

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, March 15, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 23****Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund  
Special Appropriation Act, 1983-84**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 23, the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1983-84. 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 short Bill is to authorize the Provincial Treasurer to transfer 15 per cent of the non-renewable resource revenues received in the 1983-84 fiscal year from the General Revenue Fund to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 23 read a first time]

**Bill 2****Aerial Photographic Survey  
Repeal Act**

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to beg leave to introduce Bill No. 2, the Aerial Photographic Survey Repeal Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to no longer require private individuals or companies to have licences to photograph land in Alberta from the air, to be used for mapping or surveying purposes.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

**Bill 16****Companies Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 16, the Companies Amendment Act, 1983.

Public companies that are authorized to issue shares under the Securities Act must comply with two different sets of rules under both the Securities Act and the Companies Act. The purpose of the amendment is to consolidate these rules, in form and substance, to relieve such public companies from unnecessary paperwork and to provide consistency in provincial legislation.

[Leave granted; Bill 16 read a first time]

**Bill 4****Planning Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to intro-

duce Bill No. 4, the Planning Amendment Act, 1983, an amendment to allow for the completion of regional plans, to be effective December 31, 1983, and to maintain preliminary regional plans until the new regional plans are in place.

[Leave granted; Bill 4 read a first time]

**Bill 20****Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1983**

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 20, the Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1983.

The purpose of this Bill is to make the name changes in the legislation reflective of the changes in departmental responsibilities. Reference will be included to ensure that the minister may make regulations ensuring that additional construction of new lines will require agreement of property owners. The Bill will permit the co-ops to hook up customers in franchise areas whose consumption previously made them ineligible. Lastly, the Bill allows rural municipal authorities to be subject to the same provisions as the rural gas co-ops.

[Leave granted; Bill 20 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 4, 16, and 20 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 201****An Act to Amend the  
Motor Vehicle Administration Act**

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 201, An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicle Administration Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow a judge to order the seizure of a vehicle operated by an impaired driver who has been convicted of a previous offence and is operating without a driver's licence.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1981-82 annual report of the Agricultural Development Corporation. Copies were forwarded to members on December 7, 1982.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the Legislature copies of the 1981-82 Public Accounts of the province of Alberta, volumes 1 and 11. They were made public on February 9, 1983. As well, in a package which was available, members will be provided with supplementary information and the financial summary and budgetary review for the same fiscal year.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the first annual report of the Alberta Health Occupations Board.

This being the first annual report of the board, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation and that of the government to Mr. Elvin Christenson, chairman of the board, and the members of

the board for their work in the establishment of the board during the year 1982.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this afternoon to introduce 22 grade 6 students from St. Bede school in the Edmonton Gold Bar constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Bahry, and parents Mrs. Fraser and Mr. Tulodzeike. They are in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the Assembly some students from Senator Gershaw high school in Bow Island. Approximately 20 students made the bus trip to visit the capital and the Legislature. The students are accompanied by Brian and Pam Moen and Ernie Van Soest. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Legislature, please.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce to you, and through you, 26 grade 6 students from Breton school. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Tom Gray, bus driver Ted Grzyb, and parents Mr. Ernie Mockerman, Mrs. Mockerman, Mrs. Marg Stevenson, Mrs. Elaine Adair, and Mrs. Charlotte Sobon. They have participated in a model legislature, and the students are interested in seeing their real life counterparts over there, so look sharp. They're seated in the members gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure today in introducing a class of some 20 grade 6 students who are visiting the Legislature from Anne Fitzgerald school in the constituency of Edmonton Beverly. They are accompanied by a parent, Mr. Marvin Drews, and a school teacher who, coincidentally, has the same name as the Minister of Education, David King. I wonder what those students sometimes share with David King in their class. I welcome them here today. I ask if they would rise in the public gallery and receive the usual welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Royalty Tax Credit Program

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It flows from the February update on the budget, showing our deficit up from \$758 million to just under \$2.4 billion. With respect to the royalty tax credit, which was estimated at \$282 million — and in the February update, it's going to come to some \$674 million — is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to advise the Assembly whether, to the government's knowledge, any companies took advantage of this scheme to offend the spirit of the scheme by either selling assets or dividing their operations so that they might be entitled to several credits instead of one?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the royalty tax credit is an integral part of the oil and gas activity plan, which was introduced last spring, as hon. members know. The royalty tax credit benefit flows mostly during the 1982 and

1983 calendar years.

Last summer we became aware of possible problems with respect to the way in which the royalty tax credit was being used or might be contemplated as being used in future. Of course the credit was designed, and I believe has been very effective, to assist the smaller oil and gas companies in the province in generating jobs and in exploration and production. Members will recall that last August, I believe, I issued a statement which indicated that from the point of view of policy, which would subsequently be buttressed by legislation, we would be clarifying the interpretation of the previous legislation with regard to the eligibility of the royalty tax credit to the total of \$4 million. Accordingly, at that stage that was the policy and has been the policy. In this session, legislation which will implement that will be introduced in the form of amendments to the corporate tax Act.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. During the course of the investigations that led to the announcement in August, is the minister in a position today to advise the Assembly how many companies may have offended the spirit of the program by selling some of their assets or dividing their operations in such a way as to qualify for more than one royalty tax credit?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Legislature of course debates at length, and there are many views about the extent to which the spirit of a given policy may be acquiesced in or blurred. We have to deal with what the law of the Assembly is and was. The law of this Assembly, the corporate tax Act as passed in previous years, sets forth the eligibility of the royalty tax credit. From the point of view of compliance with the law itself, last summer we indicated that we wanted to clarify the existing provisions. So we made available a policy statement to that effect in August, made it available to the industry. Amendments to effect that clarification will be brought into the Assembly for debate within weeks.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly today whether in fact companies sold some of their assets or divided their operations in such a way as to qualify for more than one royalty tax credit in a program that I remind the Provincial Treasurer has mushroomed from a cost of \$280 million to \$670 million, \$400 million of public funds. How many companies took advantage of that particular scheme to subdivide and benefit to the tune of more grants than we were told they would otherwise qualify for?

MR. HYNDMAN: I think the question as to what companies received what royalty tax credits is one for the Order Paper, and that would be public information, Mr. Speaker.

I can only say that the Treasury Department was implementing the law as passed, in terms of the eligibility of various companies who receive royalty tax credits. That information can be made available. But again I point out that it was originally planned to have a very significant amount, the largest part of the royalty tax credit, plugged in to help jobs and activity in the oil industry in 1982 and 1983. Therefore it's no surprise to see the very large amounts, which I think have clearly benefited and continue to benefit smaller oil producers,

smaller oil discoverers in this province, and certainly have created job activity in a major way.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, I'm delighted to learn that.

Mr. Speaker, an announcement as to clarification was made in August by the Provincial Treasurer. Undoubtedly something caused the Provincial Treasurer to want to clarify the position. That something was companies taking advantage of the scheme who might not otherwise be entitled to it. My question to the Provincial Treasurer: are there any facts that could be given today, or any information that could be shared with the members of the Assembly, as to the extent of companies taking advantage of this scheme?

MR. HYNDMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last summer, we felt, and my officials indicated that they thought there may be a concern developing with regard to the extent to which the royalty tax credit appeared to have been used by various organizations, various companies that were applying. We were applying and continue to apply the law as a matter of administration of the law of the Assembly. Through the statement that was made, we indicated that modifications and a tightening up, a clarification, would take place. Amendments will be introduced to effect that. If the hon. member is interested in those companies who received royalty tax credits and the amounts, certainly that information will be available upon the introduction of the appropriate motion for a return.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to advise the Assembly specifically what steps were taken by the Treasury Department or the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to monitor the operation of the royalty tax credit program from its inception?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, the usual appropriate monitoring approaches were taken from its inception, Mr. Speaker. Those are monitoring approaches which take place with respect to any tax credit, whether it's a renter tax credit, a royalty tax credit, or the various other tax credits that are administered.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Treasurer in a position to advise the Assembly why it was August and not earlier? In view of the mushrooming impact of this program from an estimate of \$280 million to some \$670 million, why did it take so long to plug the loophole?

MR. HYNDMAN: It wasn't a question of taking time, Mr. Speaker. When the legislation was implemented — I believe the royalty plan was implemented in March last year — the members will recall that it was significantly enriched from previous years, for the purpose of assisting the oil and gas industry in this province. Over the ensuing five months, it was noticed that there was need for a tightening up and a clarification, and that was announced.

There's no question, though, Mr. Speaker, that the royalty tax credit has been very, very effective indeed in building jobs and activity in the industry. That's one of the reasons very large amounts — hundreds of millions of dollars — are being used, in terms of the royalty tax credit, to assist the industry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. There may have been jobs created; I would hope so, for \$670 million. But that's almost \$400 million more than was in the budget.

At this stage, do we have any global estimate as to the extent by which companies may have benefited by subdividing their operations and obtaining more than one royalty tax credit? Do we have any figures at all that can be shared with the Assembly? We can go through the process of a motion for a return, and no doubt will. But has the minister any global figure that could be shared with the Assembly now?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the member is asking for information as to whether or not, and the extent to which, companies did or did not properly become eligible for the tax credit. I think that's something on which I would welcome a debate when the committee study of the Bill which puts in the amendments comes before the Assembly.

#### Grain Marketing

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. It flows out of a subject the minister is extremely eloquent on, abandoning the Crow rate. Have there been any discussions with the consortium building the Prince Rupert terminal as to the concern of at least some people that abandoning the Crow rate could in fact shift production away from export grains and therefore reduce the throughput expectations in that terminal?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, there are ongoing discussions with the principals of Prince Rupert Grain. When that comment was made, we asked for a general comment from the participants, and the consensus of all of them was that in fact it will not.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what steps he has taken himself, as a minister of the Crown? Has he sat down with the president of the Wheat Pool, for example? And is the minister in a position to confirm clearly to the Assembly that it is the position of the pools that there is no concern whatsoever as to throughput expectations in that terminal as a result of the Pepin plan? Is the minister in a position to give an unqualified statement in that regard?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, we sat down with the Alberta Wheat Pool as recently as within the last two weeks, and the issue was not raised at all. But in specifics I have not requested a meeting on that issue, nor have I had a solicitation from them on that issue, nor have they commented to me, either privately or publicly, on their concerns about that issue.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has any consideration been given by the Department of Economic Development to engaging a consultant with respect to the impact of the Pepin plan on the terminal at Prince Rupert, in view of the very substantial financial commitment of public dollars from Alberta that have been advanced for that particular project?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that the pools also have a substantial investment, and they haven't indicated any concern about their investment in that regard either.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In his first answer, the minister indicated that everybody seemed to be happy. If he hadn't talked specifically to the pools, did the minister talk to any of the participants in the project with respect to the impact of the Pepin plan on the Prince Rupert terminal?

MR. PLANCHE: We have a representative on the Prince Rupert terminal board. The conversation I referred to happened subsequent to the newspaper article on the concern, so I only have the reports from my officials in that regard. I have seen no need to call a meeting, because there haven't been any solicitations at all to me about a concern for throughput. The member may very well know that if the railways are not fully compensated, the issue of whether or not there will be throughput in Rupert will be irrelevant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I will resist the temptation to enter into a debate and simply ask the minister whether or not the government of Alberta will consider commissioning a consultant's study, should representation be received in the next several days from any of the participants, regarding the impact of the Pepin plan on the expected increase in throughput which is going to be necessary to make Prince Rupert a viable operation, not only for the pools but for the people of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is clearly hypothetical. What the hon. leader is saying is: if you get representations in the next while, will you appoint a commission or committee? As such, perhaps the question ought to wait to see whether the hypothetical event might happen.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just rephrase the question. In the light of the need to protect public dollars on this issue, is the government prepared to objectively assess the impact of the Pepin plan on throughput projections at Prince Rupert before that plan is rammed through the House of Commons?

MR. PLANCHE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the tone of the question seems to suggest that we care little about the issue. I can only repeat that the grain sector has a substantial investment in Rupert and, under the circumstances, they would be at the same risk as we would as creditors to the facility. If there is indeed cause to be concerned and if the issue as presented by a minority has some substance, we would be glad to consider it if and when a representation is made.

#### **Labor Negotiation**

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Labour. Is the minister in a position to indicate what steps the government has taken to respond to the motion passed by this Assembly last year, asking that alternatives to the confrontation techniques used in labor/management disputes be investigated?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, the Minister of Labour regrettably has to advise that the

activities of trying to resolve some of the problems that arose out of the current situations over the past year have deflected from some of the initiative we would like to have taken. However, I can report on a number of events.

Last fall there was the meeting in Jasper of the Conference Society of Alberta, which is a tripartite forum. Regrettably, last year it was not a forum in which the Federation of Labour representatives chose to participate, as there is some difference of view between the building trades unions and the Federation of Labour affiliates. It is very difficult to engage in conversations which simultaneously involve representatives of both those groups. That same Conference Society is now planning a conference — and I was advised yesterday of a meeting, I believe last week, of the steering committee — for this fall, again in Jasper. The focus of the conference is the very item which was the subject of the resolution. I think that will be a very useful forum again, because it does involve between 75 and, in some conferences, as high as 350 people.

The department staff has undertaken a number of other initiatives. Under the heading of grievance mediation — again an up-to-date report, anticipating that there might be some questions — there have been 29 cases where representatives of the department have assisted the two parties to come together, in the hope that it would resolve or make better their relationships for future bargaining. That has been very well received.

One other initiative is a new program for which the staff has been trained, which is called relationships by objectives. I am very pleased to report that the first exercise of that type occurred this past December, I believe, involving the Edmonton Public School Board and the teaching staff, upwards of 50 persons — I don't remember the exact number. All the reports I have heard from that three-day exercise have been very positive. So to that extent, for new initiatives I can indicate those achievements.

Perhaps I should indicate one other, because it is significant. In 105 cases in the past year, the department has assisted parties who have come together to the bargaining table for the first time. It's called first-agreement orientation. They try to familiarize the parties with what collective bargaining means, so that their expectations are reasonable. That has turned out to be very effective, both in terms of some public-sector situations and the private sector.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I appreciate that initial outline of initiatives taken. Does the minister have any plans to formalize the process of looking at alternatives, perhaps following the conference mentioned, either by bringing together labor and management leaders or by using some mechanism available to this House?

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] you delay the arbitration process.

MR. YOUNG: If the hon. leader is interested, as other members assuredly seem to be, I am pleased to report that we will be working with the steering committee of the Conference Society. I do want to emphasize that from a government point of view, we are trying to encourage the leadership to be taken by the chamber of commerce and the union representations involved. If they are their ideas, we find that a more productive way, and we can assist in a supportive role.

The other situation that might usefully be reported on is in the construction industry, where there are a considerable number of challenges at the moment, partially due to the overcapacity but also arising out of some relatively large increases negotiated a year ago. We have a tripartite council, which I chair. Actually it involves the owners as well. That council met as recently as February, and we devised five subcommittees. Two of those subcommittees, at least in my opinion, would be looking at the longer term continuing relationship and how that can be improved for bargaining table purposes. The subcommittees should be reporting this month. I regret to say that they have not all achieved as much as we had hoped, and I expect they won't be reporting until April. However, that's another initiative which affects a very major sector of our unionized employees in this province.

MR. ANDERSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the minister's intention to table or otherwise inform the House of the various options investigated by those groups reporting near the end of the month or next month and, from that time on, on other moves that this Assembly might consider to assist the private sector and the unions to move further toward resolving difficulties caused by confrontation?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to respond positively for the reason that there are some leaders involved who are, as one can appreciate, in a political situation within their union and also within the contractors' organizations. We have asked, and some of them have agreed to speak with one another most openly. That has already produced a situation where we are being very guarded, because some of the suggestions which, in their candor, they are putting on the table for discussion might well cause them some considerable difficulties if not fully understood by the membership. So in order to respect the candor being shown, which really has to be found if we're to make progress in some of these areas, I wouldn't want to make that commitment — at least not for the foreseeable number of months.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question. Recognizing the need for confidentiality in such discussions, at some reasonable time in the future will the minister bring back to the Assembly some suggestions as to how we might participate in this process?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy to make that undertaking.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I'm pleased, Mr. Minister, that you want to get away from confrontation politics with labor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: I'm leading up to the question here. Settle down, puppets over there.

As a result, is the minister prepared — and I know he can't do this alone — to push for abolishing Bill 41 and restoring full collective bargaining rights to the government's own employees?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the question that I think the hon. member seeks a response to really is not just my will but also my achievement. My achievement will be deter-

mined by what occurs in the Assembly before the completion of 1983, since Bill 11 is sunset legislation.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question. I realize it's going to come to the Assembly. I'm asking whether you as the Minister of Labour personally would push for repeal of Bill 41. I suggest this would do more to solve the confrontation with labor than almost anything else you could do.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has asked about Bill 41. If Bill 41 is the Public Service Employee Relations Act . . .

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: All right. That was and is the balance which the government sought to provide for employees of government who, to the time of the introduction of that Bill, had neither the right to strike or the privilege of a work stoppage — to put it in that context — nor, alternatively, a means that was considered to be as fair and objective for third-party resolution as is provided by that Bill. That Bill provides, then, a means for a very objective third-party resolution of an impasse and, as the hon. member well knows, has been reviewed by the International Labour Organization, who found the process for a third-party impasse resolution to be entirely acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary. I'm becoming very concerned. We have about seven members who haven't yet asked their first question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question leading from the hon. Member for Calgary Currie's question concerning consultation. Bearing in mind the value of consultation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We're getting into argument now. In view of the short time, let's stick with the question.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . has there been any specific consultation with the trade union movement in general, and the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees in particular, concerning the proposed changes in arbitration procedure?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion by a tremendous number of parties concerning advice on changes to the binding arbitration process. In terms of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, apart from that which has come through the media, I do not believe I have received any advice. But I certainly have received it from a number of other unions and from the general public. I have received more advice on that topic than I have on any other matter I've had to deal with, apart from the interruption of service which occurred in the hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville is most anxious to come in with a supplementary. Might this be the final one on this topic.

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's quite obvious that the minister has no . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. BATIUK: Come on. Mr. Speaker, it's obvious from the minister's reply that he is not planning to repeal Bill 41. I wonder whether the minister could advise whether it is his intention to expand and strengthen this legislation? [interjections]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, again I would ask the Assembly to be patient and we will know what changes, if any, are to be made.

I should add to the question from the Leader of the Opposition. I neglected to mention that the only union that has asked me for a meeting in connection with any potential changes for binding arbitration, has received such a meeting. In fact, it's had two meetings.

#### **Sewage Disposal**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. I believe his department recently requested the city of Calgary to upgrade its sewage facilities, in order not to dump so many pollutants into the Bow River. I believe this has serious financial implications to the city of Calgary — some \$200 million, I'm told. What help from the province may the city of Calgary expect in this matter?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there certainly is a concern in the province with regard to the quality of the Bow River, and every effort and attempt that is made to proceed with cleaning up that river is certainly laudatory. The province has a program to assist municipalities in upgrading their sewage and water treatment facilities, and the city of Calgary is eligible for funding under our programs. We also have initiated a phosphorus removal grant program, from which the city will benefit to the amount of \$15 million with regard to removal of phosphorus from the effluent discharged into the Bow River.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Recently there has surfaced a possible plan whereby the pollutants or the sewage would be diverted by pipeline to possibly irrigable and productive land, which is now not productive, maybe 100 miles from the city. I don't know if the minister is aware of this, but would the province be at all amenable, perhaps through its own irrigation plans, to integrating this and bringing some non-productive land into a productive situation, thus helping the city as well?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the city wishes to pursue that course of action, the province would be interested in assisting in a technical way or otherwise with a project such as that.

MR. ANDERSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether or not his department has looked at the feasibility of that kind of approach and whether it can be recommended to municipalities around the province, particularly Calgary?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there has been an interest in that approach from other municipalities in the province. I'd have to check to see exactly which projects are ongoing, but certainly we'd be interested in pursuing such projects as an option in terms of sewage effluent clean-up, as an alternative to discharge to our river systems, where they're practicable.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have in hand any studies by the provincial government which would indicate whether or not this is practical in such instances, as an assistance to such communities in determining if that is the direction to go?

MR. BRADLEY: As I stated, a number of municipalities have considered this option. It depends on the soil conditions in the area, et cetera, and it also depends on the ongoing costs, et cetera. The municipality has to consider those. I could check on the exact projects proceeding in the province and give that advice to the Assembly.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, does the minister see any present plans for irrigating some of the land within a 100-mile radius of the city of Calgary with which this could be integrated?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess I have to take that question under advisement, as to the specifics with regard to the proposals the city of Calgary has received from a consultant. We have received the report of the city of Calgary, and it is currently being reviewed by the department.

MR. MARTIN: He doesn't know.

#### **Gasoline Pricing**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, which has been prompted by several constituents raising it with me. Notwithstanding the fact that the recently announced OPEC price has done something to oil and gasoline, could the minister advise the House, or offer me an explanation, as to why Shelby, Montana, just 60 miles south of Lethbridge, which is at world price for oil, sells gasoline at about 30 cents a litre, and yet the pump price throughout Alberta seems to be about 38 or 39 cents? Could the minister offer me some kind of explanation I could carry to constituents? Or, indeed, is it the result of some policy within his department?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have some misgiving about this kind of question, because it seems to be an exercise in research. I'm sure that if that kind of question becomes customary in the question period, we're going to have an awful lot of research done on the floor of the House here.

DR. BUCK: Research and embarrassment.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I could rephrase the question. Could the minister advise some explanation for the difference?

MR. SPEAKER: I bring to the attention of the hon. member that that doesn't rephrase the question; it only summarizes it.

#### **Edmonton Annexation**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a ques-

tion to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. A number of concerns have been raised by businessmen and residents in the newly annexed area west of Edmonton. These include business tax and lack of services, which include police, fire, and other transportation needs. Is the minister considering re-evaluating the cabinet decision of June 11, 1981?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I imagine the Member for Stony Plain is talking about the cabinet decision on June 11, which dealt with the annexation order annexing territories to the city of Edmonton. No consideration is being given to a re-evaluation or a change of that order at this time.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact that some Edmonton aldermen have publicly and privately stated that it was a mistake to annex such a large area, is the minister considering legislative changes for a reversal of this annexation order?

MR. KOZIAK: That's not necessary, Mr. Speaker. If the city of Edmonton passed a resolution asking for certain territories to be annexed to the county of Parkland, I imagine they could go through the normal process and have the Local Authorities Board hear the matter.

MR. PURDY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Businessmen in the area were informed, when annexation was taking place, that there would be no tax increases of any significant nature. Subsequently, taxes have increased up to 1,000 per cent in assessment and in the actual dollar. Is the minister considering any financial assistance, either to the city of Edmonton or directly to the businessmen, to alleviate some of these very high tax concerns? It would be a reversal of what the department and the minister's office did in 1981, to put money into the various municipalities to assist them on a loss of revenue.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, without accepting certain of the preliminary remarks relative to representations that may or may not have been made as to the level of taxation, I would like to say that there are reasons for different levels of taxation in different municipal governments. Those primarily reflect the fact that, for one, the county of Parkland does not impose a business tax, whereas the city of Edmonton does. So that's one aspect of the matter.

Probably the more significant aspect of the difference in the level not so much of taxation as of assessment is the fact that the city of Edmonton is now on the new manual, whereas the county is a couple of years behind and won't be on the new manual until 1985. It may well be that once the new assessment has been completed in the county of Parkland, the level of taxation will be the same in the county as in the city of Edmonton. Of course, the fact that there has been an annexation may also reflect an increase in value that may have been attributed to property that's now within the city of Edmonton.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate if the Department of Municipal Affairs has compensated the annexed counties surrounding the city of Edmonton to make up for the shortfall position they are in because of a loss of assessment to the city of Edmonton?

MR. KOZIAK: The compensation that has been and is being provided is being paid in accordance with the formula that was developed to assist those counties that had lost more than 10 per cent of their assessment.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Department of Education also made adjustments?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we first of all provided assistance to school boards corresponding to the assistance provided by the Department of Municipal Affairs. Upon the appeal of the school boards, we examined their budgets and provided additional compensatory funding which we are providing to the boards at an accelerated rate over five years. So it is the view of the Department of Education — shared, I think, by each of the school boards involved — that they have in fact suffered no loss of revenue.

DR. BUCK: That's not true.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question . . .

MR. KING: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. If I heard from some far corner of the House the statement that that was not true, I would invite an hon. member to document that, provide it to me, and I'd be happy to respond.

#### Oil Pricing

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's with regard to the comments of Mr. Chrétien, indicating that the federal government would not support a \$4 increase for conventional oil on July 1. As well, the \$4 increase would bring conventional oil to 95 per cent of the world price. Could the minister indicate what the government's position is with regard to that matter today?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member reads *Hansard* of yesterday, once it's available, or the *Blues*, which are now available, I think our position is abundantly clear. We have long advocated a market pricing arrangement in the absence of concurrence by the federal government in market pricing. We have in place the energy agreement, which we are going to be assessing in the weeks ahead as the world oil pricing situation becomes more clear.

With respect to remarks attributed to Mr. Chrétien, which I believe were made outside the House, I simply say that I will be meeting with him on Friday in Edmonton. I understand he'll be in town on other business and has asked to have a meeting with me while he's in town. I look forward to the opportunity to discuss these matters with him at that time and would not be making any public comments in advance of that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources indicate whether the possibility of conventional oil moving to world price would be one of the matters of discussion between him and the hon. Mr. Chrétien?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, it would be an extremely surprising situation if, in light of recent world events, the topic of crude oil pricing was not on the agenda. We will be putting forward our view on that matter, as we

have in the past, and I am sure we will have a very wide-ranging discussion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister indicate whether the objective of the government at this time is to maintain the 1981 energy agreement as it is, or to change agreement to adjust to the contemporary situation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered that question on more than one occasion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate clearly the government's position with regard to that 1981 energy agreement. Will the agreement be broken, or will the government work toward adhering to the clauses within that agreement? That hasn't been clearly established in this Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY: And do the minister and the Premier have the same policy?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that question has been answered, speaking both in terms of the principles and the long-term policy position of this government as well as the present energy agreement, its status, and the assessment that was agreed to be undertaken in the light of world events as they unfold.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, if there's time.

#### **Mandatory Comprehensive Examinations**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly the specific purpose of the compulsory comprehensive examinations he is going to be putting into place?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, I don't know whether that can be answered within the scope of the question period. It would seem to be a fairly broad topic, and I realize it's no fault of the hon. member that it's coming so late in the question period, but we have just two or three minutes left.

DR. BUCK: Then I'll ask a different question. Can the minister indicate what grades and which subjects will be the subject of the comprehensive examinations?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the way the question is worded leads me to believe that the hon. member may share some confusion that is rampant in the community. I will respond by saying that the student evaluation policy of the provincial government is directed toward diagnostic evaluation and what is called normative evaluation as well as summative evaluation. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can talk to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood afterward and have all of this explained to him. My colleagues can talk to me.

The comprehensives are going to be administered in high school. They would be available to students in math and science at the end of grade 10, grade 11, or grade 12. It will be the choice of the student, because math and science are only compulsory in high school till the end of the grade 12 level. Social studies and English would be

written by students at the end of grade 12. So it's in high school in grades 10 or 11 and in grade 12 that the comprehensives would be written.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It was just touched on briefly yesterday, hon. Mr. Minister. What consultation was there with the minister's department and the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Alberta School Trustees' Association before the final decision was made to go ahead with the comprehensive compulsory examinations?

MR. KING: Of course, Mr. Speaker, no decision has yet been made to go ahead with compulsory comprehensives. The Speech from the Throne is quite clear in stating that that question of policy will be considered by the government this spring and that we hope and expect we'll be in a position to make a decision and to announce it by June of this year. But the government has not yet made a policy decision that comprehensives will be compulsory. It is correct to say that I am recommending that to my colleagues as the policy of the government in the future.

As to the question of consultation, I can only say that this consultation goes back at least as far as 1975, when the Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement was established. That committee included a representative from the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, the Alberta Federation of Labour, the Alberta Chamber of Commerce, and others. In 1979, when the report was received, we solicited responses from all over the province, and they were analysed by Dr. Gordon Mowatt. In addition to that, we surveyed the adult population via the Gallup poll. The member will be familiar with that.

MR. NOTLEY: Lots of surveys there.

MR. KING: In 1980 there were meetings with both the ASTA and the Alberta Teachers' Association, and the policy was announced on November 13, 1980. Since that time, there have been meetings at the staff and technical levels, as well as meetings of myself with members of the executive committees of the ATA, the ASTA, CASS, and others. I would say that there has been extensive consultation with all interested parties, going back to 1975.

DR. BUCK: One short supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

DR. BUCK: In the ongoing discussions that I'm sure the minister and his department have had, have there been discussions with the universities that if they are made compulsory, these will be the bench marks for university entrance?

MR. KING: There have not yet been formal discussions as such, Mr. Speaker. I have written to the Universities Co-ordinating Council, advising them of our interest with respect to the comprehensives. They have responded by saying that they will consider the comprehensives at meetings of the Universities Co-ordinating Council. I expect that in the course of that consideration, they will invite the attendance of representatives of Alberta Education and that discussion will take place.



MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has more than gone by. I apologize to the two members I was unable to reach, and I'll try to recognize them earlier tomorrow if they so wish.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the questions and motions for returns, I'd like to move that all of them on today's Order Paper stand.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in addressing the motion before the House, I'd like to make one or two very quick observations in terms of the point of procedure. It will be the intention of my colleague and I to vote for this motion today. But I would like to say, to the members of the government in particular, that I would not want to see us follow the procedure we saw in the 19th Legislature, where we had motions deferring these motions for returns coming in every Tuesday and Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that one of the motions for returns is a request for information which was desired by this Legislature in the past Legislature, the one that was prorogued, the 19th House. I understand that when motions for returns or questions are put on the Order Paper, it may well take the government a few days to evaluate whether or not they can obtain the answers. Fair enough. No one is going to demand that that immediately come before the House.

But I suggest, sir, that on both the government and opposition sides, we looked carefully at what happened last year. We found that motions for returns sat on the Order Paper week after week and were simply deferred by this kind of motion. So I raise the issue, simply serving notice on behalf of my colleague and I — I can't speak for the two Independent members — that the public right to know is so crucial that I say to the government: we do not want to go through the process that characterized the last sittings of the House.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, I say to the members of the government that during the first term of this administration, from 1971 to 1975, we had no problems with motions for returns. They were dealt with quickly. They were either accepted or rejected, but they weren't held over week after week after week. I simply say that to state our position that these matters should be dealt with as quickly as possible. Reasonable time to assess — fair enough — but "reasonable time" is not the duration of the spring session.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment or two. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated, I would never want to accuse this government of trying to withhold information. We know they run an open government. At least, they keep trying to tell people that.

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition stated, there seems to be a greater and greater tendency for this government, for all intents and purposes, either intentionally or, I hope, unintentionally, to keep information away from hon. members. We well know that the Government House Leader has said publicly — I believe to the Canadian Bar Association — that there is no need for freedom of information legislation in this province because all information is made available.

When we discussed and debated freedom of informa-

tion, members on the government side waxed eloquent on the fact that the information is available through motions for returns. But when we see the motion to hold them over being brought back time after time, pretty soon the session goes, and many of the motions for returns are never answered. So if the Government House Leader is so sure that we don't need freedom of information in this province and this Legislature, then I'm saying as humbly as I can to him that he'd better inform his ministers that they had better get the motions for returns in place. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, if that information is not available to the Assembly, we are doing just the opposite of what we're asking for: we're withholding information.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Government House Leader conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: I just want to make a few remarks in light of what's been said by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Clover Bar. At this stage of the sittings, I think we should assume that in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the ministers will act reasonably in assessing the motions, some of which are quite extensive, and that that is already in process. We appreciate the fact — and the hon. Leader of the Opposition has acknowledged it — that a reasonable time is required. As a matter of government policy, we will be looking at this type of important business of the Assembly in the same way as the other important business of the Assembly; that is, that it should be dealt with in a timely way and to full effect.

I welcome the opportunity the hon. Member for Clover Bar has given me to add at least one other remark, Mr. Speaker. He made some references to remarks that were attributed to me in respect of freedom of information legislation. I should tell him a little story; in fact, I will. [interjections]

When I first became Attorney General, I had an invitation from the midwinter meeting of the Alberta section of the Canadian Bar. One of the key issues that was to be discussed was freedom of information legislation. I was prepared for a hot time, because the Canadian Bar had already, on a national basis, passed a resolution and had become known as the sort of vanguard of promotion of this type of legislation in Canada.

Well, I was told that the number of people attending the meeting of the Canadian Bar in Calgary that January would be some 700 or 800. They always have good attendances, and I believe there were 700 or 800 there. At nine o'clock in the morning, I was to begin with a panel including some distinguished academics. Nobody suggested to me that everybody would come to the particular panel I was on, and they surely did not. The issue generated so much momentum among these leading proponents that no one was there at nine o'clock.

We deferred consideration of the matter for about 15 or 20 minutes while the organizers, in a mildly embarrassed way, went up and down the hallways looking for people. We eventually had about 40. As I sat looking them over while other people on the panel were making their remarks, I had the opportunity of doing what politicians do; that is, counting the crowd. I found that about 16 of the people they had successfully got to come into the meeting were employees of the Attorney General's Department.

I just mention that, Mr. Speaker, because when every-

body says what great momentum this type of issue has in Canada today, let them know some of these facts. It is, in so many respects, a pumped up media item. They know that; all hon. members know that.

I want to make this point, though, about remarks I've been quoted on before, because I haven't made reference to that yet. I've only shared this interesting little tidbit of Canadian Bar history. What I have said is that the promotion of American-style freedom of information legislation in Canada is something that is there because of a certain bandwagon effect. I did not say at any time, and would not say, that people who want information from government shouldn't have it. What the American system does is create a structured and stratified way, a large bureaucracy, and all sorts of catalogs and unnecessary publications which are quite expensive for the government to create and maintain.

I think this Assembly and the members of it, certainly the government, are always amenable to practical suggestions in regard to what information should be made available. But, please, don't ask us to swallow whole the sort of proposals that in the last decade have been part of the scene in Washington.

[Motion carried]

#### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

201. Moved by Mr. Lee:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to review its current financial support for urban transportation and give consideration to funding two-thirds of the capital cost of any arterial roadway project, transit project, or land purchase for future transportation right of way which is to be undertaken by a municipality and which has been approved by the Minister of Transportation.

MR. LEE: In opening debate today, Mr. Speaker, as representative of the constituency of Calgary Buffalo, it is indeed an honor to have the privilege of moving the first motion of the First Session of the 20th Legislature. While I know this motion appears on the Order Paper first by the luck of the draw, I am one who believes there are no accidents. In fact, short of the concerns of the economy, I believe transportation to be the issue of number one interest and concern to urban dwellers today.

Mr. Speaker, I recall not that long ago when I was campaigning, I was promoting the idea of a new policy for transportation and getting quite a good response at the doors until I visited one apartment in the community of Bankview in Calgary Buffalo. Not one person was interested in what I had to say about urban transportation. I arrived at the last door. It was the door of the caretaker. I said, "Excuse me, sir, would you care to know my position on this issue?" He said, "No." I said, "That's interesting. Nobody in this apartment was interested in the subject, and I can't understand. Is it ignorance or apathy?" He replied, "I don't know, and I don't care." Mr. Speaker, I think we'll find that for those of us who represent urban constituencies, there's very little apathy, and certainly most citizens are extremely interested in the subject.

Therefore, I approach the challenge of speaking in support of this resolution with anticipation, and I do so, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the subject by speaking to

seven key issues that relate to it. Number one, I wish to talk about the traumatic effect that the change and the rapid growth in our municipalities have had upon our citizens; number two, take a look at current government programs and the possible need for review and revision; thirdly, take a close look at the status of the city of Calgary, in which the constituency I represent is located, in terms of their financial status and their planning actions. Fourthly, I think it would be appropriate to express my own views on the importance of LRT and the importance of balanced transportation policies.

Fifthly, I want to review with members of the House the fundamental findings of the Advisory Committee on Urban Transit Requirements for Edmonton and Calgary. Sixth, let's look at the cost of delay and failure to take additional action in this regard. Seventh, and finally, I believe it's critical that we address the human aspects of transportation. This simply is not a matter of dollars and cents, but it really affects the lives and the quality of life of people in urban municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, when Alvin Toffler wrote the book *Future Shock*, his purpose was to address the issue of the impact that rapid change of technology is having upon the people of this earth. In a sense, I believe the citizens of our urban municipalities, primarily Calgary and Edmonton but others as well, are experiencing a form of future shock. It was less than a decade ago that one could travel from one end of Calgary to another in 15 minutes. The population was half of what it is today; people knew the community, knew it well.

But within a few short years, less than 10 years, the populations have doubled in these municipalities, and a number of changes have gone along with that. Without warning or notice, the relatively small communities have evolved into large metropolises, complicated cities of 600,000. While many of us have perfect twenty-twenty vision in hindsight, who could have predicted a decade ago, 50 years ago, or at the founding of Calgary 107 years ago, that these small communities would evolve into two major urban centres of 600,000, on their way very quickly to populations of one million.

The problem hasn't been so much, Mr. Speaker, creating a transportation system. Transportation planners can design any system we need, and I believe we have available to us in this province some of the finest transportation planners anywhere. The real difficulty has been to find a way to retrofit a transportation structure for a municipality that was never envisaged or designed to be more than 250,000. Even Thomas Mawson, who was commissioned before World War I to prepare a plan for the city of Calgary, who talked about grandiose plans of a city of half a million, never really conceived of the size and density that our cities are achieving now. Surely it must be well known that the city of Calgary, in fact, is the largest city of land area in North America today. How do we retrofit and put that community of 600,000 into a basic structure designed for no more than a quarter of a million?

Mr. Speaker, along with the trauma of the rapid change that kind of grew upon the citizens of Calgary and, of course, Edmonton, there have been many key changes in our life style and our ways of life. The registered vehicle ownership per capita in the city of Calgary has grown 50 per cent in the past 15 years. In regular interchange with the city of Los Angeles, one way or the other, Calgary is the city with the largest number of vehicles per capita of any other municipality in North America. Transit ridership per capita has been growing

every year for the past decade. Trips per capita per work day are growing. The average Calgarian makes three trips per day — that's 1.8 million trips per day within our community — simply to go to and return from work.

The costs of transportation, Mr. Speaker, are mind-boggling. Who could have predicted five years ago that the city of Calgary, in a five-year period, would have a budget to spend \$1.5 billion on transportation programs for the next five years, that fully one-third of the capital budget of the municipality of Calgary is earmarked for transportation? If you add the operating costs, fully one-half of the budget is directly or indirectly dedicated to transportation. So there have been a number of changes, both socially and factually, for Calgarians and for urban dwellers in this province. Frankly, the only consistent aspect of this dramatic change is that it's change, and change will always be there.

Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of this resolution? Well really, it's twofold, and I think it's important that we be clear about the purpose. Number one is to ask the government to review its current policy; number two, to give consideration to a new formula, a formula I believe to be a logical evolution of the previous government policy, and that is that the province fund two-thirds of the capital costs of roadways, mass transit, and land acquisition and that the municipalities fund a third. So in this resolution today, I'm simply asking that members of the House give consideration to the principle of the resolution.

Let's take a look at current government programs. The first comprehensive program really evolved in the period of 1974 to 1979, when the province had, in essence, four cornerstones to its transportation funding policy. Number one, it would fund two-thirds of the cost of research; number two, capital transit incentives; number three, funding of two-thirds of the approved cost of arterial roadway systems to a maximum; and, number four, paying for 90 per cent of major corridors that were approved by the province in urban municipalities to the maximum of one corridor per city. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this program was introduced in an era when there was relatively little major work being undertaken in the city of Calgary for capital projects for transportation.

The breakthrough in terms of policy really took place in 1979 when the government and Minister of Transportation announced a comprehensive nine-point urban transportation package, a program I believe to be one of the most thorough in any jurisdiction in North America. The total cost estimate of that package was roughly \$800 million. It included the following: funding of two-thirds of the cost of arterial roadway capital programs; two, approval of 90 per cent of the cost of major continuous corridors — and that sounds like a kind of an abstract thought, but a good example is the Deerfoot freeway. The province has contributed over \$90 million to that one roadway alone. Three, public transit capital assistance to a maximum; four, railway/highway grade separation structure assistance programs of anywhere from two-thirds to 90 per cent of the cost; five, an urban signing project; six, paying for two-thirds of the shareable costs of research and development projects, up to 100 per cent for certain projects; seven, a transportation systems management program; eight, primary highway maintenance cost-sharing; and nine, public transit operating assistance to the tune of \$9 per capita. In effect, Mr. Speaker, in 1981-82 this nine-point program cost the province of Alberta about \$155 million, and it's estimated for 1982-83 that that will be roughly \$211 million.

My contention to members of the House is that the basic program is a good one. But it was introduced in an era of catch-up, and we have not yet caught up. There is no more appropriate time for review of the policy and a clear look at an additional formula than now. Why would that be? Mr. Speaker, I think there are some clear points we should look at.

While the program appears to be generous in nature — and it is; it includes funding of up to 90 per cent of certain costs — in reality there's been a lid, a maximum, on the cost of those programs. The reality is that the city of Calgary has cost-shared with the province to the tune that the province has paid for roughly only 25 per cent of the cost of the capital projects in that city, and in the city of Edmonton the cost has been roughly 23 per cent of their projects. So really we're only supporting about a quarter of those costs that take place in the two major urban centres.

Secondly, inflation: the five-year program envisaged a rate of inflation of about 9 per cent. I'm sure most members will recognize the real rate of inflation for land acquisition has been 15 per cent a year and, for roadway capital construction, in excess of 15 per cent a year. Even in the economic downturn, these costs have certainly been way in excess of what was ever anticipated.

I think of the interchange at 16th Avenue N. and 14th Street in the city of Calgary, Mr. Speaker. A delay of three years: because of inflation, the project alone, one interchange, escalated by \$4 million. Although growth has slowed in this province, I believe that slowing of the growth rate is a temporary phenomenon, and we will be experiencing a significant growth rate again relatively quickly. So now is really an opportunity to allow more orderly planning — we're not in as great a crisis situation — and to stimulate employment through road projects and interchange and freeway projects. Thirdly, what better opportunity to avoid future rates of inflation by grasping this opportunity while it exists.

I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the addition of a more effective transportation plan of action is an asset to the entire province. I ask members who represent constituencies other than Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer, or Lethbridge to recognize that our provision of a thorough, complete, and effective transportation infrastructure system makes this province far more capable of attracting industry to our cities. The growth of major urban centres, at the rate it has been experienced for the past decade, in many respects has been a result of successful provincial government policies and programs. So in a sense, policies of the provincial government have generated and caused the in-migration to this province that was primarily focussed on the two major urban centres, but additionally it focussed on all 12 cities in this province. So in a sense, I believe the cost of that in-migration caused by these policies ought to be borne by the province in a more comprehensive and thorough way.

If we look at the expenditures of the total budget of this province for the past five years, there seems to be one consistent relationship. A good example is the year 1981-82; roughly a \$7 billion budget — transportation expenditures, \$800,000; urban transportation expenditures, \$155 million. In other words, we're spending about one-quarter of our transportation budget to service the needs of about half, plus, of the population. Please don't confuse my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I'm suggesting that there ought to be a struggle between rural and urban areas for the transportation dollar. I'm simply saying that in this case, given the rapid rate of growth in urban centres, we

ought to review the policies that affect urban centres.

Let's take a look at Calgary, the subject I know most about, having had an opportunity to serve as an alderman for five years on Calgary city council. I'd draw to the attention of members of the House the policy of the city of Calgary. I believe it was best expressed in a document submitted to the provincial government in 1981. It says:

The City strives to provide an efficient, effective level of service for movement of persons and goods, having due consideration to the financial costs and environmental consequences of their provision.

Mr. Speaker, my experience as an alderman in the city of Calgary is that in every case, the city certainly gave a great deal of consideration to the financial and environmental considerations of approving any project, and that they simply weren't approved lightly. In fact, we spent hundreds of hours annually reviewing the particular needs that were being recommended by our transportation planners. So there is very clearly a need for proceeding with these projects.

But what of the plight of urban municipalities today? Beginning in July 1981, city council in Calgary began a process of major cuts to the capital budget. Between then and today, Mr. Speaker, the city has cut over \$1.7 billion from its capital budget for the next five years. It has cut \$1.7 billion, of which half, \$834 million, has come from transportation. Frankly, I don't believe that it is fully appreciated either by the citizens of Calgary or the citizens of this province that other than the northeast LRT and the 26th Avenue connector, we have no major road projects taking place in the city of Calgary today. There is no money.

I refer members of the Legislature to the transportation improvement priority system study of the city of Calgary, that identifies the 20 top projects that are scheduled for the next five years. It has been reviewed annually during the past few years. Every project, except the 26th Avenue connector which was required for the coliseum, is not being proceeded with today: Bow Trail widening; Macleod Trail, 34th Avenue, Elbow River; 50th Avenue construction between 37th Street and Crowchild Trail; grade separation at Glenmore Trail and Elbow Drive — I don't know how many members of this House have tried to get through that interchange at any time of the day, but it is significant in delays — Sarcee Trail; Bow Trail to Glenmore Trail; interchange at Macleod Trail and Anderson Road, stopped; interchange at Macleod Trail and Canyon Meadows Drive, stopped. Mr. Speaker, I could go on with this list extensively.

Frankly, we do not have a transportation capital program at the moment in the city of Calgary, and I know it's very similar in the city of Edmonton. Why is that? The municipality has recognized that in times of economic recession, it's absolutely essential that we not proceed with major capital projects that would impact the municipal budget. The city of Calgary has a policy that under no circumstances should more than 20 per cent of the operating budget be spent for debt service. The city of Calgary is indeed keen that it not fall into the plight of cities such as New York, where in fact 85 per cent of their operating budget was allocated for debt service. I believe that is a responsible position.

The city of Calgary has adopted very responsible positions about attempting to obtain a fair return from the fare box for operating LRT and buses; that is, a goal of 50 per cent, with a current experience of about 40 per cent. That has meant raising bus fares annually at times when it wasn't necessarily politically popular. But city

councils in Calgary and in Edmonton bit the bullet and proceeded to continue to ask the user to contribute more significantly to these costs.

Mr. Speaker, so that members of the House don't look at the cities and say, why are they not attempting any innovative projects other than roadways and LRT, let me summarize for you some of the innovations that are taking place. The city of Calgary has a civic traffic management board that brings together the expertise of transportation planning, the police, and the private sector. We have a \$1 million computer for the purpose of synchronizing lights on major roadways. There has been a very successful car pool demonstration project involving city employees. There is an exclusive bus lane in some cases on Macleod Trail. We have the Blue Arrow bus system. We have a very extensive feeder bus system for LRT. There is exhaustive consultation between transportation planners and the community about changes in bus routes. We have a significant increase in the area of bike paths and, of course, free LRT in downtown Calgary; so many innovative projects, but none are really proceeding in a major way today because of the serious financial crunch that municipalities find themselves in.

The city of Calgary recommended, by way of a resolution approved on February 16, 1981, that the province adopt a new formula for funding, similar to what I have proposed in my motion today, Mr. Speaker. Edmonton is essentially in support of that position. They have recommended that roadway construction costs be increased to 75 per cent sharing from the province, with no maximums, and 100 per cent of LRT. I believe that if the government were to examine seriously the motion before us, the city of Edmonton would look favorably as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe LRT is the wave of the future in the municipality of Calgary. When the first LRT car was boarded on May 25, 1981, it touched off a romance with the citizens of Calgary, who now affectionately call it their C-Train. We haven't really had that form of transportation since 1950 when the last streetcar completed operation. But certainly Calgarians have flocked to embrace this new form of transportation in a way that very few transportation planners ever envisaged. I suggest that the fundamental value, the real value, has been the relief to the downtown area in terms of peak-hour congestion, in terms of creating a more suitable environment for the pedestrian, in terms of reduction of noise and air pollution, the eliminating of the demand for monthly parking stalls that contribute very little to the urban scene in downtown, and certainly transit efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, transportation and the funding of transportation is not just a matter of LRT. It must be balanced. In the way that with LRT there are two tracks, I believe for transportation policies, there must be both mass transit and private roadways. It is essential. In Calgary today, other than the Deerfoot Trail, there is not another six-lane, north-south corridor anywhere in the city, which means our roadways are dependent on four-lane roadways, which is two either way. If one breaks down or there is a car caught on one, where have we got a transportation system? Without funding of roadway systems that complements LRT or mass transit, we're in trouble.

We have the report that has been circulated to the members of the House by the advisory committee on urban transit requirements for Edmonton and Calgary. Their acronym is ACUTREC. Essentially, they made two recommendations. Number one, that

the Province make an immediate ... long-term fund-

ing commitment to continued development of LRT in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary . . .

Number two, that

the Province recognize Edmonton's and Calgary's current long-range Transportation plans including the LRT component . . .

This group, this blue-ribbon panel of experts who studied every major municipality in North America, has said completely that, yes, LRT works; it ought to be funded, and we ought to adopt the master transportation plans of the cities of Calgary and Edmonton. I think that is very significant evidence that the direction the municipalities are headed in is a sound one and that we ought to take the advice of a group struck by the former Minister of Education solely for his advice — good information.

Mr. Speaker, in support of this resolution, I would point out that of the 10 municipalities in the United States today that have some form of mass transit, the average funding from federal and state authorities from senior governments is in excess of 85 per cent of the capital cost; a significant factor indeed. The province of B.C. funds 100 per cent of the cost of LRT. The province of Ontario funds 75 per cent of the capital cost. I believe these are good precedents for the case that is being made today.

In closing, I want to point out the cost of delay, the failure to act. It will add not only to the level of frustration in additional time spent by our citizens in their automobiles, in their trucks, and in their taxis, but we must know and acknowledge that the transport time in the movement of goods is absorbed into the price of those goods. My learned colleague Mr. Cook yesterday pointed out the great productivity and efficiency in Japan. If we are going to be productive and effective, we must have an efficient transportation system. Certainly the person-time lost in travel reduces productivity. We all know of inner city communities where failing to see the provision of proper transportation systems results in significant short-cutting and intrusion by automobiles into quiet residential neighborhoods.

I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker, a letter I received about a year ago from an anonymous motorist who wrote me as an alderman in the city of Calgary. He got a little angry about the anti-transportation advocates, and he said:

There seems to be a false assumption that roads are for machines, not for people. Just who rides in those magnificent machines? PEOPLE. People on their way to work. People at play. People in an Ambulance desperate to obtain instant medical help. People visiting relatives. People moving goods, moving sofas and shovels, moving mens wear and mail, moving Old Blue and Pilsner and Pepsi, and Coke, people moving equipment and lawn seed and mannequins and books and T.V.s and preachers . . . people moving other people . . . by Taxi and by Bus . . . little people, big people, students . . . they're people . . . political people, even . . . Aldermen [and MLAs].

Mr. Speaker, when we address this resolution, I ask members of the House to acknowledge and recognize that what this is about is a people program and that it's time to review it.

In closing, I've talked about the traumatic effect that this rapid change has had upon our citizens. We've taken a look at provincial programs and their need for revision. I've expressed some personal views about the subject, and examined the findings of ACUTREC; I believe very solid,

good, practical advice for this province. We have an idea of the cost of failure to deal with these issues. But I want to leave this debate by quoting from a book written by Schaeffer and Sclar called *Access for All*. I really think that there's something here for everybody about how we feel about transportation.

That there is something severely amiss with transportation in our cities and metropolitan areas is one of the most widely recognized problems of the man-made environment. In one form or another, everyone has experienced the transportation 'problem' and in one form or another most have a favorite 'solution' for it. Some advocate more highways, others more public transportation. Some want to ban cars, others drinking and accident-prone drivers. Some blame the over-sized trucks, others the taxis and buses. Some want public transportation to be free, others insist that it is self-supporting. Some hope for electric cars, others for 'personal rapid transit' and 'dial-a-ride'. Some advocate special roads for buses, others more expressways restricted to private cars. With as visible a problem as traffic jams, accidents, unreliable public transportation and spiraling costs, as well as air and noise pollution and such a wide spectrum of solutions, literally hundreds of books have been devoted to all aspects of the urban transportation problem.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of books and studies. I believe that we have the best advice and information available to us today and that it is time for members of this House to review that information carefully and offer solid advice to the Minister of Transportation and the government by the adoption of this resolution. There is no more appropriate time for a review and a renewal of our commitment to the funding of urban transportation than now. I ask members to study the spirit of the resolution, to give fair consideration to the principle of the resolution, and support the principles of the motion before us.

Mr. Speaker, as this is the first motion of this session, and as I have had the privilege to be the first speaker in this debate, I look forward with anticipation to the debate that follows.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the mover of this motion. The mover suggested a number of rides per day of users. I have information that there's approximately 4,000 rides per hour in peak hours. I just wanted to clarify those figures with the mover.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I can't give the specifics, although they are available in these documents. I'm certain I can provide it to the hon. member. But I wouldn't be surprised.

MRS. FYFE: In the beginning of the remarks, Mr. Speaker, the mover gave figures about so many rides per day. I just wanted to ensure that what he was saying was, in fact, correct.

MR. LEE: It is.

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe the hon. member wants confirmation of what was said.

MR. LEE: Everything I said is gospel.

AN HON. MEMBER: Amen to that.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, in the last half hour, we've sure had an awful lot of gospel.

I would like to mention that my experience with LRT started about two years ago in this Assembly. At that time I had the Bawlf high school from my constituency visiting Edmonton and coming in to tour this Legislature. During their tour of Edmonton, they had taken a ride on the LRT. When I went to introduce them to the Assembly, I said they had taken a trip on the LST. I never did quite live that one down at the Bawlf school.

But I've also had a little experience with rapid transportation. About two years ago, my wife and I were touring the city of London, Mr. Speaker, and we got lost in the tube.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did she come back?

MR. STROMBERG: Oh, I stuck right with her, she had my wallet.

There is a brown line and a green line and a gray line and a black line. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that after so many pounds of English money, or \$50 of my hard-earned money, we saw all of London from underneath, lost in the subway. One other time we had the opportunity . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Your mike's dead.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, am I coming through? My light is dead here.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're coming through.

MR. STROMBERG: Another time I had the opportunity to be in Tokyo, Japan. The main thoroughway through their city was approximately 10 lanes of traffic. It's quite a thing to try and jaywalk across that or even just get across those streets. Down the centre of their main arteries, they had built an elevated highway. This elevated highway had four lanes. But on the side of the elevated highway were two monorails. Then they informed me that there were three subways below that. That's moving people — from distances of up to 70 miles.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the remarks made by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I was amazed that from 1979 to 1983 the city of Calgary received \$72 million for public transit capital; arterial roadway capital, they received \$44 million; major continuous corridors, \$99 million; grade separation structure, \$12.8 million; transportation systems management, \$4.1; urban signing project, \$87 million; research and development, \$314 million; public transportation operation, \$20 million; primary highway maintenance, \$3.5 million; for a total of \$258 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did they do with it all?

MR. STROMBERG: I don't know. But I look at the city of Camrose, and all we got was \$7.5 million. And I don't dare repeat the figures from our home town of New Norway. I'll tell you about it later.

I'm afraid realities have come upon us, and it's the end of the line for LRT both in Edmonton and Calgary real soon. It's going to take, in today's figures, \$2 billion to complete the line. I suppose now with the times as they are, your mass transit plans are paralyzed.

Edmonton has hopes of somehow getting on to the approaches of the High Level bridge, to the leg to the university and out to Mill Woods. They've been trying to get that agreement with CN for how many years, five or six? I'm not that familiar with Calgary, but I understand that the city of Calgary has only a third of their line completed. Their mayor has committed their city to another \$250 million of their own funds.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, LRT is an idea whose time may never come in Alberta. Population densities are way too low. Ridership: gosh, I look at how low the ridership is here compared to the city of Toronto. Here in Edmonton, we're two-thirds compared to their per capita, one-third the ridership that Toronto has. Less than 10 per cent of the people of both cities use this type of transportation, only 10 per cent. Both cities are losing their shirts. They're losing 65 cents a rider. That's twice as much as Toronto is losing.

I would just like to refer to how Canada's major rapid transportation systems compare. I'll just read 1982 for you: Toronto charges 75 cents; Montreal 75 cents; Edmonton 75 cents; and Calgary, 85 cents. Then total miles: Toronto has 33.8; Montreal has 27.5; we've sure got a lot in the city here, 5.4; and Calgary has 7.4 miles. Now total passengers is what is a shocker to me: Toronto has moved 400 million passengers — some people ride it more than once; Montreal has 335 million; Edmonton, 7 million; Calgary, 10 million. Now deficits: the per capita loss to the city of Toronto was \$23.33; to the city of Montreal, rather high, \$60 even; to Edmonton, \$70.50 per capita loss; and for Calgary, \$55.84.

However, Mr. Speaker, you add up all that per capita loss and the Member for Calgary Buffalo's city or council has lost a whopping \$33 million on rapid transportation. Our Alberta transportation officials claim that unless the system moves 6,000 to 7,000 people an hour, LRT cannot be economical. At present — and you were correct — Calgary is moving about 4,000 people an hour; Edmonton, only 2,500 people an hour. And they've got to move between 6,000 and 7,000; they've got a lot of catching up to do. As Henry Kroeger, the former Minister of Transportation, has pointed out, neither city sought the advice of the province when they embarked on LRT development. They never asked: is it a good idea; is it a bad idea? But by golly, when they're broke they sure do. In turn, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that Alberta made no promises of financing.

My colleague to my right, the Member for Cardston, California's great gift to this Legislature, who spent considerable time this winter in California, informed me that the greater bay area of San Francisco has approximately 4.5 million people. They've been operating a system for a great number of years and according to the Member for Cardston, it's a mess. It runs at quite a deficit. To the south, L.A. tried for years to move the automobile and are just starting to look at it. And a city that I am reasonably familiar with, Seattle, which has looked at rapid transit and is now backing away from it, used good judgment years ago in the freeways throughout their city.

However, Calgary council is stuck with nearly \$100 million. I've got to go back on a little bit of the council's good judgment in the past. Before they expand their system or ask for more funding, perhaps Calgary council should look at — they're stuck with nearly \$100 million in interest alone for 1982. That's up from \$40 million in 1980. I've got it right here; I'll table it. Calgary council owes \$821 million to the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation and \$42 million to the Alberta Home Mort-

gage Corporation, the federal government, and other provincial agencies. I read that council has \$18 million worth of extra LRT cars that they don't know what to do with. I wish the member had mentioned that \$18 million of extra cars. I believe they came from Europe.

I would like to point out — bear with me Mr. Speaker — and I have here the *Alberta Report*, and I would like to table it. It reads: "The Case of the Crumbling LRT: Calgary's mayor begs for more transit money as the system rots". It goes on to explain about the ties crumbling and the block-shaped shims that have all rotted away. It sounds like just one heck of a mess. Could we table that?

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to knock Calgary council's contribution to this Assembly. There are quite a number of them in the Assembly, have been over the years, but by golly I'm sure glad that they didn't run for aldermen in my village of New Norway.

MR. SHRAKE: I'd like to congratulate the author of Motion 201. In our modern society, in a modern city a transportation system is just as important in this day and age as your water system or your sanitary sewer system. Going back a few years, I'll speak of and mention my experience regarding this one portion we seem to be zeroed in on, the LRT. I served 11 years, not five years, on the city council there. I was one of the ones who made the fateful decision to go after LRT. Back in 1974, the then mayor of the city of Calgary, Rod Sykes, informed the city council that we had to get into a balanced transportation system. Frankly I think most members of the council, including myself, thought he was perhaps not wise.

He ended up taking that city council to Germany, to Europe, and he showed them some systems. I see Ed Oman smiling there; he remembers that. He took them to cities of 400,000 to 800,000 people and, lo and behold, our thinking was that Calgarians, Albertans, won't ride public transit. They love their automobiles; they are going to drive their automobiles. There is no use fooling with it. We've got to have a few buses around for the students and maybe some of the workers that don't have cars. But lo and behold, over in Europe in cities of 400,000 to 800,000 people, they rode public transit; they had a balanced transportation system. In Hamburg, Dusseldorf, or most of these cities in Germany, they do not have a lot of the problems that we had that came up later. We wondered how it worked? Why would it work over there and not over here? One of the things you suddenly find is that if you have a good system that is fast, efficient, comfortable people will ride it.

In the city of Calgary at that time, we had lots of buses. We still have lots of buses there. You have the system where the bus goes out in the neighborhood, drives maybe to the far edges of the city, 12 miles out from the city, picks up approximately 52 people, maybe 60. They are 52-passenger buses; you've got eight of them standing. You drive your 12 miles downtown. You unload them, and go out and repeat this operation again. It's not very efficient. It doesn't take much sense to realize that the bus is not the most efficient system. The old trolley of years gone by was a lot better.

But your LRT system: you have a bus that runs around within the community going by the doors — close at hand within a minimum of a two-block walking distance — feeds over to the station, unloads and makes its circle again, never leaving that community. Remember that the city of Calgary has 122 communities, ranging from 3,000

to 10,000 in population. When they unload, they get on their LRT system; they ride this thing. Off it goes downtown, wheeling down its tracks, passing the line-ups of cars on Macleod Trail or major arteries which cost hundreds of millions to build, past the people who are sitting in their cars backed up at the lights. They get people there faster and more efficiently. The LRT can link up enough cars during the peak hours to haul up to 500 people with one driver. It's a lot more efficient than the dozen buses it would take to haul this many people.

As the operating cost stands now, the city of Calgary runs a deficit each year of \$25 million. Maybe the previous speaker's figures of \$33 million are more accurate than mine. That's not for the LRT; that's for the entire transportation system, with 600 buses and 900 drivers. That is what's costing you your operating deficit. That's the reason you have to go to those high rates — not because of the LRT system. The LRT system is working in Calgary: 47,000 rides a day on one leg — a one-legged chicken, you might say. It's one little leg. One of the previous speakers mentioned figures of 6,000 people during rush hour. If you check with the transportation department of the city of Calgary, that is what they're getting during the rush hours. They peak at around 6,000 people.

In the case for the LRT versus buses, the city of Calgary has reached the end of her limits to handle this type of inefficient operation. So they've attempted to do the two horrible things that a city politician always hates. They are raising the rates to \$1 a ride. They attempted to cut service. The petitions poured into the city councils. People were upset because they needed this transportation to get to work. So they backed up and reinstated all the lines they were cutting. They got away with a few where they didn't get a very large petition.

As it stands now, the city of Calgary has an investment on the first leg of \$180 million. It's not \$300 million or \$400 million, and it's not running an interest rate of \$100 million a year. Those are not the figures. We gave them a little better interest rate on \$180 million than that. But they have a partial system at this point. What the city is trying to do is build an infrastructure, the same as a small town finally says we must put in a water or sewer system. It's expensive when you put the plant in, but later as you plug more lines in it, it's the only way to go. Once the LRT is built, there is a structure there for generations to come.

We're basically saying that our heritage trust fund is for future generations. Once built, the LRT system will cut the operating cost, the operating transit deficits, for future generations. They will have it there to use. The students can get to university and school; the people can get to work. This is a thing for the future, but it is needed.

Transportation becomes a selling point in the infrastructure of any city. The city of Los Angeles lost much of its head-office industry — the industry which is non-polluting, heavy employment generating; big pay cheques, big revenues, year after year, demanding very little back from a city, state, or province. These [industries] moved out of Los Angeles because the congestion of traffic and transportation became impossible. Some of them come to Calgary, by the way.

In Calgary the firm of Clark James Coupland offered to put up the capital cost of \$2 million to extend the LRT for two blocks if the city of Calgary would run the LRT to the proposed site of their 900,000 square foot building. Why did they wish to spend \$2 million? Because they

have an offer from a head office of an international firm. This firm employs 1,800 people in their head office. That's 1,800 full-time jobs, jobs to maybe take up some of our unemployment. They will move their head office to this building. They will lease the building from this firm and have them build it, creating jobs, wealth, if the LRT runs by it. Private industry is beginning to realize the importance of transportation.

if we take one leg of LRT in the city of Calgary — for example, the next proposed leg, the northwest leg to serve the university, SAIT, the Foothills hospital, and a few hundred thousand residents — this thing will create 3,000 man-hours of work. That's what it creates. The excavation companies that will be working there — right now we have excavation companies selling their excavation equipment at the public auction in Red Deer. American companies come in, buy it, take it down to the States, and put it to work. It should be working in this province.

We've done what we can to help the trucking industry. But if we build that northwest leg, they're going to haul a lot of dirt. I imagine every member of this Legislative Assembly has received a letter from the engineers and architects almost asking: please get us more work. This is expertise and technology in this province that we built up over a decade and have the danger of losing in a couple of years. If there is no work for them, they must go somewhere else. This will create a lot of architectural jobs, a lot of jobs for the engineers.

Members of the Legislative Assembly, our major cities must have a good infrastructure to compete against other cities such as Denver, Toronto, and Montreal. This is a system we're looking at for the 1980s, because the 1980s belong to Alberta. Alberta is going to be the place to be in the 1980s, and let's see that we have our cities ready for it.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on this motion and generally support it, being a city member also. And I don't think we should be trying to draw lines between city and rural members. I think the motion could go further because a taxpayer is a taxpayer, regardless of whether it's the provincial or municipal government.

During the election campaign we went on the assumption that we favored revenue sharing, which is in many other provinces and working very well. We suggested 8 per cent could be given to the municipalities. In this sense it would not be, if you like, a famous quote, "children of the province", that they have a legitimate right in their own minds to set their own criteria. The point we make — and I think it's very important — is that public works in a time of recession is a time to go ahead because it makes good economic sense.

Let's use the LRT as an example. Perhaps the price of oil goes up again and we have to compete, and perhaps at some point heavy oil may be economic. Perhaps even the Alsands project may be economic again. If we wait until we're competing with these massive projects, the price of LRT is going to be very expensive. The point that we all know and they even knew in Houston — the price they're paying until they waited too long. It was much more expensive. Some people may argue that you don't need LRT. If we look around the world, especially western Europe and the United States, that's the direction they're going. We're going to need to expand our LRT, to use that for an example.

Why it makes sense to spend this money now is that it's a good economic investment in two ways. One, with

136,000 people unemployed, it's going to put people to work quickly. In this day and age, that would be very important to do. The second thing — and I make the point clearly — is that it makes good economic sense to do it now rather than wait until we're competing for labor and materials with an Alsands project.

For those two reasons, I suggest that we support Motion No. 201. As I said, I do not think it goes far enough, but I think it makes good economic sense. It would put a lot of people to work. It's the cheapest time to do it. I urge the Assembly to allow this to come to a vote and pass it.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments on Motion 201, proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I'm sorry I missed some of his opening remarks as I was out. I guess I can read them in *Hansard*.

I think the motion is timely, and we should seriously look at some of the concerns the various urban municipalities are bringing to this particular table. I think we should also be looking at some of the concerns that we in rural Alberta have. I reflect on the remarks that were made by my colleague from Camrose, and I can't totally agree with some of the comments he made. The statement he made was that the government was not involved with urban transportation. But we have a policy paper, Mr. Speaker, that was done in 1977, and it has been amended a number of times. I think I would draw his attention to that. He should read this Alberta urban transportation policy that this government adopted in 1977 and has carried on over a number of years.

It covers a number of subjects of interest to the city councils, such as research and development incentives, public transit capital incentives, public transit systems' operating deficits, arterial road systems, continuous corridors throughout the cities, and rail relocation sites. So those are what is under the present policy. The philosophy of the policy is here, which says that we work in conjunction with the municipalities.

The member pointing out that the cities of Calgary and Edmonton did not consult with the government when they went ahead with LRT is misleading. I've been a member of this House for probably 12 years now and can very vividly recall discussions to put this particular policy in place. I think that both the municipalities — I'm not familiar with Calgary, but the city of Edmonton has done a fairly good job in what they embarked to do a number of years ago.

I also look at the budgetary requirements, and this does concern me a bit. We have gone from the 1977 to '78 budget, \$65 million for transit, up to the '82-83, which is an estimate of \$211 million or a total of about a billion dollars over a five-year program to help the municipalities. We look at our total transportation budget in the province of around \$800 million, I believe it was, last year — or slightly more than that — and \$211 million of that was allocated to the cities for urban transportation. It doesn't leave that much for the rest of Alberta for primary and secondary highway construction.

The city of Edmonton has also made a number of briefs to the government regarding urban transportation, and the latest was done in October of 1980. I think they put a lot of work into this particular brief, and I feel the province has met some of those concerns that the city presented to us in 1980. One of their particular recommendations was — I'll read it into the record, Mr. Speaker: The city of Edmonton urged the government of



Alberta, in consultation with the city of Edmonton, to make a firm commitment by December 31, 1980, for the development of a ring road as a vital component of the roadway network required to cope with future developments in the area.

That particular aspect has not taken place to this date. In 1972 the then Minister of the Environment unilaterally imposed upon the people surrounding Edmonton an RDA, and I was of the understanding that the RDA would encompass utility and transportation corridors.

I look at the area west of the city that I represent, and we are certainly in need of a ring road to eliminate the congestion we have on some of the major thoroughfares coming into Edmonton. A lot of truckers and other groups are going through the city of Edmonton to get to the Calgary Trail or the St. Albert Trail and don't have in place a ring road to serve their needs. A lot of traffic is now using Highway 60 to eliminate going through the city of Edmonton, but this particular highway is over-taxed right now. I'll be discussing this with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his deputy minister in the near future to see what plans are in place to have Highway 60 act as a ring road around the city of Edmonton, especially to eliminate the westerly flow of traffic off the Whitemud freeway through Edmonton.

I have another concern, Mr. Speaker. That's primarily Highway 16 west of the city of Edmonton. Right now the traffic count of vehicles coming into Edmonton is 38,000 cars per day. What is happening is ... Sure, funds have been put into rapid transit and other areas. But from Highway 16 we run into a bottleneck of 170th Street and 102nd Avenue, and this is as far as the traffic can go.

A lot of traffic is now using the River Valley Road south and then hitting 79th Avenue and going into the city of Edmonton along the Whitemud freeway. But this River Valley Road is not up to standards. It's a dangerous street here in the city of Edmonton, and I have some concerns about motor vehicle accidents. Because of traffic congestion and the high volume of traffic, we are going to have some serious accidents unless this particular arterial road is looked at.

We've made significant progress in the Yellowhead Trail on the northern route around the city of Edmonton and taking it just south of St. Albert, and I think that particular design is well received. I know that if I want to go to Northlands Coliseum, there's only about three lights I have to be up against from Spruce Grove and I'm right to Northlands. However, that route must be expanded further to allow a greater flow of traffic, and the province has committed, through funding over a continuous period until completed in 1986, a substantial amount of money to expand Highway 16 west from Edmonton to the Lake Eden corner. The right of way is now bought. A lot of the road has been expanded to a four-lane standard.

The area from Stony Plain to Edmonton is now paved as a two-lane highway with an additional two lanes to open up next year, which will give us four lanes of pavement from Stony Plain to the city of Edmonton, which I hope will eliminate some of the 38,000 cars per day on Highway 16 west. The traffic count on 16X coming into the city right now is approximately 6,000 cars a day.

While we're discussing this motion, I think we should have expanded it and looked at some of the transportation problems we are having in some of our smaller towns in rural Alberta. I represent two smaller towns, Spruce Grove with a population of 11,000, and Stony Plain,

about half that size. They are having their own transportation problems within those urban municipalities. The department has committed that there will be further moneys spent in Spruce Grove this year for additional upgrading to the Calihoo road and the Golden Spike road, which I welcome. We have the same problem in the town of Stony Plain as one of the arterial roads.

I can see rapid transit being expanded to that particular area of Spruce Grove and Stony Plain. At Stony Plain this fall, we're going to be opening the first phase of the third technical institution in the province called Westerra. It will open with approximate needs of 400 students plus staff, but by 1986-87 I anticipate, and the government anticipates through the Minister of Advanced Education and board of governors responsible, that that could have an influx of 7,000 students. So I very sincerely say that we have to look at rapid transit to those two towns to eliminate the very high congestion we'll have on highways if something isn't done, such as using the railroad as a commuter service or a further type of bus service to bring students from the town of Stony Plain to the city of Edmonton.

I guess there are a number of other things I could say on this motion, Mr. Speaker, but I think that the government, through the Department of Transportation, has committed a number of funds for the urban transportation policy. The last announcement was made two years ago, and the funding will run out in 1986. I'm sure we will be looking at re-enactment of this program with further funds to help our urban cousins. I say that because I'm an urban member, and once in a while I will support the urban concept in this House. Once in a while I don't, but generally I look upon my urban cousins as deserving and within their needs. This is why I rose today, Mr. Speaker: to support the motion of the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I look forward to debate by other hon. members in this House.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to stand here today and support the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo's motion before this House. Of course, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, I'm a little nervous.

Mr. Speaker, during the election year of 1977, that being the municipal election year, many of the candidates who ran for city council wanted to re-evaluate the development of the LRT system proposed by the former council and the mayor Mr. Sykes during previous years. When elected, many of those new council members, including the new mayor Mr. Ross Alger, initiated a re-evaluation of the LRT. Although I don't want to expound on the LRT specifically, because I think it's only a part of what we would determine as balanced transportation, the majority of the council determined at that time that they would not support that total re-evaluation. Of course, in hindsight, those of us that may have wanted a re-evaluation were not fully informed and, of course, have proven that the LRT does work.

There have been a number of comments made, specifically from our hon. Member for Camrose, and certainly they would have to be given some consideration in our discussion today and some of them rebutted. Mr. Speaker, the issue here today is the issue of balanced transportation for the urban centres of this province, not necessarily focussing on Calgary and Edmonton, but the 12 major centres that make up the major urban areas. Certainly Edmonton and Calgary, being the larger of the two and having the large populations including access to them

or service to something like 60 to 65 per cent of the population of this province, do require special consideration, as do many of the concerns of the rural members when they have roads developed in their constituencies. It's very difficult for me to come into the House after possibly a few years and say, well, I got Highway No. 40 done, or Highway 2, or whatever the highway is. Because of our network in Calgary, we just can't identify singular roads. However, we would like to have similar consideration given by our rural friends so we may be able to approach our constituency in the same manner and identify that we were able to assist in doing something for our constituency as they have done.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a comment that less than 10 per cent use LRT. Certainly 10 per cent of the population does not use LRT. However, when you only have one leg of LRT in each of the two major cities, it's pretty difficult to have 10 per cent of the population actually using that transit facility. Somewhere back in the area of '74-'75, both the major cities did discuss with the province the development of LRT, or at least a major transit facility. For some five years of discussion, this process went on. In fact on the bottom line, as I understand it, the complete Edmonton first leg and 65 per cent of the costs of the first leg of the Calgary LRT were in fact funded by the province. In that context alone, the province has made a commitment to ensure that the cities have sufficient transit and public transit facilities to move the people of those cities.

Some two or three years ago, it was stated that before further funding is given, let's wait and see if people actually use this transit system. There was a committee, ACUTREC, developed by the then Minister of Transportation. Of course their recommendations are probably common knowledge to most of us here, and those who are not, they should be available through the minister's office. It's interesting to note that in Calgary alone some 47,000 people ride a one-leg system that goes from downtown to the suburbs. Now one leg a system does not make, and until such time — and we hear arguments that the system doesn't work. It's only got 45,000 or 47,000 people; Toronto's got 400,000 people. Heavens to Betsy, I can relate to many systems in the world that I've been on, including Sydney, Australia, where they put carriages on the tracks on heavy rail; they're double-decker. They have eight carriages in one train, double-decker, something like 400 people on each car. Certainly you could argue that the population of Sydney, Australia, is a little greater than Edmonton or Calgary, and it certainly is. The systems in the States — for instance, the BART in San Francisco. I've ridden on that, another system that has very high costs, \$2 billion and losing its shirt, and has other concerns with it. I had the opportunity to discuss with people in the BART, when I was down there two years ago, some of their problems and operating concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to relate too long on this subject of LRT, but certain comments have been made in this House relevant to it, and I just want to make sure the facts are on the table. During the Stampede week, 10 days, some 2 million people ride the LRT, half a million of them riding to that Stampede. The south line, of course, is in place. The northeast line is being built, unfortunately at the cost to the taxpayers in Calgary. And of course to make that system work a third line is required, and that hopefully will be into the northwest of the city where very excellent transit use will be made of the system. If for no other reason, both the large number

of people that are moving into that area, similar to the northeast, but also because of our universities, our colleges, SAIT, the Jubilee Auditorium, the Foothills hospital — a government institution, it's a training hospital. [interjection] And you're right, Harry: the McMahon Stadium, which will be expanded for the Olympic games in 1988. However, Mr. Speaker, I can speak on some of the transportation concerns that have bothered my constituency, and my constituency alone has a greater population than any other area, including full cities of this province other than Calgary and Edmonton, considerably more than the city of Lethbridge, for example. I can relate to transportation problems like probably nobody else here.

Too often, we develop transportation policies and transportation activities after the fact of growth. During the Sykes era in Calgary, it was a thought of defer, defer, defer. That way you couldn't spend any money, and you'd save the taxpayers increases on their tax bills. Ultimately what happens, it has to be done. So what happens? You get that big growth. You have people jumping up and down and getting mad at you because you haven't done anything. Then all of a sudden you do it, and the tax bill hurts. So what we need is to jump in and get on with the jobs of developing this balanced transportation at an early date, small portions at a time, so that over the period of the growth we are able to contain that growth and keep those people that are moving into these new communities reasonably happy.

It's interesting that we had a letter come by — I believe yesterday — from the Hon. Horst Schmid regarding the export of LRT expertise to the United States. Because Calgary and Edmonton are the forerunners of this type of system in North America, we have a quantity of quality experts in our midst in Calgary and Edmonton that are being used by some people in the United States to gain expertise on the systems they've developed in Canada. So what happens if we stop developing this part of our balanced growth transportation, being LRT? What happens to these people? Do they go down to the States? Do they become redundant? Let's hope not. Let's keep our resource which we have developed at a great cost to our taxpayers that have been given the opportunity through confidence of the two major municipalities and this government. Let's keep that resource in Canada and export some of it for our benefit.

When tourists come into our province, and especially into our major centres, do they ride in automobiles, do they rent cars? No, they ride on our public transit. If any of you have gone around the world — and I'm sure many of you have travelled extensively — and into those centres that have rail systems, for some reason or other they have an attraction to tourists and they ride them. That doesn't necessarily mean we build them because of a tourist attraction, but certainly they assist in moving people around and getting them from one place to another.

Road development can only extend to a certain degree, and it takes up one heck of a lot of land. Land cost today, of course, is exorbitant, and the development of roadways is becoming even more exorbitant.

An interesting comment was made a little earlier about the useless or worthless cars that are going into Calgary.

AN HON. MEMBER: That means Gordon's old junker.

MR. NELSON: Possibly. It's interesting that with the great expansion of the transit user on the south leg of

LRT in Calgary, they do not have enough cars to facilitate those people at the present time. So many of those 'excess' vehicles will certainly be used in that area as well as the northeast.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have an opportunity here to develop policies and to develop financial policies that have some foresight to them rather than some hindsight. As I've stated — and I'm most familiar with Calgary — it's easy to look back and say, boy, we should have done that; boy, we should have done this. But unfortunately that doesn't happen. Unfortunately what does happen is that the politician representing the particular community has to stand up here or at a municipal council meeting and jump up and down and cry the blues: why haven't we got these things done? My people can't move. They cannot get in and out of those communities.

Mr. Speaker, the same argument can be given for any community or urban area in this province: Red Deer, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Fort McMurray. Any argument regarding transportation — and that's balanced transportation in those urban areas — can be given in the respect that they too have traffic congestion and, many times, unhappy people. Until such time as we develop a completed system, with roadways, whether they be ring roads around the city, whether they be wide roads able to carry a lot of traffic through the city . . . Again, we start that nonsense; we have objections. These objections, of course, create other concerns, environmental concerns, and also the movement of people, social concerns. They can be very costly, because a holdup of construction of any type of transportation not only adds to the cost; many times it creates other concerns.

We cannot compare a system to . . . And I'm going to relate to the LRT again, because comments are made relevant to that the system doesn't work. Until such time as you have a system, it will not work. LRT has one leg both in Calgary and Edmonton. I must emphasize: only one leg. Both developed with the full knowledge and support of the government of Alberta, both in financial support and moral support. We must ask that that support continue, because the argument can be given continually that the system does not and will not work because you've only got one line or one and a half lines or two lines.

Mr. Speaker, we need to develop the system which is a minimum of three lines, so that we can move people not from the downtowns out to a suburb but from one suburb through the downtown to another suburb, to our working areas, to our schools, to our educational facilities, to our social areas, to our cultural facilities, to our performing arts theatres and universities. We need to move people to be able to participate in these functions, and we need to be able to move them efficiently and well and cheaply. Not everybody can afford a vehicle. Not everybody can go and park a vehicle at these facilities. For those people that live in our rural communities that may want to go to a facility, wouldn't it be nice to drive in to the south end of the city or the west end or the northeast end and say, hey, I can drive in and park my car right here, and I can get to that function without the hassle of driving into the downtown?

People from Airdrie, Okotoks, High River, Lethbridge, and Red Deer come to Calgary to attend functions. Wouldn't it be nice if they could just hop onto the train at one end of the city and ride in and not have the hassle of parking their vehicle downtown? Business people need to have access to full transportation.

Mr. Speaker, certainly there is a cost to developing

these systems, and I think we all recognize that. I would hope that the ability of members of this Legislature to have input to the development of transportation into the various communities, and especially into the urban communities where we have so great a problem, will be encouraged by the minister. I think that we would all be only too happy to facilitate the Department of Transportation and the minister in assisting him in developing a budget and in developing what we perceive as proper and balanced transportation in our cities. To ask for two-thirds of funding is not unreasonable considering the position that Alberta has been in in the last number of years, compared to many other provinces and in fact many other countries who are offered financial support by their senior governments.

It is interesting that a comment was made comparing transportation in Canada or in Alberta to that in the United States. As the mover of this motion has already indicated, the state and federal governments in the United States provide nearly all the funding required for roads, and in many cases the development of mass transportation systems in their communities. Here in Alberta, the municipality is up for a considerable cost of the development of these facilities. It is not always the municipality that is encouraging the growth. That is why we should examine many of our policies relevant to growth and decentralization in the province, so that we can more readily see that people are moved into areas where there is work and the cities will not have to come crying to the government every five minutes for more funding for transportation because of their extreme growth problems.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying that although I had the opportunity to give a few comments here this afternoon, I will be relating to some of this issue in my comments on the throne speech. But I think the government of Alberta has to recognize the needs of both the urban and rural areas, and in general they do that reasonably well. At the same time, my colleagues from the rural areas should recognize that our urban communities have a need, as do their own constituents in the rural areas. That need is being expounded day by day as growth in those areas continues.

The cities do not have the capacity of financial gain from the taxpayer. We do not have the tax base that the province or the federal government has. Maybe, just maybe, this House should make an effort to extract more moneys from the federal government to assist that growth.

DR. BUCK: Oh, come on. Get off that stuff.

MR. NELSON: Well, he is awake and he's got a bit of a smart mouth too.

Mr. Speaker, I can answer my colleagues and the hon. Member for Clover Bar any time he wishes, and I don't want to degrade the House with return comments to him. So considering where the comments came from, I'll ignore them. [interjection] Well, when you learn my name, I'll respond to you.

Mr. Speaker, at least I am speaking in sincerity, unlike some other colleagues that are in this House — possibly right now the hon. member. The sincerity of my approach, Mr. Speaker, is such that certainly there are ways of extracting moneys from the feds, and hopefully the municipalities will have the same opportunities to extract moneys from the province to assist them in dealing with their financial concerns in developing their transportation

needs for the people of their cities.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for Clover Bar, but I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo would like to draw attention to the presence of a visitor in the Speaker's gallery.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have the pleasure of introducing to members of the House a gentleman in your gallery, an alderman of the city of Calgary. He is particularly interested in seeing LRT extended to his community of Midnapore and therefore is present for this debate. I would ask members of the House to recognize Alderman Jim Bell.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet on a point of order, I have a form of communication from the city of Calgary. It is a slice of LRT rail. My initial thought was to forward a copy of this to the representative from Stony Plain so that he could begin the extension to his community. I am not certain if it's meant to be the first link to the northwest LRT in Calgary. It certainly had possessed me to courier this to the hon. representative for Camrose.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member has already made a speech. If he wishes to close the debate, he can do that after we are all finished speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. Member for Clover Bar wish me to suggest that he get back on the rails?

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member asked for permission to introduce a visitor. On that point of order, you didn't ask the Assembly if the hon. member had consent of the Assembly to introduce a visitor. I am sure he would have, but I think it's only right that you would have asked that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I really thought that I had asked leave of the Assembly. Possibly we can consider the matter of the rail settled, so that the hon. Member for Clover Bar can get on with his speech.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by tabling this to members of the House so that all, including the Member for Clover Bar, may share in this exceptional gift from the city of Calgary.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in engaging in the debate this afternoon, I would like to say to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that I certainly appreciate the fact that he's brought this resolution to the Assembly. But my hon. friend the Member for Calgary Buffalo has already fallen into the Tory syndrome. He's only been a Tory for six months and already he has the syndrome, and that is just don't do enough to get LRT under way or continuing in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, but just throw a little bit of money to make it appear like you're really trying to do something.

I say in all sincerity to my hon. friend the Member for Calgary Buffalo that when we are looking at the extension of LRT in Edmonton and Calgary, we're going to

have to do more, better than two-thirds of the financing, because if we really believe in the philosophy of moving people efficiently, we have to look at the province taking more than just two-thirds. I am saying to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that I appreciate his bringing the resolution to the Assembly. But as he is a member of the government caucus, they are going to have to do more than just pay lip-service if we are going to have efficient and many more miles of LRT than we do have in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members of the Assembly that this is one of the shortcomings of this government, that they don't have any long-range planning. They're doing a band-aid system all the time. They have to do more than just pay lip-service that they're going to help LRT in Edmonton and Calgary. They're going to have to exhibit some long-range financial planning so that the cities can do what they want to do. They're going to have to look at revenue sharing. I appreciate the fact that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is a good politician. The reason he's a good politician is that I've taught him all he knows. At the same time, the hon. member has taught me a few things in our many years of association as fellow politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one more comment for the benefit of the new members of the Assembly. We are elected to this Assembly to serve, number one, our constituents — but to serve all the people of the province. We are not just the member from Calgary or just the Member for Clover Bar. We are members in this Assembly to serve all the people of this province. So we don't have to apologize if we are urban or rural members. We are here to serve all the people of the province.

I'm looking forward, Mr. Speaker, with great anticipation to hearing from the silent 16 from the city of Edmonton. I say the 'silent 16' because whenever anything comes up that's a little bit touchy politically, the 16 MLAs from Edmonton sort of dive into their holes like gophers do if there's going to be any threat of decapitation. Where are the members from the city of Edmonton, the Tory MLAs? Let us hear what they say about supporting LRT. Let's hear what they say about revenue sharing. Let's hear what they say about the dispute between ACT and Edmonton Telephones. You know, the election's over now. They're free to speak their views for another four years. They won't have to dive for cover because sometimes these things are a little bit politically unpalatable. We're looking forward to the participation of the silent 16.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at changing our philosophy. We have to look forward to changing our philosophy about the movement of people through the system of LRT and other surface transportation. I think we have to go to our cousins in Europe and see what the European experience has been. Their philosophy is completely different.

I think I can illustrate that, Mr. Speaker. When I was on a legislative committee in Europe — and I emphasize legislative committee, which is a little different from government committees, because we have to report to the Legislature. We have to indicate what we did and what we tried to accomplish when we're in a legislative committee. Anyway, I want to illustrate how the European looks at mass transit. I was invited to visit a fellow elected person who was elected to the German *Bundestag*. He said to me, we'd like you to come out to our place for the evening. So I expected he would say, now stay at your hotel; we'll come and pick you up. But he said: no, catch

such a train, then transfer to such a train, and then transfer to a third train, and we'll pick you up at the railroad station. That is so foreign to the way we do it. It was about 40 miles, which is about the same as the distance from Vegreville to Edmonton. What would we do here? We'd say, stay at your hotel; I'll drive in, pick you up, and drive you back. So we have to change our way of looking at how we move people.

What we have to do is have an LRT system in this province, especially in the two major cities. We have to make it one of the best in the world. We have to look at what happens to your car when you leave it in northeast Edmonton when it's 42 below Fahrenheit with a 35 mile-an-hour wind. What use is that LRT leg to you if you leave your car there and eight hours later you come back and the thing is frozen solid? We have to consider that this is part of LRT. If we're going to have to rent plug-ins, so be it. If we're going to have a system, let's have a complete system.

It's really quite interesting to see how things change over the years. It's called progress. We had streetcar lines running down the main street of Edmonton, Jasper Avenue. So we pull out the streetcar lines, pave the spots, and run trolley buses. Now all of a sudden we've rediscovered the streetcar. So we're going to put lines back in and basically run streetcars up and down those lines. Toronto wasn't quite as modern as Edmonton was. They left the cotton-pickin' streetcar lines in there. So now that we've rediscovered streetcar lines, what we're going to do is look at a combination of underground and above-ground. It took Calgary a little while to even learn how to keep two trains off the same track. But Calgary is always a little slower than Edmonton. I know my hon. friend the Member for Calgary Buffalo was on city council at that time. I guess they got that problem solved. We have a few other former aldermen from the city of Calgary that solved that problem before they came up here to try to solve the problems of the Conservative government.

The hon. Member for Stony Plain made the point that we have to start looking at using the existing rail lines for the movement of traffic in and out from our suburbs. I'd like to again illustrate from an example of how we have these rail lines to the centre of this city. The city of Edmonton is unique and very fortunate in this way. There was a rail liner running from Edmonton to North Battleford. It was coming into the city in the morning, going back in the evening. My daughter used to ride on that rail liner. But out of the total clientele using the rail liner on a Saturday or Sunday, I would say there were probably 10 people. Out of those 10 people, eight of them would be CNR pensioners.

So the rail liner was running from Edmonton to North Battleford, up and back every day. The CNR in its brilliance decided that maybe this was not such a great idea, because this thing was losing a lot of money. So they decided to discontinue it. The lobby from Lloydminster, Vermilion, and all the points down the line — the hue and cry that went up when they discontinued the rail liner was awesome. They said, we've got to keep this service in place.

When they asked me what I thought about it, they expected me to join the hue and cry. I said, no, I'm glad to see it being discontinued. It's costing the taxpayer too much money, and not doing what it's meant to do. Of course that took the news reporter back a bit, because politicians are supposed to join in the hue and cry. They're not supposed to think. They're not supposed to worry about the waste of taxpayers money. They're just sup-

posed to go along with the crowd. But I thought it was just ample time to say, let's have a look at using those rail lines for something better than just running a day liner up and down that with no one on it.

We have these rail lines running into the centre of the city of Edmonton. We have a line from St. Albert. We have two lines from Fort Saskatchewan. We have the main line from Ardrossan. We have the CNR line from the southeast. We have the CPR coming from the south. We have the main line coming in from Stony Plain and Spruce Grove. We have the rail linkage. Is it not about time — the Minister of Transportation has already left — that we sat down with these major transportation people, the city of Edmonton, and the Department of Transportation and looked at a linkage of these suburbs with the downtown core of Edmonton.

I ask the members of this Assembly, the fathers of city council, and the people who are concerned with transportation — never, never tear those rail lines out of the centre of the city of Edmonton. Because future generations are going to be able to make use of those rail lines.

So let's look at a task force to look at the feasibility of using those rail lines and linking LRT, because we have to change our philosophy. We have to look at more efficient methods of moving people. Those rail lines will be very, very important in the movement of those people.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost 5:30 p.m. and I have a few other areas I'd like to cover, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

#### 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.

[Debate adjourned March 14: Dr. Carter]

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to once again be in the Assembly. First I would congratulate you on your re-election. I'm also interested that in terms of rearranging the decor of the interior of the Legislative Assembly, not only have we improved the wallcoverings but we have moved the Sergeant-at-Arms to a position where all of us can keep an eye on him as well as the other way around.

Again, with respect to the whole decor, the general environmental setting of the Legislative Assembly, it is interesting to note that spring is coming, even in Edmonton. All of us look forward to seeing the enhanced beauty of the buildings, with all the landscaping which has taken place at the north side of the Legislature Building itself.

I also would like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion, and to welcome the other new members to this Assembly. I am certain that

they bring a great array of talents which will benefit the discussions which take place in this Assembly.

I don't know whether to regard myself as a new member or not, but as I mentioned earlier I have great appreciation of being back in the Assembly. For some of us it is a little bit harder to get back here than for others. I had someone do a bit of research to see how many people in the history of this Assembly had had the honor of representing two distinctly different constituencies. It appears from the research that there are only two of us; the other one was a gentleman by the name of Aberhart. Nevertheless, I appreciate the fact that from 1979 until the most recent election I was fortunate to represent a very interesting and diverse constituency. I must admit that I am very, very encouraged and pleased by the response of the people of the constituency of Calgary Egmont. Of course, part of my pleasure is the fact that it is kind of nice to win with an 8,000 vote plurality.

In terms of Calgary Egmont, I follow in the footsteps of a very interesting individual, Merv Leitch. I know that this council chamber is actually the poorer for not having Merv here amongst us. We know that in terms of his service to the province, he not only held down but was able to exercise jurisdiction and authority in terms of three very important portfolios within the ranks of the government of this province. I know that all members of the Assembly join me in wishing Merv and his wife well. In the next month, the constituency of Calgary Egmont will be having a testimonial dinner to honor our former colleague, Merv Leitch.

In terms of being able to deal with a constituency, whether it be with nomination or fighting an election, the only way to get to really know your people is to go door to door. In the course of going to almost all of the 8,000 doors in the constituency of Calgary Egmont, I know that I have been able to meet some very interesting people, people who come from a diversity of backgrounds. To further facilitate that kind of interesting interchange, three weeks ago we opened the constituency office in the constituency of Calgary Egmont so that we might better serve the interests of our constituents.

Calgary Egmont is a very interesting constituency. It embraces the areas of Calgary known as Kingsland, Fairview, Acadia, Willow Park and Maple Ridge. That fits within the geographic area of Glenmore Trail to the south to Anderson Road, and then on the east side the Bow River, coming back on the west side to Elbow Drive around the Kingsland area, and back along Macleod Trail. So within that whole area, we obviously have a diversity not only of individuals but of make-up. We have high-rises, residential areas, business areas, large shopping centre complexes such as South Centre, and light industrial areas.

There is a great diversity also in terms of services for the community such as day care, schools, churches, recreational facilities. With respect to recreational facilities, in each of the areas there are very fine facilities. The Rose Kohn and Jimmy Condon arenas are within the community of Kingsland. Fairview has its own recreational and community complex. In Acadia they have what is affectionately known as the ARC, the Acadia Recreational Centre, a very fine complex which has been open for just a few number of months in terms of the last year or so. More recently, the Hon. Bill Payne was present to open the new leisure centre which serves a number of the communities in his constituency as well as two of the communities within the constituency of Calgary Egmont. In each of these cases, very substantial funding was re-

ceived from the provincial government to make these facilities possible.

Lord Beaverbrook high school is one of the larger schools within the constituency of Calgary Egmont, and last fall I was present to hand out a considerable number of awards under the Heritage Scholarship Fund. The awards that could not be delivered to students that evening, I then delivered to the homes of the students. That was an interesting exercise because that allowed me to meet the parents and the students in their own homes, to talk to the parents about their occupations and various issues which they find confronting them at this stage of their lives. It was also interesting to note that a number of students weren't there, because they were busy off in other places pursuing further education. They were in a great variety of faculties, and some of them were off in Regina, Edmonton, Toronto, Utah, or various other universities throughout Canada and the United States.

In preparation for coming back to the Assembly, I visited a number of places within the constituency. For example, I went to one of the senior citizens' homes — in fact it's the only senior citizens' home in this constituency — the Francis Klein Centre, which has 104 self-contained apartment units; a very fine building in terms of its design, and built using Heritage Savings Trust Fund dollars. The sponsors are St. Cecilia's Roman Catholic Parish and the Knights of Columbus. The official opening will take place on June 24, and the facility is really well designed and very homey. Obviously you can tell the kind of homey atmosphere that is there shortly after entering the doors. One of the very interesting aspects of this senior citizens' complex is that it's built adjacent to a playing field. It's also very interesting just to watch the seniors who are very much wrapped up in watching younger people out there being able to kick the soccer ball around, so it does make for some kind of interaction between at least two generations.

At the same time, within the constituency in the area of Kingsland, a number of people are very actively involved in co-operation with one of the Lions clubs to try to work on the needs survey with respect to trying to build yet another senior citizens' facility, which would be located in the Kingsland area between Elbow and Macleod.

The constituency has a nursing home, the Southland nursing home, located on Heritage Drive. Having gone there and visited with the staff and some of the residents, I have only praise for the people and their dedication, the people who work not only as full-time staff but as part-time and as volunteers, dealing there with some of our pioneers in this great province of Alberta.

The fact that I'm chairman of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee — I am very appreciative of being reappointed to that position. Within the constituency of Calgary Egmont, there are at least two special facilities which come under the whole jurisdiction of Social Services. One of these is the development activities centre which is located on Flint Road, near Heritage Drive. This is operated by Advance Industries, which is part of the operation of the Calgary Association for the Mentally Retarded. There are 40 spaces there. The young people and young adults come from places such as Baker Centre, Fanning, and also from various group homes throughout the city. These young people are being trained for other occupations. They're also being trained in terms of general physical activity, the matter of personal hygiene and of group interaction. To tour a facility such as that would be good for each one of us, because it brings home a realization that you and I are very much blessed in terms of our

own health, our own abilities, and also our mobility. When you come to a facility such as that, or to other group homes, you realize how much you and I take for granted — the mere fact that we can hop into a car, dash off somewhere, try to perform all the many functions that MLAs are called upon to do in the course of a day.

Another facility within the constituency is known as Margaret House. This is an interesting place because it deals with autistic children and young adults. This is regarded as being an emotional disorder which also manifests itself in severe behavioral problems. There are 20 spaces at Margaret House and, again, the staff are to be commended for their dedication, because this is a very difficult and demanding kind of occupation they have entered into with such dedication. This facility serves all of Alberta, and the residents range in age from three to 17. There are a number of young people there who come from Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Rocky Mountain House, and Hobbema.

I did mention my involvement again with the Social Care Facilities Review Committee. For the benefit of new members to the House, this committee was established in 1980. Within the purview of this committee, we have over 900 different facilities in this province which relate to the whole area of group homes for the mentally and physically handicapped, sheltered workshops, facilities for juvenile delinquents, or whatever euphemism you wish to use today, overnight accommodation for alcohol and drug abuse, facilities for battered women and children, and transient shelters throughout the province. This obviously is a very interesting committee jurisdiction and, as I say, includes 900 facilities throughout the province. These facilities are among the best, not only in Canada but in North America. Within a week we expect to table the annual report of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee. I would just like to mention that in 1982 the committee made 431 visits, and since the inception of the committee in 1980, 1,136 visits have been made by the dedicated members of this committee who work with me.

A number of brief comments with respect to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. With respect to education, it's interesting to note that the emphasis is there with respect to computers in the schools. I know that this has caused a number of questions in the past 18 months, but it is interesting to realize that all of the 1,000 computers which had been purchased by the department have now been sold to schools throughout the province. An additional 3,000 computers have been purchased by schools, so at least 4,000 computers are now in place in the school system in this province.

Obviously, any of us who've gone out and bought a computer realize that the thing can sit there and gather a lot of dust while you're up here in Edmonton, and you perhaps might not have enough time to teach yourself everything about a computer. But I believe it is very encouraging to realize that we have at least 4,000 computers in the school system in this province, because it shows that this government and the Department of Education are committed to trying to equip our students and their instructors to be able to take that very rapid leap forward in terms of what computers really do mean in terms of their impact upon not only the society in Alberta but the society throughout the world. I noticed fairly recently that a report has come in with respect to the Telidon distance education project. Hopefully that will provide information for additional kinds of fine-tuning of this whole educational system, especially with regard to computers.

Last Friday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to represent the Minister of Education at Wabasca-Desmarais and was there with the M.L.A. for the area, Mr. Shaben. It was very interesting to be there at Mistassini school. In Cree, I understand Mistassini means big rock. Well, education is a big rock on which to build one's life. It's very interesting to be there in one of our smaller northern communities and see such a fine facility having been built, and to see again the dedication of the instructors to be in that community.

I firmly believe that education is the only possible way forward for our native people. It's the only way they stand a chance to be able to deal with the rest of this society. Again, with respect to computers and so forth, I hope that with distant learning via satellite and the use of computers, this does give to our native people and to other people in our isolated communities their real chance not only to catch up to us but to go past us — to go past us because most of us here in this Assembly haven't got the foggiest notion what a computer is all about, and yet a computer really is the key for the leap forward, I believe, for future generations.

With respect to native affairs, in the throne speech I'm interested to see that comment has been made with respect to the Native Venture Capital Corporation. One can only hope that this will be fully financed and able to launch forth in all of its goals.

There's another area which happened in the last number of years, and I think that all hon. members have received a copy of the BANAC report, Business Assistance for Native Albertans Corporation. It's a reasonably new and innovative organization, and was established in June 1981 with significant encouragement and support from this government. The purpose of BANAC is to encourage and assist Metis and Indian Albertans develop successful businesses. It's done in two main ways; one, by providing consulting assistance in such things as business and financial planning, and the other way is by providing an accounting and financial analysis system. After 21 months of operation, BANAC has worked with 280 clients, and formal assistance has been provided to approximately 500 other individuals. Initial indications are that about 20 per cent of the clients have a reasonable chance of developing a successful business. By way of example, one native client was able to start a kitchenware shop in Airdrie, and another client from the Broukett area is trying to purchase a special mill in order to manufacture log homes. Another client, from Anzac, up towards Fort McMurray, is in the process of building that community's first hotel and lounge.

BANAC will contribute significantly to the social/economic development of native people, but it will also be of major benefit to Albertans as a whole. I am encouraged by our government's support of this innovative program. It's the sort of program that must continue to receive substantial support.

Transportation, of course, is an interesting issue at all times. Within the constituency of Calgary Egmont, we have had a very positive impact after the opening of the Deerfoot 2 extension which I carried out together with Mayor Klein. As was mentioned earlier today, 90 per cent of the funding for the Deerfoot extension came from provincial sources. Obviously that has made for great ease of traffic flow, especially for someone driving from Lethbridge to Edmonton or vice versa. But with respect to the constituency, it also has made for a great improvement with respect to lower noise coming from the flow of traffic, the traffic now being diverted down in the

valley. To me, the most important factor about it is that now we have a greater degree of safety for the transport of hazardous goods, because that Deerfoot extension is quite well removed from centres of population.

In the area of recreation and parks, it has been mentioned in the throne speech that the Western Canada Games will be held in Calgary from July 31 to August 6. In essence, we in Calgary are trying to learn some of the good lessons which the people in Edmonton learned with respect to the Commonwealth Games. So it is that we are trying to get pre-Olympic experience, not only for the athletes who will take part in the Western Canada Games but also with respect to that great army of volunteers which is so necessary to be able to launch such things as Commonwealth Games, Universiade, Western Canada Games, or the Olympics themselves. So it is that Calgarians will welcome 2,500 athletes, but at the same time almost 5,000 volunteers from the Calgary area will be involved in terms of that particular project.

Hospitals and medical services: it's very interesting to see the continued construction with respect to the addition to the Rockyview hospital. That hospital, with its addition, will serve not only southwest Calgary but southeast Calgary, so that will deal with the constituency of Calgary Glenmore as well as the constituencies of Calgary Elbow and Calgary Egmont. We know we're in the midst of the most significant hospital construction program in all of North America. With regard to the smaller centres of population in the province, I think we should realize that something special is going on there architecturally. It's the matter of these new modular hospitals, which have been designed in large measure by an architectural firm in Calgary — the modular hospital and its ability to be added to is, in effect, architecturally unique.

My final few comments, Mr. Speaker, are with regard to economic development. In recent months there has been, obviously, a significant worldwide realignment of trading patterns as well as economic influences. It's my understanding that at the moment, Canada is having an increasing number of hurdles put in its path with respect to trade with our traditional trading partners in the European Common Market as well as into the United States. So it seems to be that, more and more, if we are to develop an aggressive and a positive economic development policy in the province of Alberta, we have to spend more time in terms of our relationship and the development of markets in what's known in the trading area as the Pacific Rim. We obviously are part of the Pacific Rim, so we want to move our product to the other side of the Pacific Rim, to areas such as Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, mainland China, and to the other areas of south-east Asia.

About a month ago, I was fortunate enough to be one of those accompanying the Minister of Economic Development on a visit to Hong Kong and Korea. When you get off the aircraft in Hong Kong, you are just absolutely amazed by the electricity that seems to sparkle through the air. There's a whole dynamism that is very much apparent there. It has something to do with the concentration of 5.5 million people in a very small area. It has something to do with the fact that the place never stops. But it also has something to do with the industriousness of the people and their true entrepreneurial spirit. Of course, we in Alberta are well represented there by a former member of this Assembly. Fred Peacock, the former Member for Calgary Currie. Fred Peacock is not exactly a laid-back individual. In terms of our time there,

I don't think he let us have more than five minutes' peace, and that was only when his back was turned.

It's also interesting to be there to visit with the people, to deal with the Hong Kong general board of trade, to share with them their concerns about what might happen in 15 years' time when the arrangement with mainland China has to come to some formal rearrangement. But it's more important to be there to meet with all the business leaders, to talk with representatives, not only of the Hong Kong business community, but also representatives from mainland China, because you realize that China is indeed one fantastic market which is also willing to reach out to gain expertise from wherever they can find it, but most interested to get it from Canada.

One little-known fact that many of us are not aware of is that in Hong Kong, there are probably 10,000 to 12,000 residents who at one time were educated at one of the high schools, universities, or colleges in Canada. So they have many bonds and ties with our country. Perhaps that will work out to our mutual benefit in terms of joint ventures in the years ahead.

In Korea there's a different situation. It's a tougher land because, like Hong Kong, they also have precious few resources. Their real resources are their people. Their real resources are their energy. Their real resources are their willingness to get out there and get going. In Korea, we Canadians have another benefit. The benefit to some degree is represented by someone like Oscar Lacombe, our Sergeant-at-Arms, because Canada is able to trade on the fact that in the Korean conflict a number of Canadians, such as Oscar, joined in fighting on the side of the South Koreans. That has meant for a tremendous reservoir of good will. There's another aspect to it as well. Korea has been overrun at least three times by Japan, so they're not terribly enthusiastic about having to deal with that nation.

What I'm saying is, there is an opportunity here for us to be able to reach out. In Korea, the province of Gangweon-do is twinned with this province of Alberta and has been for a number of years. We went to visit an agricultural farm there to be shown around where the crossbreeding project is in process, the development of crossbreeding of Alberta Charolais with Korean cattle. That is a source of pride for the Koreans but also a source of good nature, good will, towards Canada. The farmers there farm every single square inch of land. You don't see any opportunity for quack grass growing around telephone poles, because it's farmed right up to the pole. Here we have a very industrious people.

Our real problem in western Canada is our ability to be able to move product westward. If we want to deal with the Pacific Rim, we have to have trade missions, relationships, financing, and all those kinds of things. But we have to get the product to the west coast, and then we have to be able to get it out of Vancouver. Our Minister of Economic Development, who's often good at one-liners, has a great one about Vancouver: people must realize that Vancouver is not a yacht basin, but it is a deep water port for Canada. This has ramifications with regard to containerized facilities. Vancouver has to do much better than have just three cranes able to move containerized shipments to the Pacific Rim. At the moment Seattle has 22 and Portland has 12, so there's a great diversion of traffic to the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of worldwide economic reassessment and realignment, it is appropriate for Albertans and Alberta businesses and labor to deal with economic realities. Alberta's pioneers were noted for



their individuality, industriousness, and productivity. Such are the trademarks of Calgary Egmont and of Albertans today. They must still be our trademarks in terms of productivity, individuality, and industriousness if we are to succeed in the realities of the economic 1980s.

Thank you.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by adding my congratulations to those already imparted to you on your re-election as Member for Edmonton Meadowlark and for your appointment as Speaker of the House for this First Session of the 20th Legislature. As one who has had a bit of experience with chairmanship, I certainly recognize this is not an easy job, particularly with the group before you, and I commend you for your common sense and good judgment, that I have witnessed in the short time I've been here.

I also wish to extend my congratulations to all the members of this Assembly, especially those, like myself, who are here for the first time. As successor to the hon. Dr. Don McCrimmon, I wish him a long and enjoyable retirement after 11 years of service to our constituency as MLA and many more in local government as mayor and town councillor. Further I would like to thank the people of the constituency for providing me the opportunity to represent them here in this Assembly.

The Ponoka constituency — or, as I hope it will be in the future, the Ponoka-Rimbey constituency — is situated in the heart of attractive and vibrant central Alberta. There are two major towns in the constituency, Rimbey and Ponoka, and numerous other smaller centres such as Bluffton, Hobbema, and Hoadley. As well, community spirit and cohesiveness exist in many districts throughout the rural area. With some commendable help from government, but largely through local leadership and volunteer effort, these communities have developed recreational and cultural facilities and programs. As an illustration, the Wood River music festival continues to be a significant cultural event in central Alberta, and noted throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, it was only a little more than a century ago that the constituency was the hunting ground of the Cree and Blackfoot Indians. Although such men as David Thompson, Paul Kane, Father Albert Lacombe, and George and John McDougall journeyed through the area, it was not until the turn of the century that it became a focus for settlement. The construction of the railroad between Edmonton and Calgary in the early 1890s provided land seekers the opportunity of getting off at small whistle stops. One of these became known as Ponoka, the name taken from the Indian word meaning black elk. Ponoka was incorporated in 1904, and has been the location of the provincial mental hospital since 1911.

About 30 miles west of Ponoka, another settlement emerged. In 1902 Kansas Ridge, as it was known then, became the area settled by three brothers: Sam, Ben, and Jim Rimbey. In 1904 the post office department decided Kansas Ridge was unacceptable as a name — I don't know why — so some area residents met together and decided on the family name of Rimbey. Somewhat alienated from mainstream transportation systems for a while, it was not until 1919 that the railway arrived at Rimbey. The history of Rimbey and district is well recorded and preserved through the work of a very active historic society. In recent years, this group's work was much aided by the support of the province's Department of Culture. Government recognition of Alberta heritage in this and other ways is much appreciated in the area,

particularly by senior citizens.

Today, Rimbey is a busy service centre for the west end of the constituency, which stretches to the North Saskatchewan River. It is situated in the beautiful Blindman valley. Rimbey and district residents are working to improve an already fine quality of life. During the past year, Rimbey has become the home of the Rimbey West Stars, a championship calibre junior B hockey team, has launched a fund-raising effort for a new recreation complex, and has seen the completion of a much-needed hospital renovation and addition. In the future, I hope that a long-sought-after landing strip and some light industry can be provided and attracted. I look forward this spring to being present at the opening of a new parks service building and at the opening of the combined provincial building and courthouse in the community.

Mr. Speaker, in Ponoka Alberta Hospital continues to be one of the two major mental health facilities in the province. Along with excellent psychogeriatric care, the hospital's major responsibility continues as an active treatment centre. The vast majority of a busy schedule of admissions occurs for those under 45 years of age. The average length of residency for this group is 67 days. The staff of Alberta Hospital has coped rather well with the uncertainty and adverse publicity over the past while. The establishment of a regional board and the transfer to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care is welcomed in the community. Implementation of the October 4 commitment of the government to a much needed major building program and to the establishment of the promised brain damage treatment program are anxiously awaited.

Also looked forward to is the start of a much needed general hospital. This facility, with an active home care and public health program, will certainly show in the area the government commitment mentioned in the throne speech to quality health care in the province.

Ponoka is the site of agricultural services and several small industries. Firms such as Allied School Equipment and the Sommer's Pallet plant show the initiative typical of the proprietor group in the area. The government's effort to deregulate and reduce red tape is certainly beneficial, recognized, and appreciated by these people. The Alberta Opportunity Company and the Treasury inspection branch thrive in the town. Originally reluctant movers, they thrive there now. I think this certainly verifies the viability of government decentralization of services. Very recently Ponoka received approval of support for a water treatment plant and associated facilities. This will be a great help to the town in its development and in attracting hoped-for light industry.

Mr. Speaker, since I think it is acceptable at a time like this to extend invitations, I'd like to welcome everyone here to the Ponoka Stampede if you've not attended it before, or attend it for a second time. It is the second largest stampede in Canada and, to rodeo purists, the best.

Mr. Speaker, located 10 miles north of Ponoka is the hamlet of Hobbema, centre for the administration of four Indian reserves: Samson, Ermineskin, Montana, and Louis Bull. The reserves cover some of the best land in the province, and band farmers are among the best equipped and most modern in the area. Oil provides significant income to the area. Today the four bands represent a major investment force in the province, and their 5,000 residents are an integral part of the constituency. Strides are being made to promote educational opportunities, health services, cultural preservation, and

recreational development. The Hobbema Hawks junior A hockey team and Panee Agriplex, with its active rodeo program, are putting Hobbema on the map in the sports world.

Mr. Speaker, growth of the constituency has resulted in a considerable demand for acreage subdivision, especially on some of the poorer soils south of Ponoka and along the north shore of Gull Lake. These land holdings hold attractive architecture, landscaping and, in a few cases, thriving cottage industry. A problem of settling on fair taxation continues to trouble the area, and it is a matter that I feel needs further work on the part of both local and provincial governments. The Morningside area, one of these acreage areas, will by 1984 be the site of a championship golf course developed by private entrepreneurs in the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on transportation, particularly roads. Everyone needs them. All have a case for needing new or replacement roads because theirs are the lumpiest or the bumpiest. Nevertheless, I have a candidate for rebuilding and widening; that is, Highway 53 which runs east to west through the constituency.

At this time I would like to mention two problems in the area of transportation that I think will have to be addressed, Mr. Speaker. Municipal government is having increasing difficulty, despite increased support from the provincial government, keeping up with the wear and tear resulting from heavy industrial traffic on their roads. I would like to have become involved in the debate this afternoon. I would have pointed out several things at that time about the rural interests, but that will have to wait. Second, we should be looking for a way of providing more government business to local trucking firms where service to government is required in an area.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency is served by a sound school system and enjoys good access to postsecondary education: 11 public, one Catholic separate, and two Class I private schools offer grades 1 to 12 education. Early childhood committees offer ECS services, and the further education council has an extensive adult education program. Graduate students have access to Red Deer College, Olds agricultural college, Camrose college, the University of Alberta, and the University of Calgary. I commend the additional funding of postsecondary education, but further support will be needed with the tremendous increase in enrolments.

The addition of technical and trades programs at Red Deer College is much appreciated in the constituency. A start in major upgrading of facilities at Olds College would certainly be supported by the agricultural community. I would like to add my support to the statements of the Member for Olds-Didsbury, so well put forward last night, for the upgrading of this facility. The government's building quality restoration program has been a very important program for local school jurisdictions. I hope it will be continued.

I commend the department for its efforts to introduce computer technology and related programs. I hope this effort can be continued and that it can concentrate on preparing the personnel to deal with this new development rather than worrying too much about concentrating on the hardware.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt the major educational issue at the moment is the proposed introduction of mandatory comprehensive exams. Parents, students, and teachers cautiously support the need for testing to aid in maintaining standards, to provide comparability and a basis for scholarships. However, we must be sure that measures

that are introduced provide a close relationship between test and curriculum, that the granting of diplomas is the culmination of and not separate from the school program, and that all major areas of individual ability and achievement are fairly recognized. As we go about implementing exams, it is critical that this be well explained, well prepared, and presented in a positive manner.

Students face more pressures and challenges than we of a somewhat earlier vintage had to face. I am impressed by the quality of students as individuals and as scholars. Exams will always be a small part of what is necessary to ensure the quality of education.

One of the important aspects of this whole problem of standards — and I suppose it is related to testing — is the concern over literacy. I had hoped the hon. minister would be here this evening, but I will send a copy of this to him. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article entitled *Writing is an Abnormal Act in Today's Electronic World*. On my point about a special effort being needed in this area, I think we have to use the benefits of technology. We have to make an extraordinary effort if we are going to cope with all the influences that seem to mitigate high-quality literacy these days.

Turning to another topic, Mr. Speaker, the people in the constituency, the province, and the nation enjoy the facilities surrounding the lakes and recreational areas of the district, as well as the beautiful natural scenery and camping facilities. The western portion of the constituency is a hunters' and fishermen's paradise. I hope the development of the recreational potential of this area will be forthcoming and the subsequent economic effects on the district will help diversify the economy of the area.

Some people are taking up semi-permanent residence in the two summer villages. Two active fish and game associations voice concerns for the environment. The Rimbey hazardous wastes committee is a rather unique and very special volunteer initiative in the area, coping in a positive and methodical way, I think, with the whole area of pollution of our environment and trying to prevent that.

Mr. Speaker, as is the case with many of the constituencies along the Eastern Slopes, the area has an active oil and gas industry. It has certainly benefited from the recent initiatives of the government to help that industry.

Mr. Speaker, farming is the key industry of the area. This activity is concentrated on livestock production, especially beef, cattle, dairying, and hogs. In fact, the constituency contains the highest concentration of livestock in Alberta, specifically in the form of feedlot and cow-calf operations. Fortunately, through the efforts of hardworking and very productive private entrepreneurs and this government's help, the area has an excellent variety of agricultural services, including one of the largest volume auction marts in the province. In November 1982, the Vold Jones & Vold market celebrated its 25th anniversary and, in 1982, completed its highest volume year of sales.

Mr. Speaker, constituents will be pleased to see the strong commitment to agriculture shown in the throne speech. The farm fuel price reduction program, the provision for natural gas rebates, the various programs of the Agricultural Development Corporation, the small business and farm interest reduction program, are all well received, utilized, and recognized as part of this government's commitment to keep down farm costs.

Farmers in our area look forward to the resolution of the Crow rate issue, the continuance of the central Alberta hail suppression research project, refinements to the

new farm loan program, and exploration of private-sector involvement in short- and medium-range credit programs for farming. In particular, I wish to commend recent steps to bring about nationwide dialogue on the matter of red meat price stabilization. Area producers feel some urgency in seeing the issues surrounding this topic resolved.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must mention that the government, despite its tremendous effort in supporting agriculture, will have to do a better job communicating the significance of this effort to the farming community. I think more will need to be done in supporting this extremely important industry of the province.

Senior citizens form a very, very important component in our constituency. I am very proud to be able to represent a government that has made such a major commitment to the support of senior citizens with various programs. I believe one begins to understand the proud history of this province of Alberta just a little bit better after having spoken with seniors, after hearing them, in an age when some people talk only of rights, talk of both rights and responsibilities, after hearing seniors talk of the need for personal discipline in an age when many talk only of personal pleasure, and after hearing them talk of the importance of family life and the need for strong, personal commitment to that family concept. I feel that, in general, the ideals that the senior citizens carry with them are ones that are shared by the total constituency. I strongly believe that one of the prime objectives of the government must be to continue a tradition and foster goals of individual initiative and personal responsibility among the people of this province while caring for and assisting those who need assistance, who cannot take an active part in the province's growth, development, and great opportunities.

I'd like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by stating that during this recent time of some economic realignment or downturn, I found that there exist thousands of individuals in the constituency who have a great deal of initiative, ambition, and optimism. They realize that there will be a period of more difficult times, but there's a tremendous potential there that will go forth and continue the development of the constituency and contribute to the life of the total province. I look forward to my role as MLA representing this fine area.

Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased to be able to stand in the Legislative Assembly tonight and participate in the Speech from the Throne. The results of the contests that were held in the province of Alberta that culminated in the results of last November 2 provided me with a very satisfying experience, to know that the vast majority of the constituents and the people who live in the constituency of Barrhead provided me with an opportunity to return here once again. I'm pleased because when I was first elected, in the fall of 1979, I did not have an opportunity to participate in the first Speech from the Throne during the First Session of the 19th Legislature. Now that we are in the First Session of the 20th Legislature, I almost feel that this is my maiden speech in this Assembly. I'm very proud of being here again.

Sir, I would like to congratulate you on your re-nomination as Speaker of the House. I'd like to convey my sincere congratulations to the Lieutenant-Governor, deliverer of the speech, and my particular and warm congratulations to the 19 new members in this Assembly.

This is an Assembly of some esteem, not only in Canada but in the nations that form the Commonwealth. The decorum has always been of a most sophisticated and mature approach. Sir, that is to your credit and the manner in which you've handled the affairs.

As well, I would like to convey my congratulations to the new Leader of the Opposition. By the way, Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents very, very much concur in the decision you brought down the other day. In fact they've spoken to me and said that in their view, that would have been the right decision. Congratulations to that particular gentleman on his new responsibility. It's the view of my constituents that the Leader of the Opposition should rightfully be referred to as the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Undoubtedly the approach that gentleman will take in the ensuing year will reflect that general purview of what the democratic system has come to be.

I was particularly impressed with the initial speeches given by my colleagues the new members for Grande Prairie and Calgary Foothills on Friday last when they moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne in this Assembly. Once again, it's very, very quality people here. Both of those people are to be sincerely congratulated for their participation, not only in the manner and the form in which they presented their overviews but for the content and the very human aspect and nature in which they provided their thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Barrhead is really not very far away from where we are tonight and begins no more than about 25 miles from here, at a little place called Onoway, a village of some 665 people which will be celebrating its 60th anniversary in 1983. Its history goes back much before 60 years, but it was 60 years ago that it became an incorporated municipality in the province of Alberta. Prior to that, it was right in the path that the early pioneers of this province, particularly the early Catholic missionaries of northern Alberta, took when they were making pilgrimages out to Lac La Nonne, an historic point for many of the native people in this particular province of ours.

From Onoway you go north, and you go north, almost to Westlock, which is not in the constituency of Barrhead, to a place called Jarvie and, beyond that, to a place where two rivers, the Pembina and Athabasca, meet. There's a locale known as Athabina, the confluence of the two rivers. That's really the northeastern sector of the constituency of Barrhead. From there you go almost straight west, well over 130 miles, to north of Swan Hills, and from south of Swan Hills, some 80 or so miles, to a line that would roughly be between the two municipalities of Sangudo and Cherrill, and then back south along the northern boundaries of Lac La Nonne to Onoway.

Within that constituency live some 11,500 voters and approximately 28,000 or 29,000 people. It's an extremely diverse constituency. In many ways, it's a topography that's almost a mosaic of the province of Alberta. If you begin in the extreme southeasterly part of the constituency of Barrhead, you have rich agricultural soil and slightly rolling terrain. The farther north and west from that area, you move essentially into a different type of topography. You cross the mighty Athabasca River near the village of Fort Assiniboine, and you get into rolling foothills, muskeg, and forestry lands. As you continue to go farther to the north and the west, you come across a high incline in the central part of Alberta. You rise and rise until, in almost the geographic centre of the province of Alberta, you reach an altitude of some 4,550 feet above

sea level. If my understanding is correct, that's as high as Banff is above sea level. But in our part of Alberta, we don't call topography with that kind of elevation mountains. We simply refer to them as hills. They are known as the Swan Hills. Any member who has flown north and west of Edmonton, either to Peace River, Grande Prairie, or the like, will see these enormous hills that, if in any other province in any other country in the world, would simply be referred to as mountains.

The people who live in the constituency of Barrhead are as diverse as the topography. It is, in fact, the topography that causes the diversity. We have agriculture, gas and oil, forestry, and an enormous service industry to the thousands of people who live, work, and find pleasure within that constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent them once again. Without any doubt, the pride also means responsibility. That has to be proven once again. I sincerely hope that it will be.

Mr. Speaker, those constituents to whom I have talked about the Speech from the Throne that was given last Thursday are pleased with the efforts of this government with respect to that speech. When you look at the three priorities that were outlined on March 10, priority number one, economic resurgence, really says that we are going to be moving as a government and as a province to assist our private sector to market — both within Canada and throughout the world — our oil, natural gas, coal, grain, red meats, forest and other products. That has to be priority number one for a province of the type we are. I want to come back in a few minutes and address more comments toward economic resurgence and priority number one.

Priority number two, support for job training and re-training, is one subject that I will not be spending much time on this evening, Mr. Speaker. If all members would look at the Order Paper, they will note Motion No. 204, which is placed on the Order Paper in my name and, hopefully, will come up for debate next week; if not next week, the following week. Essentially it refers to current employment levels in the province, and talks about a major effort by our government, as outlined in the throne speech, with the creation and development of the Department of Manpower. It refers to Bill No. 1, which was introduced in this Legislature on Thursday last and deals with the creation of that particular department. My comments on that subject will come at a later date.

Priority number three: sound financial management. All members are going to have an opportunity later this month to hear and participate in the budget speech, and then to get involved in debate with various ministers with respect to the budgets of the departments they represent. My comments, again, on that particular subject matter will follow at the appropriate time later on in March and the early part of April.

But it's to the first priority, Mr. Speaker, that I want to address my initial remarks: the whole role of exports as they affect life in the province of Alberta. I think we tend to forget in early 1983, we tend to lose sight of the real gains that have been accomplished by the people of this province in recent years; very, very significant economic gains that have been through the late 1970s, early part of the 1980s, on the very crucial item and crucial business of exports and the growth in that area. The growth in Alberta's exports has been nothing less than phenomenal if you take a look at the growth in the four years from 1978 to 1981. In 1978, Alberta's exports totalled some \$4.6 billion. Since then, from 1978 through to 1981, early

part of 1982, they more than doubled to some \$9.9 billion worth of exports, for an average annual increase of just over 27 per cent. If you look at 1981, the export growth as compared with 1980 was something like 24 per cent, an increase of nearly \$1.9 billion in exports. By comparison — and I think it's important to compare it to see how the country has done in the matter of exports — Canada's exports grew by 9.4 per cent when Alberta's grew by nearly three times the percentage growth in a one-year time frame, as a result of efforts made by previous ministers of Executive Council, previous colleagues of mine in that crucial time frame, the late 1970s and early 1980s. In essence, Alberta has gained by its participation a larger share of Canada's exports. By 1981 we were exporting nearly 12.2 per cent of all of Canada's exports, and that was up from a percentage share of about 8.8 per cent in the year 1978.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the subject of exports, also important are the areas, subjects, and commodities that basically we are exporting. Resources — be they natural gas or crude petroleum in particular — remain our major exports. But there has been some diversity with respect to that. If you look at 1981 as a date in which current statistics are available, the top non-resource export commodity groups dramatically increased to something like 9.33 per cent, up from 2.23 per cent of the total in just the year before. Exports to the United States and Japan decreased as a proportion of the total, and that then allowed Albertans and Alberta companies to expand their share of markets in other parts of the world. In fact when our exports as a percentage of the total to both the United States and Japan decreased, they allowed our exports in other commodity areas of the world to increase from nearly 7.5 per cent to 8.5 per cent in one year alone.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of International Trade is not in his chair tonight, and I am pleased that he is not in his chair tonight. I think he would be doing service of less than I would expect as a member if he were in his chair tonight. In fact the Minister of International Trade should be out in the world; he should not be here. The one thing he should have at the end of the year is a passport that has more stamps in it than any individual I would care to know should have. His job is to get out there and find new markets for the people of Alberta, for the industries of Alberta, and he has to go.

I just cannot amplify enough the importance of finding new markets. Yesterday and this evening, I was extremely pleased with two of my colleagues, the members from Calgary Currie and Calgary Egmont, who related to the Assembly the experiences they've had in recent times in participating with the Minister of International Trade and others in this Assembly, visiting other countries and other spots of the world discussing and promoting Alberta products in a new market and a new environment. That is a very good-news subject for us, Mr. Speaker, and it should not be overlooked. We should not forsake a further opportunity in 1983 to expand those markets.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne itself, when it looks at the various departments of our government, has a whole series of positive benefits for the people who live in the constituency of Barrhead. I want to refer to the speech and comment on many of those positive benefits coming to my constituents that are already in planning, or we've just successfully now received, or we anticipate receiving in 1983 because of the initiatives of our government.

If you simply look at the section dealing with Advanced Education, one subject that is extremely impor-

tant and that I am extremely proud of: the commitment we as a government made several years ago to set aside \$100 million for a Heritage Scholarship Fund was a bold move. It was a commitment not only for today; it was a commitment for tomorrow. And it was a commitment for the most important group of people that I think we have in our society: our young people with talent, initiative, and a desire to go, expand, and promote.

When the Speech from the Throne refers to the millions of dollars that have been allocated to the Heritage Scholarship Fund, oftentimes it is difficult for members in the Assembly to concentrate fully on how many of their constituents are really benefiting from it. Mr. Speaker, when I look at the number of young people who have recently received these scholarships, I'm proud that I can look at a list that includes my constituents. I'm so proud of them that I want their names in the record of the Legislature of Alberta. These are young people who attended school at Lorne Jenken high school. It's a school I think most Albertans are aware of, because since 1973 it has won six provincial Reach for the Top championships and, in 1983, will win their seventh provincial Reach for the Top championship. It'll be my pleasure several weeks from now, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you and all members of the House the group of young people that will win it. If anybody here likes to make book, I'll let you in on a little secret. Lorne Jenken high school has already won the northern Alberta Reach for the Top Championship and will soon whip their colleagues from southern Alberta, and once again be our provincial representative.

But to the young people from Lorne Jenken high school in Barrhead, Alberta, who are beneficiaries of the Heritage Scholarship Fund — Gurminder Basahti, Ruth Engler, Graham Godberson, Cynthia Hansen, Sherry Kulmatyski, Rita Meissner, Helen Anne Pozniak, Pamela Rondeau, Lorraine Steg, Heidi Steinke, Albert Strydhorst, Barbara Tiemstra, David Tuckey, Pearl Wierenga, and Gregory Zilli; and three students from Fort Assiniboine high school, Kendrick Bradley, Dona Gilbertson, and Laurie Bready — I would simply like them to know that their representative in this Assembly is extremely proud of them and very proud as well that this Assembly saw fit, several years ago, to create the Heritage Scholarship Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the section in the Speech from the Throne looking at Advanced Education also talks about another facility that's extremely important to the people who live in the constituency of Barrhead. Essentially it deals with a facility that isn't in the constituency, but it's so close that my constituents are going to have an opportunity to advance their education in it; that is, Westerra Institute of Technology at Stony Plain. That's a major example of decentralization that has been committed to by this government, and that form of decentralization of course is going to be continued and continued.

We're a modest group, Mr. Speaker. When you look at the Speech from the Throne and the section dealing with education, it is extremely remarkable to me that in the year 1983, when one of the most important decentralization projects committed to by this Assembly in recent years will fulfil its mandate and move from the city of Edmonton to the constituency of Barrhead — I refer now to the move of the Alberta Correspondence School — that it's not even mentioned. I know that we don't like to fly all of our horses at the same time. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that that very significant achievement might have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Because

it isn't, I want to mention it here tonight and want all members to know that I am extremely proud of the co-operation that they forwarded to people in other parts of Alberta in continuing the process of decentralization that all of us believe in. All members should be aware that that new facility will be functioning within no more than four or five months in the town of Barrhead, in the constituency of Barrhead. The building is excellent, a super construction job, ahead of schedule and, I think, within costs, which is of significance to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the section dealing with Education also talks about the consideration of all members in this Assembly of the possibility of the adoption of mandatory comprehensive examinations for all students seeking a high school diploma. That's a bold concept in 1983. I am a product of a school system that had compulsory grade 12 examinations. I taught when it was still a requirement in the province of Alberta to have compulsory grade 12 examinations. I also taught when the system changed, Mr. Speaker, and 50 per cent of the student's final mark was comprised of evaluation by the teacher and the other 50 per cent from the departmental examination. I also taught, Mr. Speaker, in the third system, in which the teacher gave 100 per cent of the final mark. I am excited about the debate that will come before this Assembly when we look at this whole question about the possibility of mandatory examinations. There's no doubt in my mind at all that the views of the members of this Assembly will be extremely important in arriving at a basic decision in that matter.

Mr. Speaker, the use of microcomputers in the schools has already been alluded to by my good colleague from Calgary Egmont. But I would like all members to know that a constituent of mine, Mr. Alvin Gross, who lives in the town of Barrhead, is the Alberta School Trustees' Association's representative on the minister's task force on computers. He's a person who is extremely excited by what has happened and the direction given by our government and the direction assumed by our government in listening to the task force on this particular matter. The Member for Calgary Egmont is so right when he says, you know, we've now delivered some 4,000 computers to the various schools in this province. It's remarkable to me, Mr. Speaker, that not too many months ago there was great debate in this Assembly. There was a flurry and a barrage of questions coming from one corner of this Assembly to the Minister of Education about the — well, I was going to say stupidity of the move, and maybe I will use it now that it's there. How well history is in vindicating bold and brash moves — the bold and brash move by the then Minister of Education. He is to be much, much congratulated for the decisive approach he took in forwarding a new, innovative concept to education in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I think the importance of the section dealing with Hospitals and Medical Care is the first sentence in it:

Maintaining the province's excellent health care and hospital systems will continue to be a major priority of government.

That will be the major priority. We have to maintain the highest system of health care standards in this province because of the requirements and the needs of our people. I'm extremely fortunate as the representative in the constituency of Barrhead. Because of the maintenance of this high standard, a new nursing home facility will be constructed in the community of Barrhead that will provide some 100 new nursing home beds to my constituents.

As well, the M.L.A. for the constituency of Barrhead is determined that there will be a resolution and decision this year, in 1983, to see the delivery of a hospital in the town of Swan Hills. Swan Hills was created as a town on January 1, 1967. It was Canada's first centennial town. It was discovered and started as a community in 1957, and one of its pioneers is now a member of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more important piece of legislation and priority approach that we will be making as an Assembly this year than the Alberta widows' pension program for a group of people in this province of the ages of 55 to 64, a group of people who often tragically suffer a loss of a spouse and who are left in need, loneliness, and difficulty, and to see now in the Speech from the Throne a commitment from this Assembly and this government to see the introduction of a pension program that will have some extremely important phases in addition to income security. When we look at the outline and the parameters, we're looking basically at a program that will involve income security, provide new directions and some new initiatives with respect to health care for those people who are in that age group, and provide some new initiatives for housing for people who are in that age group. It's an extremely important program, and I'm just really pleased after the debate that's been held in recent years with respect to it that this concept is now included in the Speech from the Throne and will become a reality in, hopefully, no more than several months from now.

Mr. Speaker, there is one Indian reserve in the constituency of Barrhead, the Alexis Indian Reserve. The people who live there are very important to me because they are trying to find their way, in a very positive manner, in a society in 1983. They're a group of people who want to become self-sufficient, who are working darned hard at it, and over the last several years have seen some very significant new improvements come their way. There are not very many people who live on the Alexis Indian Reserve, but it is the reserve in the province of Alberta that was among the first to move in the area of family and community support services. I'm just really pleased that because of the excellent response from the people on that reserve, the throne speech now at least indicates it will commit the government to increased expansion in family and community support services on Indian reserves.

I would like to point out to all members of the Assembly that one of the very important programs initiated in the past year on the Alexis Indian Reserve was a highway construction program. The chief, the council came to me and said they would like to see a local road improved. We talked about it, and we talked about it. The local road was improved, but it was not improved by an outside contractor with outside forces. We worked with Keyano College in northeastern Alberta, and a scheme was worked out whereby the native people themselves built the road. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you I was never so proud in my life as when I drove over that new road for the first time, and I saw smiling men and women. The women were super workers, who got on those great big machines and those great big buggies and did the work. And we've got a super new road, so much so that the people are now after me for a second road because of their experience and success in building the first road. That's a challenge that I look forward to attempting to resolve in the short term.

Mr. Speaker, Municipal Affairs is an area that brings considerable benefits to many people in the province of Alberta. The section in the Speech from the Throne talks about enriched property tax assistance to senior citizens.

I think it's also extremely important to note — and I want to respond to some comments made by the Leader of the Opposition the other day when he got up and indicated that one of the crying problems that existed in all parts of Alberta was the property tax level and how the people in all those municipalities were really upset with the lack of support by the province of Alberta to municipal government in terms of assistance, dollars and the like.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I've found in dealing with the municipalities I represent is that there will always be an opportunity for us to provide more. There's simply no doubt at all about that. But to have any member in this Assembly suggest that we're hardly doing enough or what we're doing is leaving some people behind, is incredibly difficult for me to understand. So I did a little research. I looked at the constituency of Barrhead. I looked at the various municipalities in that constituency, and I looked at the year 1982. I looked at two basic programs of support that would come under Alberta Municipal Affairs, one called interest stabilization and the other one municipal assistance. I want to quickly read into the record, Mr. Speaker, because I think they prove the point that our government is committed to assistance to municipalities in this province in a very major way.

The figures and the statistics I'm now going to give are only a portion of the total amount of assistance the province provides to the various municipalities. These are specifically within the constituency of Barrhead. They deal with 1982; they deal with the global figures for both interest stabilization and municipal assistance. To the town of Swan Hills, \$234,000; to the town of Barrhead, \$180,000; to the village of Onoway, \$74,000; to the village of Fort Assiniboine, \$21,000; to the summer village of Castle Island, \$509; to the summer village of Nakamun Park, \$2,000; to the summer village of Ross Haven, \$4,000; to the summer village of Sunset Point, \$7,000; to the summer village of Yellowstone, \$5,000; to the county of Barrhead, \$671,000; to the county of Lac Ste. Anne, \$770,000; to the MD of Westlock, \$781,000; to ID 15, \$212,000; to ID 17, \$696,000. Mr. Speaker, that's pretty darned substantial assistance, and that's only part of it.

I'm pleased with the section in the Speech from the Throne dealing with the environment. One item in that section is extremely important, and that deals with the amendments that will be forthcoming to the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act. Those proposed amendments will include provisions regarding topsoil conservation. Mr. Speaker, the reason that's so important to me is that several years ago I was given the unique opportunity of chairing a select committee of this Legislature, which was a unique task in itself. But when the report was written, it talked about a whole series of items. I'd simply like to read one paragraph from the report. It deals with the subject of reclamation, restoration, and land conservation.

One of the most pronounced and important concerns raised by landowners was the subject area dealing with the method and manner of reclamation and land restoration. Throughout the province, landowners raised questions and suggested a variety of alternatives for improvement in this area. The various topographies, with the resultant variety of topsoil and drainage conditions and differing climatic patterns, have been impacted upon in many diverse ways by energy developments. Despite the diversity of experiences, landowners throughout Alberta share a common concern that the preservation of agricul-

tural topsoil must be paramount in the development of reclamation and land restoration standards. The committee agrees with this widespread feeling. . . .

The Committee wishes to stress that the conservation of topsoil and the preservation of prime agricultural land are of paramount importance. . . .

Mr. Speaker, less than two years after the tabling of this report in this Assembly, we now see a commitment from our government to that very important subject matter for the people of rural Alberta.

When I was elected several years ago and had an opportunity to be in this Assembly and provide my opening comments, I indicated at that time that the new MLA for Barrhead was a positive person; he was not a negative person. I indicated that the MLA for Barrhead was a person who would work harmoniously with his colleagues in this Assembly and would be a proud member of this Assembly. My philosophy of life has not changed in those years. I look forward to working with all my colleagues in this very important Legislature in the province of Alberta for the next several years.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and one of his latest wonders is for him to have me in front of you tonight. Of all the things I've done and of all the places I've been throughout a good portion of the world, I've never felt so humble or so honored as I now present myself as representative of one of the greatest constituencies in Alberta — in fact, I'd stretch that a bit, to one of the greatest constituencies in all of Canada — to convey to this Legislature from time to time my constituents' problems, suggestions, and wishes in a most clear and comprehensive manner. My heartiest congratulations go to all the members of this Assembly. I've already learned to believe that this session will be one of the most interesting and rewarding experiences that I've ever participated in, having recently associated with so many exciting and learned people.

The Highwood constituency, Mr. Speaker, is very diverse and, I believe, truly representative of the qualities that make this province such a special place to live. In my mind, there can be no doubt that the most important feature of the constituency is its people. The history of the area is as dynamic and colorful as anywhere in the province, and the impact it has had and is having has shaped, and will continue to shape, the future of our province and our country.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little about the nature and history of the Highwood constituency. The constituency itself covers approximately 2,500 square miles and includes some of the most beautiful country in Alberta. Ranging from mountains to foothills to prairie, it contains all of nature's finest attributes. Highwood is rich in natural resources — mostly coal, petroleum, natural gas, timber, clay, and drinking water, as well as sulphur. In the southern region of the constituency are some of the largest ranches in Alberta. In the eastern region there's prime agricultural land on which wheat, barley, oats, hay, and canola are grown. The western region abounds with fish and wildlife, and vast portions of wilderness remain as they have for centuries.

Highwood has the best that nature has to offer and, where nature has left off, man has taken over. The people of Highwood represent all walks of life. It may indeed be said that there can be harmony in diversity, for nowhere does it so aptly apply as it does in Highwood. Many forms of agricultural and industrial activity can be found

within the constituency, their operations conducted by a mix of people from various ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds.

At present, there are over 22,000 people in Highwood and the population is rapidly expanding. This growth has been rather dramatic. For example, in the last 10 years the town of Black Diamond has grown by 56 per cent, Nanton by 53 per cent, High River by 72 per cent, and Okotoks by an incredible 203 per cent. Similar growth has been experienced in such places as Turner Valley, Aldersyde, De Winton, Longview, Cayley, and Millarville. In fact since 1976, the Highwood constituency has on the average grown by over 40 per cent.

However, accompanying this remarkable growth are problems. But before I expand on these problems, I'd like to say that Highwood has had a history of dramatic growth. Highwood was first settled in the late 1800s, when ranchers and farmers discovered the area's agricultural potential. Immigrants flocked westward, and settlements appeared along the old Macleod Trail. The north-west cattle company — more commonly known as the Bar U — was founded in the High River area in 1882. Bar U cattle herds grew upwards of 30,000 head and became the best known brand in the west. Gradually some of these big ranches were divided into smaller farms and ranches as more and more people headed west in search of fame and fortune.

It was about the turn of the century when a bright young man arrived in Alberta and began publishing a newspaper. Bob Edwards and his newspaper, the *Eye Opener*, came to High River in 1902. Edwards developed a following seldom seen in the field of journalism. His wit, humor, and one-liners live on today, and they are still the most appropriate for the times. For instance, he said that all the country has to do to improve the government in Ottawa is to change it. How true that is. He said that except for politics, Satan would lose his grip on some men. That probably includes me, Mr. Speaker. Another one I truly enjoyed is: when a man quits turning around to look at a pretty girl, he is almost old enough for the Senate. Mr. Edwards was elected to this Legislature on July 18, 1921.

To get back to the task at hand, let me say that people continued to tread west well into the 1900s and, indeed, many of them came to us from the south. Among those numbered was my erstwhile father-in-law, Roy Jesse Widney, who landed here from California at the time Dingman No. 1 was being drilled. Upon the discovery of natural gas in Turner Valley in 1912, an era of rapid growth began. In the next several years, he and his associates drilled several natural gas and naphtha wells with cable tools. But it wasn't until 1935, when he spudded the Turner Valley Royalties well, that real history was in the making. Halfway down — as happened in so many cases in Turner Valley — the company ran out of funds, and drilling was suspended. In the early winter of 1936, work continued with rotary tools as Grandpa Roy sold his contract to Snyder and Head. By the spring of that year, all hell broke out as this big, beautiful well blew her way into the petroleum-starved British Empire by producing the finest quality crude oil the country had ever seen: forty degrees of gravity that would flow as easily as pure gasoline.

With that unmatched event in Alberta's history, Turner Valley was to provide Canada the ways and means by which it could advance into the present modern era. It gave the country the opportunity to keep up with rapidly advancing technological changes that were occurring

throughout the world. It also raised the curtain on the development of an industry that became inseparably linked with the rapid development of the province of Alberta. At this point in time, Carmen Beverly Alger brought his family from the dried-out prairies of Saskatchewan, not because of the Turner Valley Royalties well *per se* but because when he stopped there to visit a former prelate family, he discovered the hustle and bustle of the oil field and knew immediately that there was money to be made there. Therein starts my history in the petroleum world. From that day to this, I can truthfully say I've always been proud to have been associated with those many brave, indeed sometimes heroic, oil men who have helped make this great province what it is today.

Turner Valley was a wild place, almost idiotic at times — great flares of natural gas were everywhere. You could read a newspaper in the middle of the night. Several villages sprang up with names like Little Chicago and Little New York, and between them 2,700 people lived and breathed oil. That's when the Alberta government got into the act, and the conservation board was born. Thank goodness it was, as it has done a magnificent job of keeping oil and gas ratios in retrospect ever since, in all areas of Alberta, and those horrendous wasteful days were over. Hell's half acre and all other flares like it were gradually shut in, and what was once thought to be a short-lived boom turned out to be one of Canada's largest oil fields, and much industrial and commercial growth became firmly entrenched in the local communities.

Like all the communities of my Highwood, World War II drew on us very heavily as several of our youngest great men never returned. Highwood has experienced periods of phenomenal growth and has lived through them remarkably well. But today's growth has created new problems, problems that must be dealt with as quickly and efficiently as possible. Due to the vast influx of people into that area, the municipal district of Foothills No. 1, has had to increase all our taxes by approximately 62 per cent. In many acreage cases, it's considerably higher than that. We had to increase the number of our schools. We have a beautiful community school at Millarville. We had to increase our teaching force and try to keep up with a lot of other financial problems that confront us in an age when earning power for some of us is starting to slip.

In my mind, our municipal council and our board of trustees are all worthy people. Hopefully we can work out this one major problem for ourselves, without too much help from the provincial government.

With the big increase in population, the necessity for more and better roads became extremely evident. While the paved roads we now enjoy are a far cry from yesterday, the exceptional traffic on them has created a further necessity for road-widening programs that I hope would be instituted this year.

A brand-new hospital was recently opened in High River — a marvellous asset to our district. Another new hospital is under construction in the vigorous town of Black Diamond that will be known as the Oilfields General hospital.

Senior citizen homes are located in Black Diamond, Okotoks, High River, and Nanton. Nanton: what a beautiful town that is; the home of my predecessor, George Wolstenholme, the home of my competitor in politics, and the home of hundreds of good people who serve the bustling cattle industry to the west and the productive grain farmers to the east, south, and north. It is the gateway to some of the most scenic, panoramic, and

recreational country in all of Alberta. The ranches out there are so big they are mind boggling. When I say the eyes of Nanton are upon you, believe me, we here in this room are being assessed for our actions by some of the strongest conservatives known to man. They're great people, who lent an awful lot of support to my campaign and to whom I'll be eternally grateful for their hospitality and friendliness and for their genuine desire to have someone up here who can represent them properly. Mr. Speaker, I hope I'm that man.

They're not alone. The same sentiments can be echoed for the people of High River and Okotoks. The growth rates of these centres I've already touched upon. Thanks to the Alberta government for the aggressive financial participation they have taken in all these expanding centres, we can cope with the in-migration of thousands of people. We can build new schools and hospitals, we can build proper sewage systems, and private enterprise can enjoy building more shopping malls, motels, automotive outlets, lumber yards, co-op outlets, day care centres, churches, and so on.

Getting back to automotive outlets, who in the world was the instigator of self-serve service stations? Of all the diabolical things we've done in the last few years, cutting out the man at the pumps was one of the worst. Where is the paper boy? Where is the paper boy on the streets, crying: read all about it? Where is the shoe-shine man that could tell you more about yourself than even you knew, just from the condition of your shoes?

I guess what I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that in these days of a certain winding down, if you like, there are still jobs out there that could and should be done, be they menial or otherwise. The last thing you should put into an empty stomach is too much pride.

To touch on agriculture for a moment, if I may, let me advise you that our farmers and ranchers are in the same predicament as all other Albertans. The assistance and incentives this government has been able to provide literally set us apart from all other Canadian farmers and ranchers, but there are still a lot of problems facing us today that LeRoy Fjordbotten and his committees are determined to resolve.

David King is taking the same determination with the Department of Education. I've got problems in this department in Highwood I never knew existed, Mr. Speaker. But I'm sure that with proper dialogue or communication with the respective ministers and their staff, much will be accomplished along these lines.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to stand here and rave much longer about how proud I am to be in your presence and the presence of all these worthy colleagues here assembled, or how proud I am of the constituency from which I come. You've probably already gathered that. Suffice to say that I'm amused at the criticism by many of our citizens of the throne speech. I'm not sure what they expected to hear. It's a cinch that one can't expect it to be written like a novel, though novel it is. I wonder where else we could go in this nation, and indeed this world, and find the economy any more triumphant than it is here in Alberta. Surely we've undergone some difficult times, but a lot of us can remember when times were much more trying than we are undergoing today.

Just take our senior citizens' programs as a for instance. I've only been to four or five of the senior citizens' homes so far, but there is nowhere else where people who are being touched with the sere and yellow leaf of old age could live more comfortably, feel so secure, and enjoy life to its fullest. Our programs are offering more benefits to



these good folks, and justifiably so.

We're still sincerely striving to improve the lot of our Metis and all of our native peoples. I'm most anxious to revisit the native people at Eden Valley, to talk over the Native Venture Capital Corporation. They are already doing quite well developing their own enterprises, and it will be fun to encourage them into forging for greater heights of accomplishment.

Another fellow out there, Merv Edie, is doing a fantastic job of educating young men that are almost impossible to control anywhere else. He feels we should, through private enterprise, have a work position for these fellows to fit into when they finish school. Won't he be delighted to hear of the new employment expansion development program and the new Department of Manpower, that has a responsibility for apprenticeship and manpower training programs. I'm suggesting that he will, and at my first opportunity I'll be down there to talk it over with him.

Mr. Speaker, almost every paragraph of the Speech from the Throne has a bearing on some part of my constituency. The Alberta government's economic resurgence plan will continue to stimulate our economy. Programs such as the Alberta heritage fund mortgage interest reduction program and the seniors' home improvement program will no doubt continue to provide the homeowner with substantial benefits.

The agricultural sector with its primary agricultural producers' rebate program and the Alberta small business and farm interest shielding program have allowed more dollars to be put into the hands of our farmers, freeing them from or reducing the financial burdens that prevented them from improving their equipment, and thus increasing their productivity.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the government has responded most admirably to the difficult times some sectors of our economy experienced. I am sure that this government will continue to provide the public of Alberta with the best possible array of services and programs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my sincerest thanks to you and members of this Legislative Assembly for the consideration and attention you have shown me during this my maiden speech. My sincerest wish is that I won't have to make another, but somehow I don't think the system works that way. In any event, I leave all of you with this final thought as we progress through this 20th Assembly of the Legislature: let us all deliberate with equity, ponder with resourcefulness, and decide according to truth.

MR. DROBOT: It is a great pleasure to speak to this Assembly for the first time. I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-selection as Speaker of this House. I would also like to thank His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of this province for his presentation of the Speech from the Throne.

My colleagues who have spoken to date are to be congratulated for their contribution to the debate. The people of my area are dedicated and hardworking. I would like to thank them publicly for their support.

Mr. Speaker, the human mind is a wonderful machine: it starts working the minute you are born, and it stops the minute you are going to make a speech. Our constituency consists of people of many backgrounds. This unique mixture of cultures has contributed to a rich history, and I am sure it will continue to contribute to a promising future. As early as 1792, the North-west fur company and the Hudson's Bay Company built trading posts at Fort George and Buckingham House, near the modern town

of Elk Point. The provincial government has seen fit to begin excavation and eventual restoration of the Fort George site. I commend this effort, as it is important to keep these reminders of our colorful past and preserve them for future generations.

The establishment of a new provincial park at Whitney Lake will be a great benefit to our tourist industry in the constituency, especially the town of Elk Point. The town of Elk Point, a dynamic little town, certainly deserves recognition. During the past while, this community had over 1,000 volunteers from 33 organizations put in a total of 65,000 hours of free labor to build and keep their community projects going. At \$5 per hour, this comes to \$325,000.

Father Lacombe in 1896 established St. Paul as an experiment in encouraging the Metis into a farming venture. Hunting and trapping was an ingrained way of life for the Metis, and the experiment failed. However, this townsite began to attract French-Canadian settlers from eastern Canada. The excellent soil and opportunities led to a solid flow of settlers from all over Europe and the U.S.A. Early co-operation between the settlers, the Metis, and the local Indians set the stage for our multicultural character present in this constituency today. Saddle Lake, Goodfish Lake, Frog Lake, as well as the Metis colony of Fishing Lake, are important and productive areas and add to the St. Paul constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul constituency is productive agriculturally and has a growing oil and gas industry. It contains the largest salt plant in western Canada at Lindberg, Alberta. It has many successful businesses and enjoys government services that are based in St. Paul. The present standard of living is a tribute to our socially active and interested ancestors. But this socially active spirit is not a thing of the past in our area. Mr. Speaker, you will remember in June 1982 the visit to the bustling town of St. Paul by Mother Theresa of India. She came to see the people, who impressed her with their generosity and fine work. Thousands of people flocked to see her, recognizing her humanitarian services. It is my pleasure to say that with the help of the provincial and federal governments matching grants program, over \$1 million was raised to be used in her work. Yes, the people of my constituency are very self-sufficient and resourceful.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne addressed the concerns of the people in my area as well as other Albertans. However, we must keep the economic problems of our farmers in mind, for as our farmers prosper so will our towns and cities.

The emphasis on education is certainly welcomed, for it was in St. Paul that the first regional school was built. What makes this academic vocational school special is that it was the first example of co-operation between town, county, separate and public school boards, working jointly, planning and funding, and building up this school. I am proud to say that I was a trustee of that first regional school for many years.

Recently, county schools in Lafond, Mallaig, Ashmont, as well as the Racette public school, have attained community school status. The extra funding and recognition of the need for these facilities is well founded. Glen Avon, St. Paul, and Elk Point schools are also requesting this status, and I hope that we can recognize their need.

The town of St. Paul has some special concerns with regard to a new water line and possible water treatment plant. I recognize economic times call for some restraint, but this facility is of great importance to our major town.

The upgrading of the St. Theresa hospital is welcomed

and will have a positive effect on the health services in our area. Plans for a provincial courthouse in St. Paul cannot be shelved, as we have a great need for one.

We take good care of our citizens in Alberta and in the constituency. Phase two of the senior citizens' lodge in St. Paul has proven that. A proposed 44-unit senior citizens' lodge for Elk Point has been approved by the St. Paul foundation, and I personally support this excellent proposal and urge its full implementation.

The Speech from the Throne emphasized our government's high priority on transportation safety. We agree with this priority and are glad that the much-needed new bridge and alignment at Elk Point is getting serious consideration, there having been a bad history of truck crashes experienced with the old bridge. All Albertans will be glad when this hazard is corrected.

Highway 646 east of Lindberg is scheduled for reconstruction and paving. This will open the east end to safer trade routes, markets, and will improve the flow of heavy tourist traffic.

As we can see, Mr. Speaker, this government is addressing the concerns of my constituents. I am hopeful that I can maintain the high standard of response by this government.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite all MLAs to visit our constituency. It is known as the gateway to the lakeland. The vacationer will find this area very scenic. Though I expect an argument, I am sure we have the best fishing to offer anywhere in Alberta. From the proud little hamlet of Tulliby Lake, near the Saskatchewan boundary, to Vilna in the west, we welcome you all, and we will accept your tourist dollars.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I am honored by this opportunity to respond to the throne speech. First, as the others, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election as Speaker of the House. I would like to congratulate everyone else that was elected on November 2, 1982. I would also like to commend Lieutenant-Governor Lynch-Staunton on his delivery of the throne speech. Of course, what was in the speech was also for the benefit of the people of Alberta.

I'd like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to my predecessor, Fred Mandeville. Fred was the MLA for the Bow Valley constituency for about 15 years. I wish him the best of luck on his retirement. I would also like to thank the people of Bow Valley for their support in the election. I might say I was the first PC MLA in history to be elected in Bow Valley.

I'd like to make a few comments about the Bow Valley constituency, Mr. Speaker. It runs from Medicine Hat to Cluny. It takes in almost all the property between the Red Deer River and the Bow River. It is bisected by Highway No. 1. There are two major towns, Brooks and Bassano. Brooks is one of the fastest growing towns in Alberta. Since 1971, it has tripled its size. It now has a population of something over 9,000 people. It is the home of the Alberta wildlife research centre, where they raise 100,000 pheasants a year to be turned loose for the pleasure of the hunter. It is also the home of the Alberta Horticultural Research Centre where, on 160 acres, new methods of farming, fertilizing, and seeding are being developed.

Bassano, the second largest town, has a population of about 1,100 people and is both an agricultural and industrial centre. Thermo-electric generators are manufactured there and distributed throughout the world.

Bow Valley is primarily a ranching and farming area, with a large percentage of its 20,000-plus people working directly or indirectly with agriculture. It has one of the major irrigation districts in Alberta. I believe that it is the largest in North America, not in irrigated acres but in the perimeter of the district. It has one of the largest feedlots, Lakeside Feeders. It's got a capacity of 40,000 cattle. It spends over \$100 million a year on feed grain, silage, and cattle. It has other smaller feedlots. South Slope is one; agri-beef in Bassano is another. They're significant sizes. In Bow Valley we have the British block. It's approximately 1,000 square miles of reserve land that is used for experiments, research, and training of the British army. It is also sitting on top of the most extensive gas fields in Alberta, which has certainly helped the economy. It also helped the expansion of the towns.

There are approximately 140 petroleum-related industries serving about 5,000 gas wells in Bow Valley. There's also a significant number of oil wells. Bow Valley has had a significant gas and oil industry in the past. It was certainly hurt by the economy. The drilling companies and service industries did get a benefit of the infusion of funds in 1982 of the service industry and drilling rigs. Also some dirt moving contractors got the benefit of the economic stabilization program. It's encouraging to see, however, that Nova had a substantial increase in profits in 1982, especially for this day and age. I believe they showed a 15 per cent increase in net profits over 1981. They have a major compressor site in Bow Valley. Of course they're the company responsible for the transmission of natural gas to other provinces and into the Alaskan pipeline. I guess what we need for the residents of Bow Valley, Mr. Speaker, is some export market for natural gas to other countries.

Bow Valley, as I said before, has one of the largest irrigation districts in Alberta. Just a little history might be of interest; it shows what happened in downturns in previous years. The irrigation district was established in return for the construction of the transcontinental railway. Canadian Pacific railway was given some 125 million acres that comprised the irrigation district. That was at the time of the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. After surveys by the CPR, it was decided to construct the Bassano dam. Construction was completed in 1914. It wasn't until 1915 that that significant settlement began to occur. At that time the irrigation district belonged to the CPR. They were selling irrigation parcels of land to people under some kind of long-term contract.

The problem was that the economy had a downturn in 1929. In March 1935, under mounting costs, the CPR negotiated a transaction with the province of Alberta whereby the railway agreed to transfer to the trustees of the district the entire irrigation block and grazing land as described in the original confines of the district, plus staff houses, office buildings, and machinery to operate the district, together with \$300,000 working capital. To get that off their back, to get rid of it, they gave the whole irrigation project away, and \$300,000 with it. That's what happens in economic downturns.

We have had some benefits in the irrigation district recently through the Department of the Environment, with improvements on our canal system and dredging out some of our spillways. We've developed several off-river storage reservoirs for irrigation water, and are presently working on the Crawling Valley reservoir, hopefully to begin construction this year. There is a benefit to having on-river storage, however. There are two reasons, the first being that off-river reservoirs, however helpful to the irri-

gation district, have a problem with seepage and evaporation because generally they're a fairly large pond of water with a comparably small drawdown. In other words, you have a big lake and about four feet of that water that you can use. The rest of it sits there and evaporates and seeps into the ground. The second reason is that about 75 per cent of the annual river flow is in relatively short periods of the year — in the spring runoff and during the time the snow is melting in the mountains, generally in June. If we were to capture a significant amount of the water to look after all the irrigation needs, we could allow the river flow to go by during the low flow season.

During the next four years, Mr. Speaker, I hope to convince our government, considering the economy, to take a serious look at a new dam on the Bow River for irrigation water. I understand the studies have been done as to where a dam could be built 15 to 20 miles downriver from the present dam at Bassano. It would back 15 feet of water over the present dam. It would be a tremendous amount of water storage with very little land lost. Such a dam would also relieve the concerns of water users downriver because it would allow the normal flow to become a normal flow, except during the periods of the year when the river flow is high.

Mr. Speaker, I think agriculture is fast becoming our number one industry in Alberta. I don't believe we have scratched the surface of our ability to produce food if we had markets available to us and the price were something above the cost of production. I believe that a dam like this would be a great benefit to the agriculture of Alberta. Some would ask, why should the government be interested in this? Research has shown us that of the benefits derived from irrigation, the two highest benefactors are the senior levels of government. I think the farmer on an irrigated farm is seventh in line for benefits because of an irrigation project.

I'd like to say a few words about Highway No. 1. There are something just over 100 miles of Highway No. 1 in Bow Valley constituency. There are 10 miles of it twinned. We understand, subject to the budget, that we were supposed to get a few more miles this year. Our government has made a 10-year commitment to twin all of Highway No. 1 across Alberta in the next 10 years, and I believe we are now still right on target for that twinning. It is our hope in Bow Valley that the economy will allow us to stay on target or maybe do better than that in the next 10 years. It's important to the people of Bow Valley that the highway not only be twinned in Bow Valley but that it be twinned all the way across Alberta, because we do use it outside of the boundaries.

Bow Valley has several provincial parks, one of which is Kinbrook park, south of Brooks. We got some new facilities this year in Kinbrook in the way of overnight parking and picnic area. The advisory committee on Kinbrook park is now looking at some additional facilities south of Lake Newell. Dinosaur park, however, represents 32 square miles of the Badlands along the Red Deer River and is the source of dinosaur fossils that can be found in museums all over the world. It was discovered in 1910, and since that time more than 150 complete specimens can be found in various museums around the world. In 1979 it was dedicated a world heritage site equivalent to the Grand Canyon, the Pyramids of Egypt, Galapagos Islands, and Mount Everest.

There is a problem, however. People see specimens in museums other places in the world and make an active effort to see the source. There are no specimens on display in Dinosaur park. People, after making a serious

effort to come out to see the source, find nothing in the way of dinosaur specimens. There are some badlands that people enjoy viewing. There is also a cabin that is about 100 years old that belonged to the negro cowboy John Ware, and it's been reconstructed at Dinosaur park. It is hoped that in the near future we will get some facilities and some heat-controlled buildings to put on a display of fossils at Dinosaur park, as well as some kind of an audio-video interpretation site where people will know how they came about and some history of the dinosaurs. Also, the municipalities in Bow Valley are hoping to be able to take part in the recreation municipal park program in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about the red meat stabilization program. It's of interest to a lot of the people in Bow Valley. People in Bow Valley are generally free-enterprise people and tend to lean away from government involvement in their industry; however, some provinces do have stabilization programs that make unfair practice for those who do not. The United States, of course, is concerned that if we get a rich stabilization program, it will be unfair practice to the producers in their country. We have to keep that in mind. The best plan would be for the federal government to come up with a stabilization program for all of Canada, with participation from the two levels of government and the producer. It would be a guarantee of cost of production only. However, the federal government says it will not unless it has control of production. That doesn't seem to be acceptable to our people.

The next best plan would be for the provinces to get together and institute a plan that is consistent in all provinces. Ontario and Alberta raise 75 per cent of the red meat in Canada. Ontario and Alberta are the only two meat producing provinces in Canada that don't have a stabilization program. The plan should only cover the cost of production of the average producer. It should not have a built-in profit. That way it would eliminate the need for production control and also relieve the concerns of the United States' people that we would be establishing unfair competition. In other words, it would be a guarantee that you would recover your costs only.

I would like to make a few comments about the quality of water in the Bow River.

MRS. CRIPPS: Only a few?

MR. MUSGROVE: A recent announcement on the cost of cleaning up the Bow River was estimated at between \$120 million and \$1 billion. The Bow provides drinking water for some 200,000 farm families, many of which are located in the irrigation district. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting the Bonnybrook sewage disposal site in Calgary recently, and I viewed their new \$31 million addition to take out phosphates. I understand that it still requires a way of removing nitrates as well as some other components, that would improve the water quality. It is hoped that this improvement could be carried on.

I've heard recently that there is some thought being given to using treated effluent from Calgary for sprinkler irrigation. I personally believe that, providing it is economically feasible, is the proper way of disposing of sewage. Of course, if you were using it for sprinkler irrigation, you wouldn't need to take out the phosphates and nitrates because they would be of benefit to the land it was applied to. If it were applied in the proper way, it wouldn't be a threat as a drainage into our system again.

In September, 1979, we established what is the Brooks

campus, Medicine Hat junior college. It was housed in the old hospital building and was to monitor the interest in the future educational needs in that area. Today there are approximately 450 students enrolled, and they are taking courses that range from first year university transfers to administration or secretarial science, life skills, and vocational training. In 1981, there was a parcel of land donated to the college by the former mayor of Medicine Hat, Harry Viner. That parcel has now been annexed into the town of Brooks and has been appraised at a price of approximately \$1 million. It is hoped that very soon we'll get a building program going on that property, and we will have established our own college at Brooks.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I must stress the importance of our economic resurgence plan, of economic diversification, job support and training, and sound financial management. I must also mention the venture capital program of \$200 million to help develop a better industrial base in Alberta. It is also hoped that we can put together a production credit program to provide loans for the agriculture industry. We'll have more about that later.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be thankful that we live in Alberta.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, 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, the business for tomorrow will be a continuation of the debate in respect of the throne speech. Prior to that time, it's also intended to call two government motions which are on the Order Paper. It is not intended that the Assembly sit on Thursday evening.

[At 10:06 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]