concerned, I should

mention that we are proud of the record of this government in regard to the seniors of our province. I am certainly intrigued when I speak with the senior citizens, and I'm sure we all join in recognizing the contribution that these people have made to the development of this province. I think we all recognize the hardships these people faced in the early years. They were resourceful; they were self-sufficient. They did it on their own. It's refreshing to hear them describe the early days, particularly so in the knowledge that these people did not rely on outside help. The hardships they faced, they faced on their own and made do — something perhaps we could learn today in some areas.

One of the concerns that our seniors have — I won't go into the long list of benefits they enjoy today, and rightly so — that we should address, and I'm sure we will, is the problem of taxation of a senior citizen who has retired from farming and finds that he's suddenly exposed to taxation of his quarter section, that he's still living on as a retiree, in the form of a country/residential instead of a farm. I think that's something that needs to be addressed.

In the area of education, here again we are well served. We have consolidated schools in all of the urban centres in our constituency. As our population has expanded, of course, the funds have been provided to expand the schools as well. In Sundre, I believe we are having another such expansion in 1983. There's been a development recently of private schools in our constituency, and that's causing some problems in the area of educational finance that we'll have to address. But as a source of competition for the public school system, I believe the development of these schools can only serve to benefit students in the long run.

I would be remiss if, in covering the area of education, I didn't dwell for a moment on the educational feature of our constituency, the Olds College. The Olds College was founded in 1913 as the Olds School of Agriculture and Home Economics. That means that this year, it's celebrating its 70th anniversary. In 1971 it was transferred from the realm of Agriculture to the Advanced Education Department, and in 1978 this college became self-governing, with its own board of governors. It's earned a position of leadership over the years, and I think it's recognized throughout Alberta and, certainly to a large extent, western Canada as a leading institution in the area of agricultural education.

The college is combined with a substantial farming operation that started out actually a couple of years earlier, in 1911, as a demonstration farm. It was combined with the college in 1913 and serves as a means of instruction for students in a hands-on format of teaching agricultural education. Perhaps more than any other farm in Alberta, the Olds College farm is a statement to both Albertans and interprovincial visitors about the priority accorded agriculture in Alberta.

In that light, I have to say that the Olds College farm and the college itself have fallen behind in recent years in terms of its capital development. Capital projects have not been seen there in the last 10 years and, as a result, the college is suffering some really serious concerns in the area of how they are going to continue to provide the kind of technical leadership and education for agriculture. If they are to maintain the position they have earned over the years, it's essential that we move forward in all areas of technical development. The agricultural education part of that development is key to the success of young farmers coming on and learning in a setting that includes the latest technological developments. If we

don't have that at our college, if we don't have the technology that is in the surrounding area, certainly the credibility of that college as a leading institution is going to suffer.

The college administration is pleased with the response in recent talks of the previous Minister of Advanced Education and our present minister. I believe I can say that the government of this province recognizes their concerns and understands them. I believe we will be moving to do something about those concerns in the next few months.

We're living in exciting times. In the last 60, 80 years, we've seen great changes here in Alberta as well as the western world — rapid change, incredibly rapid change in recent years. In my father's time, he saw the final development of the industrial age and witnessed the change from animal power to machine power in western Canada. In my time, I've watched the development of the electronic era from the days in the middle '30s when radios first came into common use to the present time, when we've developed technology to the point that we've been able to put a man on the moon; not only that, but to watch him take that first giant step.

It's a fantastic time to have been living. But we've only just scratched the surface in this area. We're now seeing people being replaced in the manufacturing and other sectors by robots, by machines. That's going to go on. If you take that to its logical extension, there will come a day when machines will produce all of the goods that we consume, and we won't require people in those types of activities. That's going to cause severe dislocations. I think we're seeing in our present unemployment statistics some of the result of the dislocations that that's causing. I don't think it's all downturn; I think it's partly that kind of dislocation that we're witnessing. We have to address that problem.

In that context, I welcome the initiatives spelled out in the throne speech; for example, \$44 million to be spent in technical training of our young people, in developing technical training courses; in agriculture, the initiatives in developing strategic markets and developing those markets, encouraging and supporting the development of a processing industry in Alberta, the developments in the transportation of agricultural production, the approaches to farm input costs, and the opening up of public lands to increase production. We welcome, as I said earlier, the surface rights amendments. It's a time of change. We need new approaches, new ideas. That is the challenge today. It's similar to the challenges that perhaps were faced by our pioneers. I'm confident it's a challenge that will be met by this Assembly and by this government.

In conclusion I would like to invite you all to come to Olds-Didsbury this summer, because on August 4, 5, and 6 of this year the county of Mountain View, which makes up the largest portion of our constituency, will be hosting the Alberta Summer Games. It's a good opportunity to come and see our constituency. You're all welcome.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's a real honor to be able to participate again in the throne speech debate. I remember my first time, in the last session. Hopefully my speech will be just as memorable this time as it was my first time.

Mr. Speaker, before I really launch into my remarks, I'd like to recognize you again, sir. You are now the dean of Speakers right across the country, and I think you're recognized as being the person who has served us well and who is looked to by Speakers right across the country for inspiration and a source of ideas and re-

ferences. Again, Mr. Speaker, congratulations on your re-election.

I'd like to also recognize the very fine contributions made by the hon. members for Grande Prairie and Calgary Foothills. They set a very high standard for the debate, and I think that my seat mate from Olds-Didsbury has reached those high standards. It puts us, the members of the class of '79, at — if you like, it gives us a . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Challenge.

MR. COOK: Challenge, that's right. The throne speech reminds me of the old Charles Dickens quote of this being the best of times and the worst of times. We have in Alberta the highest level of services of any province in Canada. Yet we are also struggling with current difficulties of a very difficult financial picture. The OPEC accord today in London might help us somewhat to solve our short-term difficulty without having a good pricing agreement. What's good for OPEC is good for Alberta. I certainly hope the gentlemen meeting in London come to a good accord that will give us some price stability and also a production agreement that will provide some stability in that market.

I'd like to touch on this debate in two ways. I'd like to ask some questions — a philosophical approach, if you like — and then I'd like to turn to the throne speech itself and see how the questions I'm going to pose relate to the content. The first question is, gosh, can we sustain the present level of services in this province with such a difficult economic picture that we have? The international markets for our products — oil, grains, forestry products — are all in decline. Expenditures on social services and in a number of other areas are on the up side. We're having a difficult time trying to balance the two. We have about a \$3.5 billion deficit, the Provincial Treasurer has said, and that's somewhat helped out by the resource income and the income from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, in reducing that impact. Still, we have a very difficult time.

Can we sustain our present level of services? Secondly, can we become more efficient in our delivery of those services? The third one is, can we adapt our province, our economy, to take advantage of the opportunities that now exist in the world market? It sort of relates to the comments that my seat mate from Olds-Didsbury was asking about the challenges of the future.

Let's look at the industrial heartland in the United States with reference to sustaining our services. Anybody who has driven down interstate in Ohio or New York state in the last little while will have seen huge chunks of pavement missing or road detours because the bridges are not being well maintained and are in danger of collapse. There are sewers and water lines in New York state that are collapsing. My point is that they have built up a physical infrastructure in the industrial heartland in the United States that is not now able to be financially sustained.

In the U.S. Congress a while ago, there was a debate over whether or not there should be an increased gas tax to try to make some very necessary repairs. Even in the debate in the U.S. Congress, the point was made that even with those new revenues there would not be enough money to go back and redevelop all of the physical infrastructure in place now. There are bridges, for example, in the state of Maine that were built out of steel in the 1920s. Because of a great flood there then, a whole series of

them were wiped out and replaced with steel bridges. The life of those bridges was designed for 60 years; that's how long the steel was basically designed to stand up. The life of those bridges has run out. The state of Maine is finding it difficult to find the money to replace all of those bridges.

You might ask me, why are you saying that? Well, we're embarking on a very ambitious road-building project in this province. We're building hospitals, water and sewer lines, and we are going to face a day when it's required for us to go back and rebuild those roads. In fact, there is a real cost to roads. The average life of a road is about eight years. So every year, you have to go back and resurface, rebuild, reinstall culverts, or do something to maintain it. If we don't, it will be an infrastructure that will just fall apart.

So when we are looking at urban transit questions or water and sewer lines, we have to look at a different approach, I think. The "small is beautiful" approach is a new idea. Let me give you an example. We're building a very expensive water treatment plant in Fort Chipewyan, a very small community and a very expensive facility. One has to ask the question about whether or not we can sustain that. In Edmonton, we are developing a very expensive regional centralized water and sewer system that will service Vegreville, for example. Can we afford these grand, centralized services instead of going to a smaller local kind of service, perhaps more along the lines of the Fort Chipewyan. Rather than having big centralized facilities spread out the province, maybe the way to go is through the route that has been taken in Fort Chipewyan.

We're going to have some real problems in the next while trying to maintain the infrastructure we put in place. I've argued in this Assembly — and perhaps some of my friends of a more conservative hue will listen carefully when I say this — against subsidies for energy, for water and sewer lines, because it distorts the market place. It puts in place a system that encourages consumption and does not encourage conservation. I think that's the best form of conservatism: doing more with less, having a smaller impact on our resources; be they capital, land, water, or air resources. Doing more with less is the best kind of conservatism I know of. So I'd argue, for example, that we should abolish subsidies on home heating, farm fuels, and water and sewer lines. If we're looking for economies, there's a long list that we should be looking at.

The public sector is going to have to do more with less. Another good example is when I was working with the Workers' Compensation Board select committee, with the hon. minister from Edmonton Beverly. We went into the operation of the Workers' Compensation Board and found out that they were handling thousands and thousands of files by hand. They had not yet gone to a computerized system, which would be much more efficient, much less labor intensive, and much less expensive to operate. But that's the opportunity we've got to take.

I want to touch basically on the Japanese experience that is under way right now. Japan went through a series of oil shocks in the late '60s and early '70s. They had oil supply disruptions. They asked themselves what they could do to try to get off oil, to get off the energy intensive form of economic development they have — steel, automobiles, plastics, petrochemicals. They said to themselves, how can we develop an industrial structure that will give us jobs and not be energy intensive? Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1981 a special committee was formed. I

don't know what it is in Japanese, but translated into English it's called the committee of 60. The committee was basically a group of government officials from the ministry of international trade and industry and the national chamber of commerce from Japan. That committee was given the mandate by both the government and the national chamber of commerce to develop a new industrial strategy for Japan for the 1980s.

There's a good book called *The World Challenge*, that I would highly recommend to members, written by Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, who was a former French cabinet minister. It's just been released. He said basically that the committee of 60 looked at four things. They said that given the supply of energy and disruptions, Japan had to get out of energy intensive industries. They're phasing out steel, cars, plastics, and petrochemicals. We may smile, scratch our heads, and say, gosh, but look at all those Datsuns and Toyotas on the street. What's happening, Mr. Speaker, is that in the last couple of years the national chamber of commerce and the ministry of international trade have basically mandated those companies to start setting up subsidiary companies in the Philippines and Indonesia, and to start selling technology to those subsidiary companies. We won't be buying Datsuns from Japan for very much longer. We're going to be buying them from the Philippines, Indonesia, or Singapore, because they're getting out of that industry. There's no future in it. They do not want to defend industries that are unable to compete for themselves on the international market.

They said, what can we do to replace this as a source of employment? Well, they're going to get involved in the export of knowledge. Per capita, Japan generates about three times as many engineers through its universities as the United States. Almost as many engineers are graduated out of Japan as the United States, with a population of half the size. The Canadian record is even worse. We do not generate very many engineers in this country. Alberta has had a long waiting list in its engineering schools. We're not meeting the challenge. Japan is exporting engineering technology and services worldwide. They're going into computers and genetic engineering, as a couple of ideas of labor intensive, highly paid jobs that have little impact on their home environment. They're clean industries.

The key, Mr. Speaker, is that Japan wants to be on the forefront of industry and technology, and so they've also changed their tax laws in the last two years. Japan spent very little on research and development until the late 1970s. They've gone from a point where they were spending about 2 or 3 per cent of their GNP on research and development to the point now where they're spending fully 6 per cent; and they're on the way up. Six per cent of all yen that are circulated in Japan is reinvested in new technology and development. So they create new ideas that create new products that they can sell worldwide, because there's no competition for them. If they develop a new strain of plant, or medical research generates a new piece of equipment, they can market that worldwide and sell it because no one else is producing it.

Canada, on the other hand, is fighting a rear-guard action, trying to protect old industries. The Crowsnest freight rate debate that we had with the members from the New Democratic Party a little earlier this afternoon is a good example of outmoded, old thinking, trying to keep in place a status quo that has no relevance instead of trying to boldly face the future and face the challenges.

Mr. Speaker, the bailout of Chrysler and Massey-

Ferguson — those kinds of things are other examples of trying to maintain the status quo in an old, outmoded industry that has no future in industrialized democracies today. We just cannot compete with the people in Brazil or Indonesia who have lower wage rates and scales and are willing to work harder. We cannot compete with those people, so we shouldn't even try. What we should try to do is use our skills and our knowledge, sell that worldwide, and develop new technologies.

Japan is also creating training institutes, and they have already established in the southeast Asian nations. What they're trying to do is create technology links with their trading partners so they can sell their technology, so they can equip the new countries with the social and intellectual infrastructure to accept their technology, for a price.

Clearly, if we do not change our ways Canada is going to be left with the same role that we have today, Mr. Speaker. We're going to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. It seems to me that the challenges of the 1980s should concentrate our minds. Sir Walter Raleigh, just before he was executed, was sitting in the Tower of London and said that nothing concentrates a man's mind so much as the knowledge that he's about to be executed in the morning. Surely that is the rule for the western industrialized democracies. We have got to concentrate our minds and realize that there is no future in what we're doing industrially.

Alberta is starting to realize the vagaries of the international market for the products that it's selling on the world market. We're suppliers of resources. If OPEC is having problems, Alberta has problems; if the world grain prices are down, Alberta has problems; if forestry products are not in high demand, Alberta has problems. Those are all primary resource products.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very talented people in this province. We should be providing incentives and trying to develop research and development and highly technical industry that gives us a cutting edge on the future, much like the Japanese have done. The Japanese, as I referred to, have sat down in the last two years and put together an industrial strategy that concentrates on education, putting computers into schools, teaching the kids, setting high and rigorous standards in mathematics and the sciences, and demanding all school children to achieve in national exams that are set. We have to set high standards for ourselves in education and create economic opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the second point of my contribution will be quite brief I want to go through the throne speech presentation and just look at how the agenda I outlined relates to the throne speech as presented by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. We are making strides, Mr. Speaker. We see that postsecondary enrolments in this province have risen dramatically. At the University of Alberta, there is a shortage of computer terminals and computer time. Computing science is an area that we need to put more emphasis on in Advanced Education. It is a link not just for computer science, but it links all the physical sciences. In fact, it links any transfer of knowledge from one individual to another.

Computing science is so important that it is said that we will be functionally illiterate by the year 1990 if we do not know BASIC. BASIC is a method of entering material into a computer right now. If we do not understand how to use the computer at that level, we will be functionally illiterate, because the rest of society, the rest of the community, will be using the computer for recording data and information. If we cannot use it, we are going to

be poor for it. We won't be able to compete in society. So we have about a seven- or eight-year horizon to upgrade our skills as individuals. It's like learning how to read. Mr. Speaker, it is a credit to the Minister of Education that computers are being installed in the schools. That's an important program, and that is referred to in the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research is a good example of how we can put money into research and try to provide incentives for Albertans to create new ideas, new technologies and, hopefully, something that we can market worldwide.

There are some other quick points I'd like to make. The Minister of International Trade is doing a very fine job marketing our products and identifying opportunities for our people worldwide. It is that aggressive approach to selling our ideas and technology that we have got to take. I think the minister deserves a lot of credit.

The venture capital fund that the province has created is another good example of how we can try to reward initiative and new ideas, new technologies. The Utilities and Telecommunications ministry is also developing a program of research through the Alberta Government Telephones operation.

Agriculture research, Farming for the Future: I've said before in this Assembly that I don't think we're doing enough in this area. Although Farming for the Future is an important operation and is doing some very, very good work, it's too short-sighted, Mr. Speaker. It has a very short period of time that it looks at. It looks basically at projects that are viable over a five-year period. It does not look long term. It cannot look, for example, at genetic engineering, where we might be able to splice the genes from legumes that fix nitrogen with grain crops. That sort of research is being done now, and if we don't develop that here for our products, somebody else will and somebody else will sell us the service for a fee. In the meantime, if we try to challenge ourselves and do that, we can export worldwide our services, our ideas, our products.

MRS. CRIPPS: We are doing that.

MR. COOK: But we're not doing enough of that. If you think of agriculture as being a multibillion dollar operation in this province, then to keep up with the Japanese we would have to spend \$60 million a year in research alone. We're not doing that. We're spending an important amount of money, but it amounts to a very small amount. It's not enough.

Mr. Speaker, generally I would like to say that I think we are making important strides to meeting the challenge. The throne speech reflects that. I think more needs to be done. I would like to congratulate the government for moving in this direction. I would like to urge all hon. members to support the motion by the hon. Member for Grande Prairie and seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the Assembly sit tomorrow night and that the business will be continuation of the debate in respect of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

[At 10:22 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]