

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, March 22, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 9**

**Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Statutes Amendment Act, 1983**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1983.

The purpose of this Bill is to make amendments to a number of Acts administered by the department. Last year the Registrar of Corporations' periodical was established to accompany the *Alberta Gazette* with information relating to the corporate registration process. Other statutes presently bearing a requirement for publication in the *Gazette* will be amended to allow the alternative of publication in that periodical.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, amendments will be made to the Credit Union Act, to permit credit unions expanded services to their members; to the Insurance Act and the Trust Companies Act, to expand the scope of their investments; and to the Condominium Property Act, to allow condominium corporations to be exempted from the application of the Business Corporations Act since they are already incorporated under the Condominium Property Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

Bill 217

An Act to Amend the Ombudsman Act

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 217, An Act to Amend the Ombudsman Act.

This amendment would provide the impartial investigative and advocacy services of the provincial Ombudsman to the citizens of any municipality where council has passed a resolution authorizing the same jurisdiction within its administration.

[Leave granted; Bill 217 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file with the Assembly answers to motions for returns 131, 132, and 133, which were asked for during the Fourth Session of the 19th Legislature.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the Assembly copies of the annual report of Alberta Treasury for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1982.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 64th annual report of the Workers' Compensation Board of the province of Alberta for the year ended December 31, 1981, as required by statute. The report was distributed to Members of the Legislative Assembly by memo on September 9, 1982.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 35 students from the second language class of McDougall junior high school, situated in the constituency of Edmonton Centre. They are accompanied by their leader Mrs. Maldonado, their teacher Mrs. Ritchie, and by Mr. and Mrs. Parra. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a grade 9 class of 50 students from Manachaban junior high school in the town of Cochrane, the capital community of the eastern half of Banff-Cochrane. They are accompanied by their teachers and leaders Mike Taylor, Dick Broatch, John Holstein, and Ginger Hisey. Their bus driver, Eric Reid, may or may not be in the gallery. Would they please rise and enjoy the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 55 members of the grades 5 and 6 class from Sakaw elementary school. Under the supervision of Paul Ammann and Carolyn Myler, they are seated in the public gallery. For the information of members, Sakaw is Cree for "wooded area". Of course, like most new subdivisions, it's no longer wooded. But we have hopes that it will be again soon. I ask the class and their teachers to rise in the gallery and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members, Mr. Charlie Stewart, the former member, friend, and colleague from the Wainwright constituency. Mr. Stewart has just returned from a big holiday in California, and he's sitting in the members gallery. When he rises, I would like everybody to give him a hand and welcome him.

DR. BUCK: How was the fishing, Charlie?

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Hazardous Waste Disposal**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. On January 19, 1983, the minister issued a press release. I'll very quickly summarize it:

Analysis of samples collected at and around the Kinetic Ecological Resources PCB storage site at Nisku show that the site is secure and presents no danger to the public.

Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to advise the

House whether the sample results from the Vegreville environmental centre, on which the assertion contained in the January 19 release was apparently based, have been determined by subsequent samples to be inaccurate?

MR. BRADLEY: With regard to the nature of the hon. member's question, is he questioning the validity of the samples?

MR. NOTLEY: I would think that would come through, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps I can put it a little more clearly to the minister. Were there subsequent tests conducted by the Department of the Environment on samples collected at the Kinetic site at Nisku? And did the testing on these samples indicate that the information on which this release was based was in fact inaccurate?

MR. BRADLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly the reason for the government contacting a firm called Enviro-Test, to analyse a second set of samples taken from around the Kinetic site at Nisku?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have to take that question under advisement. I am not aware of the second set of samples.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Will the minister give an undertaking to the House to table the results of all sample tests, either directly at the Vegreville experimental lab or farmed out to private consultants, on this particular issue?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will give an undertaking to the House to provide the information with regard to all samples which were ordered by my department.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to confirm that subsequent to this release on January 19, in which the department indicates that there is no particular problem or difficulty, there were at least two orders to clean up the site — after the release of this document which suggested that no leakage had occurred?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any orders to clean up the site. I am aware that a voluntary clean-up took place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to explain to the Assembly the reasons for the storage of the contaminated soil? On the two particular occasions that clean-up occurred — after the department indicated there was no problem — why was this not stored in the warehouse but simply in the open, behind the warehouse?

MR. BRADLEY: The hon. member is getting into some detail. I do not have any knowledge of this. I will check into it, and I will respond.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what discussions the Department of the Environment has had with the Kinetic people concerning the financial viability of the company; whether we should continue to bring in

hazardous things to be stored, in view of the financial difficulties of that particular concern; whether in fact we are not borrowing problems because of the financial shakiness of the company?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it would be proper for me to comment on the financial aspects of a company at this point in time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I am rather amazed. There was a fair amount of publicity given . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's amazement may be amazing to himself, but it isn't part of the question.

MR. MARTIN: Let me ask the minister if he is saying clearly that he's not aware of any further tests besides the Vegreville one, he's not aware of any clean-up of areas, and he is not aware that these clean-ups are being stored? Is this absolutely clear from the minister?

MR. BRADLEY: I believe I answered that question. I was aware of a voluntary clean-up.

MR. MARTIN: What are you aware of?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could go on to the next topic.

Pincher Creek Gas Plant

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we will go on to the next topic. I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment as well. It flows from the meeting last night in Pincher Creek. Is the minister in a position to assure the Assembly — and I direct this not only to the Minister of the Environment but also to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources — that there was no contact between the ERCB and the government of Alberta with respect to this preliminary inquiry? The commissioning of same apparently took place on Thursday night, for tabling in the House yesterday. On Thursday or Friday last week, was there any consultation, any suggestion or instruction that it occur, or any discussion about it occurring, between the government of Alberta and the ERCB?

MR. BRADLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources in a position to assure the Assembly that the decision of the ERCB to conduct this preliminary analysis — very quickly and very preliminary — was done totally by the volition of the ERCB and that there was no contact either between the minister's office, the Premier's office, the Minister of the Environment's office, or any other office of this government?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak with respect to my own portfolio responsibilities. I can advise the House that to my knowledge, there was no initiation of any particular study on the part of my department, and certainly not by myself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In view of the fact that the dikes containing settling ponds have been known to break in the past and discharge effluent into Drywood Creek — apparently this happened two years ago — as a result of either discussions with departmental officials or a review of the ERCB report which was tabled, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly how the government or, more particularly and more worrisomely, the ERCB can assert that no off-site contamination occurred or that there was negligible occurrence?

MR. BRADLEY: The member originally directed the question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. However, I am not aware of the dikes breaking.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Whether or not the minister is aware of the dikes breaking, unfortunately dikes occasionally break. Apparently this happened two years ago.

My question to either hon. gentleman is: on what basis could the ERCB or the government of Alberta reach the conclusion that there is no cause for concern, when in actual fact there could well be drainage from the site if the dikes did break? In fact, I am given to understand by local people that two years ago there was indeed a problem during a substantial spring run-off; dikes overflowed. What evidence does the government have, or from either hon. minister's discussions with the ERCB, to assure the government that in fact run-off from this site and contamination of adjacent areas is negligible?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have to have the specific to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring. I am aware — and I reported yesterday — that there was a 16-hour period in which there was discharge from the ponds into Drywood Creek during heavy flows. I advised the House of that. From the information I have, there is no reason for that to be of concern.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What ongoing monitoring of Drywood Creek has there been, specifically for heavy metal content? In view of the fact that the drinking water of Hill Spring is affected, has there been ongoing monitoring over the past number of years since this was apparently first brought to the attention of the government when they were in opposition in 1968, by the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is just debate, thinly disguised as a question. The hon. member is introducing all sorts of side issues. It appears that the question is simply being used as a vehicle for debate and, as Speaker, I have to be concerned about that. I don't know which hon. members in the House would like to enter the debate; I can well imagine that there might be some. There might be some ministers who might like to present another side to the situation, in addition to the side the hon. leader is presenting under the guise of questions.

It would seem to me that in most of these cases, these rather elaborately contrived questions could be asked simply and directly. In that event, the Chair would also be in a stronger position to deal with answers. As it is, I realize the hon. minister has refrained from debating any of these questions. But if a question like that leads to

debate on the part of an hon. minister, in fairness there's simply no way that that debate can be interfered with.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Certainly, I have always maintained that a little bit of lively exchange doesn't hurt. And I think you'll admit that that's been a consistent position that I've made reference to over and over again in the House. I certainly will rephrase the question.

My point of order is simply this: if questions are going to engender debate, then with great respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that answers that might stimulate debate must be treated the same way. I raise this that we did not raise at the time because, frankly, I think a little bit of debate doesn't hurt. Yesterday when my colleague asked the question about guidelines, the Premier stood and talked about the federal leader of the NDP on oil rollbacks. Fine, I don't quarrel with that kind of interjection of debate. But if the Premier is going to be able to get away with trampling on the rules of this House [interjections] I suggest that members of the opposition might be able to trespass softly on the area of debate. I simply offer that, Mr. Speaker. If we're going to have no stimulation of debate in a question, the same must surely be true in an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier's interjection yesterday, which is really all it was, was very brief. There was no chance to intervene. It came out, and it was there. He didn't continue with it. I've heard similar interjections, in considerable numbers, coming from many hon. members, including the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There's no way the Chair can remove those words as if they didn't happen. It's when a thing is persisted in. There's always going to be something getting past the Chair, and lots of things have done so already this year. I really don't see that the hon. leader has a point of order. Had he had one, I should have preferred to have heard about it when the event happened.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I suppose. The preceding question by the hon. member was addressed both to the Minister of the Environment and to me as the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I would appreciate the opportunity to respond to the preceding question, if I might.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, in respect of that preceding question, I think it's important to draw the attention of the House and the hon. member in question to the press release issued by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. It reveals some very important dimensions that may have been overlooked in the framing of the question by the hon. member.

First, the press release makes very clear that the findings of the Energy Resources Conservation Board are acknowledged as being their preliminary views. The board goes on to point out that given the concern of local residents, they felt it was important that they not withhold these preliminary views but, given the importance of the subject, make them available to the public.

I think it's also important to be aware that the Energy Resources Conservation Board goes on to state in their press release that their course of action from that point onward will be to complete this assessment, to prepare a report summarizing their views and recommendations

and, after that work been completed, they will make it public. It is then the intention of the board to engage the services of well-qualified experts from the universities to assess the interpretation of the Gulf study. These findings and conclusions will thereafter be made public.

Mr. Speaker, when this matter is being discussed in the House, I think it's important to have a full understanding of the plan of action the Energy Resources Conservation Board has in place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, without any preface at all, my question to the Minister of the Environment is: what monitoring has there been of Drywood Creek? And if there has not been any in the past, is it the intention of the government to undertake monitoring for heavy metal content?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the specific, I will check in detail to find out what monitoring has been done at Drywood Creek.

Yesterday, during the estimates of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I responded at some length with regard to the gas processing plant wastewater management standards and the requirement to have these effluents analysed. I referred in detail to the chemical analysis reports of the effluents and the types of substances which were monitored, including a number of heavy metals and other substances. Certainly, in terms of the independent evaluation which I have directed of all the issues we've discussed to date, particularly my statement last Friday, monitoring at Drywood Creek would be included in terms of what that independent evaluation would be looking at.

Sour Gas

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

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Last night a resident of Hill Spring — which, incidentally, draws its water from the Waterton reservoir — reported, in that small community, an incidence of cancer 17 times the provincial average. My question is: what initiatives is this government going to take to undertake comprehensive health testing at all 60 sites where we have gas plants, but particularly where there are sour gas plants, in view of the fact that the two plants in question have more sulphur recovery equipment than many plants, which have no sulphur recovery equipment at all? At this stage, will any initiative be taken by the department the minister leads to undertake proper testing of people who suffer health effects, especially in areas adjacent to sour gas plants?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Board of Health is awaiting the ERCB inquiry report referring to the Lodgepole situation before determining whether or not they're going to recommend any kind of long-range sour gas study.

I've asked the Provincial Board of Health to prepare themselves for such a possible recommendation, however. They have surveyed the available literature regarding health effects of sour gas and are working with the Department of the Environment, in terms of analysing the data available from the Lodgepole situation, to see if there are any preliminary ties between health effects that

have been reported and the levels that have been identified by the Department of the Environment. They are also working with the Department of the Environment relative to the possibility of long-range, low-effect studies of sour gas on animals. So they are taking a number of steps in anticipation of the ERCB report related to the Lodgepole situation. However, a decision to go into a long-term study will be held until that particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Minister of Economic Development, who wishes to add to a previous answer.

Wainwright Community Centre Financing

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It concerns the new Wainwright communiplex. Has the minister given consideration to the Wainwright town council's request for a \$180,000 grant to help finance this mini convention centre, which has been having financial difficulties?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we were not able to respond positively to the request by the town of Wainwright for funds in addition to the about \$570,000 that I believe the town had already received through the major culture/recreation facility development program. Nothing further could be found for them.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary question. In light of the Edmonton convention centre recently receiving a \$20 million grant from the province and the fact that the \$180,000 requested by Wainwright would be the equivalent per capita benefit to the townspeople as the Edmonton grant, could the minister explain why, in these times of decentralization, the dollars were allocated to Edmonton and not Wainwright? [interjections]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, decentralization is a very positive program that our government has worked on very successfully over the past 12 years. Certain aspects of that program have limitations. The Convention Centre being built and almost ready to be opened in the city of Edmonton has a very important role to play in terms of diversification of our economy. There's no doubt that it will be the scene of conventions that will have national and international impact.

For example, Medic '83 is one of those, which we expect to hold in the city of Edmonton near the end of May. That will bring people from all over the world to the city of Edmonton, tying in closely with the very important efforts of this government in the medical research field. The benefits of that convention will spill over to communities beyond the city of Edmonton, in terms of business opportunities and particularly in terms of tourism opportunities. So it's a unique type of development that can't be duplicated in other communities in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm fully aware that the question of the hon. Member for Wainwright contained what might otherwise be considered debate, and I realize that on occasion I have intervened in similar questions. In fairness, however, I think I should point out that the hon. Member for Wainwright is a long, long way from equaling the score of other members in that regard.

Film Festival — Cannes

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Member for Edmonton Norwood gave me an opportunity to review the recent activities of the Alberta Motion Picture Development Corporation. Just as a little preamble, they have now approved 12 fairly major film initiatives and funded six, so they're well under way for Alberta's film industry.

More precisely, the question inquired whether or not several people from that development board were going to the Cannes film festival. Mr. Speaker, the answer is that there are two festivals going on in that French community, one in May and one in April of this year, one entirely devoted to international television marketing and the other to international film marketing. While it is true that spaces have been booked for all the directors, there is not any chance that they are all going. They're all members of the private sector, and it had to be booked at that time. The chairman of the board advised me today that only some will be going.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. You haven't quite answered it. How many, then?

MR. PLANCHE: Well, I thought I did answer that, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to speak more slowly [interjections] in case the member can't hear that fast. The spaces have been booked, but while all the members of the board are from the private sector, it's not clear how many can attend. Certainly it's not the intention that they will all go.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I guess we're into Conservative arithmetic. "Some" is not a precise number, in case the minister is not aware of that. So I take it that at this point — we're talking about taxpayers' money — the purpose of the junket . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Boy, they're a little feisty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjection] Order please. Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat in the usual parliamentary manner when there appears, at least to the referee, to be some need to intervene. If he has a question and he would like to come directly to it, I'm sure we could deal with it. But if he wishes to indulge in some kind of preamble, would he put a notice of motion.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order. He was debating; I'm just returning the debate.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. Yes, he's inciting debate.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member thinks that an answer by a minister is out of order, the time to raise the point of order is when the answer is being given.

MR. MARTIN: To the minister: can you advise as to the purpose of this junket and the approximate cost? Surely "some" is not an answer.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, it's pretty difficult to give an approximate cost until we know how many are going. The fact of the matter is that the whole film industry is in

turbulence, with cassettes, pay-TV, and one thing and another. In order to make good-quality decisions as to what's appropriate for investment by this board, it's important that these people need to be well apprized of current market conditions. It's for that reason that some will go.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The answer is that he doesn't know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member is going to insist on asking questions, if that's a proper description of it, in that fashion, I'm going to have to skip recognizing him once in a while.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether or not the group is taking any samples of Alberta film or television productions to the festival?

MR. PLANCHE: I didn't ask that question specifically; I'm happy to do that. The purpose of it is to assess what the market place readily will accept in the coming year. That board has a budget that was approved by this Legislature. They're operating well within it, and part of their mandate is to understand marketing trends. That will be the reason for the trip.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the hon. Treasurer. In this time of restraint, what guidelines, if any, have been put in place to govern or restrict publicly funded travel by senior members of the public service, or by government, its agencies, or Crown corporations? Are there any guidelines?

MR. HYNDMAN: I suggest that be put on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. It's a very wide-ranging question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood with his question — I take it these were supplementaries arising from the minister's answer — followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Computer Technology in Schools

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Education. I refer to an Alberta Education information bulletin of January 28, in which it was reported that 1,000 Bell & Howell microcomputers were sold to Alberta schools for a purchase price of \$2,517 each. According to the contract with Bell & Howell, which the minister tabled in the Assembly in November 1981, the minister's department purchased the microcomputer systems for approximately \$4,000 each. Can the minister indicate whether or not this discrepancy exists because not all parts of the original system were sold to Alberta schools?

MR. NOTLEY: Supply-side economics, Conservative style.

MR. KING: I would have to take the question as notice and respond to the hon. gentleman tomorrow.

PWA Boarding Passes

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. This has to do with

the scratch-and-win boarding pass you get from Pacific Western Airlines when you board. I'll just very briefly indicate that this contest is open to all residents of Canada, excluding residents of the province of Quebec. Is the minister in a position to indicate why the people of the province of Quebec are excluded from this competition?

MR. M. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to the Assembly at some later date — or would he undertake to find out from Pacific Western Airlines — why the people from the province of Quebec are excluded from being involved in the competition?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the management of Pacific Western Airlines is under a board of directors and is at arm's length, if you like, from the government of Alberta. But I would be pleased to ask the chairman of the board of directors if he might be able to advise me, and hence I could advise the House on that particular matter.

Natural Gas Rebates

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. The primary agricultural producers' natural gas rebate plan involves a rebate on over 300 gigajoules per year, which is considered the household use. I get a lot of concern from my constituents that 300 gigajoules is excessive. I wonder if this has in fact been proven excessive for household use, and are there any studies being done on it?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, for some years now, we have had in place in the province a natural gas price protection plan for all customers. During the fall of 1982, two specific plans were announced: one to aid senior citizens, and the other to aid primary agricultural producers. I believe the hon. member is referring to the portion of the plan aimed at primary agricultural producers, where a ceiling of 300 gigajoules is used to determine the starting point for the support, which is in addition to that which is already provided through the natural gas price protection plan.

As I understood it, the question was: how do we arrive at the figure 300 gigajoules, and is it a fair figure or are we reviewing it? Recalling the arguments of the then Minister of Utilities and Telephones, an average household in the province uses approximately 200 gigajoules of natural gas per year. Because the primary agricultural producers' program was not intended to be a supplement to the home heating costs but rather for other primary agricultural uses, it was deemed that we should settle on a figure above that which the average home would use. That allows us to eliminate the need to hire extra staff to determine the actual usage in a home, and all the other costs that would be associated with that. So the program is aimed at those primary agricultural producers who use between 300 gigajoules and 10,000 gigajoules per year and is for each of the calendar years 1982, '83, and '84.

Sour Gas (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the remaining time, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of

Energy and Natural Resources, flowing from the release by the ERCB of this report that the minister tells us was released to allay public concern. Has the minister had an opportunity to discuss with the chairman of the ERCB the policy of the board with respect to permitting gas processing plants to be constructed in this province without the installation of any sulphur recovery equipment? Has the government taken any position on this? Has there been any discussion with the chairman of the ERCB on that particular matter?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to discuss that specific matter with the chairman of the ERCB. As the hon. member would be aware, the ERCB is of course involved with the issuance of approvals for gas plant construction, subject to various conditions. It is frequently a condition of such approvals that proper, sulphur emission controls be involved in such a construction. Beyond that, I would have to say that that has not been a subject which has as yet been discussed in great detail by the chairman of the ERCB and myself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Given the concern flowing from not only the Pincher Creek case but the many other cases in the province, at this stage has there been any consideration by the government of changing the mandate of the ERCB to insist that when a gas processing plant is constructed, the most up-to-date sulphur recovery equipment must be part of that process, part of that construction permit, as opposed to leaving it up to the ERCB to pick and choose whether or not a plant will have sulphur recovery equipment?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to respond in a somewhat general fashion, by saying that the ERCB is staffed by people of high technical expertise. It has been the judgment of this government that they have the expertise that is necessary in assessing, in a particular gas plant situation, whether or not there is a need for a particular level of sophistication of equipment for monitoring and controlling sulphur emissions. I think that has been the policy in the past. The ERCB has the technical expertise necessary. Beyond that, again I would have to get a more detailed response for the member.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question either to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or to the Minister of the Environment. In the case of Inverness in the Peace River country, is the government able to explain to the Assembly why an okay was given to construct a plant without any sulphur recovery equipment at all, when in the same area Shell Resources was examining the possibility of building a plant that could take in the Inverness gas, with proper sulphur recovery equipment being installed as part of the basic project? Is this government going to amend the necessary legislation so that people in affected areas can have the assurance that the industry will get together and ensure that any gas processing plant that involves sour gas will have the most up-to-date technology available?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take as notice the specific, detailed question, and the after question as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. In view of the fact that the Department of the Environment gave the okay to the Inverness plant in July, when in April they were told by the Shell officials that a competing project would take in the gas from the same area in a plant with proper sulphur recovery equipment, why did the government of Alberta give the go-ahead, the green light, to a plant that will spew all kinds of SO₂ into the atmosphere when we another projected plant that will have the most up-to-date sulphur recovery equipment as part of the basic design?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking a question which predates my responsibilities in the portfolio. I'll undertake to review the specifics the hon. member has alluded to and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. Minister of Agriculture in a position to outline to the Assembly what specific initiatives the Department of Agriculture has taken to study the impact of the sour gas industry, particularly on the very sensitive soils in the Peace River region, where inadequate sulphur recovery could in fact jeopardize the productive capacity of the land? Has either the Department of Agriculture or any other department of government commissioned any study on this important matter?

MR. FJORDBOTTON: I'll have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community health. The minister says that the government is awaiting the ERCB study on Lodgepole. However, since there are 60 plants in this province, many of them without sulphur recovery equipment, has the government at any time given consideration to a proper evaluation of health impacts on people adjacent to those plants? Has the minister taken the kind of initiative that would involve sitting down with the Alberta Medical Association or the College of Physicians and Surgeons, for example, to see whether or not there might be co-operation with the profession, to work out a systematic way of conducting health studies of people who claim after effects or side effects of being adjacent to sour gas plants?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Lodgepole incident took place toward the end of November, so that's the first opportunity I had to look at the possibility of any kinds of studies. Certainly the Provincial Board of Health has been in contact with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and other medical groups, as well as local health units, throughout the entire process. My recollection is that there have been studies in the past. I can think of one that was done a number of years ago. As I recall, the overall evidence is that in the long term, at low levels, no health effects can be ascertained or directly related to sour gas.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister give the House the results of the study last summer in the Glenwood-Hill Spring area, regarding health problems?

DR. WEBBER: I don't recognize the study by the particular the hon. member has mentioned. However, I'll take that as notice, and see if I can find it.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. In view of the concern expressed by Edmonton residents following the Lodgepole blowout, why is the government not planning to hold hearings in Edmonton specifically?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's the ERCB that is holding the hearings regarding the possible effects of that Lodgepole blowout. As a matter of fact, two medical people will be sitting on that particular board. Any resident of Alberta who wants to make a presentation to the ERCB in those hearings is free to do so.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I'll refer that question, then, to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Why, specifically, are we not holding hearings in Edmonton. As he is well aware, at the time there was a lot of concern in the Edmonton area about health hazards?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I respond to that question by indicating that a pre-inquiry hearing has been held. It's my understanding that decisions that have been taken with respect to the conduct of the hearing have been arrived at as a result of hearing the input from the various representatives who attended that pre-inquiry hearing, who had a full opportunity to put forward their views. Decisions are being taken on the basis of those representations.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Then what are the reasons they are holding it there rather than in Edmonton, or both? What determined where they would hold the hearings?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to comment on what reasons were involved in decisions made at that pre-inquiry hearing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the widespread concern in the Edmonton area, would the minister undertake to contact the chairman of the ERCB and find out from him the reasons no ERCB hearing is planned for Edmonton? Obviously, this is a matter of some concern. Distance is involved. Certainly one should be held in Drayton Valley; no one quarrels with that. But would the minister undertake to contact the chairman of the ERCB to find out the reasons, and report back to the House?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy to undertake to have a discussion with the chairman of the ERCB, and report back to the Assembly the results of my discussion with respect to that particular point.

I should go on to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I take a very strong view of the quasi-judicial nature of the Energy Resources Conservation Board. I think it's important that there be that arm's length relationship with government, if we are to continue to ensure that the ERCB is able to conduct its very important affairs in an effective fashion.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the numerous questions and motions on the Order Paper as follows. With respect to the questions, I move that Question 129 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper. I might point out that following dealing with the remaining questions, I would like to move to dealing with motions for returns, relative to those which I move remain standing.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a motion by the hon. minister that Question 129 retain its place on the Order Paper and stand over for another day.

[Motion carried]

120. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

- (1) On what day did the government receive from Thompson Lightstone and Company Limited of Calgary the results of that company's "Alberta Public Opinion Study TL 3082", a public opinion study commissioned by the government for the purpose of determining Albertans' opinions on various aspects of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund?
- (2) To which individual in the government was the document comprised of the results of that survey delivered by Thompson Lightstone and Company Limited?
- (3) What were the major factors on the basis of which the decision was made not to make the survey results public when they were received?
- (4) What were the major factors on the basis of which the decision was made not to make the survey results public prior to October 5, 1982?
- (5) What were the major factors on the basis of which the decision was made not to make the survey results public prior to March 11, 1983?

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of response to Question 120, I would like to read the following into the record, beginning with subparagraph (1).

(1) The report containing the results of the study was received in March 1983 from Baker Lovick Ltd., which firm contracted the study to Thompson Lightstone and Company Limited. Preliminary results were discussed in August 1982, and a draft report was reviewed in late November 1982.

(2) Hon. Bill Payne, Minister without Portfolio, received the report and the results.

(3) It is within accepted practice to file such documents with the Legislative Assembly, and the Provincial Treasurer had made a commitment to provide the report on the results to the Assembly at its next sittings.

(4) The actual report on the results had not been received, as explained in answer to question (1).

(5) The same response as in subparagraph (3).

121. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question: What was the value, by category, of all special tax exemptions, deductions, credits, exclusions, preferential rates, and deferrals offered by the government through its tax system in each of the fiscal years 1980-81 and 1981-82, and for the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1982-83?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, in principle, the government is prepared to provide a response to this question. However, I would make two notes on the record. Firstly, because both personal and corporate Alberta provincial and federal tax systems are set up on a calendar year time span rather than a fiscal year, the information will be provided for the most recent year during which that information is available, which is the calendar year 1980.

In my view, the categories which are mentioned would include personal income tax, selective rate reduction, the renter assistance credit, the small business deduction, the political contribution tax credit, the royalty tax credit, and the royalty tax rebate.

122. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question: Is it the intention of the government to table returns in response to motions for returns 122, 126, 131, 132, and 133, adopted by the Legislative Assembly during the Fourth Session of the 19th Legislature and, if so, by what date will those returns be tabled?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of Question 122, the answer is yes. With respect to the particular numbers of the motions for returns, hon. members will note that motions for returns 131, 132, and 133 were tabled in the Assembly today by the hon. Minister of Transportation. With respect to the other two motions for returns, 122 and 126, it is anticipated that they will be tabled by mid-April this year.

123. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question: What is the government's best estimate today of expected revenues generated and received as a consequence of the energy pricing and taxation agreement signed by the government of Canada and the government of Alberta on September 1, 1981, for each year to the end of the period covered by the agreement?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the government will undertake to provide an answer to Question 123 as stated.

124. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

- (1) For the fiscal year 1982-83, and in each case, what was the annualized salary paid to each ministerial executive assistant employed in government service?
- (2) For the fiscal year 1983-84, what is the estimate of the annualized salary to be paid to each ministerial executive assistant employed in government service?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the government to provide the information contained in part (1) of Question 124 as soon as that information becomes available at the end of the current fiscal year, which is very shortly.

With respect to part (2) of Question 124, the government will not be in a position to provide an estimate as requested, because it would require the government to make predictions as to who might occupy positions for a fiscal year ending over a year from now. Therefore, we are not prepared to answer that part of Question 124.

125. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:

- (1) For each of the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83, what were the total salary and expenses paid the chairperson of the Alberta Racing Commission, pursuant to the discharge of his duties

in that capacity?

- (2) In each of the above-noted fiscal years, at how many meetings of the Alberta Racing Commission did the government-appointed chairperson attend and act in that capacity, and what were the dates of those meetings?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I accept the question, and wish to table a response.

126. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:

- (1) Has the board of review commissioned to review the operation of the Child Welfare Act and the Social Care Facilities Licensing Act (commissioned on March 19, 1980) been given a fixed date by which time it must forward its report to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and, if so, what is that date; and, if not,
- (2) When does the government expect the board of review's report to be forwarded to the Lieutenant Governor in Council?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to that question right now. The answer to 126(1) is no, there is no fixed date by which time the Cavanagh Board of Review must forward its report. The response to part (2), when to expect the report, is that it won't be available for the spring session, but we do expect it for the fall session.

127. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question: In each of the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83:

- (a) How many meetings of the board of directors of Syncrude Canada Limited were attended by the Member of the Legislative Assembly appointed by the government to sit on the board?
- (b) What were the dates of those meetings?
- (c) What expenses were incurred by the member in the course of his attendance at those meetings?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the government accepts and will provide an answer to Question No. 127. That question will be answered by including reference to the participation of the member in question on the management committee as well as the board of directors of Syncrude Canada; also with respect to the participation of the member on the board of Northward Developments Ltd., as these are all interrelated. Finally, with respect to item (c), the question will be answered by dealing only with those expenses for which the member was reimbursed by the government, of course.

128. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:

- (1) What, thus far, has been the cost to the government of the administration of the province-wide voluntary comprehensive examinations?
- (2) What formal studies have been completed for the purpose of determining what the cost to the government would be of administering a regime of province-wide, compulsory examinations for those students leaving Alberta's secondary schools?

MR. KING: The government accepts Question No. 128.

130. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:

- (1) For the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, and 1981-82, in each case, what was the quantity, expressed in litres, of product originating in the Republic of

South Africa purchased by the Alberta Liquor Control Board?

- (2) For the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, and 1981-82, in each case, what was the cost, expressed in Canadian dollars, of product originating in the Republic of South Africa purchased by the Alberta Liquor Control Board?
- (3) For the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, and 1981-82, in each case, what was the quantity, expressed in litres, of product originating in Chile purchased by the Alberta Liquor Control Board?
- (4) For the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, and 1981-82, in each case, what was the cost, expressed in Canadian dollars, of product originating in Chile purchased by the Alberta Liquor Control Board?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I accept Question No. 130 and wish to table the response.

151. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:

- (1) What was the total number of full-time permanent female employees of the government of Alberta, by division and in management, as of the following dates: (a) March 31, 1981, (b) March 31, 1982, (c) March 1, 1983?
- (2) What was the average salary for all employees referred to in (1), by division and in management, as of the following dates: (a) March 31, 1981, (b) March 31, 1982, (c) March 1, 1983?
- (3) What was the total number of full-time permanent male employees of the government of Alberta, by division and in management, as of the following dates: (a) March 31, 1981, (b) March 31, 1982, (c) March 1, 1983?
- (4) What was the average salary for all employees referred to in (3), by division and in management, as of the following dates: (a) March 31, 1981, (b) March 31, 1982, (c) March 1, 1983?
- (5) What was the average salary for all permanent full-time female employees of the government of Alberta as of the following dates: (a) March 31, 1981, (b) March 31, 1982, (c) March 1, 1983?
- (6) What was the average salary for all permanent full-time male employees of the government of Alberta as of the following dates: (a) March 31, 1981, (b) March 31, 1982, (c) March 1, 1983?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the government is prepared to accept Question 151 and will respond. There is a qualification, which I have discussed with the Member for Edmonton Norwood. The date in subsection (c) in each of the six sections in the question will be March 31. That would make it consistent with all the other questions and make the information more readily obtainable.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may now deal with the motions for returns. I move that motions for returns 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 148, 149, 159, 160, 162, 163, and 164, stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

136. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing all audited annual reports of Syn-

crude Canada Limited provided to the government in accordance with its role as an equity participant in the Syncrude project for the years 1981 and 1982.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that Motion for a Return No. 136 be amended by deleting the words "and 1982". Speaking to the amendment, the reason is simple: the government cannot provide information it does not have.

[Motion as amended carried]

139. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) The raw data, and analysis thereof, collected on behalf of the government by Thompson Lightstone and Company Limited of Calgary as a result of that company's undertaking a public opinion study in the summer of 1982 concerning various aspects of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and referred to by the company as "Alberta Public Opinion Study TL 3082";
- (2) Any and all correspondence between the government and any of its agencies and Thompson Lightstone Company Limited of Calgary, dealing primarily with the above-noted public opinion study;
- (3) The cost to the government of the study and resulting analysis, and the account or fund out of which that cost was paid.

MR. PAYNE: I would like to move an amendment to this motion for a return, initially to subparagraph (1) of the return, so it reads as follows:

The report submitted to the government as a result of Thompson Lightstone and Company Limited undertaking a public opinion study in the summer of 1982 concerning various aspects of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and referred to by the company as "Alberta Public Opinion Study TL 3082".

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this amendment is simply that it would be inappropriate to table raw data which will eventually form part of a public report; the analysis requested is in fact contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, I further move an amendment to subparagraph (2), inserting at the beginning of its present wording the following phrase . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know how many amendments there are going to be, but perhaps we should deal with them one at a time.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. PAYNE: I further move an amendment to subparagraph (2), inserting at the beginning of its present wording the following phrase: "Subject to the concurrence of other parties to the correspondence". I believe this amendment is a traditional qualification placed on motions for returns that deal with government correspondence.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Motion as amended carried]

144. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing any and all transfers of money from

the government of Alberta, its departments, or agencies to:

- (1) the Western Barley Growers Association,
 - (2) Flax Growers Western Canada,
 - (3) the Palliser Wheat Growers Association,
 - (4) the Alberta Canola Growers Association,
 - (5) the Alberta Wheat Pool,
 - (6) Unifarm,
 - (7) the Christian Farmers Federation,
 - (8) the National Farmers Union;
- and including in all cases:
- (1) the nature of the transfer of money (e.g. grant, fee-for-service, etc.),
 - (2) the dollar amount of the transfer,
 - (3) the date at which the transfer was effected,
 - (4) the program or agency under which the transfer was authorized, for the period April 1, 1981, to December 31, 1982.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment to Motion for a Return 144. In the second paragraph, where it says "(e.g. grant, fee-for-service, etc.)", following that paragraph, I would like it deleted.

MR. SPEAKER: Am I right in understanding that proposed amendment as eliminating what's in brackets, or the whole of (1)?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: It would remove the words that are in brackets, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion as amended carried]

150. Mr. Martin moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing, in each of the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, and for the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1982-83, the cost of administering the collection of health insurance premiums pursuant to the Health Insurance Premiums Act (R.S.A. 1980, c. H-5).

[Motion carried]

147. Mr. Martin moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing, in each case, the weekly landing and take-off totals for each local airstrip in which Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund moneys have been invested for the period since the respective airstrip's opening to March 1, 1983; and, in each case, the amount of money invested from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the respective airstrip.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment as follows: the motion to be amended by striking out the first line, ending with the word "local", and replacing it with the following:

In each case, the landing and take-off totals on record for each provincial . . .

The reasons are that, first of all, we do not have the information requested by the hon. member on a weekly basis. We have totals; hence the requirement to remove the word "weekly". Secondly, the insertion of the words "on record" is to provide us with an opportunity to answer the question, taking due note of the fact that there are some airports where we don't have the records, and they will be identified in the answer. Finally, the word "local" has been changed to "provincial", because in our terminology there are several different kinds of airstrips or airports. They are community airports, provincial air-

ports, and federal airports. Provincial airports, for the most part, are the ones where Heritage Savings Trust Fund dollars have been expended in terms of terminal construction. I think that will meet the spirit and intent of the request by the hon. member.

[Motion as amended carried]

152. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a full status report on development and operation of the Electric Energy Marketing Agency, showing:

- (1) progress in establishment of fair and equitable wholesale power rates for Albertans,
- (2) progress in assuring the most efficient use of power sources throughout Alberta,
- (3) progress in the reduction of the rate of increase to Alberta consumers in their electric energy costs,
- (4) progress in development of strategy for purchase of power from outside Alberta,
- (5) progress in development of strategy to allow the continued operation of utilities companies in the most efficient manner,
- (6) number of persons employed to administer and operate the Electric Energy Marketing Agency,
- (7) total cost of development and operation of the Electric Energy Marketing Agency from its inception to February 28, 1983.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend that if the House gives unanimous concurrence, Motion for a Return No. 152 be transferred to Written Questions.

[Motion carried]

153. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing details of all travel paid by public funds for Members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly, members of executive council, and ministerial assistants, for the period January 1, 1983, to January 31, 1983, inclusive, showing:

- (1) Dates of departure and return for each trip;
- (2) Destinations;
- (3) Total cost for each journey, including transportation, accommodation, and entertainment;
- (4) List of persons accompanying principal traveller.

[Motion carried]

154. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing identification of all government personnel who accompanied Premier Peter Lougheed to the Western Premiers' Conference in Swift Current, Saskatchewan, on February 2, 1983, showing in each case:

- (1) Cost for transportation, accommodation, and all other expenditures for each individual listed;
- (2) Total cost incurred by the Alberta delegation to the 1983 Western Premiers' Conference.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Motion for a Return 154 be amended by adding the words "paid by the government of Alberta" following the words which conclude each of subparagraphs (1) and (2). The reason, of course, is that whatever cost might have been incurred by people in their own private capacity should not be the subject of a return by this Assembly.

[Motion as amended carried]

155. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the total cost of Premier Peter Lougheed's February 1983 mission to New York, London, and Zurich, including expenses incurred for transportation, accommodation, entertainment, and other expenditures. Identification of the person or persons who accompanied Premier Peter Lougheed, including all expenditures incurred by each.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion for a Return 155 be amended by adding the words "paid by the government of Alberta" following the word "expenditures" in paragraphs one and two, for the same reason as in the preceding motion.

[Motion as amended carried]

156. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) Total amount of office space leased or rented by the government of Alberta, including the annual costs of leases and rentals as of February 28, 1983;
- (2) Total amount of space leased or rented in Edmonton by the government of Alberta which was occupied on February 28, 1983;
- (3) Total amount of space leased or rented in Edmonton by the government of Alberta which was unoccupied on February 28, 1983;
- (4) Total cost per month of all space leased or rented in Edmonton by the government of Alberta on February 28, 1983;
- (5) information requested in (2), (3), and (4) for the city of Calgary;
- (6) Information requested in (2), (3), and (4) for all centres in Alberta except Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to accept motion 156, amending it however by striking out "space", where it occurs in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), and substituting "office space".

[Motion as amended carried]

157. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) Total amount of indebtedness, principal, and interest on loans and/or guarantees approved by the Alberta government for Faith Farms Limited, to February 28, 1983;
- (2) Total amount of principal and interest repaid by Faith Farms Limited on loans and/or guarantees approved by the government of Alberta to February 28, 1983.

[Motion carried]

158. On behalf of Mr. R. Speaker, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing: Total cost of all government of Alberta advertising for each month from July 1, 1982, to February 28, 1983, inclusive, for each of the following media:

- (1) Television,
- (2) Radio,
- (3) Daily newspapers,
- (4) Weekly newspapers,
- (5) Periodicals and magazines,

- (6) Public billboards, and
Total cost of government of Alberta advertising paid to Baker-Lovick Limited for each month from July 1, 1982, to February 28, 1983.

[Motion carried]

161. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) The amount of each individual grant made under phases 1 and 2 of the Nutritive Processing Agreement between the federal and Alberta governments for the 1981-82 fiscal year and the 1982-83 fiscal year to March 1, by category of commodity processed.
 - (2) The names and locations of the firms receiving each aforementioned grant.
 - (3) The estimated capital expenditures on which each grant offer was made.

[Motion carried]

165. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) In each case where a royalty tax credit with respect to oil or gas produced in Alberta was given or approved:
 - (a) the name of the company receiving the royalty tax credit,
 - (b) the total dollar amount of all royalty tax credits received by the company,
 - (c) the period over which the company received the royalty tax credit(s),
 over the life of the royalty tax credit program, from 1974 to date.
 - (2) In each such case known to the government or any of its departments or agencies:
 - (a) the name of the company which engaged in a selling of some of its assets apparently for the purpose of qualifying for more than one payment under the royalty tax credit program, and the number of payments for which the company thus qualified and the total dollar amount of those payments,
 - (b) the name of the company which divided its operations in such a way as to qualify for more than one payment under the royalty tax credit program, and the number of payments for which the company thus qualified and the total dollar amount of those payments,
 over the life of the royalty tax credit program, from 1974 to date.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in urging the defeat of Motion 165. The motion calls for the revealing of confidential, in this case, corporate income tax records. I believe that is a matter of worry, in fact of very deep concern to Alberta companies and to Albertans as individuals, who have felt in the past that there is a continuing tradition, protected by law, of privacy with respect to income tax records, their own and those of others.

The royalty tax credit itself, Mr. Speaker, can be debated when the amendments which I have indicated are brought forward. But hon. members know that the Corporate Income Tax Act of this province and the personal Income Tax Act, both of which have been and are laws of this Assembly, provide that all income tax information

such as the kind requested here is confidential. Indeed every corporate and every personal tax Act in Canada, those of the 10 provinces and the federal government, provides that degree of protection.

The entire tax system, Mr. Speaker, depends on the privacy and confidentiality of the tax records of individuals and corporations. The principle, of course, applies not only to such matters as the royalty tax credit but also to the small business deduction, which is a tax deduction that thousands of small companies in this province use. They would be, I am sure, dismayed if they were to feel that there was any likelihood of those records being made public. As well, those thousands of renters in the province who have applied for the renter assistance credit would be at risk if the principle involved in this motion were put forward.

I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, and urge the Assembly to protect the long-standing tradition and custom, protected by law, of the confidentiality of income tax returns.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments to Motion for a Return No. 165. First of all, we're really talking about a program that the Provincial Treasurer, in his update, indicates is going to cost in the neighborhood of \$680 million. That's a lot of money. I realize that there has been a long-standing practice that income tax records should be confidential, so a person who benefits from a tax credit may not have his name disclosed. On the other hand, a person who benefits from a direct expenditure of the government of Alberta sooner or later will have his name disclosed. As a matter of fact, public accounts will identify, name by name, all the people who receive direct expenditures of one kind or another. Whether it be a little plumbing firm in a small town or a major corporation, money which is expended by the government of Alberta will eventually be reported in the public accounts of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it will be the intention of my colleague and me to rephrase the question to at least find out whether, without breaching the confidentiality in naming companies, we can determine the number of operations where there have been subdivisions under this particular program, so we can have some idea of the dimension of the problem that we see, at any rate. But I would simply say to the members, Mr. Speaker, that one of the problems with the whole approach of special tax concessions, whatever their nature, is that whether it is money directly expended or taxes foregone, the fact of the matter is that there is the same hole in the provincial Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems we have to face is that where there would be a direct expenditure in the form of a grant — and we've had information in the past with respect to direct grants — there would be no question about this motion for a return being accepted. But with respect to a royalty tax credit, we have the government suddenly being able to use the confidentiality of income tax records to evade, in my judgment, the information about very large amounts of money, which the public has a right to know.

I simply serve notice to members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that it will be our intention to rephrase the question and bring it back in such a way that we will be able to find out how many. Perhaps we can do it by category. But I think it is fundamentally important that Albertans have a clear understanding of the dimension of the problem which the government itself, in August 1982,

found that it had to deal with. How successful they were in dealing with it awaits more information. While this motion for a return, with the composition of the House, is undoubtedly not going to be accepted, I simply serve notice that the quest for information which is basic to this motion for a return will go on. The minister in question, the Provincial Treasurer in this case, should not be surprised if several days down the road we have a slightly rephrased motion attempting to at least find out the information with respect to the operation of the program, which I think the public has a right to know.

[Motion lost]

MR. SPEAKER: Before going on to Motion 203, I was just going to express some concern about the reading of answers to questions on the Order Paper. Subject to other views that there might be on the point, it seems to me it's governed by Standing Order 32(2), which says:

The minister or member to whom the question is addressed shall hand the answer to the Clerk of the Assembly, who shall cause it to be printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

I don't know whether there are other considerations that I'm overlooking, but I just mention that to the Assembly so we may have it in mind the next time we are dealing with questions that have been placed on the Order Paper.

May I just add, too, that apparently it would seem — I certainly wasn't around when these *Standing Orders* were first drafted; they may go back to 1916 or before — that Standing Order 33 recognizes that to some extent, because there's provision there for a question requiring a very lengthy reply. Presumably the idea is to make it unnecessary to print a very lengthy reply in the Votes and Proceedings. It would seem to me that 32(2) and 33 perhaps fit together in that way.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on your point of order. The government recognizes the concern expressed by the Speaker relative to the questions. It was felt that very brief questions could be appropriately recorded by *Hansard* and appropriately inserted in Votes and Proceedings. But we will take your admonition to mind and, in the future when dealing with these matters, take into consideration your concerns and the rules as you've correctly pointed them out. But when very brief replies are made, we felt it was unnecessary to provide lengthy written responses.

MR. SPEAKER: Without wanting to prolong this small point, it seems that perhaps we are within the spirit of the *Standing Orders* if the answers are read and tabled as well. I wasn't aware that they were being tabled or handed to the Clerk. My observation, to the extent it went, was that the answers were being read instead of the tabling. But if both are being done, then I suppose we can't complain about the *Standing Orders*.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

203. Moved by Mr. Szwender:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the Attorney General to adopt the policy that in a case involving assault on a spouse, where it is considered that there is sufficient evidence to commence a prosecution, that it be commenced by the Crown and not by private prosecution.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I ask consent of the Assembly to amend Motion 203. The proposed change in the motion has been passed around to all members. I move to amend Motion 203 by adding the words "rigorously enforce" and dropping the word "adopt" from the original wording.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, a motion by a member to amend his own motion is subject to unanimous consent. Does the Assembly agree that the hon. member may amend Motion 203 in the manner he has suggested?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. SZWENDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion that I am about to begin debate on is a very timely issue of utmost concern throughout Canada but especially magnified in Alberta in the last 10 years, due to the large number of out-of-province migrants who have come to settle in this province. Many of these individuals and families came to Alberta to take advantage of the economic prosperity of this province. But due to the economic downturn in the last 18 months, many of the newcomers are among the unemployed or underemployed. Statistics for the motion for the year 1982 are still largely unavailable but, by past experience, we can only anticipate an escalating problem in relation to wife beating. We must come to grips with this problem immediately.

As all members have read the motion, I would like to just clarify a few things in particular with the amendment. Originally the wording of the motion could have led members to believe that the police were not in fact doing their job in enforcing the issue of wife beating. It's an extremely difficult problem to tackle and has been attempted at various levels, probably in all assemblies of the country, as well as in Ottawa. By adding the words "rigorously enforce", we are trying to clarify the position that the police are doing their job. In fact, by introducing this motion to the attention of the Attorney General, what we are hoping to do is have a uniform method of application throughout the province and, more importantly, to bring a greater public awareness of a rising and existing problem in our society.

Many jurisdictions have been applying the law. Again, the law that we are questioning here is wife beating. In any terms we would like to interpret it, it is still common assault. However, because of the complexity, because of the fact that it is usually of a domestic nature and difficult to ascertain all the evidence, sometimes the police are left uncertain as to which way to proceed. But there is no question that this problem, as I mentioned before, is on the rise.

I would like to present a number of arguments in order to bring as much evidence and factual information as possible to the members of the Assembly. I would like to start by referring to an article in the *Edmonton Journal*, as recently as Friday, March 18, considering the need for shelters for women who had been victims of wife beating in the community of Sherwood Park. Sherwood Park, I think, claims to be a middle or upper income residential area. It's euphemistically termed a bedroom suburb. It's managed to largely avoid multiple-family dwellings and has rather established a reputation as an elite community.

Yet statistically in 1981, which is the most recent, there were 124 complaints concerning wife beating in Sher-

wood Park alone. Of these 124 cases in the community of Sherwood Park, only two were successfully prosecuted. It is evident by this one simple example that these cases are not being uniformly prosecuted and are not being successfully dealt with in the courts.

As I mentioned earlier, this is a complex issue, and it's difficult to determine where to begin. I suspect there are a lot of views as to the problem at hand. Maybe we could begin by briefly speaking about the victims themselves. I've used the term "wife" because, statistically, 99.9 per cent of marital disputes in which a spouse is beaten involves the wife. Very, very few cases come to the attention of the courts in which the husband has been the victim. Certainly, the word "spouse" has been used in the motion so that it applies equally in either case.

Why is this such an important issue at this time? As I've mentioned before, because of Alberta's unique situation in having attracted so many transient, migrant laborers for so many years, we have a lot of social problems that have arisen from that type of population. The facts aren't always available specifically for Alberta. Many of them have to be ascertained for the whole country and then applied to [Alberta]. For example, last year 500,000 Canadian women — 10 per cent of women married or living common law — were battered by the men they lived with. If we assume that Alberta has approximately 10 per cent of the nation's population, we're looking at approximately 50,000 Alberta women who are being victimized by what we call wife beating.

Statistics go on and on. About a quarter of the divorce requests filed by women were on the grounds of physical cruelty. Eight of 10 women seeking shelters in transition homes in Canada had been beaten while they were pregnant. One of three residents in homes for battered women had been beaten weekly or daily. I think these statistics themselves verify our concern today.

What sources of information are we looking at? Mr. Speaker, I've primarily used a study done for the House of Commons by the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, chaired by MP Marcel Roy, which was completed and submitted in May 1982. It's entitled, *Report on Violence in the Family: Wife Battering*. Much of the evidence is substantiated by case studies in various transition homes throughout the country, eight in particular, which were studied by a number of academics and professionals who collected the evidence of which reports we have the results.

Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, I would just like to make a brief comment on the response of the House of Commons when this report was originally presented. I must say that it was a shameful spectacle to view the way our House of Commons responded when questions about this report were brought up during question period. NDP Member of Parliament Margaret Mitchell raised a question to the Minister of State (Status of Women), Judy Erola, on the question of battered wives. Certain members of the House sniggered, made derisive remarks, and there were various jokes. As such, the whole issue was not taken nearly as seriously as it should have been by those members. In fact, it took three days of prompting before there was unanimous approval to apologize from some of the members as to the remarks they made. I think that in itself — that the elected members of our House of Commons did not seriously respond to the issue at stake — is an indication that maybe all of us as Canadians should take a more serious look at this issue.

I'd like to go into the nature of wife battering itself. Possibly we should define the term wife battering. As I

mentioned earlier, we're talking about common assault. The Criminal Code is extremely clear on what common assault, or assault causing bodily harm, is. If you're accosted and physically contacted by anyone on the street, that is sufficient to lay charges of assault. Yet within the confines of a home, it seems that this law is completely disregarded. If we're questioning what you mean by assault, is it enough to just slap a wife with an open hand? Is it not serious enough if you only slug her lightly, or should we say a gentle kick? In none of these descriptions can we ignore the fact that an assault has taken place. Again, I'd like to emphasize my primary purpose for standing here and speaking on this issue today. That is, in my opinion, assault is assault; a marriage licence does not give a spouse the right to break the law, as seems to have been the case in the past.

Let me return to the question of wife battering. Some members may sit here listening and feel that, once in a while, a husband may push his wife, tell her to return to the kitchen sink or the children are making too much noise, and urge her with some kind of physical contact. But the results of the studies we have at our disposal indicate that this problem of assault is of a far more serious nature. I've already mentioned that great numbers of women who seek shelter in transition homes are pregnant women, many of whom said they had been brutally kicked in the stomach during their pregnancies. It seems that the period of pregnancy often brings out the most hostile reactions in males, due to a number of emotional transitions that may be taking place.

I'd just like to make reference to a very complete study done on wife battering and bring out some more statistics that would assure members that when we talk about wife battering, we're not talking about a simple push or slap, which alone is unacceptable; we're talking about much more serious physical attack.

31% of transition house residents who were asked how regularly they were beaten, answered that they were beaten weekly or daily, 26% were beaten at least once a month.

It seemed almost like a ritual that somehow these unfortunate individuals had to be beaten to keep their place.

Three of the [transition] houses also asked their residents how many times in total they had been beaten before. One house reported that 84% of its residents had been beaten at least eleven times

before they finally sought shelter.

The other two houses found that almost all their residents had been beaten many times before.

In about one-third of the cases, medical treatment was required and received.

That in itself is a clear indication of the seriousness.

Four houses queried their residents about medical treatment. Between 30% and 36% of the women asked, responded that they had required medical care [after beating].

In another study of a sample of 100 women, these results were recorded:

All had received the minimum of bruises, but 44 had also received lacerations of which 17 were due to attack with a sharp instrument such as a bottle, knife or razor. Twenty-six [of these women] had received fractures of nose, teeth or ribs and eight had fractures of other bones, ranging from fingers and arms to jaw and skull. Two had their jaws dislocated and two others had similar injuries to the shoulder. There was evidence of retinal damage in two women and one had an epilepsy [attack] as a result of her in-

juries. In 19 cases there were allegations that strangulation attempts had been made.

Often very difficult to prove as well, unless medical diagnosis is made.

Burns and scalds occurred in eleven and bites in seven cases. All women were attacked with the minimum of a clenched fist, but 59 claimed that kicking was a regular [added] feature. In 42 cases, a weapon was used, usually the first available object, but in 15 cases this was the same Object each time, eight being . . . with a [belt] buckle.

Before I get into too much of this, I think the picture of the nature of the problem becomes evident. Just as a final addition:

Of 107 reported murders in immediate families in Canada in 1975, the wife was killed by the husband in 49 cases, but the husband was killed by the wife in only 8.

This did not involve firearms. This involved some other method of homicide.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I think it's evident that we're talking about crimes committed in a public place, in a public building. Even in a pub, I have seen fights erupt over minor brushing against someone, followed by charges of assault. Yet here we have vicious attacks on supposedly loved ones going unprosecuted by the various police jurisdictions.

The final issue that should be considered in the importance of prosecution is that, in most cases, wife beating happens on a frequent or repeat basis. It would be fortunate if we could believe that a husband in anger or in a fit of emotion struck his wife, repented, and that was the end of it. But, Mr. Speaker, the sad truth is that this very, very seldom happens. Normally the wife is the victim of repeated and continuous beatings, and this is why it is so important that the law prosecute these people to make them aware that their actions will not go unattended.

In the last four years, of 805 cases dealt with by the women's shelter, Edmonton WIN House, in only one case — that's one out of 805 — was there a situation where a woman returned to the home and violence did not recur. So I think this clearly emphasizes the need to point out to these individuals that their actions will not be tolerated. And it's obvious by the repeat performances, by the repetitions, that these individuals have to be dealt with in a severe way.

If I could just briefly compare the attitudes of wife beating to that of child abuse — they may not be very good parallels, but I think we realize that in this province Social Services and Community Health wields a tremendous amount of power whenever there is suspicion of child abuse. Anonymous phone calls can be sufficient to have health care workers, social workers, check out the possibility that a child has been abused. In recent months we heard of some very prominent cases that have gained a lot of attention, where parents have had their children removed for cases of what could honestly be described or interpreted as discipline. Yet when we're talking about wives or women who are victims of insensitive husbands, we're talking about constant beatings and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the members of the Assembly what they would do if, just walking along the street, they came across an individual, a man, beating, hitting, accosting, or dragging a woman. How many of us would consider it none of our business and walk idly by, ignoring this? I think, as dutiful citizens, we would all consider it an important action to get involved. But what if the

reply of the individual, of the male, was: get lost; it's none of your business; she's my wife. Why should that matter? Why should it matter that because a woman happened to be married to this individual, he should have the right to call her "my wife", as if he was referring to a canine, and treat her as if the law did not apply in this situation? Clearly we cannot allow this situation to go unattended.

I'd like to briefly refer to the type of men who engage in wife beating. Are these really men? I only refer to these individuals as men to identify gender. In the chauvinistic sense of the word, a real man would hardly violate the code of chivalry, which obviously prohibits preying on the weak or helpless but defends them and their rights. Who are we talking about? Are we talking about hairy beasts with loin cloths, jumping around on their haunches with clubs? Unfortunately, we're not. We're talking about individuals who live next door, individuals we work with, individuals we may be totally unsuspecting of. Who are these mental pygmies, these neanderthals? We're talking about cowards, Mr. Speaker, engaging in very cowardly acts.

It would be fortunate if we could believe that it happens in isolated cases, that the perpetrators of these crimes are people of lower incomes, people with poor educational backgrounds, people who, possibly because of poor family backgrounds themselves, are accustomed to this type of behavior. But the sad truth of it is, through the various studies I have cited, that it is not only these individuals who are involved in what we call wife beating, who are victimizing their wives. Of cases reported, only 25 per cent involved husbands who were unemployed. The other 75 per cent were gainfully employed, about half of whom would consider themselves in the frame of reference as laborers.

However, there is one particular set of facts that were especially disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker; that is, in a study done in Manitoba, it was found that

wife batterers were disproportionately represented in three occupations — truck-driver, police officer and [medical] doctor.

This may indicate individuals who are used to being authority figures, but certainly we could hardly call them individuals who come from lower income, poor educational backgrounds or are insensitive to the plight of their fellow human beings.

In conclusion, we must realize that wife battering is not restricted to lower income groups, but that women in middle and upper income groups are often victims as well. The only thing is that quite often these women in the middle and upper income brackets feel a much greater social stigma in reporting this. They would rather go about it their own way; maybe they have means available financially to leave the home and seek divorce either on those grounds or on other grounds. Obviously people of lower income are not as well educated in dealing with these problems themselves. But it doesn't matter; a beating is a beating.

As I was saying in conclusion, we have to consider that if the women themselves helped authorities, we could probably come to prosecute these cases much more successfully. But in most cases, the woman tends to blame herself, at least in the beginning. Even when the police are called, usually on a complaint from the neighbors or maybe even one of the members of the family, the police arrive and very, very seldom do they actually encounter the beating or the assault taking place. As such, they must go strictly on their own observations or depend upon the witness or testimony of those present. Usually

that involves the wife. Normally the police try to calm the situation down. Again there is a lot of problem with educating the police into believing that this is not strictly a domestic argument, but is also a strict breach of the law.

However that may be, what usually happens is that, in anger, the woman will agree to file an assault charge, and the police will file a report. But the real problem comes in the convictions. A day or so later, the husband may become a little bit repentant; he may sober up. He may try to make up with his wife, and usually he manages to convince his wife not to appear in court and testify against him. So it's very difficult to get convictions.

In the jurisdictions in Canada, particularly in Manitoba and some communities in Ontario, the police are finding a much greater success rate of indictment by getting sufficient evidence from the police report or the testimony of the investigating police officers, even if the wife at a future time refuses to appear or changes her mind about appearing in court as a witness. Again, this is something that the Attorney General's Department should seriously consider in our own province.

Where do the solutions lie? Well, I have four solutions that we may consider. First of all, as we mentioned before, prosecuting men engaged in wife beating should be pursued by all police jurisdictions on an equal basis. This is where the Attorney General's Department would come in very importantly. Society should change its attitude. It is not just a private family affair, which many men maintain at the present time. Assault is assault, and we should recognize it for that fact. Wives should not have to be made to testify in cases against their husbands. A police report, police observations, and police evidence would be sufficient to obtain a conviction.

Public awareness: a much greater program of educating the public must be undertaken. Many women believe that they are the only victims of wife beating, and so in shame they hide their case. But we know from statistics that at least 10 per cent of women in Canada are victims of wife beating, so women should realize that they are not alone and that they can find support from our society. Schools would be another important starting point in educating this society. Another group that may find this possible is Crime Stoppers, where anonymity is guaranteed, where neighbors could possibly report cases of assault, wife beating.

Proper funding for transition homes. We realize the difficulty in finding funding for everything. But the problem is that 45 per cent of Canadian women live in areas without access to a transition home, especially in rural areas, where a woman may have no opportune way and may often have to go into another jurisdiction which feels that it is not responsible for a woman coming from another community. So no minimum level of poverty should be necessary to gain admittance. Any woman should find access, and the government, as well as private groups, should endeavor to find the proper funding to facilitate the help and need of these unfortunate people.

Finally, number four, the police should be more capably trained to deal with assault without shrugging it off as a family dispute. We realize that it's difficult, and the police have many duties. But possibly by upgrading and educating the police in this problem, they would be able to deal with it much more efficiently. An excellent example is the Vancouver police force, where a specially trained group of police officers is on duty during the hours when most assaults take place, and that's between five o'clock and midnight. This squad is sent out to

homes whenever that type of complaint is made.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I think the important thing is that we have recognition of this problem by all members and, secondly, a change in attitude for all members of our society, both men and women.

MR. MARTIN: First of all, I'd like to commend the Member for Edmonton Belmont for bringing this issue up. It certainly is appropriate at this particular time. I think he did an excellent job of laying out the problem.

Knowing this Bill was coming up, I gave a call to the Attorney General's Department in Manitoba, because they've recently — I think three months ago — realized that they had a serious problem in Manitoba. He did issue a directive, very much following this motion, to the police and Crown attorneys to crack down on assault on spouses and, wherever possible, to commence prosecutions. Talking to his executive assistant today, they feel it's really too early to determine how successful the program is. I'm glad the Member for Edmonton Belmont talked about spouse assault, because two women have been charged in Manitoba since they started this. The reasons they looked into it: they saw that they had a problem; of course, they were getting pressure; and finally the government there did react to the pressure.

One of the things they looked at, of course, was the federal report that the hon. member referred to. But there is a very interesting pilot project in London, Ontario. I don't know if the hon. member has seen that. This is money that the Ontario government put in to look into the problem and to see what would happen if they did increase prosecution. So they brought it out as a pilot project in Windsor, very much following the amendment the member is talking about.

The totals that have come out of that are very interesting. For instance, in 1979 only 3 per cent of the total assaults on spouses were prosecuted. I expect our average without prosecution would be somewhat similar to Windsor. In 1982, after a directive of this sort, where the police were told to move in and prosecute wherever they could, 88 per cent of the cases were prosecuted. So it went from 3 per cent to 88 per cent from 1979 to 1982.

Now the results — and again we'd have to go and monitor these ongoing in Windsor — are very interesting. As a result, when spouses were talked to later, 62 per cent said that assaults on them were either significantly reduced or terminated. So obviously in that case — they came to the conclusion in Windsor, at least, that the police prosecuting and the Attorney General's Department pushing prosecutions did have an effect.

So the Manitoba people have gone into this since then. They are encouraged. When I talked to the executive assistant, there certainly were more cases being prosecuted. They certainly don't have the results that they do in London, but time will tell, in a year or two, how successful the Manitoba program has been.

One thing they did say, and you can't blame the police — the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont has talked about it — is that if you talk to any policeman, the thing they hate doing most of all is interfering in a family dispute. I understand there are statistics that indicate when police get shot. The time they get shot most often is interfering in domestic disputes. So it's not an easy problem for them.

In Manitoba they recognized — and the police brought this up to them — that they have problems. What they have done is given the police resource contacts. These are people, psychologists, that the police can get hold of.

Because as the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont indicated, the men who are assaulting women are the ones who have problems. Often they realize it at a certain point. Rather than the police just hauling them away, they're trying to give them resources where they can seek help themselves. This is information that the police have and make accessible to people.

In Manitoba they just formed what they call committees on life abuse. These committees generally are of battered spouses, but with some professional people like psychologists and social workers. Of course their role is to advise the government, but also to be involved for people. As the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont pointed out, most often these women want to leave, and then they back off. If as MLAs you've had cases, you'll know that it can be very frustrating. In one case I know of in Edmonton that's been in touch with our office, she's backed off about four times. If we had a committee like this, we could put her in touch with it. It's people who have actually gone through this and know exactly what she's going through.

They have also set up a series of what they call safe homes. It's similar to WIN, but they've gone into it in many more instances across the province so that women like this, who are scared to begin with and just don't know what they should do, have a place looked after by the committee on life abuse where they can go and know they will be safe. The other thing they've done there, similar to what we've done — and we've done some excellent work in child abuse in this province with the hotline — is that they have a volunteer hotline for assault on spouses. They're trying a number of programs in Manitoba. It would be interesting to monitor them and see how they work in a year or two.

I support this private member's Bill and hope the Attorney General will take a good look at it, because I think it is a good first step. If the experience of just prosecuting — if I can go back, if the experience of Windsor, Ontario, has any bearing on what we're doing in Alberta, I think it would be very significant. I think the Member for Edmonton Belmont did an excellent job showing the problem. As he put it, I think we have to get away from these crimes. In the House, we've talked about rape and wife battering and recognize that assault is assault.

The point we're making is that whether you're assaulting the person you're married to or living with, or whether one male is assaulting another, it is still assault and should be treated in that regard. If we follow the motion the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont brought in, I think this would at least be a first step in curbing a very serious social problem we have in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the Member for Edmonton Belmont for bringing this issue forward in the House. I would like to make a few comments relative to this issue.

First of all, I'd like to give a little background history relevant to the policing of battered women in Calgary. Some 15 to 20 years ago the police did lay charges against spouses who battered their wives. However, there seemed to be some difficulty in concluding these cases and changes were made to the policies of the police department, apparently at the direction of a senior judge because of no-shows. Many women would not follow up their charges or come as witnesses. Also, at the time they were not subpoenaing witnesses in attending to the co-

urts. In many cases, the charges were dropped altogether by pressure from the family or because of a change of heart in pursuing the charge. However, over the last number of years the incidence of wife beatings has become astronomical and, to say the least, of very, very large concern to the community at large. Much pressure has been placed on politicians and others to see a correction of this incidence.

To follow through, in the latter part of last year the Calgary police commission did change their policy, where in fact the police have returned to charging wife beaters. In the interim between 15 to 20 years ago and last year, the charging of the husband was left up to the wife. Of course in many cases, after a period of cooling down, the wife did not pursue that charge.

The police in Calgary may charge the participant in one of two ways: firstly, by issuing an appearance notice for an assault deemed relatively minor — at the time of the police attendance, one participant in the assault is encouraged to seek additional or other accommodation, at least temporarily, until a resolution of the problem is corrected — or by an immediate arrest by the attending officers if it is felt that the assault or violence would continue on the woman.

In both cases now, the participants in the assault — both the person being battered and the person doing the battering — are subpoenaed to appear in court. Additionally, pictures may be taken of the injuries of the battered woman as evidence. Where there are no visible injuries, the police will endeavor to take the battered woman to a hospital and get a statement from a doctor as to the extent of those injuries.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, some years ago the Calgary police department placed a crisis unit as part of the ongoing service to the needs of the public. The reason for the unit was to assist police in dealing with social problems they run into on a day-to-day basis in efforts to deal with domestic concerns. It gives them some professional assistance, cooling off the circumstance to which they were initially called, and frees up police officers to do other duties. In Calgary, police training emphasizes crisis intervention of domestic problems. I must say that the police service in Calgary does a commendable job under difficult conditions in dealing with the many, many social/domestic concerns they have to deal with in the community.

Mr. Speaker, some 20 per cent of all Canadian homicides are the result of one spouse killing the other, more in particular — as has already been mentioned — the man killing the wife. I ask, why should women and children live in fear of a husband or a man who continually threatens their existence by either a beating or a killing? Why should society, led by those people who represent all the people of the province, not give proper protection and identification to women and children for their needs and concerns about being beaten up by a bully? Yes, a bully; a cowardly, gutless wonder.

Much of our culture defines wife beating as a private individual concern and problem, not necessarily a criminal assault. What's the matter with our society? Are we as government too darned chauvinistic to identify common problems of women and children? If a man assaults a person on a street, that is a criminal assault. Why is it not a criminal assault when the same animal may go into a home and beat up his wife and kids or, for that matter, maim them for life or kill them? I suggest "animal" because that is exactly what many of these people are.

There are some suggestions that women do not proper-

ly protect themselves and children to change the situation. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately many women tend to be intimidated and overly dominated by a spouse. Fear of losing that traditional model of the family, foregoing for her and her children some comforts and necessities, is usually on the mind of the battered female. Sudden initiatives on her part to separate a relationship either in the short-term or permanently become a very, very difficult task to undertake. Where do they go? How do they survive, especially where there has been much movement of many people from other parts of this country, and they have nobody here?

Women also fear retaliation of the removed spouse wherein greater violence may happen to that wife or child. It is evident that many times women leave their spouse because of being battered or otherwise, and men become vindictive and wish to pursue and continually harass and batter that spouse. Why don't women come forward and say to the police or the courts, I have been beaten? Unfortunately many women feel embarrassed. And yes, they have pride. They don't want the world to know that they have been beaten.

Where are women's rights and where do we put their dignity? Do we place them under the table? If such is the case, let's re-evaluate that position, get them on top of the table, and make these women proud to be a part of our community again. We continually suggest that the police have to go in and clean up messes. Many times the police go in and they are unprotected. Unfortunately most of the assault cases — and I think we should address that word "assault" because it is common assault — are heard in a family court rather than in a criminal court. The existing laws are seldom equitably applied.

I think that in bringing this forward, the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont has brought an issue that our Attorney General will undoubtedly review, and maybe review the legislation. Maybe we have to put some teeth into our laws. If it is a federal jurisdictional problem, we need to lobby our MPs and ensure that they also put forward the views of these poor battered women and/or children.

Many of these women who are being beaten are not necessarily of the lower income range. It is so far-reaching in our community that the financial situation is not necessarily a factor. These beatings do not happen in an instant. It is usually an issue that has developed over a period of time within the household, or there has been a number of batterings during a period of time.

What are the solutions? Mr. Speaker, I don't have all the solutions and I'm certain that all members in this House do not have all the solutions. Possibly collectively and intelligently, with some feeling towards this concern, we may be able to develop those solutions to assist these people. We have a great opportunity to do so here. We may be able to develop options for the courts to address when a guilty finding is made. We may be able to develop better programs to deal with women's issues of this nature. We may be able to develop programs to deal with the economic security and independence of the battered woman. Maybe we should treat battered women's complaints similar to those of child abuse, because they certainly have a common place.

More shelters for these women are a necessity, especially in our larger urban communities. Here's where the planning of our communities comes into place, because in some cases the way we plan encourages this sort of thing just by the social atmosphere we create. In some of these urban areas, we don't create family homes; we create

jungles. People's attitudes become cannibalistic through those jungles we create.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would just like to encourage our members to have our Attorney General review this legislation and his directions to our various police departments and commissions in the province. The women of this province, as in other parts of this country and/or the world, need protection from those people that I've called cowardly, gutless wonders. These are the people who feel they have to go out and beat women and children to feel as if they are a man. I suggest to this House that those people are not men; they are cowardly, gutless wonders.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, rising to speak to Motion 203, the first comment I'd make as a member whose now entering his third term is that I continue to be impressed with the calibre of people Albertans send to this Legislature to represent them. We have the Member for Edmonton Belmont, a man elected for the first time, who obviously believes that he's reflecting the views of constituents in sponsoring a motion like this that's so important in society today. Then we have two other members, the Member for Edmonton Norwood who has added to the debate, and particularly the Member for Calgary McCall who has spoken so eloquently as to how he perceives the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin discussion somewhat at odds with the comments made by the mover of the motion. First of all, he indicates that two of the three largest single categories who are guilty of this act of abuse, assault, or battering of wives are indeed the very people who, according to all the evidence — and heaven knows, there's no end of evidence — these battered women turn to for help: the policeman on the one hand, and the medical practitioner on the other. What hope is there if the very people they turn to are the primary cause of the assault in the first place? Perhaps members should think very deeply about that. In reading the evidence published by the committee of the House of Commons, I don't know where that leaves the truck driver. One should be a little patient in accusing the truck driver without perhaps recognizing the evidence or the incidence of what happens while he's away from home. I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the observation that the Member for Edmonton Norwood pointed out that there's evidence indicating that one in every 10 spouses — I think he said wives — is the victim of assault, assault being a hostile or violent attack on the body. I've read studies subsequent to that that say one in three. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that one has to be very careful about accepting evidence. If indeed it's one in three, then 3,000 of the 9,000 female voters of my constituency of Lethbridge West are battered, and I have some difficulty reconciling that number.

However, without arguing as to the numbers, there's no question that the figures are impressive. They're impressive to the point that one would think anything, any problem, where 10 per cent are affected should get priority. If that's not true, then we're sure wasting our time talking about unemployment in Canada which, since it passed the one in 10 mark, has been a number one priority with many political parties in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there's no question in the views of all of us, in the eyes of all Albertans, that citizens, married or not, must be protected, should be protected, and have the

right to be protected from assault on the body. Surely there's no question about that.

When do these incidents happen? That might be important. I don't see it in the evidence, but I believe the majority happen in the home. They don't happen in public. I think if one looks at some specific cases of those who are admitted to WIN House in Edmonton — which, as members may be aware, stands for "Women In Need" — you find invariably that alcohol is involved in almost all the cases. I haven't heard a comment today on the results of alcohol. I haven't heard any comment about the fact that we generate a quarter of a billion dollars profit.

Is that a factor? I think we should reflect on that. I think we should be reflecting on the causes and not just the act. I think we should reflect on the symptoms of the causes and not just the results. How significant are booze and doctors' prescriptions, the Valium and the Librium and the rest of them that alter people's minds? I don't think it's sufficient only to consider the fact that people beat people.

We're not particularly proud in Canada to have incarcerated the highest number per capita in the western world. I don't think we're proud of that. Does that mean that we have good law and order? I think it means we have effective police forces. It may say something about the number of laws we put on our books. There are some people who believe that if the law doesn't work, make a new one. Looking back, I think we all have experience of when it was illegal for 16-year-olds to smoke. We know what happened to that: a law that's not respected because the law is not enforceable.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like to harp on alcohol. It seems to me that in some people's views I become associated with the subject. The fact remains that every Albertan over 15 in this great province of ours drinks 799 bottles of beer a year. That's a fact. After dinner we may throw our food scraps in the garbage, but I question whether we ever pour any booze down the drain. In other words, when we sell some 50-odd million gallons of booze, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I think it's consumed. And when it's consumed, certain things happen to the human body and mind. I think the results of that indeed affect the subject we're talking about.

There's no question that if one looks at matters such as unemployment, it becomes a very difficult, traumatic time within the family. A man who's accustomed to going to work day after day has the respect of his family and others. Once he loses his job, he certainly loses a high degree of respect. There's strong evidence indicating that those with alcohol problems are prepared to lose their house or family, all their assets, but the most dramatic thing that affects them is the loss of their job. So one can appreciate that when a man loses his job he loses a tremendous amount, and many things can happen. I think one can begin to understand why, through tough economic times, there's a dramatic increase not only in the incidence of breaking and entering, theft, and robberies, but in physical abuse of other people. A case was made that only one in four of the battering cases is the result of unemployment or connected with unemployed people. I don't care if it's one in 10. It's too many.

Reference was made that how could anybody on Jasper Avenue not interfere with someone beating someone else. I remember like yesterday some 30 years ago on a street in Toronto — Yonge Street, I think; one of their pure streets — outside a pub where a man and woman were fighting. A friend of mine came upon them. We were with the military and we were in Toronto on some parachute

exercise. I recall vividly what happened.

This veteran of World War II, a super guy, went to break it up. He was six months in hospital with a fractured skull and multiple concussions that only high, spike heels can inflict. He tried to break up this incident that he viewed as battering. Not only did he suffer dramatically through a long period of hospitalization, but indeed he was sentenced to 18 months in jail for helping. One should be very cautious, and begin to recognize that while it may be noble to interfere, one should be very careful for one's own sake. Fortunately in this province we have the Crimes Compensation Board and, if one can justify that a crime was committed, there could be some compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a moment to look at our society to try to understand the symptoms and the cause of the problem. We're in the instant society. I would venture to say that in three-quarters or more of all the homes in Alberta, the first action that's taken upon entering the home is turning on the television set. It's to try to get into that other world, that fantasy world. People aren't real anymore. We put a man on the moon, we talk to him, and we bring him home. In Calgary, one of the greatest cities in North America, I suspect not five out of 10 people know their next-door neighbor. Is it any wonder we've become an impersonal society?

It's like a fellow named Joe — some of you may have heard this before, and I ask your indulgence — who was married, had eight children and three jobs; it was all he could do to support them. He said to himself: my gosh, if we have another youngster, that's it, I'm finished, I'll do away with myself. By and by his wife informed him about what she thought was good news and he thought was bad news: a ninth child was arriving. There he is out in the woods, a noose around his neck, standing on a box, and about to step off, when a little voice in his mind says: Joe, are you sure you're hanging the right man?

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes we're prepared in our anxiety to resolve what we view as an individual and societal problem and want the government to solve that problem. We now have one policeman for every 550 people in this city. We equate it with the same number of physicians. Lethbridge is one in 700. The inference is that if we're prepared to have one for every 200, we'll solve the problem. Well let's go to the people and ask them for another \$200 on their house taxes, because that is the saw-off. If we expect, Mr. Speaker, to have more and more people available to solve what I believe are essentially community problems, society problems, not only do I think that's the way to go, but let's have the courage to go out to the people and say, pay for it. I don't think we're prepared to do that. Certainly our municipal politicians aren't — at least not this year.

What is the role of our society, Mr. Speaker? I think it's interesting to spend a minute and view that. I attend four school board meetings in my community a year as a citizen — a budget of some \$20 million and 7,000 students in one district. I'm the only one there. I'm the only one attending. If that's not apathy, Mr. Speaker, what is it? We've all heard the saying that one fellow said to the other: do you realize that the two biggest single problems in society today are apathy and ignorance; what do you think of that? The other fellow said, I don't know, and I don't care. That, I think, is indicative of many people's attitudes. We've reached the point where we think government can solve everything.

Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity as an Albertan and a member of this Assembly — I look at the trends. I

look at the Gaming Commission report just published: some \$200 million gaming. That's not lotteries. Lotteries are something else. The profit of lotteries is \$16 million; never mind what the gross is. That tells you about people's priorities. Some 1,300,000 voters spend about \$550 a year in booze. Does that tell you something about our priorities? I am told the third largest seller in one of our major food stores is pet food. That tells you our priorities. If we think that much about other things, how do we have time to think about our fellow man?

I am not surprised at some of these statistics. I am not surprised that every second day in Edmonton there is either a rape or a sexual assault on a woman, and only one in 10 is reported. I am not surprised at that. What I am surprised at, Mr. Speaker, is the total apathy of a community. If you change a dog by-law, they will march on city hall 10,000 strong, yet when they see their citizens being assaulted, they write the odd letter to the editor. That's the extent of it.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is not going to change society. It's a question of people's personal choices. It seems to me that we somehow manage to think George should do everything; someone else should do everything. I went to a local school in my community and talked to a 25-year-old schoolteacher. I think she has 23 or 24 students in grade 4, and eight of them are problems. Instead of going home at four o'clock, she got on the telephone and phoned the parents. From six of the eight parents, there was no answer. The seventh parent really lit into her, because her youngster was fine. Needless to say, a teacher is not going to do that forever. That tells you something about our society, and that tells you something about the attitudes of our citizens. Here we are, seeing the very result of that kind of thing, thinking that if we only enforce the law, we will solve the problem; if we only hire more policemen, we'll solve the problem; if we only spend more money, we'll solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues in this House that speeches are fine, but I sure don't see things changing. If people want suggestions — and I admire the Member for Calgary McCall for suggesting. One shouldn't criticize unless they are able to suggest alternatives or action. I have long believed that until we suffer very severe economic depression, we really won't be concerned about our fellow man until we're in the same boat. But let's say I'm wrong — I've got a hunch a lot of people hope I'm wrong, especially those that play the market — what can we do now? Well we can do one thing with that press gallery. Lord Thompson of Fleet, his definition of the news was something you put between the display ads. The press, for all its freedom, could publish — how often has it published? — court actions. That could have a dramatic impact on people. I don't see it happening. To me, that would be a very positive step. But you don't criticize the fourth estate, the third estate, the second estate, or any other estate unless you advertise.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue I feel strongly and sympathetically about. I want to close with this comment. A government can do many things: it can raise funds and it can spend funds. But it cannot change the basic will of society. Let us not finish this debate today on the understanding that we're going to come to a conclusion because of a few speeches and a few actions, that this government or any other government is going to change society. Mr. Speaker, it takes two: you and I. It takes two to love, to hate, and to fight. Until we as citizens of this country have that understanding. I really don't see any change.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's a tough act to follow.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, somebody just said "that's a tough act to follow", and it really is. I think there was a lot of food for thought for all of us in what the Member for Lethbridge West said. However, I am sure that the points he threw out are open to debate, and I think that from now on you will hear some debate on his concerns. While I looked around the Assembly and saw that everybody was sitting quite spellbound, listening attentively to what he said, I am sure there is a little feeling of uneasiness, along with a feeling of hopelessness, in what we can do regarding this problem. Or is it our responsibility as members of the Legislature?

I think one of the most important points of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs of the House of Commons when they were given their mandate in 1981 is very important, because at that time they had the task of studying the prevention, identification, and treatment of abused persons which, very nicely phrased, was called the abused persons involved in intra-family violence, commonly known as battered wives. It was certainly hoped their publishing of this report would, number one, contribute to a much greater understanding of the problem; number two, [provide] a little better protection and assistance to the victims. So I think today that if we go no further than to feel that we, in our way, have met that first objective — to contribute a little bit more to each and every one of our understanding of this problem — I think that will have achieved something.

I think it's interesting to note that the motion was introduced by the Member for Edmonton Belmont. I congratulate him for bringing this before the Assembly. The other speakers have all been men. I think that's an important factor. Not that any of us have any trouble in realizing and appreciating that we're vitally concerned in our own constituencies and across this province about problems that relate to men and women, but I think, unfortunately, there is sometimes a bit of a public perception, for various reasons, that there are some social issues that are not of concern to us in this Legislature.

I understand that the issue of emergency shelters has been debated in this Legislature previous to this. But at no time in the past has the issue of battered wives been before this Legislature. So I do think it's an appropriate topic the member has introduced for us to, hopefully, look at all the implications. I do believe that that federal report is an excellent starting ground for most of the members here, to pick up and read and understand what their mandate was about, and then see how they go about it.

I'm not quite certain if I agree with the Member for Edmonton Belmont in his interpretation of what happened in the House of Commons. I say that not having read the actual debate, so someone else can take me to task on that point. To me, it could well have happened that there might have been some laughter when the topic was introduced, but it may have been a private joke. It may not have been totally related to the circumstance. I do think that there are times in this Assembly when we are discussing a very important and serious matter and we manage to see some humor in something in regard to that circumstance. I'm not sure that the Members of Parliament can really be taken to task for feeling that they are not sympathetic to such an important issue.

It's been stated many times today that there is an approximate statistic that one in 10 of the women that live with men will be battered. I suppose for anybody

that's had contact with anybody in this circumstance, it doesn't really matter what the statistics are. All you have to do is see one woman, with or without children, in a battered state and see the total dismay, anguish, and suffering — possibly physical, but probably mental — that she is going through.

As a nurse, I've had the experience of caring for somebody on an emergency ward. The irony of the whole story, which I never will forget, is that she was brought to the hospital in a taxicab with her child. Finally, after I had looked after the woman and the doctor was attending to her, I said to the taxi driver, are you waiting to be paid? You can leave now; it's not necessary for you to stand around. He said, well, I'm the husband. It was all I could do to carry on a conversation with the man. I thought, what warm compassion. After he beats her up, he at least has the decency to bring her to the hospital in his taxicab. However, the ending of that particular story: after seeing that the physical needs of the patient were met — it took a little while to cope with the mental anguish and the emotional problems at that time — she went off. I asked her where she would be going, whether it would be to friends. Did she have any family, or did she have any money so she could go to a hotel or motel? She said, of course not; I'm going back home.

So it was pretty disillusioning to think that while you may have helped somebody in an emergency situation and had some satisfaction in that — this happened in a small town, so for many years later I often wondered if I wouldn't run into the situation again, or I wouldn't be able to find out exactly what did happen to that woman and how many times she had to go through this experience. So I don't really think statistics matter as to the number we're talking about. I think it's just tragic that it happens to a few.

The Member for Edmonton Belmont also mentioned the point of view that the problem has increased due to the in-migration to this province. Of course that basically is true. We have had a lot of people coming into Alberta in the last few years. But I really don't like to just associate the problem with the in-migration. I think the problem was here years ago. While it may have increased the number of cases, unless that can be proven, I don't think that's the only reason for it. I think there are certain other reasons why the problem has increased. There's just basically more people here.

Interestingly enough, you have to look back, and what the report says is, why do men behave in such a violent manner? It's very interesting, because they don't seem to say it's necessarily because there's a drinking problem, because he's lost his job, or some of the other reasons we might associate this problem with. One of the reasons is that he has seen abuse as a child. That abuse is either his father abusing his mother, or that he himself has been abused as a child. They feel that this is one of the main reasons for the abuse being carried on.

Another interesting reason is the traditional views about a man's and a woman's place in a domestic relationship. This encourages a person who is predisposed to abuse to strike his wife just because of that environment. Another reason which is interesting is the effect of pornographic literature. The example given is that basically there is a love object, such as a woman, who is generally depicted in some violent situation. I don't see any knowledgeable looks on the men's faces around the Legislature at this time. Oh, there's one. I wasn't sure if there was any truth in that statement or not. But I thought that was an interesting fact, that they do feel that has some bearing

on the reasons why men are violent in the home and not elsewhere, out on the street.

It appears that this is not an abnormal phenomenon but is bound up in beliefs and feelings which are present in our society and which are not easily understood or erased. I believe, in all sincerity, that's probably what the Member for Lethbridge West was alluding to. However, it's a very complex issue. I think this has been brought out today by the other speakers. Everybody seems to be just a little bit helpless in this circumstance. I mentioned my own feeling of helplessness in an emergency ward. The police seem to be a little bit helpless when they're called out to what is described as a domestic problem. What can they do?

The Member for Calgary McCall indicated the action that is taken now by the city police in Calgary — and I also believe that is happening in Edmonton — which hopefully is a step in the right direction. If that is what is necessary, the charges should be laid, because I believe he also gave the reason — and it's well documented now — that unfortunately the women either do not know how or will not bring charges or follow through on the charges.

I suppose, to a rational being, it is hard to understand why this wouldn't happen, but if you can only be empathetic and put yourself in the shoes of that person and try to deal with all the other problems that are probably going on in her life — the care of the children, money. It's very, very real when you don't have any money. One solution to this problem is that the legislation should be looked at so the man has to leave the home. I thought, what a simple solution. Why is it that the woman and the children have to be the ones to leave? Why isn't it the man that is taken away from the home when the abuse happens or continues to happen?

There have been many references today to the child abuse program, and I think it just points out that we want to be more involved in the issues in society and many of the solutions that appear to be working very well in regard to that program, a public media program to bring it to the attention of the public in general. How many of us struggle in our own lives when we know there's a severe, personal marital problem with a friend? You quite often think, should I get involved; how do I get involved; isn't it best to say nothing? Things will work out; let them work it out.

So it's very difficult when you have a social conscience and you want to use that, or how you're going to use it. I just say that in the past it hasn't always been easy to be the one who would report a wife beating, particularly, as time goes on, if that person definitely says, well, let's leave it for now; it'll be all right. That's what's so sad: when there's so little support for them outside to realize that maybe now is the time to take some action.

I believe it was the Member for Edmonton Norwood who mentioned one of the programs in Manitoba where there is a co-ordination of services. That's probably another idea that should be looked at because I think it's very, very difficult, particularly if the woman has primarily been in the home raising the family, a homemaker who has not been out in the business world or has no idea what services are available. She has no idea how to contact them, and if she has no money, she probably has no understanding that some of those services are free. So I think she needs some type of counselling or help to show her which of the services would be available to her.

As you know, we are fortunate in Alberta. In 1981, the Department of Social Services and Community Health gave \$2 million to emergency shelters in this province.

Calgary and Edmonton, of course, had emergency shelters, but now they have expanded to some of the other centres in Alberta. Tragically enough, the spaces are not always available. There's just not enough room. Calgary is now in the process of having a second emergency shelter built. The one in Calgary states that the problem is not just one of arrest and charging when there is wife battering, but what to do with the violent man as a follow-up.

I think one thing that's very significant — if we do nothing else but come out of this debate today, hopefully you will realize what a very initial stage we're at in coping with this problem. Because really we are reacting to the immediate situation and trying to solve some very basic problems for the people involved, mainly the wife and children. How sad; we haven't even gotten around to looking at the basic problem. And isn't that a good point about there being some follow-up for a man if he is charged, and according to a lot of the information, many men are not charged or the charges are very, very light.

There is one program at the Calgary General hospital in the forensic unit. That's a volunteer batterers' group. In this program, the men meet once a week. There are 17 men at the present time, and they talk in a self-help group. The only outside person, of course, is a professional counsellor involved in this program. Periodically, they do check with the spouse to see if the battering has not occurred again. In fact some battered women have made it a condition that before there will be a reconciliation with their husbands, they must attend a volunteer group like this one.

Another very unique program that occurs in Calgary is called Discovery House. This is more or less what is known as a second-stage program, because the temporary shelters have a limited time that people are permitted to stay there. Generally it's about three weeks in that shelter, and therein lies the problem. The problem may be solved in three weeks, but it may not be solved. So at Discovery House they're offered a protected environment for a woman and her children, and they can stay for a period between two and six months. During this time, a woman has a chance to build her self-esteem so that in case she decides to return to her husband, hopefully she will be able to cope a little better with the situation.

While all I've managed to do in the short time I've been speaking is also allude to and identify some of the problems and concerns, I think we have to get the message across, particularly to the public, that it is a multifaceted problem, therefore the solutions are not always going to be easy. But I do think this government has taken many a step to assist in this problem, mainly through the financing of the emergency shelters.

It's also interesting to look at some of the other services that are offered through the Department of Social Services and Community Health. We wonder how many of the public know about the family maintenance and court services, the family planning services, the family and community support services. We in this Legislature know the amount of money we put into those programs, and I wonder how much the public knows about them, or if they really feel that money from all those programs — if you notice, every one of those programs is family-oriented. Isn't this a family problem we're talking about today? So maybe we should be making people more aware of what services are available, and if we feel that some of this money should be directed toward this specific concern, one thing we can do is go out into our constituencies and find out where the problem is or what

others see as the solution to the problem.

I urge that you give consideration today to the motion and to the amendment to the motion.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that the mover of the motion has brought to the floor of the Assembly a very interesting motion and, in terms of the discussion this afternoon, I think the attentiveness of the members is testimony to the fact that the care and concern is there on behalf of all the Assembly. So, Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that this evening, when the House reassembles at eight o'clock, the Committee of Supply will deal further with capital projects estimates and the supplementary estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund; then, if time permits, to resume the throne speech debate. I would therefore move that when the House reassembles this evening, it do so in Committee of Supply, and the House stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that when the members reconvene at eight o'clock, they'll be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Then the Assembly stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

Before we leave, might I just mention two things. If hon. members will, this evening, leave their copies of the *Standing Orders* on their desks, the Parliamentary Counsel and his helpers will insert the new sheets which have been printed as a result of the amendment that was made some days ago, I believe particularly in regard to *Standing Orders* 7 and 8.

The other item is that I was surprised to learn that some hon. members were not aware that the proposed supper with the legislative interns that had been intended for this evening had been cancelled. I thought that that word had gotten around, possibly a month ago, but perhaps it didn't. In any event, that's what happened.

[The House recessed at 5:29 p.m.]

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

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND
CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION
1983-84 ESTIMATES OF
PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of
Energy and Natural Resources

Agreed to:

1 Alberta Oil Sands Technology and
Research Authority \$68,000,000

2 — Alberta Reforestation Nursery

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments in regard to the Alberta reforestation nursery. The Pine Ridge Forest Nursery is one of the most highly developed and specialized facilities of its kind in North America, or perhaps in the world. It was established in 1975 under Rural Development and this government's policies of decentralization.

For the benefit of the new members — I spoke on this before on several occasions — the geographic location of the Pine Ridge Forest Nursery is about 145 kilometres northeast of Edmonton, along Highway 28 in the county of Smoky Lake. The objective is to produce seed, but specifically seedlings. The seedling production is by two methods. One is indoor. There is a nursery complex of 20 interconnected greenhouses that produce 10 million seedlings. Then there is the outdoor method, with 73 hectares of space developed and turned into 47 different fields. That also produces 10 million seedlings. The intent is to increase that 20 million to 33 million in the very near future.

The seed extraction plant is there, and it's extracted from cones supplied by the companies that require the seed for reforestation of Crown land or burnt-out areas. There is also a research lab for the purpose of developing much superior seedlings and therefore better trees. The genetics portion of it is very, very important.

That's the extent of my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I will have more to say under Vote 4. Thank you.

Agreed to:

2 — Alberta Reforestation Nursery \$2,683,000

3 — Grazing Reserves Development

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to address a short question to the minister with regard to this vote. I think it's appropriate because of the amount of land that's available in the northern part of the province, and specifically in agricultural based land. Will this create any more land agricultural-wise, and will it free up any as far as individual ownership, or is it the intent to keep it within the government confines? Addressing in particular the green zone area, will there be any more land available for agricultural purposes?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Chairman, this specific vote would not increase land available for sale. Basically, clearing of approximately 6,500 acres of bush, seeding of 12,200 acres, and about 159 miles of fencing will be done with this vote. We will be looking at approximately 215,000 acres in other programs, but not under this vote.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, could I very briefly ask the minister what the status is of the Blackfoot grazing reserve? I know the minister has had representation to find out if anything is going to happen with the reserve, and the people in my constituency in that area have asked me to bring the matter to the attention of the committee. I'd just like to know if the minister can give us any indication what they're going to do with the Blackfoot grazing reserve. The issue as to the multiple use of the area east of South Cooking Lake has been discussed in this Assembly at some length, and I would like to know if the minister can bring us up to date as to what is happening and when it's going to happen.

MR. SPARROW: Yes, I'd like to inform the hon. member that, very definitely, approximately \$1.7 million of this vote is planned for Blackfoot. It is in its final stages of planning, and I would invite the hon. member to go over the plans with me prior to proceeding with it. We are looking forward to its being one of the first integrated plans of its nature being put into place under this program.

Agreed to:

3 — Grazing Reserves Development \$6,897,650

4 — Maintaining our Forests

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just comment about the fact that national forest week in Canada will be celebrated May 1 to 7, 1983. The week is a once-a-year time that Canadians pay tribute to the very important industry in Canada. This is the fifth year that a centre in Canada will be named as a forestry capital in Canada. It started some five years ago in Saskatchewan when a local publisher, thinking about his raw material, pulpwood, had many people of his small community get involved in their only industry, forestry. The Canadian Forestry Association saw fit to name that little community as the capital of forestry in Canada at that time.

Then New Brunswick had its turn and, last year, Ontario. This year it's Alberta's turn to have a capital, and the theme is forests for the future. Pine Ridge and the county of Smoky Lake and area will be named as the forestry [capital] of Canada.

The time of celebration will be forestry week. On May 2 the celebrations will be specifically in the county and town of Smoky Lake, with dignitaries from Ottawa, Edmonton, the Alberta Forestry Association, and the Canadian Forestry Association.

Mr. Chairman, it is the most important industry in Canada. In Alberta, it is agriculture. Just a few statistics here: there were \$21 billion worth of forest products harvested in 1981 in Canada; the net value of forest products exported was \$12 billion. That's higher than the net for all of agriculture, fishing, mining, and petroleum products. Certainly, the forestry industry is the important renewable industry in Canada. In this country, it supplies work for 300,000 people directly and 700,000 indirectly. The main industry of forestry is scattered throughout the country in 300 centres. Pine Ridge employs 24 permanent people, and 120 seasonal ones from March until August or September.

Wednesday, May 4, of forestry week is usually declared Arbor Day. I'm sure hon. members will be involved in many tree planting ceremonies. The impact will certainly be there on every community in the province of Alberta. I

invite all members to attend either the May 2 celebration or take a tour of the very impressive Pine Ridge Nursery in the county of Smoky Lake.

Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, just a short question to the minister with regard to the vote as well. I'd like to know in particular, is the close relationship with industry with regard to this particular vote — are they working with them? Is there a possibility that it's on leased acreage area, or is it strictly on Crown lands that we're referring to? Will there be future consideration perhaps given to selling off some of this acreage so that the end users themselves could accept the full responsibility, and later, in years to come, we wouldn't be faced with such expenditures, that we would be putting it back into the user-pay concept and let them be responsible for future development and growth?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I can perhaps respond, at least in part, to the hon. member's questions. The maintaining our forests program is, of course, designed to reduce the rate of depletion of our forests that occurs through timber harvesting. I should say to the hon. member that it really is, in a significant way, above and beyond the normal obligations for reforestation which are involved in forest management agreements where that obligation is imposed upon industry. In terms of our total forest management program, though, it's fair to say that there is a strong working together with industry.

With respect to the other aspects of his question dealing with leased lands I would, of course, refer that question to my hon. colleague the associate minister.

Agreed to:

4 — Maintaining our Forests \$6,235,700

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll do the supplementary estimates first.

Agreed to:

1a — Alberta Children's Provincial
General Hospital \$500,000

3a — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I want to make only one remark that applies to both of these votes, in case it's not absolutely clear. These supplementary votes do not represent any increase in cost over what I reported at the session last year or in the total final cost of the project. They're merely as a result of cash flow problems because of late starts or late equipment delivery and lapsed appropriations in the previous year, which we now have to make up this year. We don't have the special warrant procedure applicable in the heritage trust fund. I just

want to make that clear. It's merely an adjustment in cash flow, not an increase in cost.

Agreed to:

3a — Southern Alberta Cancer Centre
and Specialty Services Facility \$4,780,000

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the resolutions be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll go to the 1983-84 estimates of proposed investments.

1 — Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I know that probably what I say tonight may not have much difference, because we've already had this in question period. But as an Edmonton MLA — and I think most northern Alberta MLAs would agree with us on this point, and I think the minister is aware — I would like to make a plea that in the near future we believe that there is a need for a northern Alberta children's hospital. I know we can vary on estimations, but there are some 370,000 children needing a children's hospital in northern Alberta. If you compare the major cities right across Canada, I think Edmonton and northern Alberta come last in the studies they have had recently. I know the minister is going to plead poverty, and I know that it is a lot of money. I suggest that in terms of priorities of other things that we do in the health care field, that should be a relatively high priority.

The other point I would make, and I think we would all agree, is that in the election — I know that the Member for Edmonton Glengarry does not give government policy, but it made the news. When a MLA from the government says a kid's hospital is "go", I think most people, in Edmonton at least, believed that he knew what he was talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't always believe Rollie.

MR. MARTIN: I recognize that. But I'm saying that for the people who don't know Rollie in Edmonton, I think there was some feeling that the government was at least looking seriously. If you would have polled people at the time in northern Alberta, I think they would have expected and thought that the government was going to go ahead.

I asked in question period the other day and didn't get a commitment by the next election, but I hope the minister will take it as a high priority and, if at all possible, see fit to look at this, at least in the next three or four years. I would even be glad if it comes before the next election. Even if you have to campaign on it, it would be well worth it from our perspective of living in Edmonton.

MR. NOTLEY: But, it could be a promise next time too, Ray.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sure they won't have the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry campaigning for them on it.

It's fine to vote this in Calgary. Calgary has a good children's hospital, and I am sure this money is needed. But the point I make, in all seriousness, for northern

Alberta, is that I hope you will take a serious look at the children's hospital and see fit, perhaps in the next three or four years, to begin looking at that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two comments on the almost proposed northern Alberta children's hospital. I find it rather repugnant — "distasteful", for those who don't understand repugnant — that the government would infer before the last election that the people of northern Alberta would be getting a northern Alberta children's hospital. I know the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is a man of integrity, and he didn't say it. But there were inferences made in the election campaign which seriously did make the people of this part of the province think that we were going to go ahead with the children's hospital.

Mr. Chairman, my philosophy and my stand haven't changed. I believe that a northern Alberta children's hospital would certainly be of benefit to the people in the northern part of the province. I know that there will be many arguments, pro and con, that it should be at the Royal Alex or it should be at the University hospital site; some medical people would like it, some wouldn't. Mr. Chairman, when it all comes out in the wash, if we are trying to develop a world renowned medical centre in the city of Edmonton as part of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I think the northern Alberta children's hospital would fit in with that type of theme.

I know that our hospital costs are escalating, and I know that the minister looks at ways of trying to keep the costs within reasonable bounds. It's a very, very difficult task. But I think it's a matter of priorities. In this area, we have sort of been promised, for about 12 years now, a hospital in the Sherwood Park-Mill Woods area. I know that the former MLA for Sherwood Park, John Ashton, pretty well gave up on that fight. Now it's left up to the hon. member, Mr. Woo representing that area, and partly myself, because part of that infringes upon my constituency. But I think it's a step that's going to have to be taken, Mr. Minister, within the next four years. If the minister has any clout in the inner circles of the cabinet — and I know that the minister does have clout in that favored five — it would be a priority and a facility that the people of the province would look up to.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the minister that I think the government should go back to its priorities board and have a close, close look. We don't want to go through the hoops that we have to wait for the Queen to come over like we did to open the Grande Prairie hospital. Heaven forbid, because by that time we may have a new king.

In all seriousness to the minister, I think it's a project that is certainly due consideration of the government. The people who have established the foundation have certainly done their job. They have tried to bring the matter to the attention of the government. They have public support, so it's not a political liability. I think it's a political plus. Of course, this government especially always worries about the debit and credit column, about what it'll do for them politically. Well, this is one they can win on.

Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks, I certainly do support the concept of a northern Alberta children's hospital, and I think it behooves the government to take some concrete action in this field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry indicated a wish to speak, but he's is not in his place so I'll recognize the Member for Calgary Egmont.

DR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister would be good enough to sort of give some clarification to the whole matter as to just what the real need is in terms of bed supply for children in the Edmonton area. It's been my understanding that a fair amount of surveying has taken place and that there is more than enough bed space with regard to the hospitalization of young children within the Edmonton area.

At the same time, earlier today I was speaking to one of the board members of the children's hospital in Calgary. In actual sense, you know, the real title of that hospital is the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital. I trust that while all of us as members of the Assembly do have a care for the issue that proper treatment is given to all youngsters as well as to all Albertans; nevertheless we're still caught on the horns of a dilemma about trying to see Calgary and Edmonton in constant competition, that what one city has, the other one will have. That of course is a difficult area, to try to satisfy the demands of the constituents whether it be in Calgary or in Edmonton.

I wonder if the minister would be good enough to sort of enlighten the House as to what the real demand is in terms of Edmonton and northern Alberta, especially given the fact that in this day of transportation, if a child is in need of immediate hospitalization, the facilities in Edmonton are first-class, in fact world-class, in terms of emergency service. Then the matter of being able to transport the children to Calgary really is not that big an issue in terms of getting them there.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I was waiting for the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry to outline to the committee the same passionate defence of a children's hospital that I thought marked his comments during the election campaign, at least those reported in the press.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin my comments by saying that the children's hospital should not be looked on as simply a project for the city of Edmonton: Calgary has one; therefore Edmonton has one. As a representative from a rural constituency in northern Alberta, I'm happy to stand in my place and support the proposition of a children's hospital for northern Alberta. The fact of the matter is that it should not simply be something that is thrown to Edmonton for the sake of appeasing Edmonton because Calgary has a children's hospital. The question is: are there reasonable arguments for a children's hospital?

As I look over the information -- for example, the document prepared by RPM Planning Associates entitled *Alternative Modes of Delivery for Pediatric Care in Northern Alberta: The Issue of a Children's Hospital in Edmonton*, the final summary position is in favor of a children's hospital. Without belaboring the issue, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a couple of lines from that summary and conclusion section of this report.

The delivery of pediatric care in Edmonton and Northern Alberta transcends the issue of the need for a free-standing Children's Hospital and requires focusing on ways of establishing a working environment in which the management of pediatric beds, programs, and personnel can be balanced with cost efficiencies and operational effectiveness. In this regard, the key factor in improving upon the quality of pediatric care in Northern Alberta ...

and it goes on to the attraction of various specialists

Without a sufficient patient volume in at least one hospital in Edmonton, it will not be possible to attract pediatric subspecialists or keep them on staff. To create this critical mass of patients, consolidation of existing pediatric beds would be required. . . .

If the Government of Alberta decides upon any of the alternative modes of delivery for pediatric care in Northern Alberta, then at a minimum, this will require:

- i) reducing pediatric beds in existing general hospitals to 25 bed units;
- ii) consolidating 250 to 300 pediatric beds in one facility; . . .

Mr. Chairman, I think the argument has been well made by those people who've been promoting the idea of a children's hospital that if we are going to attract the specialists and provide the atmosphere in which children can recover from illness, there is a strong argument for one, centralized facility in which you have people who can be brought in from around the country and can practise together and can develop that camaraderie of common practice, where you have the paraprofessionals working in an atmosphere where their clientele, if you like, are children.

In one of the observations in the study, Dr. Harry Bain makes the point that whether it's the person who welcomes the child into the hospital, whether it's the nurse, the people who work in the hospital, or the doctors who treat the children, one of the advantages of a centralized facility is that we bring the entire operation under one roof with the principal mandate of providing care for children. Obviously these arguments were quite compelling; we would not be voting money for a southern Alberta children's hospital if the arguments that the foundation are making for northern Alberta didn't make sense. If they don't make sense in northern Alberta, it's not likely they make sense in southern Alberta either.

Mr. Chairman, one can argue that there are available hospital beds. That may be true. But the fact of the matter is that the foundation points out that if you are going to properly treat children, the entire atmosphere is the factor that has to be taken into account. I suppose one can argue, look, we've got this planning group in the city here, and they have said no children's hospital, that we can shift here, shift there, and shift someplace else, and we can handle the needs of our children within the existing city system.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose there are many things we could do. The minister may well argue that we have to make difficult choices, but I would say to the minister that if we have to make choices I sometimes wonder at a few of these capital estimates that we're dealing with. We've just approved the Paddle River project, where we've got a cost/benefit analysis that shows that for each dollar of benefit it's going to cost us \$5, where the inquiry officer says there are no advantages at all compared to the costs. Now if this government is going to push ahead with a project where the evidence is overwhelmingly negative, I really wonder why they reject the well-argued position of the foundation here requesting a children's hospital for northern Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the minister that this is not something that has been newly placed on the agenda. Members of this Assembly will recall the frequent efforts the foundation has made to contact members of the Assembly. I may be mistaken, but I seem to recall one particular evening when the minister himself was present

at a function where MLAs from both sides of the House were given information on the advantages of children's hospitals elsewhere in the country. I thought the foundation outlined the arguments in a very persuasive way at that time.

I say to the minister: of course we have to make choices. There's no question about that. And we've got some difficult expenditures in the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. When we get to the Walter C. Mackenzie, we have an illustration of a project that has mushroomed and cost far beyond its original estimate. But, Mr. Chairman, surely we have learned from those lessons and that we could undertake the development of a children's hospital for northern Alberta at a cost which is reasonable. The proposal of members of the foundation is one that I would suggest should be very seriously considered. Obviously it's not going to be in this budget, but the point that my colleague and the Member for Clover Bar are making is that in the next short period of time — not just two weeks before an election, but in the next period of time — we should have some clear idea as to where this project fits into the scheme of things as far as the government of Alberta is concerned.

I would simply argue that if we need a little bit of the money, perhaps the minister might look at saving some money on the new Berwyn hospital, which is going to be built in Grimshaw. Despite the overwhelming opposition of the residents of that area of the Peace, we seem to have this project going ahead. Yet here you have a province-wide — perhaps I should correct myself, Mr. Chairman, and say if not province-wide, at least in northern Alberta — very strong consensus that we should have a children's hospital. Whether you talk to people in the Peace River country, in northeastern Alberta, or in the city of Edmonton, you find the same common thread: that this would be an investment which would be well worth the money involved and which would be a standing tribute to the capital works division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I remember the former Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Olds-Didsbury, tabling in this House one of the largest petitions — a whole series of letters that had been sent to his office simply by taking out several ads. The Member for Clover Bar will recall that incident when the office was deluged with letters sent in by people urging that we have a children's hospital in northern Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I think this committee allows Edmonton MLAs and northern Alberta MLAs the kind of opportunity to put on the record the passionate defence of their area that we saw the other day by their Member for Barrhead. I didn't agree with the Member for Barrhead. I think he was wrong; but he was at least representing the views of his constituency on the issue of the Paddle River. Fair enough. He knows where I stand; I know where he stands. But I think people throughout northern Alberta, but in this city especially, have a right to know where the Conservative members from the city of Edmonton stand on the children's hospital. Are they for it or against it? Are they behind the minister on this matter, or are they hiding behind the Chair? [interjections] Where are they?

I say especially to the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who was quoted on October 29 during the election as saying: MLA says kids' hospital is go. This is in one particular newspaper, that may have taken his comments out of context; I don't know. But I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, and I think the people in

Glengarry would like to know whether or not they have an advocate in the caucus totally committed to this hospital. They would like to know where the other members from Edmonton stand on this hospital. They would like to know where the members from Edmonton stand as they know where the Member for Barrhead stands on the Paddle River project. Nobody can misunderstand his position — very clear, very emphatically put. And we have the time during the discussion of these estimates, I assure you, to let every single Edmonton MLA let the people of this province know, through this important committee discussion, where they stand, one by one.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come for this government to get off the fence on this important issue, for the minister to stop hiding behind his planning council, the name of which escapes me right at the moment. I wouldn't want to misquote the name. But the commitment that I think Albertans in the northern part of the province want is some clear indication — first of all from the MLAs from this area, but then, beyond that, from the minister — as to where this proposal fits into the planning process of the government of Alberta.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I've been looking forward to this. I'd like to make comments on two points, one, dealing with the children's hospital. I remember well the forum that the hon. New Democratic members are referring to. It was held in a community hall. We were discussing a number of issues, among them being the children's hospital. When asked, I remember standing up and reading a copy of a memo from the the Premier to the chairman of the children's hospital foundation saying that if the report recommended we should have a children's hospital, then one would be built. I remember standing up and reading that recommendation from the Premier and, secondly, noting that the report was in and that in fact the report recommended that we build a children's hospital. But it also recommended that there be planning given to other priorities; for example, the care for senior citizens, which is perhaps a little more serious given the fact that there is no evidence to suggest that the care for children in the northern half of the province is of any poorer quality than anywhere on the continent. Far to the contrary, it's a high level of care for our youngsters.

So if my hon. friends from the NDP are listening carefully, the report recommends that while the children's hospital be built, planning and attention also be given to auxiliary care for senior citizens and for other projects in the hospital system in Edmonton. I stand by that report, and I stand by that commitment.

I'd also like to note that in a pre-session meeting before the Assembly opened, I discussed a number of things with about 40 citizens from Edmonton Glengarry who came out to discuss issues, including the children's hospital. The overall conclusion of the evening was that given the very serious budgetary problems of the province, we should be trying to pay attention to trimming our administration and balancing the budget a little bit more. That was the flavor of the meeting that evening. We had discussed the children's hospital.

So I think that the citizens of Edmonton Glengarry who are interested in this are saying two things: yes, we'd like a children's hospital, but we also recommend that in these times we try to be efficient in our administration of health care and pay attention to some other needs that are probably a little bit more pressing.

I'd like to also touch on one more thing. I was down in the United States a little while ago. Talking to some U.S.

physicians, they told me that the incidence of heart attacks, stomach cancer, and a few other illnesses that are related to diet, drinking, or smoking patterns show that health education in the United States by insurance companies, governments, and professional associations is working, and that people are starting to pay attention to the way they live, work, and play. By doing that they are reducing the demand for health care services.

I wonder if the minister could comment on whether or not, under these estimates in the heritage fund, it might not be worth while considering a life-style advertising program to try to educate Albertans about the benefits of not smoking or drinking, paying attention to our diet, our driving habits, or a variety of other things, and reduce the need for health care facilities like a children's hospital or other general care, active-treatment facilities.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Chairman, it's really a supplementary to the Member for Calgary Egmont, but perhaps in a more specific area. I'm concerned about the level of child care that is being offered through the facility. Is it on a par with Canadian standards in particular? Representing a rural constituency, I'm concerned because of the quality of care. We're very pleased to think that we have a new hospital facility going in Lac La Biche and a new facility in Fort McMurray.

Would you specifically advise the Assembly what effect this would have on a child and a parent from a rural constituency such as I outlined. Would a child be denied care in this facility in Calgary? At whose expense would it be borne? More specifically, if the child had to go to Calgary, would the transportation cost be borne by the provincial government? Would it be borne for the parent and guardian as well? Then if it were a prolonged illness or, say, even a seven- or ten-day period, where would the parent or guardian stay? Would they be able to stay in residence or at bedside during that confined period with the child, and at whose expense?

As you realize, with a young child it's sometimes very disadvantageous to be separated, and disorienting for the child as well. In the recovery period, it would be much more suitable for the parent or guardian to be with him.

I'd like the minister, if at all possible, to clarify those issues, to assure me and the constituents of the Lac La Biche-McMurray area that there is no problem for their children, being that they reside in a rural constituency.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief comments. I've had the opportunity to be in the University hospital children's ward a great many times over a number of years. The care of children at the University hospital and at the Royal Alex has been second to none. I also had the opportunity to go to the most renowned children's hospital in Canada, which is the Toronto sick kids, and the minister will be pleased to note that the care our daughter received there was in no way superior to the care received here in Edmonton.

Over the eight-year period that I was in and out of the hospital, I had an opportunity to meet with other parents from all over northern Alberta, because certainly Edmonton is the centre of children's specialized care for northern Alberta. The University hospital at least, and I think the Royal Alex too, has special apartments or rooms available for parents who have children in the city, and that might answer the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray's question. I never once heard a parent complain about the kind of care that their child was getting in the University hospital.

The problem, Mr. Minister, quite often was in the emergency facilities. I have spent anywhere from half an hour to five and a half hours in emergency, waiting for somebody to make a decision on whether the child should be admitted or not. Never once on those over two hundred times, did I take my child home. Quite often I waited in excess of two or three hours. I really believe the problem is in emergency, because we don't have emergency specialized for children. I would encourage this specialization of children's services, but not necessarily a freestanding building.

Mr. Chairman, I think the most ludicrous thing I heard tonight was the Leader of the Opposition saying "a standing tribute" to the capital projects division. We don't want a monument to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; we want effective hospitalization, and I think we have that today. We don't need a monumental edifice for their future.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, if I could impose upon you and the House for just a few minutes, very briefly, almost non-politically — you might almost call it 'advertisingly'. I am in the hospital business myself to a degree, and I want to express to every member here the fact that our children get wonderful care in Canada, and we pay for it pretty well through our systems of health care.

But I should express to all of you, and through all of you to your respective people in your constituencies, that crippled children are another type of child altogether. While we have pretty remarkable facilities, there is an organization that I belong to that presently sponsors 19 orthopedic hospitals and three burn units throughout North America. The primary one in Canada is in Montreal, where they have done just fantastic research work and have recently come up with the discovery of what causes crippling arthritis in children. We spend millions of dollars on research in this hospital. Indeed throughout North America, our present budget is about \$83 million a year. We have to raise this money through various and sundry ways, but most of it comes to us through endowments, wills, and gifts.

The point I am trying to make, ladies and gentlemen, is simply this: if you have discovered in your area crippled children of people who can't seem to afford to get to hospitals or, as the hon. Member for Drayton Valley suggested, where are the parents going to be, that sort of thing, this organization not only flies the child to probably the closest hospital, which in our case would be Spokane or Portland, but would fly the parents there to be with them the entire time if necessary, or fly them back and forth as desired. It's an average of 31 days now for a crippled child to be in and out of the hospital.

I just want you to know this, Mr. Chairman, for the simple fact that it's great to build hospitals if we need them. In our organization, we have discovered that when we don't need them, we shut them down. We did unfortunately have to shut one down in Winnipeg because of lack of census. You will discover that from time to time in hospitals. In many cases, you build a 50-bed hospital and there are only 30 people in it. You are automatically, you might say, losing money on the project. I don't think it happens an awful lot of the time, and I'm not trying to steer away from the necessity for a children's hospital here in Edmonton. I simply want you to know that if any of you are in a real bind at given times, let any Shriner of North America know. We'll take care of that child.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that members of the committee would agree that a children's hospital is one of the most desirable developments within any community. The services, the type of equipment, and the trained staff are something that is a special kind of hospital. But I think we must remember that in our capital projects for hospitals in this province, the southern Alberta children's hospital, as was mentioned by the Member for Calgary Egmont, was originally designed to serve the entire province.

I had the privilege of visiting that hospital a little over a year ago, and I was extremely impressed with the staff, with the specialists I met who had been attracted to that hospital. We met one physician who had come from the southern United States, who specializes in children's tissue diseases. He came to Alberta because he felt he could get in on the ground floor. He didn't come here because he would make a vast fortune compared to the salaries they might earn in the United States, but came because he thought Alberta was a growing province that had a tremendous amount of potential.

Because this hospital has been able to attract some specialists, I think there's an argument to say that it's something we should work for for northern Alberta. But before we make that decision, I think it's important to evaluate how effective the southern Alberta children's hospital is. I wonder if the minister has had the opportunity to determine, in fact, how many specialists were attracted to that in addition to the one gentleman I mentioned and, secondly, how many children have been referred to the southern Alberta children's hospital rather than outside the province, where equal treatment could have been received within Alberta.

I believe it's important that we develop a co-ordination between the two centres. In my study in this area, it is not a matter of duplicating what one city has over what the other has, but it's a matter of one trying to develop in a particular specialty area or a number of specialty areas and the other city developing in other areas, not trying to duplicate the same type of service. I think we'll find what the hon. member who spoke previously said, that certain hospitals develop to give treatment for handicapped children or for children who have suffered burns. It's important that we look at our facilities, that we look at treatment areas that are not duplicating what we already have.

In the priorities that must be set when we're looking at the spending of public dollars, it's important firstly that we examine what our needs are. As the member for the St. Albert constituency, I feel rather strongly about getting an addition to the Sturgeon General hospital — the minister is quite aware of the needs of that hospital — because the needs of the children in that area are newborn infants, who are now at the point where they're going to be born in the hallways because the case rooms are filled. So to me that is a priority, and that's a children's priority. It's one that has to be resolved before we move into another new facility.

If we were able to use hindsight more effectively, if we were able to go back 20 years and determine what would have happened, we would have seen that the development of the two referral centres or the two tertiary care hospitals within the city of Edmonton probably wasn't the most advantageous way to go. If there had been one referral centre that developed, we wouldn't have had the competition that now exists between the two major hospitals, the University and the Royal Alex. I believe and have said before in this Assembly that it's important, in

my opinion, that we no longer continue to develop two tertiary care facilities but that we direct our funds towards one. That does not necessarily mean the capital structure of a new children's hospital.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we must look at the priorities that exist within the Edmonton area — and there are priorities that are established. One I mentioned a few minutes ago: there are priorities for auxiliary beds. We know there are many seniors or those residents of our society who have required the special care of an auxiliary hospital and are on lists waiting to get in. We know that we have developed first-class children's facilities in Calgary and in the two hospitals that provide tertiary care in Edmonton. We know there are always improvements that can be made in hospital facilities, but first, let's look at the priorities, that our dollars can be best utilized to provide the best quality care. By that way, we will serve the children not just now but in future years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions or comments, perhaps the minister would wish to respond.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In all of these comments that have been made in support of a children's hospital, I was hoping that somebody would say they were in support of the vote that's being requested for the Alberta children's hospital in Calgary so we could finish it. Nobody did, but by the remarks made I assume the vote will be supported.

I think an important question that was brought up in the general discussion about the level of services for children's health care programs across the province takes us back to the basic question posed by the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont when he asked what, in fact, is the pediatric bed capacity in Edmonton, especially compared with other Canadian cities. I don't have the figure at hand. It's in the front of the book that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was quoting from. I'm not far off, though, when I say there are about 425 pediatric beds in the city of Edmonton, and the average occupancy rate is 55 per cent. So 45 per cent of them are vacant on any typical day.

On the other hand, as some members have pointed out, we have a severe overcrowding problem at the Cross Cancer hospital because of recent, rapid population growth. We've got a waiting list of elderly sick people usually hovering around the 500 mark, waiting for an empty auxiliary hospital bed to come along. Some other members have spoken about the needs in their neighborhoods or communities.

So it really does become a question of priority, and that takes us back to the children's hospital in Calgary that we're talking about. That had a long history; it was there for many years. Several years ago the government, in a total provincial thrust, decided that it would establish new cancer treatment facilities in southern Alberta, rebuild the existing children's hospital, and go ahead with the health sciences centre here in Edmonton, which, looking at it from a total provincial coverage point of view, gave us an incredible array of hospital services. I'm sure that will be added to. I guess the point I'm trying to make is that given the times being what they are and given the need and the alternative services that exist, I think we would be wise to support the finishing vote for the children's hospital in Calgary.

The points brought up by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray have been answered by his colleague with respect to the assurance of services, or transporta-

tion, or support services for parents of children who require specialized care in the province, because that is available.

The last thing I want to comment on is the cost, because I think there are some misconceptions. It's very easy for the Leader of the Opposition to say that instead of doing this, let's build a children's hospital. You can pick just about anything and come out on the winning side of that, because who is going to be against sick kids? Nobody. We're all in support of them, and we all want to look after them. There's nothing more appealing. That doesn't mean to say that facilities for those kinds of citizens should be built at the sacrifice of everything else, but I think any government tries to balance the projects that go forward for all our groups of citizens through the various service departments of government. So I don't think it's a case of saying that instead of a highway we'll have a children's hospital. Obviously the objective is to try to get an acceptable level of services in each department.

Incidentally, with respect to the costs of these specialized facilities, the capital costs are really a drop in the bucket. I hate to sound flippant about it, but that is true. The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to cancelling the new hospital in Grimshaw. Really, you'd have to cancel about six of them to build the children's hospital proposed for Edmonton. But that's only the beginning. We've got a children's hospital of 138 beds in the city of Calgary, capital costs about \$40 million. So we're looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300,000-a-bed in capital. The operating costs of that centre are \$1,100 per day per bed. That's an ongoing commitment that's there forever, that some government has to be willing to take on when they make the commitment to make the hospital. I'm trying to point out that the building is really the easiest part. It's the ongoing operating commitment that is tough and has to be worked into your long-range financial planning.

With respect to the attraction of specialists and the referrals to the southern Alberta hospital as it now exists, I was rather surprised when I looked into this. I know they are starting to attract people, not only there but up here, as a result not only of our capital program that's under way in Alberta and is really unique in Canada, but also because of the heritage medical trust fund. That's attracting some good people here. So the bank and the source of manpower is starting to build up. Surprisingly, though, the referrals to the children's hospital from parts of Alberta north of Red Deer represent only about 5 per cent of the patient population of the hospital. When I asked why, they said that the equivalent services are available in the city of Edmonton; there is no need to refer. I'm sorry the Leader of the Opposition didn't hear that, because it's a very important part of what we are talking about today.

Agreed to:

1 — Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital	\$1,434,126
2 — Applied Cancer Research	\$5,359,000

3 — Tom Baker Cancer Centre and Special Services Facility

MR. MARTIN: I would be remiss if I didn't make a quick point on this one, Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, sorry, Mr. Chairman.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention to the minister that he talked about prioritizing and said it wasn't as simple as juggling something here to build something there. Surely what government is all about is making decisions. The point we're trying to make is that there are priorities that you have to make from time to time. I guess we would disagree on the priority at this point of the children's hospital.

In terms of the Walter C. Mackenzie, here is a good example of probably a good idea that's gone completely out of hand. I'm not sure that we still have a handle on how much it's eventually going to cost. I wonder if I could ask a question of the minister. What is the final cost at this time, in his best judgement?

MR. RUSSELL: I think that's the next vote, Mr. Chairman.

Agreed to:

3 — Tom Baker Cancer Centre and
Special Services Facility \$5,501,000

4 — Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, this is the one I want the answer on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments before the minister responds?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the final cost of that hospital can be given in either today's dollars or future inflated dollars. I hesitate to use the latter, because people always compare that figure with the original figure back in 1971.

MR. MARTIN: There won't be any inflation during the session.

MR. NOTLEY: Let's have all the figures.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, the hospital is within the approved budget, that we arrived at some two years ago in discussions in this House, of approximately \$361 million.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in what kind of dollars is that figure of \$361 million, and does that figure take into account all the phases of the project?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes. That's the complete project finished, and that is April 1, 1981, dollars. That was the year and the session in which we had the Auditor over there and the reorganization and rebudgeting, and the session in which we had all the attention in the House. The figure was \$361,544,612.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Bearing in mind the suggestions that have been made by previous all-party heritage trust fund committees that we should have a final figure, and also the Auditor's comments, what is the minister's best estimate as to what the final figure will be in total dollars spent? Three hundred and sixty-one million as of April 1, 1981, dollars — what is

the estimate of inflation, and what are the latest figures the minister has? As I recall the discussion we had in committee a year and a half ago, we were looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500 million, if my memory serves me correctly. Is that figure still correct, or what is the latest estimated final figure?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, this is the answer I always have difficulty with, because 361 million 1981 dollars are not 361 million 1988 dollars, and yet people talk about them as if they are. I'm adding inflation, but they are the same dollars. As of today, we see no reason why that April 1, 1982, budget should be exceeded. The thing is on target; it will not result in 361 million actual dollars being spent. They will be inflated another five or six years hence. So we're guessing, and I think I'm not far off when I say in the neighborhood of \$500 million. I have a more accurate estimate than that that I could give out, but that \$500 million represents 361 million April 1981 dollars.

Agreed to:

4 — Walter C. Mackenzie Health
Sciences Centre \$95,000,000

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the resolutions be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration and reports the following resolutions, and requests leave to sit again.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the purpose of making investments in the following projects: \$68,000,000 for Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, \$2,683,000 for Alberta reforestation nursery, \$6,897,650 for grazing reserve development, \$6,235,700 for maintaining our forests, to be administered by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources; \$1,434,126 for the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital, \$5,359,000 for applied science research, \$5,501,000 for Tom Baker Cancer Centre and Special Services Facility, \$95,000,000 for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

It was also resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, for the purpose of making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$500,000 for the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital, \$4,780,000 for the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Specialty Services Facility.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

6. Moved by Mr. King on behalf of Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the report of the special committee appointed March 10, 1983, under Standing Order 46, be received and concurred in and that the committees recommended therein be hereby appointed.

[Motion carried]

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

Moved by Dr. Elliott:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate March 16: Mr. Martin]

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, as an opposition member I, too, would like to congratulate you on your — I sometimes wonder — onerous task of trying to keep this Assembly down at times. I'm sure from time to time we'll disagree, but it will be done in good humor and honor. I would also like to congratulate the Member for Grande Prairie, and the seconder, from Calgary Foothills. They gave excellent and eloquent speeches in defence, I should say, of an indefensible document.

I think the tradition is to talk about our constituencies. I've noticed a number of the members, as they have given speeches, have talked first of all about the massive majorities they achieved in the recent election. Well, in my election in Edmonton Norwood I had a massive majority of 74 votes. But I'm very proud of the people of Edmonton Norwood. When you look around at what's happening in the province — and you people are all examples of it — it took a fair amount of political courage, I believe, to elect somebody on the opposition side. A little history lesson, and I hope it's a sign of the future: I believe that Edmonton Norwood is the first Conservative seat to be lost since Premier Lougheed was elected in 1967. So we're hoping this is a sign of the times coming ahead — Highlands next.

DR. BUCK: You can thank Rollie Cook for that.

MR. MARTIN: Thank Rollie for that, yes.

In terms of the boundaries — I say this without being corny, because I live in the riding — I believe that Edmonton Norwood is probably the most interesting part of Alberta. It's interesting for many different reasons. I grew up — as many of you people did, I expect — in rural Alberta, my home town being a metropolis called Delia, Alberta, which is around Hanna and Drumheller — somebody's nodding over there. The thing I like most about Norwood is that it very much has a small town flavor in the middle of the city. It is very ethnic, as anybody who knows the area. There are many different

ethnic groups there: a number of Italian, Ukrainian, Portugese, Metis, East Indian, and Black people, and even some WASPs like me. The thing that the ethnicity does, of course, is that there are many different little shops.

One of the reasons that I like Edmonton in particular, and especially Norwood, is that there is still some character left. There are many little shops where you can buy different types of foods and many different little restaurants, as many of you would know.

The other thing that I find interesting and one of the tragedies, I think, in city living is that we all tended to congregate in the same age groups. If you go out to the suburbs, and I have lived in the suburbs in both Calgary and Edmonton, everybody tends to be approximately the same age — I wouldn't say little boxes, but in that vicinity where we have children and adults about the same age. Sometimes I think that's not healthy. Growing up in a small town, as many of us did, you saw many different types of people: older and younger people and, again, the different ethnic groups. This is very much the way Norwood is.

I've canvassed doors there, and there are people who've lived there all their lives. I talked to one older woman just the other day, and she's lived in that area 70 years. In fact on the house that I live in, we have papers that go back to 1908. Along with the older people who have lived in the area, I think there are younger people who are moving back towards the centre of the city — a commitment, if you like, towards the inner city. As a result, there are many very active community groups. I expect the most active community groups in the city are in Edmonton Norwood.

So all in all, I'm saying that we enjoy living there. I would not live in any other part of Alberta. I know that's what everybody else said; in my case it happens to be true. I chose to live there and, as a result, I'm very, very proud to be elected from Edmonton Norwood. Any opposition member who got elected in the last election, of course, has to be very proud.

To turn to the throne speech — and I will come back and talk about the throne speech and, indirectly, about how it affects my particular riding — I know the Conservatives aren't going to like this: I was not overwhelmed, to say the least. I think it was too self-congratulatory. Most of the things we knew about. They'd already been announced in the election. They were things that were going on from the past. I expected to see some new ideas in my first throne speech, especially with the changing circumstances. I think we all recognize that. Many of the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, have talked about the changing circumstances in Alberta. We're facing times in Alberta that we haven't seen, at least not in my age. Many people are referring to the Dirty Thirties. I'm not suggesting it's that bad yet. I don't think it would ever get that bad again, but certainly it's a new realism for Albertans. I expected the throne speech to talk a little more about some new ideas.

The only new specifics I could really get out of it was that we are going to have a new Libraries Act. Now I like libraries as well as the next person, but when there are 136,000 unemployed, I expected a little more. The other thing that I expect we'll see somewhere down the line and the other specific is that we're going to change the arbitration process. I don't like the arbitration process either. I think we should repeal Bill 41. If we'd had free collective bargaining with our own provincial employees. I suggest that those settlements would have come in realis-

tically in this time of recession. Perhaps they would have been a little higher when times were better, but probably they would have been a little lower than the arbitration awards came out with now. The point that we make, though — and we say this in all sincerity to the government — is that you were the ones that created the system, and they should live it. They shouldn't change the system just because it doesn't work their way every time.

Let me turn to my three main areas of concern, if I can. I mentioned that I'd like to bring it back as much as I can to how it affects my riding. As you're well aware, my riding, being an inner-city one, is not a wealthy area. It's an inner-city riding. So I've picked three areas that I believe are applicable to what I know is going on in that riding. I suggest, in all due modesty, that I do have a fairly good idea about what is going on in that riding, having squeaked through an election. I've already pointed out that that was very difficult for an opposition member to do in this election.

The first one would be unemployment. I know all hon. members are concerned. I think we disagree on how we should handle this particular problem. My understanding of the government's strategy will be that we will have to cut back on our expenses, especially in the people services, and wait until the private sector takes up the slack. I suggest in all honesty, Mr. Speaker, that this has been tried before in history. I refer to how R.B. Bennett and people of that ilk tried to get us out of the depression at the time. I don't believe it worked then; in fact I know it didn't. It took an American president called Mr. Roosevelt with the New Deal to bring us out of that depression. I believe we can learn something from that. I think we can learn something from history.

The economic impact, though, of 136,000 people unemployed — let me look at the economics of that, first of all. Then I'd like to look at the psychology of it. First of all, when 136,000 people are unemployed, we are losing money to our treasury. It's our estimation — and of course it's only an estimation but, I think, a relatively correct one — that we are losing \$5.5 billion into our economy by 136,000 being unemployed. Of course, when they're unemployed we have to pick up certain things. We have to pay welfare. When the minister comes with his estimates, I expect that will have skyrocketed in the recession. We have to pay unemployment insurance and all the other things that go into providing services for the unemployed.

But more important than that is the lack of purchasing power. Surely if you want to get the economy moving again, Mr. Speaker, you put the money into the pockets of the middle- and lower-income, because they will spend it. They will not hoard it; they have to spend it. With the lessened purchasing demand of 136,000 unemployed people and a number of others worried that they could be next, their tendency is to save all the money they can, because they're not sure when they're going to be laid off. As a result, businesses — some small businesses in my area and, I expect, in other hon. member's ridings — are going out of business because people aren't buying the same way they did. So I believe that it doesn't make good economic sense to have 136,000 people unemployed.

But I would say it's more than economic; it's a psychological thing that happens to people when they're unemployed. If you're unemployed for any length of time at all, and if you talk to people who are recently unemployed — I'm not talking necessarily about the chronically unemployed; I'm talking about people that have more recently fallen into this, people that are 40, 41 years old

that have had a job all their lives. What happens very quickly when you go around rejected because there are no jobs is that you begin to feel a feeling of worthlessness. After being unemployed for a length of time, it comes almost to the point that you can't work. You forget how. You don't have any self-confidence. All the things that start happening to people at that point start to occur.

The other major problem with unemployment is that the biggest group of the 136,000 to become unemployed — if our figures are close, and I only have the Canadian figures — at least 30 per cent of that group, probably closer to 35 per cent, would be young people between the ages of 18 and 25. Besides the social problems that can occur if we have a huge group of young people unemployed, these people are in the process of developing attitudes and habits. If they haven't been able to get work for two or three years down the road, they're not going to be any good to any employer.

The other thing that happens — if I can just quote figures from *Perception* magazine, which is published by the Canadian Council on Social Development. It recently printed the results of some U.S. research into the social costs of rough times. The researchers found that for every 1 per cent rise in unemployment, 4.3 per cent more men and 2.3 per cent more women are admitted to state mental hospitals for the first time; 4.1 per cent more people commit suicide; 4 per cent more people are put in prison; 5.7 per cent more people are murdered; 19 per cent more people die from stress-related chronic ailments over a six-year period.

The point that I'm trying to make about unemployment is that we pay a tremendous cost in economic, social, and psychological terms. It should be the aim of the government — and I hope they will look at this seriously — to do everything they can to put as many people back to work as they possibly can. You could say: what could be done? During the election, we tried to lay out — with modest success, I admit — how we would put people back to work. We brought out a START program. In other words, we almost considered it, and using a phrase a "new deal" for Albertans.

There are things that we could do. Just to use a couple of examples: now is the time to get on — and I think the city council from Edmonton tried to point that out — with some capital projects like LRT, heavy oil upgrading. The reason now is the time to do it is, first, it's the cheapest time to do it, because capital is there; they are not competing with some megaprojects to drive the price up. There are many people ready to work. There's labour there, there's capital there, the goods are there. We're not facing an inflationary spiral. So we do two things: we put people back to work, and we also do it at the best possible time, because we know we're going to need these projects in the future. Even a place that we'd hardly call radical in terms of LRT — Houston, in the United States — found that they are now going to LRT. They said they never would, and now they're forced into it. I'm only using these as a couple of examples. I'm not going to bore everybody with a whole booklet that we put out.

The point that I want to make is that things can be done if governments want to do them. I believe that people are looking for governments, are looking for answers. Not that governments can do it all; we know very well that the private sector plays a very important part. But everybody is sitting around waiting for somebody else to move on it. The costs of unemployment are just too high in the long run. That's my point.

The second thing I believe — and I hope I'm wrong —

is that if we follow the sort of old-line Conservative thinking, we will also move and try, as we go into recession, to cut back on the people services, i.e. education, social services, health care. It seems clear, and I suppose it will be clearer after we see the budget, but this seems to be the type of rhetoric we're getting from the government.

It seems to me that this is rather short-sighted at this point, because people are being punished twice for being unemployed. First of all, we're not moving into any job creation. So as a result of high unemployment, people need services more than they ever needed them. In times of low unemployment, they don't need those services. But as the recession goes on, and more and more people are unemployed — and I suggest that 136,000 is not the end — then people have a demand for services.

I come back to my riding. I have very high unemployment in the riding, because it is an inner-city riding; it is a working-class riding. We then have a need for social services. I think it was put rather well, Mr. Speaker. This is from a letter that was addressed to me — and I see the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is here, and it's from me as the M.L.A. to him — from the Norwood Community Service Centre, people who do an excellent job. I'm sure the minister is aware of them. But they write this letter, and I think they sum their worry up well. First of all, they tell what they do:

The Norwood Service Centre is funded by Family and Community Support Services and Early Childhood Services. Operating under a volunteer Board of Directors, the Centre offers a variety of valuable preventive services to the residents of Norwood and surrounding communities. The majority of our programs are childbased with our primary target being families with pre-schoolaged children. However, the Norwood Community Service Centre also offers an outreach service for families and programs for seniors, parenting classes, and personal growth workshops as well as providing meeting space to self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Win-House. Our programs place a strong reliance on volunteers and encourage community spirit.

This is the key that they're worried about.

With the current economic situation, it is evident that there will be an increasing demand for the type of services and programs that our Centre offers. Norwood's population density is one of the highest in the city and its proportion of single parents is 50% higher than the city average. In 1979, Edmonton local board of health statistics indicated that 50% of the newborn children, and approximately 1/3 of the pre-school children living in the Norwood area were categorized as being "at risk". If this situation has improved, much of the credit must go to the preventive programs offered by the Norwood Community Service Centre.

They say it well. Their concern, Mr. Minister, as they go down is that perhaps they're worried about being cut off and won't be able to provide the same type of service. I think their point is well made. Especially with the recession in Norwood, things are getting worse. They need the money to provide these services, especially to the children.

The third area I would like to talk about that affects our area — we have talked about it somewhat in the Legislature — is the whole area of crime control. I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands would agree with me that in certain parts of his riding this is a major concern of people, especially old people. In Edmonton we

have a severe crime problem, as we're well aware. Our figures are that there were 1,100 violent crimes per 100,000 people — statistics I'm not particularly proud of. I think that puts us second, behind Vancouver, in the country of Canada.

We've already talked in this House about some of the serious crimes today — wife battering, sexual assault. It's all part of it. But in Norwood, what happens as you go door to door — if you're out, even after dark, especially the older people are frightened. They're like being in their own prison. They will not answer the door. They're not sure what's going on. I think this is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that people who have lived all their lives in this province have to live out their declining years in fear, and the only time they go out is during the day. I got this complaint from them time after time after time.

So we know that crime is a problem. People say — and I think one of the members mentioned it today — that if we just had more police, if we just had this or that or whatever, if we just hung them high, or if we brought capital punishment back, we'd have no more crime. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the old answers don't seem to work. Crime seems to be due to many different reasons. Certainly some of them are poverty, and I've already alluded to unemployment causing more crime. I've already alluded to the figures. Stress causes it: social isolation in the cities, people with no friends, cultural breakdown, especially in an area like Norwood where they've just moved over and don't understand the culture. There's a fall-out between boom and bust, and I think the government has to take some responsibility for this. When things were good, people were rolling in here, and of course that creates pressures. Now that the recession has gone, they're still here.

Not that there are any easy answers to this in cities all across North America; there aren't. But I think there are some areas we could look at and, I hope, the government will take a look at. There are some experiments going on, especially in some American cities, that seem to be working. First of all, I think we should — and we will be presenting a private member's Bill — bring in a community crime control division in the Department of the Solicitor General. This new division would oversee the implementation, administration, and funding of a number of programs. The basic purpose would be to work with municipal governments.

I am throwing out three main areas as ideas for hon. members to think about. One is to move back, as Calgary has done somewhat, into neighborhood policing. I think it makes much more sense if we have the policeman in the area on foot. He gets to know the people. The policeman's role changes. He's not just driving through in a car. He is there, and he begins to know all the older people and younger people in the area. People learn to trust the policeman; they know that particular policeman. In many cases, this policeman can act as a social worker. Again, where they are finding success is where they are moving in this direction.

Now I tie that in. I mentioned you cannot hire enough policemen. But the other thing that has worked is in Detroit, where they went with Neighborhood Watch. It's a little different from our Neighborhood Watch. Detroit, as you well know, was probably the most crime-ridden city in North America; it was called Murder City. I believe the figures were something like 60 murders a day in the late '70s in that particular city. But what happened is that the police decided to look at new ideas. They put the police back into the neighborhood and had them

work out of church halls, community halls, or whatever, and go out to organize the people and the community leaders. They had a number of community groups that worked together. Those people went out and signed up people. They signed up over 50 per cent in some of the roughest areas in Detroit under Neighborhood Watch and said, let's work together and work with the police. They had meetings in the community halls.

The figures were striking; they have had some figures back now. In the roughest part of Detroit, in one crime-ridden neighborhood on Detroit's west side, overall incidence of violent crime dropped by 65 per cent. Perhaps there were other reasons. Robberies dropped 67 per cent, burglaries 61 per cent, and rapes 60 per cent. I think these are significant figures in a city that was much rougher than Edmonton. I hope we can look at new ideas to combat crime.

One other idea is the community board pilot project. They tried this in San Francisco. They found that most crimes involved neighborhood disputes. As I go around Norwood, I often find this. The neighbor, as you knock on this door, will be talking about the next-door neighbor, almost to the point where quite a bit of hatred has developed. What they did in San Francisco was set up a community board pilot project. I will admit that it's too early — this was just done last year — to really effectively assess how well it's done, but the people seem to be encouraged. They set up a community board, not a formal court, and people can take their little disputes to this board. They found in one neighborhood that over 300 people had done this. Again, I would not suggest that we have the final answer to this, but they seem to think it's working. It's community helping community, people helping people.

The point I'm trying to make is that we could hire all the policemen we want, we could spend a lot of money on cars, and we could have capital punishment. We could go back to the olden days and throw people in jail as they do in the States — they put more people in jail; they are second only to the Soviet Union — and their crime still keeps going. Where they have had some success in North America is where they have involved the community. I believe that one of people's most important issues, at least in the inner city, is crime. I think we should be looking at new ideas, and I throw these out for hon. members' perusal.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we are here, believe it or not, as two in opposition and two Independents. It is our job to oppose, and we will oppose the government where we think they're wrong. I have to admit that we think they're wrong quite often. That's the role of parliamentary democracy. But we will try to oppose not just for the sake of opposing but because we honestly feel that things can be done better. As a result, we will be advancing alternatives on how we would see the problems being solved. In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that will be my colleague's and my presentation. It will be to oppose but not just for the sake of opposing. We are going to present ideas across. As they are shouting across and we're shouting back, I think we'll all remember that we all have some ideas; we all believe in different things. But we intend to make it an interesting session this time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. First of all, I would like to congratulate you on your reappointment as Speaker. It was a worthy choice, and I

can assure you that you have the respect of all my colleagues.

As you are probably aware, the Lacombe constituency has been represented since 1972 by Jack Cookson, who served for a number of years as the Minister of the Environment for this government. It is my hope in the next four years to attain the high standard of service that my predecessor set for the Lacombe constituency. I wish Jack Cookson a healthy and happy retirement from this Legislative Assembly. Last Wednesday the constituency put on a roast for Jack. It turned out to be more of a testimonial dinner than a roast, which indicates the type of individual he was. In talking to Jack that night, I asked him how he was enjoying his retirement and he said, I'm doing a lot of fishing. He said, when I was in the Legislative Assembly, I just didn't have the time to do any fishing at all; I applied myself to the job. That shows the kind of chap he was: he put work before pleasure. I think that's indicative of the ministers of this government, the high calibre of dedication they apply to their responsibilities. They put that work ahead of pleasure.

The Lacombe constituency should be of concern to all Albertans. It acts as the hinge of Alberta, between the northern and southern regions. The area's tourism, industry, and services all have positive effects throughout the province due to our central location. The beauty of the area, with the numerous lakes in the Lacombe constituency, has created an active tourist trade in the area. Both Aspen Beach and the new Lakeview Park on Gull Lake attract many Edmontonians and Calgarians. On any given weekend during the summer, there are in excess of 30,000 campers in that one particular area.

Central Alberta is also a prime agricultural area. We are responsible for half of Alberta's wheat, 60 per cent of her cattle production, 80 per cent of her hogs. As well as the highly modern and mechanized dairy, beef, and hog industries, there are large feeder operations located in central Alberta. The oil and gas industry is having a larger impact than ever on our area. Not only do we have numerous oil and gas wells, but we also are the site of the Alberta Gas Ethylene world-scale petrochemical industry. With our natural gas reserves and returning investor confidence, the province is a natural place to establish such plants, and they are establishing in central Alberta because of the availability to the market and to the gas and oil wells located there.

Alberta Gas Ethylene presently employs 320 people. They'll complete phase two in 1984. When they complete phase three in 1986, they'll have committed over \$1.5 billion to that one project. The presence of this world-scale plant has drawn other plants to the area. There's Enesco Chemical; they'll be building a \$215 million plant. Union Carbide is committed to a \$259 million plant, and it's well under way with completion in late 1984 or 1985. When these plants are all on stream, they'll create over 600 permanent jobs. While the construction period is on, there are approximately 1,700 jobs in the construction phase.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard about how high our unemployment is going, and this is just a clear example of how the free-enterprise system has a solution for it. Our plants are created, we're getting investor confidence back, and we're going after it. The government doesn't have to get involved. I think the industry itself can bring us out. It's a clear indication here.

Mr. Speaker, with the growth of these industries, we must at all times strive to preserve prime agricultural land. We must protect that area. It is a resource that is

diminishing in some areas, so there has to be a compromise between industrial growth and the agricultural section.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Lacombe is a growing one, but with growth there are accompanying problems. I was encouraged to see that the Speech from the Throne addressed many of our concerns in Lacombe. I was particularly glad to hear that the government will continue to emphasize reliable transportation systems. The stated priority of transportation safety is, I'm sure, shared by all of us.

On that particular point, I'd like to raise a major concern in our constituency of Lacombe, and that's the Highway 2 intersection at Blackfalds. That road services all the petrochemical development area to the east, that I had mentioned previously, plus all the tourist industry from Sylvan Lake and Gull Lake. They funnel in through that one intersection onto that major north/south highway link. It's on a downhill curve on No. 2 Highway. There've been numerous accidents and deaths on that corner. With the continued growth that we see in both the tourism and petrochemical areas, it's only going to increase. I would urge this government to give serious consideration to rectifying this hazard. Just to emphasize a little further how dangerous that intersection is, I would say there isn't an intersection in another province or state in North America where the entire official opposition of a government could be wiped out in one little accident.

In the transportation area as well, Highway 51 in the west of the Lacombe constituency is long overdue for paving and upgrading. Highway 51 services the Gull Lake recreation area as well as the entire west end of the constituency. A paved Highway 51 would, besides giving much needed service to the citizens involved, make a tremendous contribution to tourism and increased agricultural production, both beneficial from a provincial standpoint. Highway 51 would be a very picturesque direct route for all of northern and central Alberta to connect with the David Thompson Highway and the mountains. Not only would it improve the transportation link for the farmers there, it would also open up a lot of marginal land that isn't being developed now for agriculture because they haven't got a road to get out. We don't need to look way to our complete northern boundaries, way north of High Level, for homestead land. Right here in central Alberta, we have land that can be proved if we got Highway 51 paved to open that country up.

Also on transportation, Mr. Speaker, secondary Highway 597 from the Joffre area, where the petrochemical industries are located, to Highway 21 should be graded and paved as soon as possible. With the expected growth in that petrochemical area, they're going to need that additional transportation link.

I also strongly endorse the proposed Buffalo Lake stabilization plan through the Parlbay Creek drainage system. It's comparable to the Paddle project, that we heard the hon. Member for Barrhead talking about previously. This would correct a 30-year problem of flooding, which has taken hundreds of prime acres of hay land out of production. It would also increase the water supply for the towns of Mirror and Alix.

I particularly liked the emphasis placed in the throne speech on advanced education and agriculture. Agriculture has always been part of my life, being born on a farm in the little town of Delia. You've heard that that's in Mickey Clark's area. I want to mention that there are two of us from there. One of us went down the progressive road to free enterprise; the other got on a slow boat

to nowhere called socialism.

We have in the Lacombe constituency the highly-respected Canadian Union College, with students from across Canada and the U.S. It offers several degree courses. Canadian Union College is worthy of our support in its future growth, and I'm sure that support will be there when they need it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must say I was totally amazed to hear some members of this Assembly state that the throne speech was an empty document. They can't be living in the land of reality, because the throne speech realistically addressed our present economic situation and illustrated that this government is able and willing to constructively tackle it.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations on your reappointment to the Chair — the longest serving Speaker in Canada, although you've now been sitting long enough that it's probably become old hat. One of the advantages of speaking near the end of the debate on the Speech from the Throne is having had the opportunity to listen to the many fine speeches, particularly of note the mover and the seconder who did such fine jobs and have been recognized by so many members of the Assembly.

I would like to express my appreciation to the residents of the St. Albert constituency for the opportunity of representing them for a second term in this Legislative Assembly. During this term an electoral boundaries commission will be established to review constituency boundaries throughout the province. The St. Albert constituency, with a population of approximately 60,000 residents, which includes urban and rural, is second only in population to Calgary McCall. This diverse and very heavily populated constituency certainly offers a challenge and an opportunity to learn about many wide varieties of issues and concerns.

One of the characteristics of the St. Albert constituency is that it has a wealth and depth of Alberta history. I'm going to take the members through a short history lesson regarding the settlement of the St. Albert constituency this evening.

With the settlement of the Red River region, many Metis families moved further west to preserve a traditional way of life, which was primarily hunting. Missions had been established in various settlements in Alberta. In 1857, Bishop Taché asked the Sisters of Charity of Montreal, who became fondly known and are known today as the Grey Nuns, to come and work in the newly established settlement in Lac Ste. Anne, which is now within the riding of the Member for Barrhead.

On September 24, 1859, Sister Emery, Sister Lamy, and Sister Alphonse arrived by oxcart after 52 days of travel over 900 miles of bumpy, rough, prairie trails from the Red River. After arriving, starvation took its toll on the residents of the tiny settlement, and in 1860 the search began for a new area that had more productive agricultural soil. Bishop Taché and Father Lacombe left Lac Ste. Anne on January 14, 1861, enroute to St. Boniface. When they were nine miles from Edmonton, they stopped on a hill overlooking the Sturgeon River. They cleared away the snow, lit a fire, and rested. It was on this spot and at this time that Bishop Taché cut down a young sapling, made a staff, planted it in the snow, and said to Father Lacombe that this would be the site of the new mission, and that the new mission would be named after Father Lacombe's patron saint, St. Albert.

At that point we certainly have to recognize our Sergeant-at-Arms, who claims to be one of the living descendants of Father Lacombe. [applause]*

After four years of hard work, the Grey Nuns — the three sisters that had arrived — moved to St. Albert, accompanied by seven orphans. The sisters brought with them the skills to develop a convent, which was completed a year later. Their convent, a two-storey house, became the first hospital, the first school, and the first orphanage west of the Red River.

In 1870 an epidemic of smallpox wiped out entire families and reduced the population of the settlement by more than a third. Many orphans, whose parents died during the epidemic, became wards of the Grey Nuns. In that year, 1870, the first physician visited St. Albert and a newly built ward adjoining the convent was opened. This became the forerunner of the Edmonton General hospital, which opened 15 years later.

The main population until this point, 1870, was exclusively Metis. In 1878 the first influx of settlers arrived. In 1888 the school developed by the Grey Nuns was recognized by Regina as the St. Albert public school district No. 3. This is the oldest school district within Alberta, and today still confuses many newcomers, who learn that the Catholic system is the public school system.

Two weeks ago, a group of very energetic volunteers from St. Albert, entitled the St. Albert Pioneers Committee, initiated and organized a week of celebration in appreciation of the members of the Grey Nuns who, over 120 years, contributed to the work and the life within St. Albert and within the province of Alberta. Sixty-one sisters have lived in St. Albert from 1863 to 1967, when St. Albert became a city. This week of celebration was highlighted by a banquet on the Saturday evening, which included tributes from many. The Lieutenant-Governor of our province, whose father knew Albert Lacombe well, paid a tribute as one of the members attending the banquet. His Honour described when, as a boy, one night Father Lacombe and an Indian rode into their ranch on a buggy to spend the night with the Lynch-Staunton family.

This week of appreciation reminded us of the sacrifice and hardship endured by the Grey Nuns as they worked diligently in the early history of this province. They brought the first schools, the first hospital, and the first health units. They became the friends of the Metis people and developed bonds that are lasting. During the 120 years the Grey Nuns have touched many residents in St. Albert, particularly the school children, the orphans, the sick, and the elderly. In more recent years the Grey Nuns developed facilities to care for the elderly, and today, nursing home care is the main involvement of that order in St. Albert.

Tonight I want to bring this brief history of the involvement of the Grey Nuns and pay my personal tribute to their long history of work that has been done quietly and diligently for that long period of time and has contributed so much to the development of our province. [applause]

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to refer to the tabling of a document in this Assembly on March 11, Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis. I realize that this is designated for discussion later on this week, but I would like to mention it, as I was speaking about the Grey Nuns tonight and I think it follows in the same line. In the evolution of our democratic system of government, there has been a separation of state and church. There is often a great temptation for the clergy to become involved in

state affairs. Statements made by John Paul during his recent tour to Central America have once again emphasized the position of the Catholic church regarding such involvement.

However, this does not mean that the church has changed from the acceptance of its role within society to provide services such as those that the Grey Nuns have provided for 120 years within this province, and also to address current issues from a moral perspective. This document is to be considered by the entire Christian community and clearly states in the third paragraph:

As pastors, our concerns about the economy are not based on any specific political options. Instead, they are inspired by the Gospel message of Jesus Christ.

While no one is compelled to agree with all aspects of the document, there is a great deal of food for thought: comments about the worth of work, the responsibility of each of us for those who are less fortunate. Recently we have seen many examples of workers sharing their hours of work with others so their fellow workers would not face layoffs or unemployment. But I abhor the use of this document in trying to turn it into a political statement for the NDP, which only serves to minimize the concern expressed by the Catholic bishops.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn briefly to a few constituency concerns. First, I would like to comment on assistance for water and sewage programs. I would like to disagree with the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who opposes subsidies for water and sewer lines. I only say that that member is not living in a community where the sodium content of the water supply is so high that it's barely usable.

During my maiden speech four years ago, I suggested that country residential development should, or perhaps could, be curtailed until we come to grips with what I consider an extremely serious pollution problem. Over the past four years my concern has grown, as many country residential developments have continued to sprout, often against the wishes of the local authorities, with approval coming from bodies such as the provincial Planning Board. A concentration of these developments in certain areas, depending on the density and the subsoil structure, has resulted in raw sewage filling ditches, floating into adjacent properties, and into our river systems.

I believe that it is essential that the water and sewage assistance branch carefully review the areas of urgent concern, and that they set priorities based on the need of cleaning up these areas. Alberta is far ahead of other provinces in dealing with the treatment of effluent. However, some development, such as country residential, falls outside the funding qualifications, and yet poses serious problems and potential environmental health concerns.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne lists a wide array of programs and services that affect each constituency. I would like to express my appreciation for road improvements that have happened within the St. Albert constituency over the past term. The 125th Avenue Edmonton corridor, which is 90 per cent funded by provincial dollars, has helped immensely in moving traffic into Edmonton from the northwest. The upgrading of 124th Street, and the interchange at 125th Avenue and the St. Albert Trail have made a dramatic improvement in traffic flow. These are very much appreciated by those residents from outside Edmonton travelling in daily as commuters, or those that come in less frequently than daily to spend their dollars in the businesses.

*See Hansard, March 23, 1983, right column, paragraph 1

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne states that a top priority will be the reduction of the size of the provincial government deficit. The unprecedented political success of the New Deal, which has been mentioned in this throne speech on a number of occasions, demonstrated the vote-getting magic of giving to some without taxing others.

I agree with certain of the comments made by the Member for Edmonton Norwood [concerning] unemployment. I think unemployment is one of the most difficult problems we face. The throne speech, however, recognizes that this is an extremely important problem, and includes the announcement that we have a new Department of Manpower, which is responsible for a number of programs: the apprenticeship program, the manpower training programs, priority employment programs, and the summer temporary employment program. The new Minister of Manpower undoubtedly has a lot of challenges to face, and we're all going to do our best to help him in the months and years to come.

Thomas Sowell, a distinguished American economist, has written that with deficit financing and inflation, the government can seem to be giving everyone more than they paid for. It is only when you begin to count up how the value of your money is being stolen by inflation that you realize that taxes are only part of the cost of government. The biggest cost of inflation is what is silently stolen from pay cheques and from savings. And whenever we yearn for more government giveaways, we must realize that every government giveaway is also a takeaway.

There is a realization that challenges that we face must be addressed [by] each one of us; a realization that government cannot continue to grow and develop new programs when those who must pay have been severely affected by the effects of high interest rates, by the national energy program, by reduced consumption. Alberta is not an island and is not immune to the worldwide economic turnaround.

I would like to conclude tonight, Mr. Speaker, by again expressing my appreciation to the residents of the St. Albert constituency that have given me support to represent them in another term.

Thank you.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your reappointment as Speaker of the House. During the past week I've gained great respect and admiration for the dignified way that you control this Assembly. I'm sure everyone appreciates your unending patience and keen sense of humor. Mr. Speaker, the first week I was afraid I was going to have to give this speech, and the second week I was afraid you weren't going to let me give it.

I would like to thank His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on his reading of the Speech from the Throne. The hon. members for Grande Prairie and Calgary Foot-hills, as well as my other colleagues, are to be commended on their presentations to the throne speech. For new members, these interesting speeches enlighten our knowledge of the constituencies of our beautiful province. It is now my privilege to be able to tell you of the Wainwright constituency.

The four largest towns we have are Wainwright, Provost, Hardisty, and Camp Wainwright. There are several villages: Amisk, Hughenden, Czar, Metiskow, Cadogan, Hayter, Bodo, Chauvin, Edgerton, and Irma. The area covers approximately 4,500 square miles, and includes 75

miles of the beautiful Battle River valley. This river received its name from the fierce battles between the Indian hunting parties along its banks, and is now a very scenic attraction for many tourists.

The history of this area, Mr. Speaker, is very interesting. The first white man ever to see Alberta entered our province in what is now my constituency. On September 11, 1754, Anthony Henday camped along the Battle River near the village of Chauvin, which lies a few miles inside the Alberta border. Henday was a Hudson's Bay Company representative and visited many of the Indian tribes in Alberta, trying to establish a fur-trading business. It was near Irma that Henday visited an Indian camp and traded a gun for a horse. This made Henday the first white horse trader in Alberta. And since Irma is my home town, Mr. Speaker, and no one seems to know where it is, I hope that the Minister of Education will see fit to have this vital part of history recorded in our children's history books, then people will remember Irma as that horse-trading town in Alberta.

Homesteaders began to appear in our area in 1904, increasing in number with the building of the Grand Trunk railway in 1907. In 1909, Buffalo Park was established just south of the town of Wainwright. On June 13, 1909, 323 buffalo arrived in the Wainwright park from Elk Island Park. These buffalo came from a park in the Flathead Indian reservation in Montana. The price paid by the Canadian government at that time was \$245 a head, and this was certainly a big price in 1909. From 1909 to 1938 the buffalo increased in number, and during these years many were shipped to different parts of the world. There have been many interesting and humorous stories recorded about the adventures of the men riding herd on these buffalo. Due to the war, in 1938 Ottawa gave orders to clear out the buffalo. Over 7,000 head were slaughtered or shipped out.

The federal government then turned the land over to the Department of National Defence, where it was initially used as a prisoner of war camp during the Second World War. On May 6, 1945, the first prisoners arrived, and between 1,200 and 1,300 were concentrated in the camp. Now it is a regular army training centre for Canadian and British troops, employing about 400 permanent staff. The 140-square-mile camp is the largest primary training base in western Canada. This summer, 12,000 British troops are coming to camp for training manoeuvres.

As early as 1921, both oil and gas were discovered in the area. This had a great effect on the commerce of the constituency. Near the town of Wainwright, oil and gas reserves have been active for quite some time. Most recently, large discoveries of heavy oil deposits near the east end of the constituency have made little boom towns out of Provost and Chauvin. These discoveries have helped shield this area from the economic downturn that we have today.

In the west of the constituency, at Hardisty, there's a plant that refines raw butane into propane. At both Hardisty and Hughenden, there are large underground storage facilities for propane. These facilities are unique, in that there are large salt deposits about a mile underneath the ground. A large cavity is created in the salt deposit by pumping hot water down a pipe, dissolving the salt, and forcing the salt water up another pipe. This cavity is where the propane is stored.

Hardisty also has a large pumping station for the inter-provincial pipeline that pumps oil to eastern Canada. They have storage tanks and a transfer station as well. The oil from the eastern side of the province is piped or

trucked to this main terminal, where oil is blended and pumped into the interprovincial line. There's a network of pipeline from the many fields between Cold Lake and Lethbridge that leads to Hardisty's pumping station.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the number one industry in this constituency. The rolling terrain and the rich soils lead to a wide variety of mixed farming. We are especially proud of one mixed farmer down there, Martin Daniels, who has just recently been inducted into the agricultural hall of fame. He is a founding and key figure of the association of Alberta co-op seed cleaning plants, which now operate all across the province. His organizing ability was just as instrumental in setting up the credit union in Wainwright, which is one of the largest financial institutions in that area. I was personally pleased to see his dedication and skill recognized by this well-deserved award.

The grain growers and livestock producers are anxiously awaiting the final legislation on the Crow rate. We realize the impact this will have on the future of the whole agricultural industry. With a new Crow rate settlement, we are looking forward to having a proposed \$9 million canola oil refining plant in the constituency. With the newly balanced freight rates, it makes more economic sense to process our own products here in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, we now have on the Order Paper Motion 202, which urges the government to explore and improve agricultural credit. This motion, called production credit, is due to briefs submitted to the caucus committee on agriculture by the Alberta Cattle Commission. They have done an enormous amount of work and deserve a lot of credit for their effort on this project. There is much work yet to be done, but I will strongly support this concept. With the implementation of production credit, we will have a credit system that will benefit all phases of the agricultural industry.

Being an agricultural area with a lot of new oil development, the people are very interested in the changes in the surface rights legislation as proposed in the throne speech. Mr. Speaker, agricultural lands are vital as productive, renewable sources of revenue for Albertans. But power lines, pipelines, oil wells, and roads, of course, need to be built. I strongly hope that the views of the farmer are given their due weight on this important issue.

I was glad to hear in the Speech from the Throne that the Alberta government will continue to make transportation a high priority this session. It is one of the major concerns of the people in my constituency. A lot of the roads, now being used as major trucking routes, were not built to take the heavy traffic. With the federal government's proposal to abandon rail lines, there will be much more grain traffic transferred to our highways. Also, the development of the heavy oil industry in this constituency has led to a large increase in heavy truck traffic using these roads. I could guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation would make a lot of friends in the Wainwright constituency if he helped pave and upgrade some of our roads. We might even name one after him.

With fuel costs close to tripling in the past few years, the farm fuel distribution allowance of 32 cents a gallon and the primary agricultural producers rebate program have certainly been welcome pieces of legislation to the farmers of Alberta. Many have also benefited from the farm interest shielding program. The assistance given by ADC to young farmers is also a great asset to our farming industry. It has been a major factor in keeping the family farm together, which is vital to the survival of

our smaller towns. This assistance has made it possible for the younger generation to remain on the farm. I am very proud of the fact that my two sons are the fourth generation of farmers, on both sides of the family, that farm in the Irma area.

The high standard of medical care and hospital construction done by this government has certainly helped the people of this province. We have a new hospital in the town of Provost, and we have construction that is taking place on new hospitals in both Hardisty and Wainwright. Every town in my constituency has benefited from grants given by the Department of Recreation and Parks. These matching grants provide the needed cash that, when matched with volunteer labor, make the construction of these projects possible.

Curling rinks, artificial ice, golf courses, and community halls are all examples of projects that have been undertaken in this manner. Mr. Speaker, I might add that most of these facilities are paid for when the construction is completed. Recreation matching grants have really helped to bring back the true pioneer spirit of co-operation, which is a hidden value that is equal to the grant itself. This pioneer spirit of co-operation goes a long way in the operation of these facilities after they are built.

I am particularly proud, Mr. Speaker, of how our government looks after our senior citizens. I think we'd all agree that these special citizens deserve the finest facilities. The construction of manors in small towns has been a very valuable and welcome project. It has enabled our senior citizens to remain in their home towns with their families and friends. Since 1979 most of the towns and villages in my area have built or renovated a building to become their senior citizens' drop-in centre. I am sure that every drop-in centre has added new vitality and interest for our senior citizens. They are a most active group of people, and it is a pleasure to see the enjoyment they get from these centres.

As was rightly noted in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, we are in an economic downturn that is worldwide. Alberta has fared well in weathering the times, and we can be proud of the level of services that we offer our people. I believe there will be many good things that come from the recent downturn in our economy. It has forced our business to become more efficient. It has made our labor more realistic in its wage demands. And I might add that if this continues, it will go a long way in decreasing unemployment. Perhaps most importantly, it has decreased the expectations and dependence of most Albertans on the government. If traditional sources of caring for people are strengthened by these harder times — by that I mean the family, the church, and private organizations — I am sure we'll all be better off for it in the long run.

As the Member of the Legislature for the Wainwright constituency, it is a great honor for me to be following in the footsteps of the past three MLAs, whom I know very well. Mr. Bill Masson from Irma was the MLA from 1935 to 1955. Mr. Masson is presently living in the Vialta lodge in Viking. Hon. Henry Ruste from Wainwright was the member from 1955 to '75. Mr. Ruste was the Minister of Agriculture for the Social Credit government. Mr. Charles Stewart followed Mr. Ruste to the Legislature, and was, as most of you know, the Conservative member from 1975 to '82.

I was privileged to have the help, advice, and knowledge of Charlie during my campaign. One of Charlie's quotes has stuck with me, and I'm beginning to believe it

more all the time: more people have talked their way out of this building than have talked their way into it. I'm sure you will all join me in wishing Charlie a happy retirement.

I have been in touch with nearly every minister concerning problems that affect my constituency, and have been very impressed by the high calibre of people we have governing our province. I appreciate the co-operation and friendly atmosphere that prevails among the members.

In closing, I would like to thank my constituents for the faith and confidence they showed in Premier Lougheed and this government on November 2, by giving me the privilege of representing them in this Assembly. The constituency of Wainwright consists of dedicated, industrious, and talented people. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can serve them as well as they deserve.

Thank you.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in the throne speech debate. In my first address to this Assembly, I would like to add my congratulations to the number of other speakers that have gone before me to you, sir, on your re-election as Speaker of this House. We in Alberta, through this Legislative Assembly, are singularly fortunate to have the most experienced speaker of any parliament in Canada rule this Chamber. In the short period of time I've been in this House, Mr. Speaker, I've come to learn that we will be well guided by your wisdom and experience.

I would also like to pay my profound respect to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. Our representative of the Queen is a shining example of the strength and wisdom of the people of Alberta. I wish him good health and long life.

Additionally, I extend my congratulations to the Member for Grande Prairie, who moved the Speech from the Throne, and to the Member for Calgary Foothills, who seconded the speech. Their thoughtful remarks and excellent presentations have set a high standard for all members of this House, indeed, I would suggest, for even some of the more seasoned members of this Legislature.

I would like to congratulate the Member for Wainwright and all members who have contributed to the throne speech. It's been said that one can learn a great deal about Alberta through the speeches from the throne, and I can assure you that I'm one who has. Finally, I would like to congratulate all members of this Assembly, irrespective of their political affiliation, for their important commitment to their constituencies and to the political and legislative process of this province.

Mr. Speaker, as I take to my feet for the first time in this Assembly, I'm somewhat overcome by a sense of tradition. One can hardly cast his glance about this room without feeling a certain pride in the tradition and heritage of our free democratic system. I have a deep-seated feeling for tradition. Indeed it is one of the more compelling reasons in my seeking to become an elected representative.

I'd like to explain some of my personal reasons for this abiding interest in tradition. On August 1 of this year, on the long weekend, my family will celebrate its 100th anniversary in Alberta — a total of 127 years in Canada. My great grandparents emigrated from Scotland in 1856, in a sailing vessel that took over six weeks to cross the Atlantic. They settled in a little village called Carluke near Hamilton, Ontario. In Carluke they had a neighbor by the name of Colonel James Walker, who was an officer with the Northwest Mounted Police. Colonel

Walker had a regular tour of duty to the western regions and often related many glowing accounts of the promise of the western frontier in his many discussions with my great grandparents.

Due to his influence, my great grandfather decided to follow the stream of settlers headed west. He and his two oldest sons, one of whom was my grandfather, set out in 1883. The CPR was in the process of extending its steel towards the mountains, and the group arrived at the end of the line at Maple Creek, Saskatchewan.

Prior arrangements had been made for the family to meet Colonel Walker, but typical of a McPherson arrangement, a misunderstanding took place and the Colonel wasn't there. However, by good luck and good fortune, my great grandfather Joseph happened to run into a family by the name of McInnis, who were headed for Calgary, and was able to load his gear onto their wagon, leaving the two boys to walk and hitch rides to the village of Calgary.

By October of 1883, the CPR had extended the line to Banff, and my great grandmother and the rest of the family arrived in Banff in the luxury of the CPR. I've read many accounts of the family history. Nowhere have I been able to determine how the family got from Banff to Calgary, but no doubt they walked too. The family first lived in a stone house near the No. 1 fire hall in Calgary. After about three years, they homesteaded in the Spring Vale area, about 6 miles west of Calgary. Joseph McPherson and his sons entered whole-heartedly in the cattle- and horse-raising business. The family operated one of the first threshing outfits in the district before the turn of the century and did much of the area's custom threshing. Joseph was also one of the instigators for the irrigation canal project in the south Springbank area. In typical western pioneer fashion, the family worked hard and prospered.

My forebears were no different than the countless thousands of early pioneers who settled our province. They came from different ethnic backgrounds, different religions, different stages of prosperity, and different philosophies. Many left their homelands in search of freedom because they were oppressed. But they all had one common thread: they believed in the work ethic, in the uniqueness of the individual, and in striving on their own to achieve their goals. These were laudable attributes in difficult conditions, and their philosophy is as valid today as it was 100 years ago.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, it was 101 years ago that Red Deer received its first non-native settlers. They homesteaded at the location where the old Calgary-Edmonton trail crossed the Red Deer River, about four miles upstream from the current location of the city. During the Riel rebellion, the Canadian militia established a military fortification close by, known as Fort Normandeau. Many, many people passing by Red Deer on Highway 2 often stop to view this very important historical site. In fact, the provincial government has recently transferred this site to the city of Red Deer, and it will become an integral part of our expanding and developing urban park known as the Waskasoo park.

The first homesteader on the land where the city is located was Dr. Leonard Gaetz. The townsite of Red Deer came into being in 1891, when Dr. Gaetz offered half his land to the Calgary-Edmonton railway company. The population of Red Deer was 300 when it was incorporated as a town in 1901. By 1913, when Red Deer was incorporated as a city, the population had jumped to 2,300. Red Deer had witnessed its first boom.

In 1905, the year Alberta became a province, Red Deer made a pitch to have the capital located there. The Lieutenant-Governor and all the members of the Legislature were invited to a lavish banquet at Red Deer's finest hotel. The speeches went on until a quarter to five in the morning. But, alas, the legislators decided to locate the capital in Edmonton. I suppose it proves the point, Mr. Speaker, that legislators even back then made the odd mistake.

The boom came to an abrupt end at the outbreak of the First World War. After the war, Red Deer became a quiet but relatively prosperous community. The 1930s produced hard times for Red Deer, as they did for the rest of Canada. However, Red Deer fared a little better than most centres, primarily because central Alberta was not hit by the drought that affected many other areas of western Canada and, more importantly, because Red Deer entered the depression debt free. Growth returned to the city after the outbreak of World War II. Red Deer provided the site for the A-20 military camp, which housed as many as 1,800 men, and a major air force base was located just south of the city in Penhold.

After the war, Red Deer experienced another boom. Rich oil and gas fields were discovered in the area, and oil exploration and well servicing became an important industry and a major economic stimulant. By the late 1950s, Red Deer was the fastest growing city in western Canada.

The boundaries of the constituency of Red Deer are almost identical with the city limits, making it one of the largest urban constituencies in the province. The population of Red Deer in 1982 was 48,562. Red Deer lies in the middle of the most heavily populated area of the province. It has a regional trading area of more than 170,000 people. In fact, Red Deer is the only city in the prairie provinces that can lay claim to a market of 1.5 million people within a 100-mile radius. Its economy is diverse enough to make it the envy of many other centres. Red Deer's historical base, of course, is agriculture. It is the capital of the central Alberta parkland, where the soil is rich and black, the crops are heavy, and where a livestock industry has been well developed since the 19th century.

In recent decades, the labor-intensive petroleum service and exploration industry has played an important role in our economy, and accounts for a significant portion of the employment in Red Deer. The economic downturn has reduced activity in this sector and other sectors recently. I think it's noteworthy that the Speech from the Throne states that the

government recognizes the continuing need to encourage and promote the development of Alberta's energy resources as a keystone in its plans for economic [recovery].

In fact, included in the very first priority of the throne speech, His Honour calls for

intensive government efforts to assist our private sector to market both within Canada and throughout the world, our oil, natural gas ... and other products.

His Honour also referred to a second ethylene plant and derivative plants under construction and on schedule. The hon. Member for Lacombe has gone into some detail with respect to the economic statistics of the area. These plants are in fact in his constituency, so I won't go into them again in detail. Suffice to say that the economic development of the area is a very important factor in the economic stimulation of the central Alberta region.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned but a few of the major

industries that contribute to the economy of Red Deer. I could go on and on. Red Deer is a major regional trading centre and, as such, it is serviced by a wide range of manufacturing, wholesale, retail, and service industries.

I would be remiss if I did not make mention of small business. For, after all, small business is the backbone of the economy of Red Deer. It employs many of us directly or indirectly. Small business circulates and invests its capital directly back into the community. Once again, government commitment to small business is emphasized in His Honour's speech, by ensuring "government will continue to foster a positive business climate".

Mr. Speaker, our city has been a major beneficiary of the government's program of decentralization. The economic impact of the government facilities in Red Deer cannot be disputed. But when I think of decentralization, I think of opportunity. At the time I graduated from high school, most of the young people left Red Deer in search of educational and career opportunities. This phenomenon has now changed. Young people aren't leaving Red Deer like they used to, because there are educational and employment opportunities in our city. In fact, many of my old school chums are returning to Red Deer. They are returning because they recognize, along with all the people of Red Deer, that our city offers a particular and special quality of life. We have most of the amenities of the large metropolitan cities, and you can still drive out into the country from anywhere in the city within 10 minutes. People recognize it's a wonderful place to raise a family, and there exists a well-developed community spirit and pride in the amenities and facilities offered to our citizens.

Evidence of the provincial government's contribution to our quality of life can be found in the recently completed regional hospital and provincial building, the nearly completed provincial courthouse and, as I mentioned, the Waskasoo urban park and the expanding Red Deer College.

The Red Deer Regional Hospital was completed by the province in 1982 at a cost of \$59 million. It was completed on time and within budget. It has 367 active beds and 100 auxiliary beds. I mentioned opportunity, Mr. Speaker. This facility has a payroll of over 1,800 people. The opening of this institution has brought about a 50 per cent increase in medical specialists, a regional cancer clinic, and an advanced regional laboratory that services 25 hospitals and clinics in the surrounding area. This facility will meet the health requirements of the region for many years to come.

The downtown provincial building, which is the third largest provincial administration building between Edmonton and Calgary, was opened in 1980. This complex cost \$15 million and houses 700 civil employees.

The provincial courthouse, which I view from my constituency office, is currently under construction and is expected to be completed later this year. This facility will house the Queen's Bench, the Provincial Court, and the Family Court. The residents of Red Deer and the surrounding area will soon be able to bring and hear all forms of provincial litigation within one location in Red Deer.

The quality of life of the residents of Red Deer is being greatly enhanced through the government's program in support of the urban parks program. Total funding for the Waskasoo park will reach \$27 million when completed. This park runs for about 13 kilometres along the Red Deer River corridor, and the project is rapidly developing. Most of the land has been acquired, and the design is

nearly complete. Many recreational facilities are planned for the Waskasoo park, and they include a golf course, picnic areas, the Gaetz Lakes interpretive centre, the Hoopfer equestrian day-use area, a campground, and over 60 kilometres of walking and bicycle trails. The park will be a source of terrific pride and enjoyment to the people of Red Deer and, in my view, a most appropriate application of funds from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, for it will provide a fine legacy to future generations.

I mentioned educational opportunities, Mr. Speaker, and note that support and job retraining was stated as a government priority in His Honour's Speech from the Throne. Our government's commitment to education is clearly demonstrated in my constituency through the Red Deer College. This summer the new trade and technology wing will be completed. It will make Red Deer the third largest technical school in all of Alberta. As well, students from the surrounding area can now find accommodation in the newly opened student housing project. The college will soon be going to tender on a new fine arts centre. The Red Deer College is a source of great pride for the citizens of Red Deer, and will enhance our very important educational and cultural activities.

Mr. Speaker, Red Deer has had a stable history, marked by periods of rapid growth which we have witnessed in recent times. The population of Red Deer grew an average of 6.5 per cent annually from 1976 to 1980, compared to a 4.5 per cent average growth in Calgary and a 2.3 per cent rate in Edmonton. In the period between 1980 and '82, Red Deer's population grew 16.8 per cent. The stability and diversity of our economy assures continued growth over the medium and long term. This growth, however, places pressures on public facilities and heightens the need for effective long-term planning. Red Deer has many attributes and, as I have mentioned, has enjoyed rich benefits from our provincial government. While ever mindful of the need for economic restraint during these times, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of constituency concerns whose cause I hope to advance over my term in the Legislature. Among these are railway relocation, downtown revitalization, and completion of the Westerner Exposition facilities, including the construction of a coliseum.

The relocation of the railway yards will effect considerable transportation savings and play an important role in future planning in our city of Red Deer. Presently, the city is seriously hampered, in terms of planning, by the current location of the downtown yards and north line. Removal of the railway will improve the present imbalance of residential and industrial land in the northwest by freeing 400 acres of residential development north of the river. Relocation will also enable the city to offer spur lines to the new industrial park, in which city of Red Deer taxpayers have a significant investment. These are important planning considerations for attracting new businesses and new industry to our community. In terms of transportation, rail relocation will eliminate the need for expensive grade-separated rail crossings at a number of locations and will defer the need for additional bridge crossings. Relocation will enable the city to complete its major east-west thoroughway, by linking the new Taylor bridge to Ross Street, providing direct access to the downtown core from the northwest sector. The increased

accessibility to downtown, coupled with the release of 15 acres of prime commercial land, will act as an important catalyst to the much needed revitalization of Red Deer's downtown core.

In November, the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs along with myself representing the hon. Minister of Agriculture, officially opened the Altaplex building at the new Westerner Exposition site on the south side of the river. The Westerner is one of the oldest agricultural societies in Alberta. This year will be its 93rd annual fair. The new Westerner location is a reality, through the fine co-operation of countless volunteers, the city, and the province. This fine facility has unlimited potential and will become an important area in terms of trade shows and agricultural shows.

Central Alberta is the heart of cattle country, and the easily accessible Westerner Altaplex will do well in attracting many of our provincial livestock associations' regular shows. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, a number of players have been involved in the Westerner, including the volunteers, the city, and the province. And all have contributed financially. But because this park is in an urban setting, most of the funds have been directed towards servicing the land.

Our challenge in Red Deer now is to develop the additional people facilities. High on the list of priorities is a new race track, stabling barns, and a new coliseum. A new coliseum, to replace the antiquated arena built in the 1950s, will integrate with the facilities at the Westerner site and fill a much needed demand for sports, cultural, agricultural, and industrial use. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, a new coliseum and the completion of the facilities at the Westerner will greatly stimulate the overall economy of Red Deer, be a source of great community pride, and make the Westerner the agricultural showplace of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I come back to tradition. I've referred to it in a personal way. I've referred to the proud heritage and tradition of the constituency of Red Deer. I've referred to the existing and future public facilities that enhance the quality of life that we in Red Deer so deeply respect. I refer now to the long line of tradition of excellent representation from the nine members of this Assembly from Red Deer who have gone before me. I'm honored to represent Red Deer, and I hope my role will follow this tradition.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, due to the late hour, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon we will be in Committee of Supply for the purpose of continuing to deal with estimates of the capital projects division. As well, if there's time, we'll return to the debate in respect of the throne speech.

[At 10:54 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

