

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, March 19, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a very distinguished guest seated in your gallery, in the person of His Excellency The Lord Moran, British High Commissioner to Canada, who is paying a farewell visit to Alberta. Lord Moran has visited our province on other occasions during his tenure as the British High Commissioner, most recently in connection with the visit to Canada of the Rt. Hon. Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of [the United Kingdom]. I might say that before that, in June last year, he represented his government at the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Medicine Hat.

His Excellency has been a good friend of our province, and we bid him a fond farewell as he goes back to the United Kingdom and into retirement, where he assures me he will be taking an active part as a Member of the House of Lords.

Will you please extend to our distinguished guest the usual welcome of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 12****Co-operative Marketing Associations
and Rural Utilities Guarantee
Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 12, the Co-operative Marketing Associations and Rural Utilities Guarantee Amendment Act, 1984. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of the Bill is to transfer provisions of the Financial Administration Act which allow Treasury to buy out defaulted rural utility lien notes and, secondly, to make the existing provisions for the discontinuance of gas supply to persons in default on lien note payments apply to member-owned rural gas co-operatives.

[Leave granted; Bill 12 read a first time]

Bill 16**Stray Animals Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 16, the Stray Animals Amendment Act, 1984.

[Leave granted; Bill 16 read a first time]

Bill 10**Fur Farms Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 10, the Fur Farms Amendment Act, nineteen eighty-four. [laughter] I wish that had been on purpose; it was just a slip.

The purpose of this Act is to make some regulations regarding inspection, definition, and certificates of health.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

Bill 204**An Act to Amend the
Alberta Income Tax Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 204, an amendment to the Alberta Income Tax Act.

Its effect is to assist all Albertans, particularly the retail sector, by decreasing the personal income tax rate to the 1983 level. In effect, Mr. Speaker, it abolishes the 13 percent personal income tax brought into effect on January 1, 1984.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

Bill 9**Senior Citizens Housing
Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Senior Citizens Housing Amendment Act, 1984.

The purpose of the amendment is to allow senior citizen lodge foundations to levy an interest penalty on any requisitions which are not paid within 90 days after notice of the amount of the requisition is given to the municipality by the foundation.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

Bill 3**Emblems of Alberta Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 3, Emblems of Alberta Amendment Act, 1984.

The purpose of the Bill is twofold: firstly, to name a provincial tree and, secondly, to clarify the provincial colours.

DR. BUCK: Call it Tory deadwood, George.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 read a first time]

Bill 6**Pre-judgment Interest Act**

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Pre-judgment Interest Act.

This Bill provides for the payment of interest on sums awarded as judgments of the court for the period during which the matter is pending resolution in the courts.

[Leave granted; Bill 6 read a first time]

Bill 4**Municipal Land Loans Repeal Act**

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 4, the Municipal Land Loans Repeal Act.

This Bill will repeal an Act which allows municipalities to secure loans for the acquisition of land directly funded from the General Revenue Fund. No loans have been made under this Act since 1979. For the past four years, all loans to municipalities have been made by the Alberta Municipal Financing

Corporation. The purpose of this Bill is to get rid of the law which is no longer used, so as to cut red tape and regulation.

[Leave granted; Bill 4 read a first time]

Bill 11
Municipal Financing Statutes
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 11, Municipal Financing Statutes Amendment Act, 1984.

This will require changes in three Acts: the Local Authorities Board Act, the Municipal Government Act, and the Municipal Taxation Act. The debenture approval process review committee has recommended these changes.

[Leave granted; Bill 11 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 16 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

Bill 207
Remembrance Day Act

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 207, the Remembrance Day Act.

The principle of this Bill is to impress upon young Albertans the very high price paid for our freedoms by veterans of two world wars. The mechanism would be to arrange that a ceremony take place in each school in the province of Alberta, with particular emphasis on a two-minute period of silence.

Mr. Speaker, I regret I wasn't able to get in before the hon. House leader moved adoption of government Bills. [laughter]

[Leave granted; Bill 207 read a first time]

Bill 201
An Act to Amend the Hospitals Act

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 201, An Act to Amend the Hospitals Act.

Notwithstanding current legislation, the purpose of this Bill is to permit an approved hospital to specifically request the establishment of a palliative care unit to be operated in connection with the approved hospital.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm filing the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on the Debenture Approval Process, which forms the basis for the amendments found in Bill No. 11, introduced in the Assembly today.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm tabling a copy of the 1983 annual report of the Legislature Library. Copies will be going to all members.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file a response to Motion for a Return No. 219, which was accepted late in the 1983 fall session.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file sessional papers 90 and 91, pursuant to statute.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Department of Housing for the year ended March 31, 1983.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual reports of the Department of Culture and of Glenbow for the year ended March 31, 1983.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure this afternoon in introducing to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 85 grade 6 students from the Glen Allan elementary school in Sherwood Park. They're accompanied this afternoon by their group leader Mrs. Jeanne Sargent, teachers Dr. Darrell Souster, Mr. Wayne Malkewich, and Mrs. Marilynne Clarke, and parents Mr. Bernhardt and Mrs. Alice Gunderson. They're seated in the public gallery, and I request that they now rise and receive the very warm welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 12 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre. They are studying English as a Second Language. Accompanied today by their teacher and leader, Mrs. Anne-Marie LaBrie, they are seated in the members gallery. I ask that they please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly 24 grade 6 students from Glendale elementary school. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Rider, and by teacher Mr. Hudson. They have indicated to me, Mr. Speaker, that they expect to find this afternoon as refreshing and entertaining as they would their ordinary school afternoon. I ask that they rise and be recognized by the Legislature.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Manpower

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to members of the Legislature that the government of Alberta will recommend the allocation of \$20 million for the 1984 summer temporary employment program. This is an increase of almost \$8 million more than was allocated for the program last year, a 66 percent increase in funding this year over a year ago.

The government of Alberta recognizes that young Albertans, those between the ages of 15 and 24, experience the lowest employment levels. While there are indications the economy is gaining in strength, young people with little or no work experience will continue for some time to have difficulty in securing employment.

The significant increase in the funds allocated for this year's summer temporary employment program will greatly enhance the employment opportunities for our young people during a period when competition in the job market is at a peak. The program will run from April 30 until September 1 and is expected to provide approximately 9,000 positions.

Employment is provided through four program elements. Under the provincial government department element, approx-

imately 2,400 young Albertans will find jobs designed to emphasize individual career development with the 27 government departments. Summer temporary employment program employees will be paid \$5.50 per hour.

Community employment will provide approximately 4,600 young Albertans with work experience. Eligible sponsors include municipalities, school boards, agricultural societies, and nonprofit organizations. The government will reimburse these employers the minimum wage; however, employers have the option, and are encouraged, to pay additional wages.

Summer farm employment will provide an estimated 1,600 jobs for Alberta's youth. Participating farmers will receive up to \$300 per month for each position.

Under the career opportunity component, some 400 young people will receive career-related work experience in four areas: recreation, veterinary, law enforcement, and fish and wildlife. Recreation and veterinary positions will be cost shared equally, with the government reimbursing employers up to \$500 per month. Employees in law enforcement and fish and wildlife positions will receive \$5.50 per hour. In addition, postsecondary institutions are eligible to participate and will receive \$5.50 per hour for each employee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that although the summer temporary employment program is directed primarily at young people, it is also open to other unemployed Albertans. On a further point, application forms and information will be available by early April.

In closing, I would state that the summer temporary employment program is one of nine specific employment initiatives of the government this year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to respond to the ministerial announcement, a copy of which I have not received at the moment, I would like to say that while the minister was quick to point out an increase from \$12 million to \$20 million and used a percentage increase of 66 percent, and everybody pounded their desks, the fact of the matter is that that \$20 million has to be examined in the context of a total provincial budget of approximately \$10 billion. Put another way, it represents about two-fifths of 1 percent of the provincial budget.

Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we have 150,000 people out of work in this province and given the fact that the minister is right that the highest incidence of unemployment is among younger people, at this time I would say to the members of the Assembly that while the \$20 million is a step in the right direction, it is still a very modest step. Before members of the government spend too much time patting themselves on the back, in their individual constituencies they will have to ask the question, are we doing enough for the many thousands of young people who will still be lining up? Because while it will be a step, this program is not by any means going to be the solution.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Justice System

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Attorney General. It's with respect to public assertions made by that hon. gentleman, flowing from the questions I asked on Friday concerning Luscar Sterco. Is the Attorney General in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the policy of the government of Alberta that with respect to enforcement, certain types of laws take precedence over others?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think most of our citizens would readily understand that the criminal law is a unique institution throughout history, and in the lives of everybody, to the extent that it is there in order to maintain public order and deter crime. All the characteristics of the criminal law are that the representatives of the people, in the form of the Parliament of Canada, have chosen by definition to say what is and what is not a crime. When they do that, it is then their reflection, presumably of all of us, that this is conduct deserving of censure and, indeed, in appropriate circumstances, of punishment before the courts.

To say that other laws, whatever they may be, that are in the form of municipal bylaws, provincial statutes, and federal statutes, which have totally different objectives than the criminal justice system — to try to draw a comparison and say that they are in any significant respect directed at the same purpose or are there to achieve similar results, is simply not so.

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to go on too long, but simply want to add that the regulatory and supervisory aspect of non-criminal law is of the essence of that type of statute. With criminal law, it's well known that the objectives and the character are entirely different.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'll have an opportunity to debate the minister's approach in a few minutes' time, and that certainly will be forthcoming. However, I would ask the hon. minister whether it is the view of the government of Alberta that the Fisheries Act, Section 71 of which states that it's an Act "binding upon Her Majesty in right of... a province and any agent thereof", is merely a regulatory law?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think environmental statutes, along with numbers of other statutes that attempt to govern the way in which people, in the corporate or individual sense, govern their business affairs, would be typical of legislation which is meant to provide for guidelines being set for education of the industry and the people involved with it, and a general supervisory and leadership type of function in declaring that certain standards should, in the public interest, be maintained. But to say that the breach of such a regulatory provision should bring with it the sanctions of something equivalent to the criminal law is a misapprehension of the way in which the administration of justice should function.

On the question of the Crown being bound in regulatory and supervisory legislation of this type — something that sets standards for water and air, the sort of thing we're talking about in that type of legislation — that sort of thing being typical, as it is in a regulatory or supervisory thing, binds the Crown when the Crown is in the business. In other words, if you say that a particular coal mining company or pulp mill must comply with discharge requirements into a river, then if the Crown were in the same sort of business, as it may well be in some provinces — mining uranium or the like — it is bound. That's what it means when a statute like that says that it's bound. There is no attempt to suggest that in the application of regulations an administrator, be he the minister or one of his officials, does not retain discretion in respect of how those regulations are enforced.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, that certainly was an invitation to debate, and we'll have an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Speaker, in his discussions with federal officials, has the minister been advised that a statute of Parliament which carries with it a maximum fine of \$50,000 for breach of that statute is in fact merely a piece of educational material or a

dictum as to what people should do, all things being equal, as opposed to what they must do with respect to a law formally passed by the Parliament of Canada and to be enforced by the province of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, little is served by quoting the amount of the maximum fine under any legislation. Normally, nothing approaching the maximum fine is assessed by the courts. As the hon. leader is placing it before us now, it perhaps would tend to lead one to the conclusion that a fine of that order might be levied in a case like the one my hon. colleague the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife can surely elaborate upon, and that is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but it was my understanding that the question was directed toward eliciting information with regard to possible discussions between the hon. minister or the government of Alberta on the one hand and the government in Ottawa on the other.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. That's the question. I think the answer is no.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as to discussions on the enforcement of regulatory statutes, I don't ever remember being approached by a representative of the federal government on such a subject.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife advise the Assembly what communication took place between the department and the president of Luscar Sterco, as indicated in my question last week?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, since Friday I've been informed that my deputy minister, Mr. McDougall, had communications with the president. Shortly thereafter, all government departments interested in the project met with the management of Luscar and came up with a very comprehensive plan to solve the problem.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to give the Assembly the approximate date of this meeting?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I would like to bring you up to date and answer the question that was posed to me on Friday. It may be very lengthy. I think there are several interested members who would like the facts of the case, so I would like to attack it on that base. There is a lengthy discussion that could take place.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know what the hon. minister's concept of lengthy is. I must say that I have an unusually long list of members who have not yet had an opportunity to ask their first questions. Perhaps we could find out what the hon. minister's concept of lengthy is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, on Friday a question was raised concerning the enforcement of the Fisheries Act at the Coal Valley mine operations of Luscar. The problem at the Luscar mine site was that the mine site water management system did not adequately deal with the water flows, which from time to time had uncontrolled releases of silt and coal into the Lovett

River. Actions have taken place, with very positive results being achieved.

One aspect of the question asked by the leader on Friday was the implied comparison of procedures used in the enforcement of the Fisheries Act and those used in the administration of criminal justice. The Fisheries Act contains a very broad regulatory group of provisions which must be applied with discretion, and I think it would very wrong to try to say that such a comparison with criminal justice could properly be made. It's been standard government policy here in Alberta and in other jurisdictions to work under prosecution under the Fisheries Act as an enforcement option, with environmental and fishery departments free to accept or reject, under specific cases, the advice given by the lawyers in the Attorney General's department.

In this case, we are dealing with sections 31 and 33 of the Fisheries Act, which deal with the pollution of fish-bearing waters and damage to fish habitat. Concern that some regulations might have been breached resulted in a series of meetings last summer with all the concerned government departments, and with Luscar in September, to come up with a complete and comprehensive plan for the improvement to the mine water control system. On October 12, an agreed management plan was completed and, after consultation with senior staff of the department, the Deputy Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife advised me that he had decided that no further consideration would be given to legal proceedings under the Fisheries Act unless the company failed to carry out its agreed program.

On November 1, construction of permanent improvements to the mine water control system commenced at the mine site, at a cost of some \$500,000 to Luscar. Had the government opted for the legal process, these positive results would not have been so quickly achieved. Significant legal costs and a major staff effort would have been required. By the approach taken, the most useful results were achieved by departmental and company staff working together to solve that problem.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that with the co-operation of all those government departments, along with industry in this case, justice has been given to the citizens of Alberta by maintaining work for our citizens and promptly securing a high level of environmental protection for all Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, it would seem to me that he was clearly embarking on a debate on the merits of the topic rather than just [answering] questions. Under the circumstances, there is no way that I could deny the Leader of the Opposition the same latitude.

MR. NOTLEY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will have an opportunity in a few minutes' time, and I certainly intend to deal with the minister's invitation to debate. On a point of order, might I just suggest that if we're going to have answers which in fact are ministerial statements, they should be made in the form of ministerial statements so that both I as Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Little Bow as leader of the Independents would have the ability to reply. What we had a few moments ago was certainly the government's opinion, but that's all it was — the government's opinion.

The minister gives us such a glowing picture, Mr. Speaker. However, I'd like to ask him why, when the first directive went out on August 5, 1982, and recommendations for prosecution came in on July 28, 1983 — that is just a week short of a year — the minister's department apparently did nothing to deal with the repeated infractions of departmental instructions to that company during that period of time? What was the department doing?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, the file on this case is about four inches deep. During that time frame, numerous efforts with the Department of the Environment and Luscar were taking — several visits to the site, temporary improvements were made, and a great deal of work was done with the Department of the Environment and our staff during that year.

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

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

MR. NOTLEY: What is the policy of this department when an infraction has occurred repeatedly, after efforts — and I have the chronology here of the meetings, the many meetings. But after each meeting, more infractions. What is the policy of this department with respect to prosecution, or will it ever occur? Are we forever going to take a John Howard approach to dealing with industrial polluters?

MR. SPARROW: My colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources may want to [supplement] this, but our policy with reference to using the legal process to achieve a goal is very hard to determine. Success is never certain in legal proceedings. In this particular case there was a strong possibility that the charges would not be successful, and if so, it might be that the time frame to get a successful legal solution would be very time consuming.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be allowed an opportunity to both supplement the answer given by my colleague the associate minister and respond. Number one. I have some knowledge of the circumstances of this matter. Relatedly, there have been some very serious allegations raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, both within and without the House, and I'd like to offer information in response to the questions that have been raised in respect of the Luscar royalty relief matter. If I could ask for the indulgence . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister might deal briefly with the matter further, in the framework of the question that was asked.

MR. NOTLEY: And a ministerial statement tomorrow, John.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, let me simply respond by saying that in asking questions about handling pollution matters, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has characterized the matter, or sought to characterize it, as a question of the administration of justice. I can advise the Assembly that back in 1983, when the application for royalty relief was brought to this government, the matter which was before this government was not in fact a question of the administration of justice but a question about jobs for our coal industry and a matter of a clean environment in this province.

Mr. Speaker, this government was informed by the Luscar Sterco operation that their financial circumstances were such that in the absence of the royalty relief requested, there would be a likely layoff of some 120 workers. We took a very long look at this application for royalty relief — the precedent being the Grande Cache mine operation — and came to the judgment that this was a very valid application brought before us. At about the time this matter was being resolved, advice of some pollution concerns related to the operation came from the associate minister. The judgment was made that in granting the

royalty relief, clearly it would be important to provide as a requirement that this pollution matter be resolved.

So rather than a matter of any miscarriage of administration of justice, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen here is the granting of royalty relief and the cleanup of the environment, with three results: number one, 120 coal workers have jobs who might not otherwise have jobs; number two, the environment has been cleaned up, \$500,000 has been spent, and the Lovett River is clear; and number three, the public of Alberta has been spared a very costly legal proceeding, the only losers being the lawyers, and that's not such a bad thing.

Mr. Speaker, this was a very solid and proper judgment on the part of the government.

MR. NOTLEY: Once again, another ministerial announcement.

In light of the minister's answer, I'd like to ask one supplementary question of either the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the associate minister. Is the minister of energy telling the House that he was not aware of the complaints and the investigations that had started in August 1982 until the date in 1983 when he discussed the question of royalty relief with the company?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I have no particular recollection of any specific possible court proceedings being brought to my attention until the latter part of the decision-making process with respect to the royalty relief application. I can check my records further and refresh my memory on it, but that is my recollection. It was brought to our attention through the associate minister, and subsequently by other documentation through the department. But from our standpoint in Energy and Natural Resources, clearly there was an application for royalty relief which was adjudicated based upon its own merits.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about the proposal on July 28 that prosecution occur; I am talking about the repeated infractions of the Fisheries Act over a period of at least one year. At what point did the minister of energy become knowledgeable that these infractions had in fact occurred?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I think it's very much an open question as to whether or not there were infractions of the Fisheries Act. That is a matter that would have been adjudicated upon in a court.

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] the prosecutor.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: I should add — the hon. member suggests this is a matter that's determined by the prosecutor, and that's patently incorrect. All a prosecutor does is provide a legal opinion. It's nice to have an encouraging legal opinion, but the final resolution of whether or not there is an infraction is by a judge in the court.

In terms of the specific question that was raised, I think my hon. colleague has responded to that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, again we'll have an opportunity to debate the issue.

MR. MARTIN: Their memories will be refreshed.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, their memories will be refreshed by that point in time.

McDougall School Renovation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Premier. In view of the 22 percent vacancy rate in the city of Calgary, is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly what consideration led to the expenditure of funds for the renovation of the new Premier's and Lieutenant Governor's offices in McDougall school?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I refer the question to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think it's probably useful to point out a bit of background. Almost four years ago, the then school board of the city of Calgary came to us and pointed out that they were looking at closing McDougall school. They were considering options, one of which would be removal of the school and redevelopment of the land. They recognized, however, that it was an historic resource. In fact, the building was designed by Mr. Jeffers, who was the architect who designed the Legislature Building. They felt that because the building had heritage value, they would like to see it retained for the people of Calgary and the people of Alberta.

We looked at it, evaluated it, and found that the building was in excellent basic condition. It required electrical and mechanical work and upgrading to meet current building codes and safety standards but was basically sound. So the price that was agreed upon for the purchase of the land and the building, the property, was some \$20 million, which was far less than the market value of the property if they had chosen to proceed with redevelopment. Also the building — I could go into great detail with regard to the merits of the building, but I think I probably shouldn't in the question period. The plasterwork and woodwork are very fine indeed.

It became apparent that the building would make an excellent centre for government purposes.

DR. BUCK: For 31, it should.

MR. CHAMBERS: We therefore concluded a three-way deal with the school board, through purchase of the property, and the city of Calgary, who wish to develop a parkade. As I think members are probably aware, a 600-car parkade is well advanced in construction. The province's role will be to complete a park over the parkade. The city is building a structural slab, which will contain the park, on the top. A park will be built over the top of the parkade and on the west side and around the building, and then the province will renovate the building.

We propose to use the main floor space for departments which require really constant, ongoing, street-front usage. I'm talking here of Public Affairs, Vital Statistics, and Travel Alberta. These are departments which, statistically, people visit often and which require a central location. We also thought it appropriate to develop space in a central location for our Lieutenant Governor, Premier, southern Alberta MLAs, and visiting cabinet ministers to meet with the public — the people of Calgary and southern Alberta. This space will occupy the upper floor, the second floor.

Mr. Speaker, I think the space will indeed be well utilized and the building and the park around it well accepted and utilized by the people of Calgary and of southern Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. To preface my question I must say how flattered I am. It's not every day that one can get three ministerial announcements in oral question period.

Given this government's so-called commitment to privatization, why was emphasis not given to the fact that there's a 22 percent vacancy rate in office buildings in Calgary, as opposed to the renovations to this particular project?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I always give consideration to space requirements and availability in Alberta. I would point out that the space presently being utilized for the government purposes I referred to, in the Bowlen Building, is required for the juvenile court system and the family court system; therefore, we're required to move from there. The overall impact in terms of space is not large. The departments I referred to, that will be utilizing the main floor space, are scattered in the city now, and I think will be able to serve the public much better in that central location.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. In these lean, difficult times, with a 22 percent vacancy rate in office buildings, has the minister's department any comparative costs of the \$11 million needed to renovate the McDougall school, the square footage involved, compared to the going lease rates in Calgary? Do we have any figures at all that the minister can table in the Assembly?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, lease rates at any given time are of course a fluid thing. Lease rates today would perhaps vary appreciably from lease rates a few years from now. This building will be for the utilization of the people of Alberta for many, many years to come. The cost of construction today is optimal, and the job will employ approximately 100 people through the construction phase over the next two years. I consider the construction to be very cost effective.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Manpower could indicate to the Assembly whether he was involved in the discussion of the \$31 million for Government House south. How can the minister reconcile \$20 million for the student temporary employment program, versus a \$31 million expenditure on Government House south? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: This is something we might deal with in the debate on the motion for the address in reply to His Honour's speech. It seems to me that we've been having some debating questions and answers thus far. Perhaps this one goes a little farther than some of the others. Under the circumstances, the minister might answer briefly. I am very much concerned. We're certainly not going to reach all the members today who wish to ask a first question.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, very briefly. I would just point out that this project is part of the capital projects carried out by this government that in the past year have generated over 37,000 man-years of work. You can't ask us to spend capital dollars on one hand, and then be critical every time there is a project carried out.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont.

DR. BUCK: The house that Peter built.

MR. LEE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister of public works indicate if there were any offers from the private sector to construct or pay for this major new public park located on-site, in view of the fact that there are only three small parks in all of downtown Calgary?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we shouldn't call off the question period and get into the throne speech debate right away.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to narrow the focus with respect to the McDougall school site, to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. In terms of the cost analysis what portion is going to be picked up by the city of Calgary? And how many jobs are going to be created in terms of the whole project?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the cost to construct the city's 600-car parkade is in the order of \$9 million. As I mentioned earlier, the jobs appear to be in the vicinity of 100 over the next two years in an ongoing way.

With regard to the province's cost, I would point out that when the school board came to us, they pointed out that they had a need for schools in outlying and new areas of the city and that they wished to use the \$20 million paid for the land for the construction of new schools. The actual cost of renovation and the park would be something in the order of \$11 million.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could we be absolutely crystal clear on the access to the facility when it is completed? It is also going to be a place where other members of the Legislature who are not members of the government can have access.

MR. SPEAKER: Are we having a supplementary ministerial statement?

DR. CARTER: I'm not that kind of minister. [laughter]

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the minister's answer on the expenditures for the renovations to McDougall school, could the minister indicate why the old Transportation Building here in Edmonton is being demolished rather than renovated?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the old Transportation Building was constructed as a temporary building in the early '50s. It was never meant to be a long-lasting building. We did an evaluation on that building during the last year, and it was apparent that it would require very extensive funds to renovate the building. The fact that it was a lightly built building, built really as a temporary building, and had used its useful life cycle, made it apparent that it was not cost effective to renovate that building. Since the space wasn't required, I concluded that the most cost-effective solution was to remove the building and put in grass for the benefit of the people of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: I must confess that that one got by the Chair. I have a little difficulty finding a transportation building in Edmonton as some sort of supplement or adjunct to one in Calgary.

Agricultural Loans

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture is with regard to any changes in government policy under the Agricultural Development Corporation, with regard to either bankruptcy of some farmers or the lack of operating funds they are facing coming into the spring term.

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Mr. Speaker, there is no basic change to the program. As usual, the Agricultural Development Corporation is working with accounts that are in some difficulty or where there are cash-flow problems, to try to assist them in some way to operate for the coming year. In addition, there is also assistance available from the Department of Agriculture, through the regional specialists and others, in financial counselling to help them work through any difficult financial problems they may be in.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, responsible for the Alberta Opportunity Company. Is any change being considered in terms of agribusiness in the province? Are the number of agribusinesses financed through AOC under some duress at the present time? What is the present situation?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, any businesses that are funded under the Alberta Opportunity Company are in the same area as before; in other words, the program has not changed to any degree. The one area I should point out where there is not what you might call duplicate funding — in other words, the opportunity for a business, if it happens to be in the agricultural area, to go to the AOC for a loan, and then to go to the ADC for a loan. We watch that very closely and assist each other between the two corporations, in the sense of working to the best advantage of the businessman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister considering any change of policy that will assist some of the agribusinesses that are now in some financial difficulty?

MR. ADAIR: No requests have been made in that sense, and we aren't considering any particular changes to the method of operations of the Alberta Opportunity Company at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the Minister of Agriculture had any discussions with the banking institutions of the province with regard to credit situations at the present time, particularly with regard to operating loans that are due as we go into the spring season?

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Yes. Mr. Speaker. I have had ongoing discussions with a number of banks. As well, the chairman of the Ag. Development Corporation has been involved in those discussions. At this time the banks are being very sincere and dedicated in their efforts to try to assist those who are in difficulty. There are now some 22 agrologists on staff at the banks in the province, and they are working with any accounts that may be in some difficulty now, trying to work with them before the difficulty arises. If they can see some opportunity for a difficulty on the horizon, they try to get to them quickly.

In addition to that, through the Agricultural Development Corporation we are also working with those who may be in some difficulty with operating capital.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Is any consideration being given to a

change in policy under the Agricultural Development Corporation whereby the debt of the farmer could be loaded onto the end of his loan? In other words, the loan term would be extended, and that would reduce the current payments of the farmer, allowing the farmer to have greater access to operating funds at various banking institutions.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes. There is that flexibility in each account, if there needs to be. Through the Ag. Development Corporation, in each individual situation we are prepared to determine if something can be done in refinancing arrears. That's one area you raised that we are certainly involved in. Postponement of payments is another one, and total refinancing in other cases. So there is that flexibility. We must also be sure that the repayment ability on each of those refinanced loans is there.

PWA Operations

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Could the minister advise what action is being taken to prevent the government's remaining investment in PWA in view of the deterioration in service between Calgary and Edmonton since the recent sale? There's also been a decrease in revenue, I understand, because of the decrease in service.

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, since the Legislature adjourned in the fall, we have been successful in selling a significant portion of the government of Alberta's ownership in Pacific Western Airlines. In fact, I believe we currently hold less than 15 percent of the shares in Pacific Western Airlines. As I said last fall, at some point in time it is our intention to reduce our share ownership to 4 percent or below, which is consistent with the provisions of the legislation as they would apply to other governments.

In that context, as a minority shareholder in Pacific Western Airlines, it is no longer our intention to involve ourselves in any aspects of the day-to-day operations of the company or in any aspects the hon. member mentioned. In that regard, the hon. member would be advised to direct his comments directly to the management and board of directors of Pacific Western Airlines or to the regulatory authorities that control the operation of that airline.

With regard to the ongoing ownership of shares by the government of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that our view is that the balance sheet of the company, as it has been provided to the public in recent weeks and days, speaks well for the operation of the company. In due course we expect to dispose of additional shares at a value that's consistent with those values that have been talked about in recent weeks as far as PWA shares are concerned.

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

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the impending hearings on airline deregulation by the Canadian Transport Commission, is it the intention of this minister to make a submission to encourage competition on the Calgary/Edmonton airbus route?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, my information is that the Minister of Economic Development and/or his department staff will be making a submission to the CTC hearings into domestic and transborder airfares on March 23. I'm sure the hon. Minister of Economic Development would be pleased to provide

the member with a copy of the comments made by this government at that time.

Hospital Services

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Being the helpful person I am, I'd like to assist the minister whose riding contains the Holy Cross hospital. Can the minister confirm that it is the intention of this government to transform the Holy Cross active treatment hospital into an auxiliary facility?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of speculation over the weekend about plans that may or may not proceed, depending on what's contained in my colleague's budget. I can only say that I think people may be reassured at such time as statements are made following the submission of the budget.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand plans were in place for major expansion and renovation at the Holy Cross. Does the minister have any ballpark estimate of the cost of this expansion compared to construction of a new hospital, say, in northeast Calgary?

MR. RUSSELL: The cost of renovations for the Holy Cross is estimated at \$162 million and the cost of a new hospital at \$141 million.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. What priority has the government established for the four proposed new hospitals, two in Edmonton and two in Calgary. In other words, which ones will be built first?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, members will recall that when that program was announced, it was in an effort to provide metropolitan hospital facilities at a high standard in an era of very rapid growth. They were proposed to be built not only to catch up with population growth that had occurred during the late '70s but to anticipate growth to take place during the decade of the '80s. We know now that those projections have changed, and our financial ability to proceed in the original manner was revised. We're on record as saying that when part of that program could proceed, it would. I believe I'm on record as saying that in my view the highest priority lay with the Calgary northeast hospital. Insofar as the city of Edmonton is concerned, of course, the new Mill Woods hospital was proposed by my predecessor. So those are long-standing commitments and, at the appropriate time, will be commenced.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question dealing with the Holy Cross hospital, Mr. Speaker. A call from a person in Calgary indicated that he had recently waited nine hours in the Holy Cross emergency ward before a bed could be found, and that bed turned out to be on the surgery floor. My question is: what immediate plans does the government have to resolve what appears to be a crisis situation at the Holy Cross?

I might point out that when the gentleman talked to us, Mr. Speaker, he indicated he was a member of the Conservative Party.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I believe the political beliefs of patients showing up at hospital emergency rooms don't make any difference; at least I hope that's the case. So I can assure the hon. member that if he shows up — and I suggest some

repair work might be in order — he'd get just as good service as I've been getting. [laughter]

In any event, the member is dealing with a broader issue. We know that during that period from '75 to '80, Calgary and Edmonton were the two fastest growing cities in Canada. There was a great rush on in a period of high inflation, particularly in the construction industry, to respond and keep important community facilities building at the pace they should be.

The different hospital boards have been asked to submit their long-term plans for expansion and renovations. Those are in addition to plans we may have for additional facilities. In any event, finally someone has to work out a plan that is economically feasible and combines rehabilitation with expansion. At the appropriate time, those answers will be forthcoming.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could indicate how many beds per . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have run through the allotted time for the question period. There is such a long list of members who haven't been able to ask their first questions yet that I don't think any slight remedial work I might undertake in that regard would be significant. I would respectfully suggest that any further questions might be left for tomorrow's question period.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Moved by Mr. McPherson:

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. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the bulk of my speech, I want to take a few moments and deal with some matters of particular concern to the people in the Spirit River-Fairview constituency, Albertans I have the honour to represent in the Legislative Assembly.

Perhaps right off the top I might itemize an issue that I think is important; that is, the work the Department of Culture is doing with respect to the Dunvegan project. This is an excellent project, which will eventually cost somewhere around \$15 million or \$16 million but will lead to the reconstruction of one of the earliest forts in the province of Alberta. For any of you who have had the opportunity of travelling in the north, you'll know that Dunvegan is a particularly scenic area. We now have a campsite. At one time at the turn of the century, Dunvegan city was to be the growth capital of the north. We still have people — in New York City, I think — who have deeds to parts of the hill, who bought lots during the Dunvegan boom when the railroad moved to both the north and the south and

didn't come to Dunvegan. The boom left that particular little community.

But the history, which dates back to the time of Mackenzie, is worth preserving. I notice the minister is not in her place at the moment, but this is one project that I not only commend the minister for but, in a speech which in the main will not be flattering, commend the government.

I'm also pleased that we had the opening the other day of the Mackenzie planning commission; a very ecumenical session, with the Member for Peace River, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. Minister of Culture, and I all getting on quite well actually — much to the surprise of some people — on a day when we saw the opening of a beautiful new building in the town of Berwyn. It's unfortunate that the hospital won't be there. The new Berwyn hospital is in the process of being finished in Grimshaw, Mr. Speaker — way over budget. I might add. Nevertheless it was a nice day, and we did have the opening of the Mackenzie planning commission building in Berwyn.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to see the minister of highways get on with some major highway priorities in the north. I would underline two that I think deserve a good deal of attention. One is Highway 64 west of Fairview to the B.C. border, and the other is secondary road 733 south of Wainwright. Both are major arteries which, in my judgment, should be given priority by this government, the sooner the better.

Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to deal with two principal issues. The first will be the management of the Alberta economy and the choices one has to make in a time of recession. The second will be the question of the administration of justice.

When you look at the economy of this province in 1984, you don't see the boom, the prosperity, and the optimism which characterized the 1970s. As a matter of fact, when I look at the indicators compiled by the Conference Board of Canada, there are some really remarkable statistics. Government members don't like our citing the Conference Board of Canada very much, Mr. Speaker, because they'd like to forget the Conference Board. Of course they also like to forget the fact that when the Tory government sought re-election in 1982, the Premier went from one part of this province to the other citing the Conference Board of Canada as a reason that things were looking up. When the news changes, the government very quickly discards any harbinger of unpleasant news. Anything that gets in the way of the official propaganda of this regime is set aside. But because the Conference Board of Canada was used as the basis of the appeal to the people of Alberta by the Premier, whose coattail brought in most of the backbenchers in this Legislature — let's face those facts — the fact of the matter is that it's appropriate in the spring of 1984 to review the Conference Board of Canada quarterly report.

When one looks at it, one finds first of all, dealing with unemployment, that according to the Conference Board, Alberta will be the only province in Canada to see an increase in unemployment this year. The Minister of Manpower and some of the front-benchers can pound their desks as much as they like and say that the signs of recovery are present everywhere in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, but as I travel around the province, I don't hear that from Albertans. Nor do these objective forecasts I read, which the Tories thought objective enough to take to the people of Alberta in 1984, indicate that things are going to change dramatically. When one looks at the unemployment rate, one finds that according to the Conference Board there will be a reduction in Newfoundland, P.E.I., Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba. Saskatchewan will stay even, but Saskatchewan has a much lower unemployment rate than we have in Alberta. B.C. will see a drop

in their unemployment rate. The only province that is going to experience an increase in unemployment is the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, it really isn't good enough for this government to bring in the complacent Speech from the Throne, the agenda for action that we saw introduced last week, that is going to be the basis for legislative work in 1984.

Let's take a look at other indicators from the Conference Board. If one analyzes gross domestic product, where does Alberta stand? Every other province is going to grow more quickly than Alberta. I have to say the prognosis is that there will be marginal growth, but we rank 10th among the 10 provinces in the increase in gross domestic product. Real domestic product: again, 10th among the 10 provinces.

On Friday when I raised questions about the rate of consumer spending, our friend the Provincial Treasurer told us that we had the highest per capita consumer spending. That may be, Mr. Speaker, but with higher indebtedness on the part of Albertans, with rising unemployment, the last thing we should be complacent about is our retail sales increase compared to other parts of the country. If we look at the Conference Board statistics and examine the increase in retail sales, we find that the outlook for Alberta is bleak. Again, we will rank 10th among the 10 provinces in terms of increase in retail sales. That is something which simply confirms the concern that both opposition groups raised in the Legislature last fall. When you have lagging retail sales to begin with, when you have all kinds of evidence of a slowdown in the economy, why do you then increase personal income tax and take more purchasing power away from the average citizen in this province?

What we see in 1984, in my submission, is a sluggish economy that is showing no sign at all of recovery. Recovery is now a word which is acceptable in other parts of Canada but, as you travel around this province, you do not hear business people talking about recovery; you do not hear farmers talking about recovery; you don't hear the unemployed talking about recovery. Eighteen months into this government's term, the economy has slowed to a screeching halt. Instead of action to improve that situation, to bring in some kind of economic recovery program, we have this complacent document.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the obvious impacts of the current Tory recession in Alberta. The first is the 150,000 people who are out of work. This government is going to spend \$20 million on the temporary student program this year. We have government members pounding their desks, but the very day we are talking about a STEP program of \$20 million, we have the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services justifying a \$31 million expenditure on renovating an old school in Calgary to turn into a Premier's office. Whether the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Little Bow, or the Member for Edmonton Norwood could go down and hold meetings there is quite beside the point. I think we have the priorities of this government very clearly delineated here: \$20 million for the young people who are out of work, \$31 million to renovate McDougall school. Another way of looking at it is to note that in the city of Calgary, we have something in the neighborhood of 20 schools that are being closed down now because this government isn't properly financing education, yet we're spending \$31 million to renovate a structure so we have a nice, fancy new office for the Premier. I think that raises in a very clear way not only the question of the scale of importance of providing jobs for young people against the Cadillac Tory set in Calgary but the issue of government priorities.

Mr. Speaker, we have the concerns of the unemployed and, later on in this debate, my colleague the Member for Edmonton Norwood will be outlining to the members of this Assembly

some of the social and emotional problems that face families where one or both breadwinners have lost their jobs. Not only do we see the impact on the unemployed, we see the impact on the business sector of this province; not the big companies, not Luscar Sterco, the firm that is 25 percent owned by the Alberta Energy Company, not the high rollers but the small businessmen who are closing down their businesses as bankruptcy overtakes them.

Mr. Speaker, the government can say that they have all kinds of programs, but let me itemize just a couple of cases of Spirit River-Fairview constituents that came to my attention in the last few weeks that illustrate what a terrible job this government is doing. The first is a gentleman on the north side of the river who opened up a farm, expanded his operation, did all the things the Minister of Agriculture suggested he do, and made sure he had a big operation. But he operated a business on the side, which was the kind of thing that allowed him to supplement his farm income. When the bank began to change its tune and wanted its money back, what happened? He went to the Agricultural Development Corporation to borrow some money to consolidate his debts. He walked in the door, sat down with them, and they looked at him and said: we can't loan you any money, because you've got a business. So out the door he went. He then went to the Alberta Opportunity Company. They said: you can't come to us, because you operate a farm. This particular gentleman has fallen through the cracks of government programs. I'm sorry to say that I suspect he will be on the street — or on the road in that particular part of the province, and not a paved road either, I might add — because we don't have programs which make it possible for someone who has both farming input as well as a business role to consolidate his debts and go to these so-called lenders of last resort.

Another example is a gentleman who came from British Columbia and, again, went to the local Department of Agriculture, made sure everything he did was correct, at least according to the government experts. He came to this province with about a quarter of a million dollars, and he got into a good-sized farming operation. But as people who know rural Alberta will quickly understand, from time to time you can have bad years, and the bad years have now caused the bank to decide: okay, we want our money back. And they're selling him out. Mr. Speaker, they will get their money back — no question about that — but in the process of getting their money back, that man will not have a single bit of equity that he brought from British Columbia. I might just add that in British Columbia he was not a supporter of the party I represent, but with the kind of situation he's facing in Alberta, he will certainly not be a supporter of this government either. We had him see the local credit people and appeal it. But the problem is that the programs really aren't filling the cracks, at least in my judgment, and you've got a number of people who are falling through.

As I've had occasion to attend farm meetings — Unifarm conventions, stockgrowers and other meetings, not only in the Peace but throughout the province — I've had a number of farmers especially come to me and say: what are we going to do about farm credit; we're caught with interest rates that we can't pay; we've got higher input costs; at best, our products are staying stagnant and, in some cases, dropping. You've got a large number of people who are headed for bankruptcy, especially young people who bought land two or three years ago when land was much higher than it is today. If they do find that they have to leave, that they're foreclosed upon, then what will happen is that for the most part the financial institutions will get their money back but the individuals in question will lose everything. That is something which, in my submission,

should be addressed, and I see not one bit of evidence that this government is seriously prepared to tackle it.

Mr. Speaker, it's not just a case of businessmen and farmers and unemployed who are paying the costs for this government's mismanagement of the economy; we have some communities that are in pretty rough shape too. All one has to do is listen to the people in Grand Centre who talk about how they got into a municipal project which involved the purchase of land and a decision which has awarded the owners of that land some \$4 million — they're apparently prepared to negotiate for \$3.6 million — a level which is going to completely break the community of Grand Centre. How did that happen? It happened because in the 1970s this government was telling everybody that we were going to go ahead with a major project in north-eastern Alberta. However, it was this government that brought the Cold Lake project to a halt in 1980 when it decided, with members of the government applauding very enthusiastically, that the Alsands and Cold Lake projects would be put on hold as a result of the Premier's then war with Ottawa.

Who's paying the price now for all these wars between federal and provincial politicians? Some of the people who are going to be paying the price, Mr. Speaker, are the citizens of a little community like Grand Centre, who are faced with the staggering cost of a \$3.6 million to \$4 million load that they were encouraged to undertake in order to prepare themselves for the boom. The little community that I live in — we had the Premier standing in his place in 1980 saying: we're going to go ahead with the building of a dam at Dunvegan, and we're going to get the Caterpillars in there almost any day. Unfortunately for some of the business people in the Peace River country, they listened to this government and made business investments on that basis. I tried to suggest to them: just wait before you invest a dime; make sure that in fact those trucks are down at Dunvegan, that the Caterpillars are there, and that the work is under way; don't start investing on the basis of a promise made by this government. There are going to be some people who lose a lot of money because they believed in what this government was doing. What really disturbs me is that the Tories, who are so quick to take credit for everything that goes well in this province, are somehow not able to accept any of the responsibility when things don't go well.

As you read the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, what do you find? You find one example after another of: it's somebody else's fault. It's Ottawa's fault, it's the United States' fault, or it's the fault of international conditions. But nowhere is it the fault of this government. When things were going well, it wasn't because of the OPEC nations, it wasn't because of international circumstances; it was because this government was such a shrewd group of managers. But when responsibility comes for the recession, as it turns out that recession is indeed an orphan. This government is not prepared to admit paternity at all. Like the travelling salesman of old, the farmer's daughter is left, as the Tory party marches on to yet another — not victory. God help us; if this is victory, I would hate to see what defeat is.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with a couple of other aspects of this government's approach to the economy. We have heard that the new theme is going to be privatization. Of course it's a little bit inconsistent for a government that is talking about privatization to spend another \$11 million renovating a school in Calgary with 22 percent of the office space vacant. One would think that we might see the symbolic value of using empty office space and getting a good price for the taxpayer.

What I didn't notice in this Speech from the Throne was any commitment to a white paper. You may recall white papers, Mr. Speaker. When this government came into office in 1971,

they were going to make big announcements in the form of white papers so we'd have an opportunity to review them carefully. One would think that if we are now going to embark upon privatization of almost everything, we would have promised a white paper as to how we're going to do it. Are we going to put these opportunities for privatization up to public bid? How are we going to handle it? Are we going to have the highways in such and such an area farmed out? How are we going to deal with that? There's got to be some sort of strategy involved. Or is it going to be the approach we've seen with hiring certain people in the top echelons of the public service — the George de Rappard approach, the cronies approach? Are we going to have free enterprise or crony enterprise in Alberta? Albertans want to know that, and a lot of people who may be very conservative minded want to know it too. If you're going to privatize something, why has there been no white paper setting out the ground rules for privatization? And no commitment. You would think if you were going to write a Speech from the Throne, it wouldn't really take much to stick in a little line — I mean there are so many lines here that are completely meaningless anyway. You could put in a meaningful line saying that this government is going to present a white paper on privatization to ensure that it be fair and equitable, and not just a code word for more Tories at the public trough.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether members in this House want to hear this, but I want to tell you that as I travel around the province — and I'm sure other members of the opposition will concur — wherever I go there are concerns about cronyism, about patronage. Is privatization just going to be the new Tory approach to patronage? If this government had wanted to bring in a policy with some promise of success, they would have at least made it clear that they were going to set out the ground rules carefully and not just simply give us rhetoric over and over again without coming forward with some specifics.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that in any recovery program there has to be tremendous emphasis placed on the private sector, particularly small independent business. But I am not sure that taking elements of government expenditure now and farming them out holus-bolus to private enterprise is the way to go about that. I really suggest that perhaps the best approach would be to undertake not a different division of today's pie but policies which would be aimed at enlarging the pie.

It's one of the reasons we have to talk about priorities. I think it's a complete and total waste of money to spend \$11 million on the renovation of McDougall school, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't consider public projects. Because some public projects this government has undertaken are demonstrably foolish doesn't mean that all public projects are foolish. As a matter of fact, as one has a chance to meet with people around the province, there are demands — quite proper demands — by local governments that if we're going to get better value for our dollars, now is the time to get road programs under way, for example.

I notice the Minister of Agriculture isn't here, but he mentioned that they're going to be studying the Crow rate and the impact on the economy of rural Alberta of the federal decision to remove the Crow rate. You don't need a number of high-priced consultants. If members of the government had read the submissions from the farm organizations, they would know perfectly well that the impact of removing the Crow rate is going to be extremely adverse, especially on the farmers in northern Alberta.

One of the things we should be looking at — I've said this before, but I'll say it again. Now is the time we absolutely must have rail links with British Columbia, or the promise of

expanding agriculture in northern Alberta will be just empty rhetoric and nothing more. Mind you, at the rate the lands department is proceeding, the expansion of agricultural land is so slow — if we'd had the same approach to homesteading in western Canada, we certainly wouldn't have had a Riel rebellion, because Lord Selkirk would still be at the boat waiting to come to Fort Garry.

The fact is, though, that if we're concerned about looking after the economic future of this province, agriculture has to play an important role. If it's to play an important role, agriculture must have access to markets. Access to markets is always important, but when you shift your transportation system from one where there was a subsidy to ship grain at a very low price to a user-pay concept, if you don't make those rail links a high priority of government, you are foreclosing the opportunity of developing further northern agriculture and you are signing an economic death warrant to many of the 7,000 permit holders who are operating today in the Peace River country. That's the sort of thing we could be looking at that would allow us to expand business opportunities. But I say to members of the Assembly, we're not seeing that being proposed in this Speech from the Throne. Instead, we're being asked to take the existing pie and carve it up in a little different way as far as the private sector is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give the members of the House this warning. I'm sure no one will pay a great deal of attention to it today, because we always think for the present in Alberta. When times were booming, everybody had a boom mentality. They couldn't visualize that there could be a recession. I want to tell you quite frankly that if you privatize in 1984, with the sluggish Alberta economy, you will probably be able to get very competitive prices. I'm not sure it will be any lower, that the taxpayers will save any money by doing it, but very competitive prices — I'd be willing to admit that. But when the economy begins to recover, a provincial government that has privatized important public services must realize what happens when the boom begins. How many rural members in this House can stand in their places during the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne and not cast their memory back to '78, '79, '80, '81, when we had the boom and the problems we had getting any road construction in this province because of the impact of the boom on contract prices? The more you privatize, the more vulnerable you are to whatever impact will occur four or five years down the road if there is some economic recovery. And we all hope there will be, although I must say that this government is doing precious little to contribute to it. But this is a strong and vibrant province, and in spite of the government, we may have some recovery. If we have that recovery taking place, several major projects under way, and we have privatized all these services, I just want to say to the members of this House that at that point we will find that the taxpayers will either have to accept inferior quality service or much higher costs.

Some of my teacher friends in Fairview say — it's very interesting, because when the boom was on and the private sector was doing so well, some of the real estate people said to some first-rate teachers: why don't you give up teaching and sell real estate; you could make more money. That was true. They made far more money, because there was a boom and they could make that kind of money. But you know, Mr. Speaker, the more we privatize our public service, we are vulnerable to economic recovery, and the taxpayer in fact becomes the person who must bear that added cost.

I say to members of the Assembly, for a year or two you can make tub-thumping speeches before your right-wing friends, and people like Peter Pocklington and so on will think

it's just great. But you will be borrowing from the future in order to do something that is politically expedient today. That doesn't mean there shouldn't be review of the role of the public service, consolidation of departments where consolidation should take place, consolidation of agencies where consolidation should take place. That's an ongoing thing that any government should be undertaking. When I see that we're going to be looking at the operation of the aids to daily living program, it's about time. The former premier of Saskatchewan and I had a discussion about the two programs in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Because the Saskatchewan government didn't have the kind of money that we in Alberta have to throw at problems, they brought in a much more cautious program — just as workable but a program that emphasizes recycling of appliances.

Mr. Speaker, the question of determining priorities, which is the responsibility of government, is why people out there today are asking: what are this government's priorities? Privatization, but no idea as to how it's going to be done fairly; no serious economic recovery package; frills, continuation of frills. Whether it's the first-class travel expenditures whenever ministers travel, whether it's legislative committees that are going hither and thither around the world, regardless, the public senses — and I think correctly so — that we have a government which really has some muddled priorities. Some members may say: oh, this is unfair; the costs the opposition cite — the Kananaskis sand, the Senate committee's proposed expenditures, the little session the public works ministers had in Banff, or the fact that cabinet ministers always travel first-class — are just a drop in the bucket; you shouldn't be picky. Except that symbolism is important: if you're going to be saying to people in Alberta that we have to set priorities, then you've got to set priorities at the top as well. If you're saying to the average working person that they have to hunker down, tighten their belts, and all the rest of this Churchillian rhetoric that we occasionally get from Conservative backbenchers before service clubs, then I think you have to show that you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the government are prepared to exercise some leadership.

As I've mentioned, people out there are questioning the frills. What they're talking about is a government which is going to get back to some bread-and-butter issues such as, number one, education. But not the kind of approach we're getting from the Minister of Education. The Minister of Education doesn't want to spend any money on schools or wants to avoid the thorny issue of financing education. So when we had the Kratzmann report, we had the Minister of Education standing up time after time in question period and saying: oh, the Kratzmann report, we don't agree with it; we've got this special committee, the minister's advisory committee on financing education. It was going to be the most learned group of people imaginable, and it gave the minister a beautiful excuse to do nothing for several years while this committee studied education.

The first recommendation to the minister in the committee's report is that 85 percent of the costs of education be met by the province and that we get away from this business of nudging all the costs over on local property tax payers — a very sound recommendation. When the issue was raised last year, the minister's excuse was that he needed to read the committee report and to think about it. Instead of coming through with action on the recommendations in the committee report, what do we have today? We're going to have the greatest study imaginable. We're going to have thousands and thousands of Albertans filling out these questionnaires, and we're going to be thinking about secondary education and junior high. Isn't it going to be great? We're going to be studying and studying and restudying

education, but there still isn't going to be any money in the budget to provide the school boards with the funds they need to undertake the job. So, Mr. Speaker, people are saying: we want less studies from the Minister of Education and more action in terms of dealing with his friend the Provincial Treasurer so that we can properly fund education.

Then we have our friend the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. If there's any sort of honesty in the Tory caucus, surely some of the backbenchers have to take the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care aside and say: look here my friend, you've got us into an awful mess. Here we're bringing in user fees. The hospital boards don't like it; public opinion is against it; our federal Tory friends don't like it either. They're prepared to support Madam Bégin's new national health Act in order to deal with the right-wing policies of this minister.

I wonder where these backbenchers are, unless in fact they support this kind of policy. In which case, Mr. Speaker, we will certainly want to have that clearly understood as we get ready for the next election. As we get closer to the election, I suspect that these people who are so buoyant and enthusiastic whenever a minister stands up and berates the opposition — I have a hunch as we get closer to the election provincial Tories will be a little bit like federal Tories, and they will waffle on user fees and say: oh well, that's the minister's policy, but basically I don't think it's a good idea. I suspect that we're going to see a minister — if I could use this term in a gentle way — politically abandoned by his colleagues as we get closer to the election. But if he needs counselling, there will certainly be room in the new Berwyn hospital in the town of Grimshaw.

Mr. Speaker, another area we've focussed on is the need for highway and capital construction, areas where there can be agreement. It would appear that at this stage, instead of moving forward, we're going to see retrenchment in that particular area.

I want to say one other thing before turning to the administration of justice. We hear that there is to be this great economic strategy paper. I find that a little strange. We've had a government in office for 13 years now. In 1974 the Premier told us that we had one decade left to diversify. Here we are 10 years later. After 10 years of becoming more dependent than ever before on our nonrenewable resources, we now hear there's to be this paper on diversification, on economic strategy for the province of Alberta. I gather that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and the Minister of Housing have been working on it. This information isn't quite ready yet but presumably will be ready at some point during the session. Well, Mr. Speaker, Albertans faced with record bankruptcies, record foreclosures, 150,000 out of work, simply ask the question: why 10 years for an economic strategy for this province? This is the government that, when they were the official opposition, berated the former administration for not having a clear and coherent economic policy and promised to bring one in if they were elected. Thirteen years into their government, and 10 years after the Premier's speech in Calgary, we still have to await some action.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move to the administration of justice, but I do want to say one additional thing. The way in which our government deals with difficult issues always amuses me. You may recall that back in antiquity, sometime between Adam and Eve and the flood, we in the opposition asked for a motion for a return to be tabled in the House on the cost overruns in the heritage trust fund. I should say that it had been duly accepted before the 1982 election. What should happen *but* that it wasn't tabled until the last day of the fall session. I would certainly not want to imply that the timing was deliberate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not this government.

MR. NOTLEY: Not this government, of course not. No, open government . . . But I found it rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it does reveal that there has been a remarkable overrun in these capital projects. If anything leads me to say that the comments I made about getting locked into private-sector expenditures in administration should give us a warning bell, it's this report on trust fund overruns. But I thought that just for a second or two I might advise members who may not have had an opportunity to know just how this money was handled.

We have the grazing reserves development — a very worthy project, strongly supported on this side. But the estimate was \$26 million; the current cost estimate is \$40 million. So we're about 70 percent over there.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think what is useful in looking at this subject is to read the way in which the Tories explain it.

As the programs progressed, detailed estimates were developed for individual reserves and the total project cost has been refined accordingly.

"Refined" — what a nice way of saying an overrun.

We have the irrigation system estimated at \$110 million; current cost estimate, \$342 million. Then we have the Paddle River project. I always enjoy the Paddle River project; it's our only sort of moving dam in the province. I think the hon. Member for Barrhead should be able to set up a ticket selling agency there; like the leaning tower of Pisa, we're going to have a moving dam on the Paddle River. Estimated at \$18,800; current estimate, \$38 million — 100 per cent out. Again we look at the explanation, Mr. Speaker, and apparently these figures also had to be "refined". I could go on. The Hospitals and Medical Care commitment to the Walter C. Mackenzie project: \$135 million; current estimate, \$432 million. Kananaskis: \$40 million — and we were all told that we had this project right in hand — current estimate, \$218 million.

Mr. Speaker, I just cite as evidence that we had better watch the move to privatization. One reads over and over again that the justification for these phenomenal price increases has been the impact caused by inflation — inflation greater in Alberta because of the boom. I just say to members of the House that if this occurred in capital construction in the '70s — and we all know it did — it will occur in the operation of our departments too. And it is a word of warning. I know that members won't agree with me today, but I want it in *Hansard* as word of warning so that in the years ahead we can perhaps reflect upon it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with what is as important an issue as the economy: that is, the administration of justice. I suppose that in any democratic society there are several givens. One is that we are all equal before the law. It doesn't make any difference who you are. Whether you're a person with a lot of money and a lot of station in life or whether you're a drunk with a bottle of wine down on 97th Street, we're all equal before the law. I think another thing that is given in a democratic society is that you are innocent until proven guilty. I don't think there's any question about that. And the third thing is that in a democratic society we must make our laws in the open, through our elected representatives. If we are to be equal before the law in terms of developing our laws, the process must be done in the open.

Having made those observations, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the events of the last few months. Let me say at the outset that at least part of the problem this government faces is something that can be related to all Albertans. In our system you cannot make a government function well, over time, in the absence of a balance in the Legislature. There has to be the give and take of political options.

In the last election, those of us in opposition attempted to make that point. It was our view that restoring democracy to the Alberta Legislature was, in my judgment anyway, the most important thing Albertans could have done in 1982. They chose not to do that, and the four of us who remain in opposition have to carry on a fairly large responsibility. But I don't think anyone can objectively argue that democracy in Alberta would not be better served by having 30 or 35 people on this side and 40 or 45 on the other side. That's how our system works. There may be other types of governments in the world that can work outside of that adversarial competition of ideas approach that is basic to the parliamentary system. But when you have overwhelming majorities, one of the problems is that there seeps into the leadership of any government the feeling that they can do no wrong. While that assumption must be challenged, in the name of accuracy it must be admitted that it will occur unless the people themselves take their responsibilities clearly.

I think I mentioned this once before in the House, Mr. Speaker, but it bears repeating. One of the people that I respect, probably more than anyone else in Canadian public life, is T.C. Douglas, who was leader of the Saskatchewan CCF government between 1944 and 1961. For several of those legislatures, the CCF enjoyed the same relative position in the Saskatchewan Legislature that this government has in the Alberta Legislature. It practically decimated the opposition. For several of those Legislatures, it was a pretty close contest between the Liberals and the CCF.

With the experience and, I think, the wisdom of someone who has gone through leadership and looks back, Mr. Douglas is the first to say that the best governments Saskatchewan had under his leadership were those occasions when it was close between the government and the opposition. The most difficult times he had to face as leader of government were the occasions when the CCF had virtually every seat.

I regret to say that kind of sage political advice from someone who has been in politics a long time has not been taken very seriously by Albertans. Notwithstanding the fact that we as citizens have been at least partly responsible for what I honestly believe is an unacceptable level of behaviour in terms of the administration of justice by this government, it must nevertheless be pointed out that the maintenance of a democratic society comes right back to citizen responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the administration of justice, I want to begin by saying that I don't accept the rationalization of this government that there must be a smoking gun in order to hold a proper judicial inquiry. We are not dealing with a situation that involves imminent or even probable criminal charges. We are not talking about the system having the right to be considered innocent until proven guilty. If we are talking about individuals, yes. The individual has the right to be considered innocent until proven guilty. But when you look at a system, then we have to ask ourselves, does that system deserve the right to be presumed innocent until some smoking gun proves it guilty?

Let me use the example of the United States. No position in the world had greater respect than the presidency of the United States. In 1973, before the tapes and before the final revelation that led to the resignation of Richard Nixon, the American people had to look very carefully at what their entire democratic system was about. Allegations had been made that perhaps people in the executive had acted improperly. There was no evidence at that time that the President had acted improperly. There was certainly no smoking gun at all. But when the Senate of the United States chose to embark upon the Ervin hearings, they did so because there was sufficient concern that the Senate of the United States decided there should be a clearing of the air.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at the reasoning for a public inquiry in this province, the reasoning is not that we have absolute proof that somebody has meddled in the administration of justice. The reasoning is that if there is concern, then that concern must be properly evaluated and laid to rest. My purpose today is to relay to my colleagues in the House the concern that I believe exists in Alberta. There is really no absolute proof. If that were the basis for inquiries, we would not have had the Cavanagh Board of Review. We would not have seen the Ombudsman's report on the Metis raids.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight. The question is whether there is concern. Bearing that in mind, let's look at several examples. First of all, the firing of one John Faulkner, a Crown prosecutor, a man who apparently was well regarded by his peers, well enough regarded that he received whatever bonuses one obtains for doing first-class work — dismissed, we are told, because he revealed to the media that there was an investigation of a particular individual, and that that somehow was so wrong, that speculation was so wrong, that the only way to deal with the question was not to reprimand or to suggest that it not happen again, but we had to have a dismissal.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that disturbs me about that is when I look at the request, the application for a search warrant, dated May 12, 1983. Virtually everything — and I would say "everything" if one reads it carefully — that Mr. Faulkner is reputed to have told the *The Calgary Herald* is contained in the search warrant, which is a public document. I think it may in fact be reasonable for the law officer of the government to say that any revelation of information which is not in the public domain is so serious that the strongest kind of action should be taken. But, Mr. Speaker, when I read this information, as I see it everything that was confirmed was already in the public domain if a person cared to look. Why, then, that extreme form of censure, the firing of a person who apparently, by all standards, had been doing a good job?

In this debate, I think it's incumbent upon the Attorney General to outline why that firing took place, why a different course of action wouldn't have been preferable. We all know that there have been comments made by the Attorney General himself about cases, and I would be less than honest if I didn't say that on occasion I've even raised issues in the House. But here we have the firing of a person. If we presume that a person is innocent until proven guilty. I ask members of the House whether or not this government took that kind of position with respect to Mr. Faulkner.

Mr. Speaker, the discussion of Dial has to be limited, because certain aspects of the case are before the courts. One aspect that isn't before the courts is the question of how the person who had been the chief executive officer of that company was chosen deputy minister of cabinet, apparently during a time that the company he was administering was under criminal investigation. Last summer Mr. Trudeau chose a member of the cabinet, a member from Newfoundland. A few days later he requested and received the resignation of that member. In between, apparently, he discovered that that particular individual was under investigation for income tax evasion.

The question I put to members of the House is how could we as a government consider the appointment to what is in many ways the most important civil service position in this province of a person who was executive officer of a company during the time the RCMP had obtained a search warrant to investigate a very serious criminal offence? We're not here to argue that the final decision of the prosecutors was right or to suggest that Mr. de Rappard was guilty of anything, because he has a right to be presumed innocent just as Mr. Faulkner or

anyone else does. My question is: notwithstanding that right to be presumed innocent, why would a government in its right mind undertake an appointment during that time? When the issue was cleared, fine; proceed with the appointment. But why at that time?

Mr. Speaker, we have the so-called Paisley memo, sent by the Deputy Attorney General, dealing with the investigation of public people. The (a) section of the memo is straightforward enough:

In cases where an offence is alleged to have been committed by an employee of the Government of Alberta who was not on duty at the time and the alleged offence is not in respect to his employment, notification is not required prior to the commencement of the investigation.

That's fair enough. I think that should be read into the record. However:

Such notification shall not be required in relation to minor, routine Provincial statute offences unless having regard to the circumstances overall, the matter is perceived to be sensitive in nature and/or one which may attract media attention or generate public controversy.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker, in terms of equality before the law? If there was equality before the law, surely the question of whether or not an investigation occurs is on the basis of the evidence, not whether the evidence may be such that *The Calgary Herald* wants to print a story about it or *The Edmonton Journal* may cover it or CBC television carries it.

But the (b) section disturbs me a great deal:

In cases where an offence is alleged to have been committed by an employee of the Government of Alberta while on duty or in respect to his employment, notification is required prior to the commencement of any investigation. Such notification shall not be required in relation to minor, routine Provincial statute offences unless having regard to the circumstances overall, the matter is perceived to be sensitive in nature and/or one which may attract media attention or generate public controversy.

We're not only talking about notification if there has been an investigation; this memo makes it clear that there must be notification before the commencement of any investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I raise the issue that other people have brought to my attention. I am not trained in the law. I don't pretend to know the law, sir, that you or the hon. Attorney General does. But in talking to people whose judgment I do respect and whose experience and understanding of the law is, may I generously say, at least the equal of some of our esteemed legal friends in this House, they have raised serious concerns about the impact of this particular provision. I ask members of the House how it could happen that we have this kind of memo sent out. What is the reasoning behind this kind of memo? Oh, a little later on it says that this will allow the Attorney General's department to help with the investigation. But what's the impact going to be on an enforcement agency that gets this kind of memo? The implication will be — especially in a province where the government enjoys a huge majority — to play it safe, and the implication is very dangerous for the equal administration of the law.

Mr. Speaker, we got into the debate over the Luscar Sterco incident. One of the things I was amazed at in Luscar Sterco was the memo which apparently went out indicating that since there could be investigations of companies, the government wanted this information as well, particularly in light of any adverse publicity, anything that would generate media interest.

What have we got? We have the Attorney General's department saying to police forces: let us know before you begin investigating an employee of the government, particularly if

it's going to get into the newspapers. We have the Department of Energy and Natural Resources saying: let us know, particularly if it's going to get in the newspapers. Mr. Speaker, I believe that really is wrong.

I want to deal just a little more with the Luscar Sterco issue, and attempt to comment on two aspects of the case. The first is the suggestion by the minister of energy, in what was basically a ministerial announcement as opposed to an answer, in question period that somehow the government did the only thing possible and that as a result of the negotiation over royalty relief they kept the jobs, cleaned up the river, and that everything is fine.

For someone who scans the surface, that may seem like a reasonable argument. But there are just a few problems with that argument. Problem number one is that the complaints came to the department a year and a half before. Problem number two is that the fish and wildlife people investigated offences or what they considered to be violations. Problem number three is that after uncovering those violations, they went to the company. Problem number four is that the company, after the department had contacted them repeatedly, continued an unacceptable level of behaviour. Problem number five is that the department went back to see them again. We had a meeting a year after the concerns were first expressed, and a decision was made. But in the months following, one violation after another could be cited. I won't bore people with all the details, but for anyone who wishes it I think the chronology is now available. Step by step by step, over a year and a half, we had a company which had been warned, lectured, and directed, and didn't follow the directives.

So finally, on July 28, we have evidence that two Crown prosecutors recommended that the company be prosecuted under the federal Fisheries Act. The minister of energy attempted to sort of sidetrack the entire issue today by suggesting that had the prosecution occurred, somehow everybody would have been laid off. That's absolute nonsense. The prosecution of Great Canadian Oil Sands took place. The net result, it seems to me, is that they probably cleaned up their act somewhat. The issue was not a closure order. The issue was whether or not the evidence of failing to comply with a federal statute should be proceeded with. Here we have, a year and a half later, after repeated infractions, the government working out a little deal.

The Attorney General can stand and say: oh, this is just an environmental piece of legislation; it's there to encourage people to do the right thing; it's not the same as the criminal law. If a democratic society is to have any meaning, the law is the law. If you're driving down the road at 90 miles an hour, Mr. Speaker, and a policeman comes up and says "I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark is speeding", you cannot turn to him and say, but that's just a provincial law, that's a regulatory law; it's not the same as the Criminal Code, so get lost. You wouldn't do that, Mr. Speaker, but neither would any constable allow himself to get lost. He would very quickly write out a big ticket, and properly so.

What about the little business people who have to obey all kinds of regulatory laws? The Attorney General's department frequently prosecutes them. To suggest that somehow we can turn and say, well, shucks, the federal Fisheries Act, an Act of Parliament — a \$50,000 fine, a year and a half of breaking the law. They were told about it, warned about it, directed not to do it. Then we have Crown prosecutors saying that there's evidence to prosecute. We don't prosecute. The minister of energy makes a nice little arrangement, and then tells us it's really keeping jobs in place when that's not the issue at all, the issue of equality before the law.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, next time some little business man in the minister of energy's constituency in east Calgary finds himself behind the eight ball, faced with prosecution for some of the various regulatory rules and laws we've passed in this Legislature, he will be very interested in the minister of energy's response, and he may want the same sort of treatment.

We continually talk about environmental legislation. If this government wants to change, let the law be the federal government's and say we think the Fisheries Act is too stringent. If they don't want to enforce the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, let them change those Acts so that certain things which now are illegal are legal. That's what we mean by doing the public business in public. But let's not pass on this absolute nonsense that somehow private little deals are a substitute for equal administration of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a matter that needs to be dealt with. For that reason, I would like to move the following amendment to the Speech from the Throne. That the motion for an humble address to be presented to his Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Alberta on today's Order Paper be amended as follows:

by adding at the end of it:

"but regret that the Executive Council has not thus far seen fit to request Your Honour to cause an enquiry to be made into the administration of justice in the Province of Alberta."

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I shall shortly have a look at the amendment the hon. leader has just presented, but I did get the gist of it from his remarks.

I think I can be generous enough to say that there are perhaps several things the hon. leader said which are worthy of some comment or reflection. In the course of dealing with an issue as broadly stated as a reference to the administration of justice, I think most of the things the hon. leader spoke of in his general remarks are also suitable for the amendment.

One of the most basic qualities that we as a people have inherited over the centuries has been the value and the quality of a justice system which, in comparison with most other parts of the world over the centuries, has shown itself to be superior. It is not something that should ever be free from comment or criticism, but it is something that when we choose to do that. I think we should have in mind the principles which have been so meaningful over the years and be as sure as we can that in our positions as legislators and leaders, we do no unnecessary offence to the prestige of the law and the prestige of the administration of justice system, merely for the desire to perhaps gain some brief political advantage.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't anyone in the Assembly who disagrees with the main principles described by the Leader of the Opposition as being some of the cornerstones of our system. Equality before the law: of course every hon. member immediately declares his and her strong belief in the necessity of there being not only a full understanding but a full application of that principle. That applies, of course, to all who have any responsibilities whatever in respect of the administration of justice. The hon. leader also referred to the well-known maxim, which I think all of our population is so well acquainted with, that a person is innocent until proven guilty, and made further reference to the need to make laws in the open. That is, of course, the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to have regard to what the real issues are in the present days in Alberta in respect of whatever question about the administration of justice there might be in the minds of any person at all, and any concerns that citizen may have as he perceives some of what is occurring.

If we are to deal with the real issues, I have no difficulty in coming before hon. members, as I have come before other Albertans, and saying: surely there are matters that must be reviewed, and surely we will find, as a result of that process, that changes are probably required. I believe that will be the case. I think it is a timely review that is taking place at the present time and that it will be valuable to the people of Alberta when that current review has been concluded.

I say again that it's my intention that insofar as things like administrative directives and so on are concerned, they should surely be reviewed, surely be debated, and no doubt in a number of instances changed. But I wouldn't want hon. members to believe that the existence or not of administrative directives by itself is anything that goes to the core of the administration of justice issue. I don't know how hon. members would perceive that a large organization involving over 100 Crown prosecutors tries to bring that equality before the law, to people throughout the courtrooms in the dozens of communities in the province where trials are held — how that could possibly be done without some indication, as a matter of policy, from the senior law officers to those in the field as to how they should conduct particular types of cases.

What the issue became was that the independence of Crown prosecutors, which is historic and acknowledged, should be maintained. It is therefore a question of balance between administrative necessity and the historic tradition of independence in the judgment exercised in individual cases by Crown counsel. I think that balance does deserve to be reviewed from time to time, a proper balance can be struck, and probably the process improved as a result. But to say that the circumstances that make a timely review necessary show some deepseated deficiency in the administration of the justice system would simply be an irresponsible statement incapable of support by any facts.

The desire I have then, Mr. Speaker, is to deal with what the real issues are. I have begun to do that by saying that so far as they relate to administrative matters, that is in hand and I expect to see improvements in the result.

Very briefly, I want to put on record some items on a specific, if I might, because I don't think the amendment would have been moved at all without some reference to a former employee, so to speak, of the Department of the Attorney General. Mr. Faulkner was indeed an able legal counsel, and no doubt still is. The employment of him, though, was by way of contract. I don't think anything was done in respect of the termination of his contract that any employer would not feel free to do, and nothing was done — and this is vastly more important — in respect of the termination of his contract that any client wouldn't feel free to do. Mr. Faulkner's client was at all times Her Majesty. The work that a Crown counsel does is not discussed except in the presence of the client, the other law officers of the Crown and, obviously, in the presence of investigators and potential witnesses. To say that before any decision is taken in respect of an individual case as to whether any charge should ever be laid — to say that that is a matter which can be discussed publicly in any way is such a grave breach of the code of professional conduct of lawyers that it probably deserves little more by way of comment, other than to say that that professional ethic was breached in this case. In those circumstances, any client would be entitled to say to his or her legal counsel: I terminate your services.

The false statement has been made that Mr. Faulkner did no more than confirm existing information that was already public. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be a breach of professional ethics even to lend the name and the weight of a Crown attorney to confirming information which was published in some form, information that is part of a document or is

published in a newspaper, and then to have that available for people to see. That's one thing. But to go beyond that and say, I as Crown counsel confirm that, you're at that point discussing in public the affairs of the client and matters that relate to the absolute entitlement a citizen has to be presumed not to be involved in any offence or any investigation until such time as sufficient evidence has been produced in order to consider the laying of a charge and, in fact, have the charge laid.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's worth remarking that the termination of this particular contract was really quite generously done. The contract was a three-year contract, of which over two years had expired. There was a clause for termination for cause, which was not exercised. There was a further clause which allowed either party, Mr. Faulkner or the Crown, to end that contract upon giving six months' notice. In this case, it was the Crown that gave the six months' notice. The contract, to which Mr. Faulkner agreed when he entered into his employment by contract with the Crown, has the provision that when that is done in that way, no reasons need be given.

I'm sure hon. members will be gratified to know that when I made that decision, although it was very offensive to have had a situation where one of the Crown counsel would publicly discuss a case, I thought it would serve both Mr. Faulkner and his employer quite well to use the six-month clause. In his case, it would provide him with half a year's salary, and in the Crown's case of course it would avoid controversy.

The other thing that should be said, though, is — I've said that the confirmation by itself of something that might be in existence in some document or newspaper article, when it's done by the person who is handling that particular client's affairs, goes too far. But of course what has been published in several respects about the suggestion that in the particular case of Mr. de Rappard, it was known because of the information in support of the search warrant that he was under investigation — when that statement is made, that statement is false.

The information in support of the search warrant is a document of some 47 paragraphs in length. In two of those paragraphs, reference to Mr. de Rappard was made. In both cases, it made statements which were well known to be public. Those statements were that, in one instance, he had been the chief executive officer of Dial Mortgage Corporation; the other statement made in respect of him, which was also well known, was that he had been a signatory to a prospectus. Nothing else was mentioned. The important part of that document — and I never understand why it isn't emphasized from this point of view — is where the person swearing it. Corporal Morse in this case, gives his opinion as to what all of that means, and says that he needs the search warrant in order that he can consider charges under a certain area of the Criminal Code, and then he names the persons against whom he believes the charge might be laid if evidence from the search is forthcoming. That's the important part of that document. That is the part where three names were mentioned, and not the name of Mr. de Rappard. It's not my business to further publish the names of those who were referred to in that. Mr. de Rappard's name never appeared in that part of that document.

Mr. Speaker, I spend just that much time on it in order that it can be amply demonstrated that whoever says that by the reading of that document it would be known that de Rappard was under investigation, would now know that a further looking at that document will find that his name does not appear in that essential portion of the document. Therefore when it's said it would be known that he would be under suspicion because of that document, that statement is false. I just hope the time comes when people who comment upon this matter, either in the Assembly or elsewhere, will put it in that light instead of some other light.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I am able to deal in any detail with one of the other issues that came up. I think the remarks I've just made in respect of that particular document answer to a large extent the question the hon. Leader of the Opposition posed when he said, how could this person be chosen to serve in a senior position in government at a time when he was under criminal investigation. If what I have already said in respect of the published documents does not fully answer that, I can also say that it has been my responsibility as Attorney General to receive briefings on cases from police on a periodic basis. This is done in a structured way, and in a typical case there would be 20 or 25 cases referred to by way of a brief overview. That would constitute the briefing.

For a period covering almost the past two years the name Dial has occasionally come up, but not on every occasion. On all of those occasions where any name other than the name of the company itself was mentioned, I can assure hon. members — this is absolutely true, in my personal recollection of those meetings — that although from time to time names of some other individuals came up because of some degree of suspicion, the name of Mr. de Rappard was never mentioned. As a matter of fact, the possibility that he was under investigation in respect of a criminal matter came to my attention as a result of the article that appeared in *The Calgary Herald* following Mr. Faulkner's conversation with one of the reporters from that newspaper — and, I say again, not in any briefing. I'm now speaking of matters which normally are entirely confidential, and I speak of it only because it's necessary in order to make the point and to answer that particular question.

I have agreed that the memorandum, which is an administrative memorandum, that deals with how certain types of investigations should be handled under direction by Crown counsel, which is a role that they play in a vast variety of complex cases — in fact the Crown counsel assists in the investigation in quite a direct way by being involved with the police investigators after a certain stage has been reached. That is entirely normal. One of the types of cases in which the administrative directive suggested that that should be done is in cases involving public servants. If there's any unfairness there, Mr. Speaker. I've already indicated that this is the viewpoint I will be looking for from the committee of lawyers which is studying these issues on behalf of the Canadian Bar Association. But that unfairness, if there is any, is simply this. People would say to me: you're an employer; you have the particular ability as an investigator to find out if one of your employees is in breach of the law. That means that if somebody in one of the government agencies is taking kickbacks or embezzling, you want to know about it right away. You want the police to be telling you about that, and you want to guide that particular investigation. I say that's surely a sensible enough thing to do. If someone is thought to be stealing public moneys and we employ them, surely it would be careless if we did not act as soon as possible when information of that type became available.

So what's the unfairness? The unfairness is: well, these things happen in banks and trust companies too; people steal money. But the manager of the bank doesn't have a special arrangement by which he can, as an employer also, be informed according to some special structure and some special administrative procedure. So I say that if there is an unfairness or an inequality there, it's directed at the fact that the Crown may have available to it, as an employer, certain information which is also available to it as an investigator. That would be for the purpose of enabling timely steps to be taken to look into the employer/employee side of it. And I admit that the banks and other employers across the country don't have that particular advan-

tage. Perhaps that's unfair. I don't think there's any way, subject to the time when a charge would surely be laid — and of course, then people do get to know about these things in a situation of a private employer just as well as they do in the situation of a public employer. But it just may be that at the beginning or in the early stages of the investigation, the Crown, having an advantage that others do not have, should give up that advantage. If that's what it takes to be fair, then that could be contemplated. But I don't know that it is entirely clear that that is the real way to serve the people and to protect the situation where the employee being looked at would be in a position where the crime with which he was going to be charged would be one against the Crown itself.

So whatever the merits and the arguments in the debate may be, there is a reason for this type of approach. If it's wrong, we will find out in due course.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to perhaps conclude by making some reference to the remarks that were made about the Luscar case. I think that two of my colleagues are much more acquainted with the circumstances there. I would have summed up the hon. Leader of the Opposition's argument about the similarity, as he sees it, between criminal justice matters and regulatory matters by saying that what he really advanced was an argument that environmental regulations, for example, should have been addressed by the Parliament of Canada and placed in the Criminal Code. That's what he's saying. I think there are countries where maybe that is done. Maybe it's not a bad idea to have a certain type of offence, if there's enough danger to the public involved and if there's enough real potential harm to persons in the sense of their physical health. You hear stories about these things. Someone said that the way they cleaned up pollution in the Thames River was to make sure that the directors of the corporations involved in the pollution there for a few years went to jail. A criminal piece of legislation would bring that about. They say the results are excellent and the river is much nicer now. But I don't think that's a sort of thing that must be done at all events. At least the argument should be made — the hon. leader should speak to his colleagues in Ottawa and say to them: these pollution matters are so grave that they must be in the Criminal Code, not in the Fisheries Act. That's really what his argument comes down to. I don't think that he will persuade Parliament, in respect of the sort of thing we're talking about here, that it's a matter for the Criminal Code.

I referred to what has been reported as the British experience only in passing and to say that if one really believes in such things, that's a fair enough viewpoint to hold. But keep it in perspective and see if the sort of thing that we were talking about here is really the sort of thing that should become part of the criminal law of the land. If that ever were to happen, I can assure the hon. member that I take the law as I find it and would indeed prosecute in cases where the Criminal Code declared such things to be an offence against that legislation. But it must be understandable to all that when the real objective is in the area of the company's operations and what is hoped for is to see the operations improve rather than to bring some sort of retribution, a more discretionary type of administration is possible and, no doubt, desirable than would be the case in criminal matters.

I now conclude, Mr. Speaker, by recommending to hon. members that the amendment which is before the Assembly at the present time not be supported. However, I am indeed looking forward to the contributions of others in respect of the same debate.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise to participate in the debate as the Attorney General says that he wants to hear

from more people on this issue. We're only too glad to continue the debate for the reason, as we see it, of the need for a public inquiry.

The Attorney General, in his way, has tried to make a case — he does it very well — for really making the most out of a sort of hopeless situation for him. I agree with the Attorney General in one thing he said. He said that over the years, we in Canada and Alberta have developed a superior justice system. Mr. Speaker, I agree with him in that regard. The logic was there. From there, the Attorney General basically said that we don't want to hurt that justice system, and by having a public inquiry we would be damaging it. At least that's the nub of the argument as I understand it: that if we had a public inquiry, that would somehow hurt the system and people would not believe in it as much.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest — and I say this sincerely to the Attorney General — that the damage is already done. I know that the Attorney General has had meetings with constituents — some of them were published in the paper — and these sorts of things. But we've also been having meetings. As you go around the province and in my riding and talk to people, they already believe that the justice system is tainted. If the justice system is good — I recognize that there's no perfect system, but if it's as solid as the Attorney General says, then a public inquiry would be precisely what we would need to clear the air. Out of this public inquiry, if it's as solid as the Attorney General says, people would again have faith in the justice system.

Mr. Speaker, when we have the very people that are involved in the justice system — it's not just us in the opposition here. When we have people like Crown prosecutors, trial lawyers — most of them, I might add, were Conservative supporters — the very people that are involved in the justice system calling for an inquiry, then how can the average person, who doesn't know much, not begin to believe that something is wrong? Mr. Speaker, how can that average person, after he has heard trial lawyers, Crown prosecutors, and other people that are involved in the justice system publicly criticizing it — and I'll come back specifically to the one area we're talking about: I'm talking generally. When I read and hear what they're saying, they're saying the whole system is basically in a mess. That's why we need a public inquiry. I know we have some specific examples that concern me. But whether they're right or wrong, if they have the perception that something's wrong, then obviously the average person is going to have that same perception.

Mr. Speaker, as I go around and talk to people — and maybe I talk to different people than the Attorney General, but we have public meetings also — they tell me one thing and one thing clearly: they doubt that the justice system is being served well at this particular time.

I would like to continue with a couple of specific examples, so with the lateness of the hour I move adjournment of the House at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, the debate is automatically adjourned. It doesn't depend on the consent of the House whether the hon. member may adjourn the debate.

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

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue. I see that the Attorney General is back. I am sure he came especially

to hear my words of wisdom in terms of the need for a public inquiry. With this point, I thought it was self-evident even for this government. But I have to admit again that the Attorney General's defence of the indefensible was well done, as it always is.

But to continue, as I mentioned before, the people who are most involved in the justice system are the ones who are criticizing it the most vociferously. If we just go down two or three points — I am not going to go into each of the reasons people have concerns. We have talked about Dial, and I will come to that specifically because of some of the things the Attorney General said in his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

More recently in the news, of course, is fatality inquiry in the Jeffers' case, where at the very minimum we can say that the way they administered justice in that specific case was incompetent. As we know, it was a sad case where a young woman went into a coma after giving birth and never recovered and died. In an inquiry, it would seem common sense to me that at the very minimum you would call in an expert medical witness. This is what they were about to do, but the expert medical witness was told, you don't need to bother to show up. Along with that, Mr. Speaker, all the people who were in the delivery room at that particular time were not even questioned in this particular inquiry. It seems common sense to me, if we want to look into an inquiry like this, that we at least talk to everybody. As I say, this particular case was, at best, a case of incompetence.

My colleague has talked about Luscar Sterco. I won't go into to that, other than to say that this government has a rather amusing view of justice. I say "amusing" with some trepidation. If a starving person were to steal some food, it seems that would be under the Criminal Code, and that's a more serious offence than if some major company dumps pollutants into the river, because it's not in the Criminal Code. Mr. Speaker, to me, that shows a completely screwed up justice system. If I can understand what they're saying, they will prosecute only if it's in the Criminal Code. If it's regulatory, if it's under the Fisheries Act, then it's not as important. I think we have to weigh what they're saying.

The third thing is the Paisley memo. When you look at that memo, it is clear that there are two rules of justice. If you happen to be important to the government and

the matter is perceived to be sensitive in nature and/or one which may attract media attention or generate public controversy

then the law enforcement agencies have to come to the Attorney General with this. But if you are Joe Smith, they certainly don't have to check with the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, the point is that there are some problems with the justice system in this province, and people are rightfully picking this up.

Let's look at Dial. The Attorney General himself went through the Dial case, as indicating that's probably the only reason that people might want a public inquiry. One of the things that the Attorney General said, Mr. Speaker, is that at best Mr. Faulkner had betrayed — I believe he used the term "a professional breach". That was the reason he was given his walking papers, albeit, as the Attorney General talked about, with six months' pay.

It seems that there is a difference here among the legal profession about what "professional breach" is. Certainly the trial lawyers and other Crown prosecutors who are calling for a public inquiry do not believe this was a breach of conduct, so there seems to be some confusion among the legal profession. The Attorney General seems to have one view of a professional breach, and the trial lawyers and other lawyers must have a different idea. Why else would they be sticking up for

Mr. Faulkner and saying he didn't do anything wrong? At the very minimum, there seems to be some doubt in the minds of the lawyers whether this was a professional breach or not.

MRS. CRIPPS: Did you ever see two lawyers agree?

MR. NOTLEY: They are in the case, Shirley. That's the trouble.

MR. MARTIN: A number of lawyers are disagreeing with the Attorney General on this one.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the nub of the problem. We've asked people, and I think this is where people are cynical about the Dial case. If you ask Albertans — and I have done this. If Grant Notley, the Leader of the Opposition, had been investigated in the same matter Mr. de Rappard was, the question the people clearly ask then is: would there have been an investigation; would Mr. Faulkner have been fired? Whether it's true or not, when you ask average Albertans that, they come to the answer no. They believe, as many of the lawyers and Crown prosecutors do, that it was specifically because we were dealing with somebody who was close to the government and, in particular, somebody who was close to the Premier. Whether this is true or not, if the Attorney General would go out and ask people that question, he would find that that's what they believe. The point we make is that if that doubt is there — even if it is not true — that is all the more grounds for a public inquiry, because people believe that. Whether the Attorney General believes that or not, if you talk to the people out there, that's the popular perception.

The other thing that was rather curious with Dial — and I know the Attorney General attempted to explain it — is the fact that we hired a deputy minister of Executive Council at a time when he was under criminal investigation. The question is: why was this happening? Did nobody ask Mr. de Rappard the question? Is there any evidence that this could have happened, that if he had been found guilty of criminal charges he could have been Deputy Minister of Executive Council, perhaps the most important deputy minister in the government? I know the Attorney General tried to answer that. All they could find out on May 12, the same as anybody else — and my colleague talked about the fact that Mr. Faulkner had not given out anything that was not public, that anybody couldn't pick up. Here it is. It says that if there were reasonable grounds for believing that, he has reasonable and probable grounds. There's Mr. de Rappard's name right in the middle. So it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that at best they didn't even check. I expect the problem was that he was too important to this government to even ask those questions. The fact remains that at the time he was under criminal investigation, he was appointed Deputy Minister of Executive Council in this government. We could go on and on and on.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, justice must be seen to be done. It is not good enough to have a closed-door inquiry, as the Attorney General has announced, where a few friends of the government get together. Of course we know their answer; they'll find out that nothing is wrong. If there was something wrong, it's not going to be made public. As a result, this superior system the Attorney General is talking about will still be behind a cloud of doubt. You will still have lawyers and Crown prosecutors believing that something is seriously wrong with the justice system in this province.

I know we've brought in this amendment. I'm well able to count, and I expect we'll lose the vote again, Mr. Speaker. The government can be cute about this, but the fact remains. I think if they were smart politically, they would have a public

inquiry. If, as the Attorney General says, the system is generally superior, a public inquiry would show that. I think the government would come out of it looking good. They would say that we had the public inquiry, that the complaints by the trial lawyers and the Crown prosecutors were wrong, and in doing it they would look good.

But this government now is so closed, so frightened, and so scared that something may pop out of it. Why else would we not have a public inquiry? Are they hiding something? While the Attorney General will say no, the fact remains that most Albertans feel that the government is hiding something, especially in the Dial case.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I just say to the Attorney General, the House leader, and the government that you can win this vote in this House. But if the government continues to stonewall — and this is just another example — eventually this government is going to pay for it politically. They now think they are so powerful, that they've won seats so easily in the past, that they can do anything. They don't have to have a public inquiry; no, I said everything's okay. That's fine. But other governments that have got this arrogant and paranoid have paid the price in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, if there's one last chance here that I can help out the government, that at the last minute, the House leader could turn around and say to the gang in the back: it's okay; you can vote the way you should in a moral sense and we can get on with the public inquiry — unfortunately, I think I'd be helping out the Conservative Party, but I really don't expect they will do this. In conclusion, if the government is unwilling to have a public inquiry. I predict the day will come when they wish they had been more open with the people of Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add a few comments to the observations made on the amendment. What a contrast between the wise, rational, and logical explanation given to us by the Attorney General in explaining this matter, and the baffle-gab we heard from the opposition side.

The Member for Edmonton Norwood assumes that we don't read the newspapers. Hearing his comments almost seemed to be a complete replica of the comments we've been hearing from their allies in *The Edmonton Journal*. I think the members of the opposition should realize that newspapers are not elected. They have no authority, and they are not responsible to the people. Only the members of this Assembly are. So we will not give into any requests by the newspapers that they need more material for their pages. The evidence has not been presented in any way. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition ...

MR. MARTIN: That free press is dangerous.

MR. SZWENDER: ... made a request. He said: would any people come forward and, in complete and strict confidentiality — the NDP will protect them — give us some evidence so we can use this to prove that there has been political interference in the judicial system? Where is that proof today? Not one iota has been produced, not one shred of evidence. These are just empty callings.

The second point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is the issue of public inquiries themselves. Members are probably aware of a public inquiry presently proceeding in Toronto, the issue of the children's deaths in the Toronto Hospital for Sick Children. It's almost saddening to see the effect that public inquiry has on the lives of numbers of completely innocent people who are being implicated because they were called as witnesses to that inquiry. So if we have a public inquiry, more

damage is often done to the people who are in no way involved than in finding or determining the results of that inquiry. As such, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the Assembly to defeat this amendment.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of Lethbridge West, I welcome the opportunity to make some comments relative to the throne speech. First of all, I'd like very much to congratulate my colleagues, the Member for Red Deer and the Member for Wainwright, who I think have done an excellent job in speaking and moving the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, once again it points out the democratic system we have in the province. Certainly when you look at the very hotly contested nominations of the Conservative Party — I can't speak for the other parties. The result of that on election day when the people of Alberta send their representatives here to represent them culminates in a very substantial way not only by participation in caucus that some people of the House don't see, but certainly everybody sees and hears the very fine speeches made by the members. And again I endorse and congratulate the Member for Red Deer, the mover of the speech, and the seconder, the Member for Wainwright.

In making some comments relative to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on several areas that may appear in some way to rebut comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, but I assure you that's not the intent. As the Member for Lethbridge West I want to make some comments endorsing the throne speech and the actions taken by government, and where I may appear to take some exception, I hope they're accepted in the spirit in which they're given, in that I think there are probably other ways — maybe even better ways — of addressing some of the questions.

There's no question, Mr. Speaker, that in the last 18 months to two years we in Alberta have been through not only an exciting period but in some respects a very disappointing period. It's been reflected. I think the order in council the other day writing off increased costs in land because of the way the lending from the heritage fund is structured is an indication that things are not all well in the province of Alberta. Yet on the other side we see that last year there were some 14,000 companies registered under the registries Act of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Anytime you get over a thousand companies a month being registered in the province, surely that's an indication of growth within the province, that the engine of growth, small business, is still alive and well, notwithstanding that bankruptcies and other difficulties are perhaps at an all time high.

When we realize that the budget is approaching \$10 billion and look at the source of that revenue, we begin to realize very quickly how vulnerable we are. When we look at jurisdictions that have populations similar to ours — the state of Arizona comes to mind; it has a couple of hundred thousand people more than our province and yet a budget of \$3 billion. It's something about the size of the province of Manitoba, and yet they seem to survive. Here we have a budget of \$10 billion, and it's primarily from nonrenewable resource revenue. Is it any wonder then that we become nervous as we see events of the world unfold? Certainly Iran and Iraq will have a dramatic effect on the number one item that provides us with revenue in this country, because we're tied in some ways to the international market.

When you look at the Canadian scene, Mr. Speaker, it appears evident — depending on who you read, and if you believe who you read — that there are some very strong, rea-

sonable explanations as to why the Canadian economy is where it is. How can we in Alberta, representing some 9 or 10 percent of Canada's people, be immune from it?

We know that there is great slack in the Canadian economy in terms of capacity that is not being utilized. A few years ago, we went through the process around Oshawa, Canada, of producing diesel-electric locomotives, and the only market available at that time happened to be in New Zealand and Australia. They were very pleased to take those diesel-electric locomotives, provided we took beef. We ended up in Cardston, Alberta, the beef capital of Canada, with New Zealand beef sitting on the shelves. I think that's an indication that he who controls the strength of the nation — namely central Canada, where the greatest numbers are — tends to control the destiny of Canada. We saw the result of that reflected in many ways. One of them was a new style of political party that gave birth in this province, went through its gestation period, and died a reasonable death. That doesn't mean it won't come back.

Here in the province of Alberta, we see — and I think we heard it from the Treasurer the other day — that Albertans are certainly listening to the policy of the government. They're being urged by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to spend more, and they are spending more, so retail sales are up in province. They're not where they were — agreed — but they are up.

The question, though, continues to be: why will they not be sustained? Very clearly, they will not be sustained because business people have been trapped before. Business people simply will not invest capital to any great degree for a couple of very good and, I suppose, honest reasons.

One of them — and it is not unreasonable to expect a businessman to anticipate a return on his investment — has gone through a very traumatic period in our province where about two thirds of his cash flow went to service debt; two-thirds of his cash flow seemed to go to the bankers. Obviously that's unacceptable; you can't continue in any business at that rate. Secondly, in addition to unreasonable — depending on your point of view — interest rates, it had such a terrible effect on his business, he simply couldn't compete with other jurisdictions. Thirdly, and I think equally meaningful, was that he seems to be operating today in Canada, and even in Alberta, under a system where — and I'm from Lethbridge — the rules seem to change like the weather.

There seems to be a great uncertainty of any certainty in regulations regarding government. If it's not there in fact, it's certainly there in perception. The small-business man of this province, I submit, is the strength of this province. If he's not prepared to invest, if he's not prepared to take a chance — and the major reason he's not prepared is because the regulations are new regulations — then obviously the answer lies in us as a government establishing some degree of certainty that we won't change the rules or, perhaps better yet, unwinding some of the rules. That's the area of deregulation; it's been spoken to earlier. I don't think that deregulation is obviously the answer. I think it's fraught with problems, and one should approach deregulation very carefully. They say there's nothing new under the sun, Mr. Speaker, and I tend to agree with that. One better be very careful before he starts deregulating any industry or any section or sector of our province.

One other thing should be commented on, Mr. Speaker. We in Alberta experience deficits; we know that. We're not bound by a constitution that prohibits it like some jurisdictions. But very clearly, when we see the nation having a deficit each month equivalent to the United States of America when they fought the greatest war in history, the Vietnam war — they had a reason for spending that kind of money, I assume; they

were attempting to win a war, or contain it. In Canada we seem to have the same deficit without fighting a war. Until many businessmen begin to accept that governments at all levels are sincere about living within their means. I don't think they're prepared to invest their capital. I think they're saying: hey, we've got our house in order; what about you? They'll be looking forward very keenly to next Tuesday evening to see what this government does with regard to a budget.

The U.S. is having a better experience than Canada. I don't know about Alberta, but it's certainly better than Canada. When one looks at the reasons — I'll just emphasize a couple of them. I think the fact that they've cut taxes in America and allowed more money to flow has obviously been a factor. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that in America the psychology seems to have taken hold where people actually believe the country is turning around. I suppose if you can convince enough people of something, people will believe it. That's absent at the moment in Alberta. It's absent at the moment in Canada. I'm pleased to say that Lethbridge didn't experience the boom that our urban centres did and, as a result, hasn't experienced the bust that our urban centres did.

A couple of years ago I recall talking to a bank manager who had just had lunch with his vice-president from Calgary. He really got roasted because he wasn't moving the money quickly enough. He is the man who saved the day; he's now a hero. He had a little bit of common sense about him. I suppose the reason he's in Lethbridge — he wasn't a good enough banker in Calgary in the first place. But he didn't lend out money helter-skelter. As a result, when the embarrassments came with the Bank of Commerce and others, the small town bankers — i.e., in Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Grand Prairie, et cetera — were the heroes, because they hadn't pushed that tremendous amount of money out. They'd exercised a little restraint, the very thing that people are finding so popular today.

There seems to be an inference, Mr. Speaker, that the government should be creating jobs. I've always had trouble with that. The colleague to my right hasn't: I recognize that. That happens to be a political philosophy — more power to him. That explains the popularity of his party in the nation. I think most people are saying that historically the private sector should really be the people who create the jobs, and government should restrict themselves to fiscal and monetary policy. We in this province obviously have no say with monetary policy, because we're children of the federal government under the Constitution. But certainly with fiscal policy, the raising of taxes and the expenditure of money is right up our line. Maybe we haven't done the best, but I submit, with respect, that we've done better than most provinces in the country.

I'd like to make a comment about unemployment because unemployment has been mentioned. As I say, some people think government should be creating jobs. I'd like to recite an incident that happened not long ago — if I can find it. You see, Mr. Speaker, other parts of Canada seem to have the same trouble we do, some of them even more difficult. In Ontario there was a Kinsmen Club. We all know how aggressive young Kinsmen are; they're Rotarians, except younger. They wanted to do something for the community. They realized that this particular community, Leamington, which is synonymous with ketchup, needed a sports stadium. They said, how can we get people together to do it? They first of all identified the need. Secondly, thanks to federal and Ontario programs — makework programs, agreed — they got these people together to build this centre that was so badly needed in their community. Here's what they did.

They came up with an agreement that workers on the project who were unskilled would get \$200 a week; workers who were

skilled would get \$400 a week. The project was commenced and went merrily along until somebody didn't like what was happening. In this case it was union management. It could have been a doctor or a corporate president in another instance, but in this case it was a union president. He said, that ain't right. He took that to the labour relations board of Ontario, regardless of who appoints a labour relations board. They found that the unskilled people should get \$500 a week and the skilled people, \$900 a week. Net result: a building half built; a community called Leamington, Ontario, financially embarrassed; everybody who was hired out of work again; and the Kinsmen Club saying, what's the use?

Another example was in Kitchener. These are well documented for anybody who's interested. Kitchener has a lot of unemployed bricklayers. A similar group thought, here's a chance to get them to work. They found a community project and worked out what was a fair deal. They got both levels of government to make some contributions for make-work. So they got these bricklayers working at \$10.40 an hour. Is that enough? I don't know what's enough. But I do know the good intentions ended up in somebody's hands. It went to a labour relations board. The group was then compelled to pay \$20.88 an hour. Net result: no project. It stopped; it's half built.

What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there seems to be a feeling among certain people and certain members that government has an obligation to provide employment to everybody. I submit that employment, reasonable wages, and fair standards of living are concerns and problems of communities, and not governments. Here we had two examples of communities who were prepared to do something, not on their own but as a shared effort of everybody with an interest. It got going well, and somebody pulled the plug. As long as there is a distinct difference between the needy and the greedy in our society, that will happen. I'm not here to preach that people shouldn't be needy or people shouldn't be greedy, but unless we learn to pull together in the interests of unemployed Albertans, there ain't going to be any change. I don't think there's going to be any change.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just give a little bit of advice to those great people amongst us who are forecasters of the future. I learned a long time ago that those who live by the crystal ball better learn to eat ground glass, because eventually they're going to be wrong. I guess we get here by predicting the future. We should either develop a good set of dentures or learn to get by another way than by predicting what's going to happen in our future.

I think a larger question, Mr. Speaker, should be: will there be jobs for our children? I think that would be an excellent question to debate. Will there be jobs for our children? I look at some of the indicators. For example, I look at the automotive industry. In Canada it takes an average of 52 hours to produce an automobile. In Japan it takes 27 hours. That's slightly more than half. A lot of people will come right back at me and say: Gogo, if you feel so strongly about that, why don't you do what Sweden does to drunk drivers? I get off that because the Solicitor General has that responsibility, not me.

The point is that it takes almost twice as long in Canada — certainly 70 percent longer — to produce an automobile. One of six Canadians is employed in that industry. What do we do in response to that? We put up tariff walls all around our country, and if tariffs don't seem to work, we work red tape to slow it down. I guess the point I want to make and come to is what the future holds in terms of productivity in the nation to make us competitive, or recognizing that unless our young people become exposed to some of the very real things — and it's spelled out in the throne speech that it's a trading nation.

Unless we learn to compete internationally and train our people to compete internationally, then it's really academic; we're just not going to get anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I learned something from the Minister for Economic Development about computers and microelectric computers. I see now where they have a microchip in place which is not half as large as your thumbnail, which contains a complete FM radio. I didn't know that existed.

Secondly, we have a system in the country called optoelectronics, and that is a microchip with all the characteristics of an eyeball, except one-tenth the size, that will see everything the eyeball sees, will retain what the eyeball retains, and will do all the necessary calculations that the eyeball can actually do today. It is half the size of your fingernail. One other exciting one that is now being explored will replace keys in people's homes. You put your hand on the door knob, and unless the fingerprints belong to the owner or one of those people, the door won't open.

Even today, with all the talk of advancements, who would have thought that these things were ever heard of? If I hadn't either talked to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health or read this document, I wouldn't know. But very clearly our children are faced with that. I was surprised to learn that the average credit card that we carry in our pocket, the typical credit card with the black electronic band on the back, presently contains 5 million pieces of information. Most of us have medical records that probably consist of 25 pieces. The age of tomorrow, and our young people must be prepared for it; everything in their life can be on one card.

Mr. Speaker, I guess what I'm getting at is that unless our system either teaches or is geared to teach future Albertans that, we're simply not going to be competitive. That's what the message is. The way I see things going now — and I am very careful, because the Member for Edmonton Norwood is a teacher, the Member for Edmonton Belmont is a teacher, and we have a couple of other teachers here — the Member for Redwater Andrew. I must be very careful in my comments regarding teachers. I want to make a comment about the schools, because we seem to think schools are synonymous with education. We seem to think that if you put them in one end and keep them there long enough — in Lethbridge you pay \$4,400 a year — they will come out the other end ready to compete in the world. The Minister of Education knows that's not true. I think many of us know it's not true.

What we have to do is begin to address the question of education as education and not schooling, Mr. Speaker. I submit that education consists of many things other than schooling. I don't think many of us appreciate that. Questions in this House to the minister about closing schools in Calgary — with respect, he is paying for over 200,000 empty school desks in this province today. There are members here saying, why are you closing that school? I don't think it's difficult to understand that spending \$1.3 billion — I don't know what the budget holds. I see him smiling. It must be good news; I hope it's good news. We somehow have to set some priorities with regard to the education of our children.

My views have been known for some time. In a 10-, 15-, or 20-room school building, I think you should take one-third of them for classroom instruction called schooling, you should take another two or three and have senior citizen groups in there, and another one or two for service clubs. My city has 17 service clubs. Calgary must have 170 service clubs. Surely they should be occupying some of those facilities and allowing our young people to be involved at the community level through senior citizens, who would utilize some of that class space, and through community people represented by service clubs.

Thirdly, we insist on running day care centres, many in the back of Chinese restaurants. If we have all this unused school space, why aren't the day care centres in our school system? The law of this province says that they must go to school anyway when they're six. Wouldn't that account for a lot of the unused school space? It seems to me it would. It seems to me that those young people — ages two, three, four, or whatever their ages are — would naturally grow into a system of understanding what a school is all about. Heaven knows they would be protected from fire and flood — acts of God I am not qualified to debate — and certainly in terms of safety on school grounds. I think there is much we could do with regard to that and, frankly, I don't really see it happening. I think we could and should.

The Leader of the Opposition is out of the House at the moment. There is a fellow, well known to Canadians — not as well known as his father, but still pretty well known — who spoke in Calgary not long ago. I think this explains why some of our schools are having trouble. I very greatly respect school trustees in this province who stand for office and assume a responsibility; they're my peers. Albeit they only have jurisdiction with five cents of every dollar; 95 cents other people decide. They're called school trustees and school teachers. This man's name is Stephen Lewis — well known, almost premier of Ontario. He missed by 50 seats, but he was almost. He is a man who is highly respected across Canada. You find him on the Gzowski show every morning now. He said he never liked school trustees. I think that was reflected in attitudes around the province of Ontario with regard to schools. If you do not have respect for those people elected to represent the public in any capacity, I don't see how a system can work.

I know the Minister of Education gets along very well with school trustees in this province regardless of the topic, whether it's closing schools — he's never closed one yet — or opening schools or sex education. I can speak of the Minister of Education with a great deal of authority in my constituency. I asked him to come and meet with my school boards, and I have three — two legal and one private. He was quite prepared to meet with them at 11 o'clock at night. I think the attitude displayed by our minister is exceptional. He's more than prepared to meet the school trustees.

I simply want to quote from this. If we're going to compete in the world, somehow we have to train our people to compete or at least enable them to be exposed to a system where they can be trained. This Canadian leader says:

Teachers must guard against becoming obsessed with students' job preparation.

As I see it, that's the exact opposite of the responsibility of education and the schooling system. Yet this man is able to claim some pretty high fees speaking across the country. I simply say that if our ATA membership of 28,000 believes what he says, then we have a problem. Without the teacher in the system, nothing is going to happen.

From my point of view, I think we are served by many dedicated teachers in this province. I called on a 25-year-old teacher at one school here last fall at about 4:15 in the afternoon. I said, how's it going? She wasn't very happy. She was 25 or 26 years old, or maybe still is. She told me she had 31 children in her grade 4 or 5 class; 10 of them were problems. She had just called the parents. She got to nine; eight of them weren't home. The ninth one reamed her out: how dare you question the ability of my child? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when we have teachers who are dedicated enough to take the time to call parents to discuss their children, and there's no parent at the other end, for heaven's sake, let's not blame the teacher. Let's be thankful for that teacher. I simply submit that if that keeps

up, those kinds of teachers are not going to be around. Somehow I think they should be recognized and given thanks.

For those who think that money — and I think I heard from the Leader of the Opposition that the answer is more money. Twenty years ago the mayor of Lethbridge was chairman of the school board. He was telling me that they had 6,000 students in Lethbridge District 51, and their budget was \$600,000. Today they have 7,000 students in Lethbridge District 51, and their budget is \$26 million — a million higher than the city I represent. That's \$4,400 per student.

So for those who think the answer to the problem is more money, I think there's ample evidence to show that when we have a system in this province where we have by far the highest teachers' salaries in Canada — as of '83, \$38,000 for Category 4 teachers, and the lowest is \$23,000 — compared to all the provinces. I suggest and submit that putting more money in the system is not going to solve the problem. I think they're entitled to adequate remuneration, but I simply put the case that money is not the answer.

The final comments I want to make are really in two areas. One is the health care system, and the other is the young offenders Act.

The other day I received, as I assume most members did, a piece of propaganda called A Vital Issue from the doctors' union of this province, the Alberta Medical Association. They refer to things called: is capping the answer? I was confused, because I am attending convocation at U of L, and they go through that process. But that's not what "capping" means in this instance. I don't know what it means in this instance, but the medical profession is frightened. Otherwise, they wouldn't come out with that kind of strength and that kind of information.

Quite frankly, I get a little uptight when I see that we're one of three provinces in Canada with a premium system, because we believe the citizens of this province should partly pay their own way. To have the medical profession, with no evidence whatsoever, saying: the answer to your problem, government, is a \$200 deductible per patient . . . That makes it \$560 deductible, by the way, because it's already \$360. They seem to think that's the answer. They go on to say — and I guess that's the part that annoys me — if you'd only listen to us, you wouldn't have a problem. I submit that's why we've got the problem. We've been listening too long.

They say that the 10-bed hospitals we provide throughout this province to accommodate our citizens are one of the very important reasons we have runaway costs. I think this year's projection is \$2.8 billion. The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care put out a document very clearly. I don't understand how one-half of 1 percent of anything can drive you broke, and that's all the rural hospitals are costing: one-half of 1 percent.

As a matter of fact, the AMA says: hey, if you want to get your house in order, here's what you'd better do; have more big hospitals in our centres. In a letter dated March 8, the minister of hospitals put out that the 20 largest hospitals in Alberta — and I don't have to tell you where they are; they're not in Whiskey Gap — take 80 percent of the budget. And the AMA is saying: if you want to solve your problem, listen to us; put your bigger hospitals in your bigger centres; do away with the small hospitals. That's one example.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to have to draw to the hon. member's attention that his time has elapsed.

MR. GOGO: I apologize for talking so long, Mr. Speaker.

If I could close on this note. I say in substance that the role of government is to assist those who cannot help themselves.

I submit that the Alberta government has recognized that and is doing the very best it can. I certainly endorse all my colleagues in moving, passing, and adopting the throne speech.

Thank you very much.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues before me, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the debate, and I rise in this Assembly with great pride as the representative for the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. I will try to be much briefer than my previous colleague and allow many more members to participate this evening. I would like to extend particular congratulations to the members for Red Deer and Wainwright for their stimulating and thoughtful contributions in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that only yesterday I had the privilege of delivering my maiden speech before this Assembly, yet a year has already passed. On some nights it seemed as if a whole year was passing. But overall it has been extremely enjoyable and a great learning experience. With the opening of this the Second Session, I feel much more confident and prepared to play a more active role in the business of this government. Over the past year many individuals have offered advice and a guiding hand during my apprenticeship in this Assembly. I owe each and every one of those individuals sincere appreciation and thanks. Few other endeavours, whether private or public, offer one such an opportunity to work with so many dedicated individuals, all striving in their contributions to make this province a great home for so many Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I must offer a special tribute to you as senior counsel in this hallowed Assembly, for the inspiration you have given me in the fulfillment of your task as the Speaker. On many occasions during the First Session you showed all members, by your knowledge and wisdom, what a true gentleman you are. So it is with great embarrassment that I have on occasion watched the childish antics and outbursts against your decisions by certain members of this Assembly. That behaviour can only be described as undignified and leaves our parliamentary tradition of respect for the Speaker's Chair somewhat tarnished.

It does not take any courage to make attacks upon your person. Mr. Speaker, since you cannot defend yourself through debate as all other members of this Assembly are able to do. We cannot tolerate a few individuals or their press allies smearing respect for this House, and I urge you to continue applying the rules of this Assembly fairly and equitably so that our Assembly will continue to represent a model parliament in this country. Do not let our high standards be eroded by those seeking to selfishly benefit from such changes, but let other parliaments in this land rise to our levels of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, the past year, 1983, has not been a particularly bright one for some constituents of Edmonton Belmont. There are those that have faced the hardships of recession with a strong will and determination; however, the bankruptcies, foreclosures, and unemployment in Edmonton Belmont are the same problems facing other Albertans and Canadians. But 1984 has brought with it a cautious optimism. Much of that optimism rests upon a change of government in Ottawa. The federal government, which has plundered the west and has attempted to bring it to its knees, has achieved much damage. But they did not conquer the western spirit — the spirit of individualism and incentive, characteristic of the free-enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, it would serve little purpose to repeat the problems that we face. Many of these problems were created in large part by the uncontrollable growth in this province's economy during the 1970s, but now our government is retrenching. First, we believe that the federal scene will take care of itself, helping in a positive way the investor climate of this province

and the country. Second, we know the problems we face on the provincial scene, and we will face them head on. There is no question that the provincial economy is the number one priority of this government, and that is a situation which directly affects the levels of employment in this province. The throne speech clearly outlined the approach this government will take in order to deal with the problem.

It is with great enthusiasm that I listened to the Lieutenant Governor's words from the throne, for they carried that magic phrase which we have not accentuated strongly enough over the past number of years, and that is "the private sector". Mr. Speaker, to show the high emphasis put on the commitment to privatization in the economic strategy for the province, reference to the private sector was made no less than 28 times in this speech. I know that the members — or the member, at present — of the Official Opposition cringe at this reference to privatization. It is something they are worried about, because it will take away many of the arguments they have had. They continue to often preach the kind of rhetoric that we have heard from the 1950s, and even their own advisers are telling them that they are now bankrupt and no longer viable.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployment issue is paramount to the constituents of Edmonton Belmont and myself. As a member of the government party, I am confident that this government has initiated major policies for solving the problem. The first, as I've already mentioned, deals with the privatization of many public-sector areas and the commensurate savings in tax dollars to Albertans, as well as an improvement in efficiency while preserving the levels of service.

The second and equally important direction of this government is the emphasis on education and job training. There's an old Chinese proverb, Mr. Speaker: give a man a fish, and you feed him for a day; teach a man how to fish, and you feed him for a lifetime. With large numbers of Albertans going through job training and retraining, or returning to universities or colleges to upgrade their education, it is clear that this is the best method of preparing Albertans to make their skills more marketable. This government is placing an extremely high priority on the field of education. Already there are steps being taken to revise the School Act, the Teaching Profession Act, the secondary school review, as well as the introduction of departmental exams in our school system. As an educator, I am greatly encouraged by these measures, which will have a tremendous effect on the quality of education in our province.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Edmonton Belmont recognize that we have gone through a tough period of adjustment over the past year or year and a half but, as another old saying goes: when the going gets tough, the tough get going. The people of Edmonton Belmont do not want to run to the government with open hands, but they do need the positive support of their government to instill the needed confidence to do it for themselves. I believe this throne speech is the right start to achieving this goal.

As a final note. Mr. Speaker. Edmonton Belmont is still a rapidly growing constituency. Although housing starts in this province are not expected to be much higher than last year, many of those new homes are being built in the northern part of the constituency itself. If all goes well, I hope to become a member of my own constituency some time this year and move into the constituency. Also of significance in our riding is the official opening of St. Michael's nursing home and auxiliary hospital, which will have its official opening on May 6. That is a facility that will have 150 beds: 75 for auxiliary care and 75 as a nursing home. It's a beautiful institution, built jointly by the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care and the

Ukrainian-Canadian community. It's a hospital which is under the able directorship of Mr. Bohdan Shulakewych.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my second year as a member of this Legislature will be as memorable as my first in serving the people of Edmonton Belmont and the province of Alberta.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to participate in the throne speech debate. I, too, would like to congratulate the members for Red Deer and Wainwright on their fine performances in moving and seconding His Honour's speech.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, would like to comment on your performance as Speaker in this Legislature. I believe that you have performed your tasks with distinction. You have been extremely fair in your rulings and have brought to this Legislature a sense of order and decorum that I'm proud to be a part of. There certainly are those within and also those outside the Legislature who would like to see our House turned into a circus. I can understand the desires of those who wish to see that; however, I congratulate you on the way you handle the affairs of this fine House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to represent the constituents of Calgary Bow in participating and commenting on the throne speech. I've listened with interest to the hon. members that have made their remarks before me. Listening to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, I was reminded of the late John Kushner and some of his comments about standing up in the Legislature and speaking "off the cuff of my head", or in getting excited about a particular issue and saying "you've got my dandruff up".

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the throne speech, I would like to indicate that I, as well as a number of other members of this House, have come to this Legislature prepared for this spring session by finding out the best way we can what the views of our constituents are. We've had presession meetings in the constituency, and even had some members of the party to which the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood belongs come and learn a few things, and as constituents, of course, to express their views as well, which they're entitled to do.

In terms of door knocking, I would like to indicate that sometimes if you listen to the wrong sources or to certain sources to get your information, you can get depressed. However, the one Thursday afternoon I spent a couple of weeks ago wandering through the constituency, knocking on doors. I really was on a high, so to speak, when I came home at the end of the afternoon. It was nothing that I had to drink, nothing else, simply talking to the constituents and their attitudes toward what's happening in this province. Certainly they made known their views and their concerns. Their main concerns were related to the effect of the economic recession, primarily with respect to the effect on our young people in terms of the unemployment rate among that particular sector. We've heard a partial response to that concern this afternoon with the ministerial statement of the hon. Minister of Manpower.

However, Mr. Speaker, two years ago in going through that same constituency. I heard us as a government being blamed for the economic recession we were in. Things are different in that area now. I detected the realization that Alberta is not an economic island unto itself, that we had an overheated economy, and that the recession is certainly not limited to our part of the world. My constituents expressed the views that government as well as others, other individuals and the private sector, have to exercise greater fiscal responsibility and restraint during these particular times. Having said that, they want us to maintain the high quality programs we have in place but to build in cost efficiencies and improvements in the delivery of those programs.

I certainly support the tone of the throne speech in terms of creating a climate for economic recovery, with the emphasis on deregulation and privatization so that our Alberta businesses can compete and thrive without undue government involvement. I support the concept and the reality that job creation primarily comes from the private sector and that massive government intervention in this area is certainly not the route to recovery. I believe our government has responded responsibly to the public through our economic resurgence programs with the various aspects of that, whether it be incentives to the oil industry, the small business and farm interest shielding programs, the mortgage interest shielding program, or the senior citizen home improvement program so well accepted by many constituents in Calgary Bow, which has been a factor in creating some jobs.

In the throne speech, I support the small business venture capital initiative of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, where equity capital is intended to be provided in a way in which capital will be controlled by the private sector. I laud the private sector in the creation in this province of what I believe to be a coming-on-strong, high technology industry, including a very significant component of research and development. In electronics and telecommunications we see the examples of Northern Telecom in both Edmonton and Calgary: research and development, manufacturing. Out in the small community of Bassano we have the thriving industry of Global Thermoelectric.

My experiences in the previous four years before coming to this portfolio were with regard to Alberta Government Telephones. A number of initiatives were made to promote the development of telecommunications and high technology in this province in a way in which we could attract the private sector into this particular area. One joint venture which involved Alberta Government Telephones and Nova: creation of a new company called NovAtel where they are manufacturing and marketing a new mobile telephone set; you've seen it advertised under the name of the Aurora system; a leader in the world in this respect with recent contracts not only throughout Canada but in the United States and the Far East as well. A company that is coming on strong — manufacturing plant in Lethbridge, with research and development and marketing from Calgary. It is estimated that some 700 new jobs will be created from this company alone in the next year.

Also the subsidiary company of Alta-Can Telecom, a small arm of Alberta Government Telephones, with some \$10 million for investment into small projects and ventures which are intended to try to get the private sector, small groups of individuals, going with their ideas; also to be able to lend some of the expertise that AGT has in provision of some of the services that these small companies are providing. Just recently, Nova injected another \$10 million into that particular company.

The medical research foundation attracts top scientists from all over the world. In that delightful afternoon I had, I met a young lady on the street. Her husband is a scientist at the medical school at the University of Calgary, sponsored by our medical research foundation. She was most excited about the future of working in Alberta and showing their talents here.

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to turn to the social side and some areas that I'm responsible for in Social Services and Community Health. I've already mentioned the objective of maintaining high quality government programs, including Social Services and Community Health programs. There's reference in the throne speech to the widows' pension, which is unique in Canada. We have some 2,500 widows and widowers receiving benefits from that program today. Certainly there are improvements that I think we can make in that particular program. One

thing that I've heard in the constituency and that other MLAs have brought to my attention, is the fact that to qualify for that particular program, your previous year's income is taken into account. There are some individuals who may have a sudden drop in income, for one reason or another, and they would not qualify for the widows' pension until they waited one year and maybe in that year would be required to go on social allowance. We're looking at ways in which the appeal committee might be able to better address that particular issue. I say the appeal committee, because the Act does provide for appeal committees to listen to any cases that are brought before it regarding eligibility.

In the field of social allowance, I'm very proud of the social allowance program that we provide in this province — second to none in Canada in terms of benefits. I would like to comment briefly on the changes that we made to the program last spring. I notice that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood was incensed recently that we might have saved \$50 million from the changes that were made there. However, I think we've done the responsible thing — responsible to the citizens of this province who are paying taxes — in terms of trying to see where we can build efficiencies into the different programs we have. As a primary aspect of those changes, we had the change in the shelter ceilings, the amount of money we pay out for rent and accommodation. Other aspects we don't hear the hon. member discuss are the 5 percent increase in food allowances last summer and also the increases in the amount of money social allowance recipients can earn before any benefits are removed.

We speculated that these shelter changes and other changes would result in about \$50 million savings, and that in fact has occurred. I indicated at the time to this House and outside this House, that if there are people out there who are unduly affected by these changes, special consideration can be given to those people through the regional directors or through the appeal committees. We did make some modifications as the program went on. We gave special considerations in the area of utilities — since utilities were included in the total rental allowance — special considerations relative to the shelter costs, and also for winter clothing. I believe we've responded very responsibly in view of the fact that I believe it's the community, the family, the church, and government — all these groups — who are responsible for assisting those unfortunates who, through no fault of their own in many circumstances, are unable to find jobs or are on social allowance. I applaud the food banks that are a response from the community. We have a liaison between our social services district offices, and in particular in the Edmonton inner-city core, with the different agencies that are providing excellent services there.

During the past year, Mr. Speaker, we've had a significant reduction in the number of families who are on social allowance. That is due primarily to the fact that a number of social allowance recipients and families left Alberta in the past year. It looks as though we'll end up with a yearly average of about 45,500 cases with respect to social allowance. And that is significantly less than the total number of cases during the previous year. It's tough to estimate the numbers, but the best guesstimate that I've been able to determine is that we've had at least 15,000 families and individuals that were on social allowance leave the province. So as a result of that, and other programs, like the widows' pension where a number of people came off social allowance and onto the widows' pension program, we have less than what we had a year ago. The objective of the social allowance program is to provide services to those people who need them and, at the same time, it's our responsibility to see that the dollars are well spent. That was the

objective behind the changes last spring. I look forward to any questions on this particular topic that the hon. member and anyone else might have in question period.

There's also reference, Mr. Speaker, to the extended health benefits program and the aids to daily living. I'll only comment that the details of those changes were referred to in a ministerial statement of November 3, 1983, and many of the implementations or changes we were wanting to make begin April 1, 1984. We see a greater role of the health units in determining the benefits that individuals should receive under these two programs. As the administration of these changes proceed, I expect that there will be some minor adjustments and changes to accommodate unforeseen concerns that could arise, and I encourage members to make those concerns known to me.

There's reference to the Mental Health Act in the Legislature in that steps will be taken to implement some provisions of the Report of the Task Force to Review the Mental Health Act. We have an interdepartmental committee in place, and they're reviewing this particular report. I look forward to upcoming work in that area.

Two Bills that we will introduce this spring in the Legislature are the child welfare Act and the public health Act. I would like to comment briefly on the process that has taken place with respect to the child welfare Act. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we did have the Cavanagh Board of Review with their recommendations, and shortly after receiving that report, we introduced Bill 105 in the fall session of the Legislature. The Bill died on the Order Paper. We invited public response and certainly got it. We sent out over 2,000 copies of the Bill, along with copies of the Cavanagh Board of Review report, and to date have had approximately 150 written briefs from agencies and individuals in the public, numerous letters, as well as approximately 50 briefs from child welfare workers inside the department. I spent approximately three weeks during the month of January going to different parts of the province, from southern Alberta through northern Alberta, getting responses and reactions of people to Bill 105 and received some excellent comments.

I would also like to thank my colleagues in terms of encouraging individuals in their constituencies to respond. The one particular area where I think we received the most reaction was in terms of the proposed adoptive registry, where both an adult adoptee and a birth parent would have to register before any match-up could occur. We have received some very positive encouragement in that respect from many adult adoptees and others.

Mr. Speaker, in observing your particular position, I assume that I am running close to my time, but I am not sure. In any case, I would indicate that one area where I think we need to do a better job is in encouraging the native people of this province to assume a greater responsibility for the care of their children. To date, and for some time now, approximately 40 percent of the children we have in care are from native families. It is encouraging to me to see such agreements as the Lesser Slave Lake council, agreements where some nine or 11 bands are working with the government to assume a greater responsibility for the care of children. This will be phased in over a period of time.

We have received a number of briefs from different Indian bands, the Metis Association, and the Indian Association, with respect to the child welfare Act. I hope to be able to introduce that Bill very soon with a number of amendments as a result of the input we've received from across the province.

The public health Act will be a total rewrite. One important aspect of that will be a redrafting of the regulations. There are a tremendous number of regulations associated with the public

health Act, and certainly in the spirit of deregulation, we will be looking at the task we have ahead there. The public health Act will consist of the amalgamation of some six Acts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also congratulate the Minister of Advanced Education who has assumed responsibilities for the Women's Secretariat, which also includes the Alberta Women's Bureau. In my view the family violence issue includes a multitude of issues, whether it be child abuse or violence against women. The term wife battering is often used. I really would prefer another expression, either violence against women or assault against women. In this particular area as well, I see the responsibility of family, the community, and government working together to try to see what we can do to change societal attitudes with regard to this most difficult area.

in the boom times we had just a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot about social upheaval and social ills related to the boom times. The divorce rate and family problems were, to some degree, attributed to the boom times we were in. Now that we are coming through the recessionary times, we are hearing the theory that it is the difficult economic times we're in that are causing family problems. I guess it depends on what kinds of statistics we look at. There are some statistics which show a lessening of some of the concerns. One of the statistics that I point to is the fact that we now have some 16,500 children in need of protection in care and receiving services in homes in this province, as opposed to some 18,500 one year ago; so some 2,000 less.

On the other hand, there are other statistics that people can point to which show a concern with respect to violence against women. There have been a number of proposals for women's shelters in this province, and we do have about a dozen. We have experimental programs in both Lethbridge and Calgary with respect to counselling the perpetrators as well as the victims of the abuse. There is no way that we can afford to put women's shelters in every community in this province. For one thing, it does not address the problem of family violence. However, it is one means of looking after the victims for a short term.

I was very interested in receiving a proposal from north-eastern Alberta, supported by the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray. A lady in that particular part of the province has done a great deal of work and, in my view, a great deal of original thinking in terms of addressing the problems of violence against women. She has come forth, with other people, with a proposal for a great involvement of volunteerism for what might be called refuge shelters or centres in different communities, where people have volunteered to use their homes as a refuge for the victims of family violence. We have given consideration to this particular proposal, and I am happy to indicate tonight that we will be funding this particular experimental proposal to the tune of some \$67,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone on, on a number of issues related to my responsibilities. There will be other times when I can comment on other programs. I look forward to the budget proposals coming up which, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, are designed to support our priorities, consistent with appropriate restraint in the public expenditure.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to respond to the throne speech presented at this Second Session of the 20th Legislature. After just having heard the previous speaker, perhaps I should quit now while I'm \$67,000 ahead.

Compliments are due the hon. Member for Red Deer who moved the speech, and to the seconder, the hon. Member for Wainwright. Their thoughts and words were well chosen and

meaningful for us all. Thank you also to His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, Frank Lynch-Staunton, for his throne speech delivery. His graciousness added great dignity to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to recognize the 19 members who first joined the Assembly at this time last year. They have proven hardworking and valuable colleagues. I trust that we have made them feel a trusted and integral part of this House.

My sincere thanks to my constituents for their concern and active participation in the life and progress of the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency and in that of the province as a whole. Again, I renew my pledge to represent them earnestly, with honesty and integrity, and to make their voices heard.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray is unique not in terms of its near 53,000 square-mile size nor for its agriculture, fishing, and oil patch industries, but because of its people, a wonderful cosmopolitan population made of the stuff that built our country. I am extremely proud to represent this constituency and also to present her to this House and to the Assembly this evening.

I have travelled a great deal over this past year to remote areas like Fort Smith, Fort Fitzgerald, Fort Chipewyan, Chard, Conklin, Janvier, Caslan, and Kikino. I visited with the folk at Plamondon, Wandering River, Anzac, Lac La Biche, Fort McMurray, and Fort MacKay. I've had the opportunity to travel by all modes of transportation. I wonder how many members or colleagues in Alberta let alone Canada have had the opportunity to visit their constituency by such a variety of transportation methods. I've travelled by snowmobile, boat, bus — yes, I travelled 5 hours on a bus to get here yesterday — plane, and I've hitchhiked. I'm not ashamed to say it; we have some nice people in our constituency who picked me up.

In travelling to the constituency, I found that the people want to communicate — the farmers, fishermen, trappers, trades people, professionals, homemakers, and business people; those in every workplace and the young people as well. They have a lot to share, and everything isn't rosy out there. Restraint is a cold, hard fact of life. They meet it everyday, at home and at work. They also understand that there is only a limited number of dollars to serve the entire province and are prepared to make the adjustments, just as they're doing in their own lives. Their call to us as their representatives is for responsibility and accountability in management. I personally am very encouraged by our government's stance in making fiscal policy our first priority. While sharing concerns and solutions — many viable ones are frequently offered to me, new ideas and concrete advice — we as government need to listen.

I urge all members to spend more time in their constituencies. There is a lot of help and guidance out there just waiting for our ears. Talk about representation — and representation in this House is what it's all about — we're here because of our own initial choice, which was endorsed by constituency support and trust. Our presence here, Mr. Speaker, is a privilege. We have a great responsibility. We are here to serve.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of working behind closed doors; not so. We must bring ourselves closer to our communities to dispel this misconception. I am grateful that my constituents do speak freely. Their honesty gives recognition to the many positive things that are happening. Regretfully, I do not have the time today to share all these positive things within my constituency of Lac La Biche-McMurray, but I do want to share a few with the Assembly this evening.

The decentralization of government agencies is working most successfully in our region. It provides a greater sensitivity to local concerns, and the simple geographic accessibility it

affords results in even more efficient networking. The Department of Social Services and Community Health is to be complimented for the manner in which they handled the traditional phases of last summer's assistance changes, just mentioned by the hon. minister. Support given to both staff and clients eased this difficulty in this initial phase considerably. It proved once again that people are able to adjust.

Encouragement and help given to the volunteer force of many communities is making quite an impact. I see it in programs such as suicide prevention, distress telephone lines, teen involvement, and counselling. Even the business world is adding their support through such things as employee assistance programs.

I would also like to mention the sustenance of women's crisis centres, a clear indication of this department's sensitivity to peoples needs. After just hearing from the hon. minister, I'm very grateful to acknowledge receipt of the \$67,000 approved for our initial test program in the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency, which I'm confident will be successful.

The Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission's diligence in the field of education, and prevention and treatment of alcohol and other drug abuse provides more far-reaching effects than most of us realize. Public support of this agency grows steadily, and I am grateful for the work they are accomplishing within my constituency.

Deregulation, as promised in the throne speech, will be meaningful for my constituency, Mr. Speaker. It is something my people have been asking of me and government for a long time. Acknowledging the average age of some 22.6 years of Fort McMurrayites, I must mention the consideration government has given to this city and other centres in the field of education. Our growth has been recognized: two new elementary schools in Fort McMurray; approval for facilities in Janvier, Conklin, Garden River, Anzac, and Fort Chipewyan, with an expansion-need review for Fort MacKay. Because of our young population, interest in education runs high, and the minister's proposed basic education reforms are welcomed. I'm especially proud to say that we're meeting the needs of the constituency adequately and meaningfully.

My personal commitment to education has included bursary sponsorship at both Keyano College in Fort McMurray and at the Alberta Vocational Centre in Lac La Biche. I would encourage other members to consider a similar gesture of support. I committed \$1,000 a year for five years to the two centres. This is my personal contribution. It's committed to those individuals who do not have the opportunity to continue without extra funds — not based on performance records but on need. I would encourage all other members to be involved in their communities. I've now completed three years of that five-year program, and hope to see it to fruition.

Basic needs are real, and government's response to our constituency has been evidenced by such things as tentative approval for additional senior citizens' facilities in Wandering River and Fort McMurray, along with water and sewer projects in Anzac and Fort MacKay. While special I.D. tax transfers have not been extended for Fort McMurray, I am confident that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will recognize the need for increased funding in the area of unconditional grants, as there are inequities in the unconditional grant formula.

Transportation remains a priority in the northeast region, Mr. Speaker, and again I believe government has responded. At a cost of \$10 million over a three-year period, isolation relief in the form of a road from Conklin-Janvier to Fort McMurray has been a significant government decision, especially in view of this period of adjustment. Although choice of the route has not been without controversy within our constituency, the fact

remains that people in this remote area will have access to vital services. While maps clearly indicate the absence of road connections in our area, I'll continue to work toward the extension of this road south to create an all-weather road from Fort McMurray through Janvier-Conklin to Lac La Biche. I'm confident that government can and will respond to this need.

Still in the area of transportation, a five-year agreement between the department and the city of Fort McMurray has seen a nearly completed \$17 million project through the city. It was sadly needed, and we are pleased. We accept it and think the minister has responded in a very appropriate manner.

As well, I'd like to extend congratulations and a thank-you to the Minister of Economic Development along with the Minister of Transportation for assistance in developing, with the federal government, a six-year agreement for the continuation of the barge system on the Athabasca River, which will continue north to Fort Chipewyan — a very vital link for communication to those living in the north. The new port of entry, home to the tourist and convention bureau and the chamber of commerce in Fort McMurray, became a reality just recently. The Minister of Tourism and Small Business was there to officiate at the opening. This has been a joint effort of the Kinsmen Club, the city, and the province, and I believe it will probably be the last of the 75th Anniversary-funded projects that have taken place in the province of Alberta.

Government support has been extended to include the interpretive centre in Fort McMurray. I was pleased to hear reference to this centre in the throne speech. The facility will document the history of the oil industry in our area. Construction has begun, and completion will see a second-to-none facility which will serve the entire tourist industry of that particular area.

Speaking of the oil industry, Mr. Speaker, I just can't help but bring Suncor and Syncrude to mind. We're most fortunate in our area to have two such industries which bring economic stability to us and to the province as well. The major \$1.2 billion expansion program announced by Syncrude last June will evidence itself in unemployment relief for our constituency. I feel it is most important to note that local hiring is a priority practice for both companies, and it is certainly indicative of their community commitment.

Mr. Speaker, while we haven't specifically addressed all the unemployment issues, and I certainly don't want to minimize it and say we don't have an unemployment problem in our community and our constituency — if there is but one unemployed person in that constituency, it's a problem to that individual — we'll continue to work with industry and the private sector to improve in that area, and work with such programs as STEP and PEP. This government will answer and try to be responsible, to privatize wherever possible, and to assist in the community and in particular the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency.

A very big highlight for us in Fort McMurray is the awarding of the 1985 summer games. It is significant to note that the games in 1985 — International Youth Year — will take place in such a youthful community. I say that's good planning. I've just had the pleasure of representing the Minister of Recreation and Parks in the signing of the agreement, and I'd like to take this opportunity to invite all to visit us in '85 in the city of Fort McMurray, especially during those events.

I would like to thank government for its foresight in initiating and providing ongoing support for the Northern Alberta Development Council. Mr. Speaker, the chairmanship has proven a most rewarding experience for me over the past year, and for the benefit of my colleagues who may not be familiar with its function, I'd like to share some background and a little bit of

an update. Simply defined, the council's mandate is to foster and promote the economic and social growth of northern Alberta. This it has done since its inception in 1963 as an advisory body to government. Reorganization some 10 years later strengthened this mandate under the authority of the northern development Act. The membership was expanded to 10 — two MLAs and eight citizens at large, all from northern Alberta. At this time I'd like to recognize the hon. Member for Grande Prairie and other council members who give unstintingly of their time and valuable efforts and talents in the interest of the north.

To encourage active participation in the planning and delivery of government services, we hold six to seven public meetings annually throughout the region. This enables council as a communication vehicle to become more accessible. Travel throughout this large portion of our province provides an excellent opportunity to address major concerns of communities large and small.

Mr. Speaker, over 1,000 individual briefs have been submitted to these meetings since 1973, and some 60 percent have received favourable responses following investigation and presentation to government. Submission topics brought to our table include such issues as agricultural land development, education, health services, housing, local and provincial government concerns, transportation and tourism. They're varied and very diverse — all very similar to those we meet in our individual constituencies.

Our response to needs has given rise to such follow-ups in specific areas as the \$600,000 student bursary program to encourage professionals to the north. A major thrust in the area of medical practitioners, which was most gratifying and received such helpful media support, was held this past year and was very, very helpful in bringing doctors and medical practitioners to the north. The September '83 northern ministers' conference was well attended and productive. An agricultural paper was presented to the energy conservation board, and I see by the response in the throne speech will bring some 200,000-plus acres of agricultural land to be developed in the north. Workshops such as the jointly sponsored series with AADAC — Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission — last year, and just recently three workshops dealing with the problems of early school leavers. More currently we're looking at addressing a research project into regional economic development opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, there have been more than 40 major studies over the past six years that have all been undertaken in examination of a wide variety of topics brought to council's attention by northern citizens with northern views. In serving as a liaison, we have received much encouragement from the people of northern Alberta, their MLAs, and from government. The ongoing support from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, Leader of the Opposition, has been most beneficial, and I personally thank him for that. Service in the development of northern Alberta is challenging with exciting prospects. The possibilities are countless with confident hope for the future. I feel privileged to have shared a small part of this progress.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to return to the subject of the greatest resource — people. I'd like to underline that Alberta is for everyone. I am proud of this government which has seen the need for such agencies as the Committee for Tolerance and Understanding, the Human Rights Commission, and the Women's Secretariat. With this attitude and support it is small wonder that people are choosing our country and this province. Some out there will say: hey, that's not happening; people are leaving. I'd like to bring up in a minute what's happening in Lac La Biche-McMurray.

The encouragement of multiculturalism and heritage preservation results in such things as 163 persons from many, many different countries becoming Canadian citizens in Fort McMurray since February 1983. While population is declining in some parts of Alberta, Fort McMurray in particular has seen an increase of approximately 3 percent. That's significant, Mr. Speaker, because it wasn't but a year ago that I heard an awful lot of people out there say: with the demise of Al sands, Fort McMurray was a boom and bust community, and those 34,000 people will be leaving in droves. Mr. Speaker, we're 35,500-plus and we're growing, and we'll continue to grow.

The community contributions made by people are varied, creative, imaginative, progressive, and productive. And that's what's going to make it grow — the people. For instance, I think real ingenuity has been demonstrated by the north-central roads committee with their unique proposal for road construction. The wild game ranching project at Kikino, very unique; the drop-in centre at Fort Chipewyan. A Chinese school now operates in Fort McMurray, which is open to everyone, and although it's sponsored by the Canadian Chinese Culture Society, it certainly contributes an awful lot to our community. The Newfoundlanders club recently launched a most successful fund raiser in support of a liver transplant for a four-year-old youngster down east. Local golfers worked long and hard until their Autumn Leaves Golf Tournament developed into the largest in western Canada.

You haven't really enjoyed the sport of winter until you've shared in Fort McMurray's winter carnival, Mr. Speaker. Eleven young princesses alone raised some \$30,000 for prize money just a month ago, and you may be interested to know that McMurray is now home to the Canadian sled dog sprint championship. Have you ever seen a dog race? Now that's excitement. International recognition is putting not only the city and the constituency on the map but our province as well. It just shows that people can respond, do respond, and get out and work for their community. I believe the volunteerism in that area cannot be equalled anywhere but is shared by all Albertans. The events of the carnival are many, and at this point I guess I must brag about winning the VIP stock car race on ice for the second consecutive year as well, and I want to tell you that the competition was tough.

Just as an aside, thinking of vehicles reminds me to tell the hon. Member for Clover Bar that thanks to him I've a very irate constituent. In anticipation of a pending 3 percent sales tax, he rushed out to make a major purchase of recreation vehicles. Now that's just got to be false economy, but helps the sales and some other efforts, so if that's what the hon. member wishes to do — predict through his crystal ball — more power to him.

Seriously though, Mr. Speaker, people working with people. And the arts are not forgotten. Thanks to joint sponsorship from IBM Canada Ltd. and Syncrude, the National Ballet of Canada performed at Keyano College this winter, and the college foundation continues to work toward a centre for the performing arts. Music and drama festivals are an integral part of our community life throughout the constituency. Libraries flourish, and cultural activities abound. It is enriching; it helps us grow; and it's people who make it work.

A very special sensitivity was shared by a little girl in Fort McMurray when she wrote last fall — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read to you and members of the Assembly a little poem:

"November Twilight"

Frost's in the air now;
 All the trees are bare now;
 Grey shadows creep; cold breezes blow;
 Daylight is dying; withered leaves are flying;
 Soon they will sleep; under the snow.

Mr. Speaker, she was tragically killed two weeks after writing that poem. She was 10 years old. Sleep well, Sally; we'll remember you.

In closing, I would like to repeat that people are our greatest resource and strength. I am hopeful that my constituency travel will continue to increase, because the people are speaking. They face reality head-on. They have something to say. We must be there to listen and to act. To ensure the progress of our province, we as elected representatives must capitalize on this strength. Albertans are waiting. They want to be heard; they want to help. And we are here to serve. As the learned David Suzuki said, "This country resonates in diversity". That, Mr. Speaker, best describes the constituency of Lac La BicheMcMurray.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased to participate in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. At this time last year, I too felt very, very different. I had great sympathy for my colleagues from Red Deer and Wainwright when they were moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne. At this, the beginning of the Second Session of the 20th Legislature, I feel a lot better about standing in front of my colleagues. I appreciate your sympathy and understanding and the education you have given me over the year, Mr. Speaker, in the rudimentary operation of the House.

Our constituency of Calgary Foothills has approximately 10,415 homes. I believe we are very fortunate in this province, in being a constituency with very high employment but, as I travel through the constituency, I hear again and again concern for the future — for their children and the children of the coming generation generally. Many members of the constituency are concerned regarding three areas. They are addressed very well, and they deal with deregulation, expanded privatization, and the reform of basic education in our province. In addition, one of the capital projects mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is Scurfield Hall at the University of Calgary. I believe the construction of this building is a singular example of the cooperation between private industry and government, and an answer to a very real need that has developed in our community. This building will house the faculty of business management, a faculty that has exploded dramatically in our city and desperately needs new quarters.

It also exemplifies another phenomenon that I see portrayed very strongly in our Speech from the Throne. That is, the higher the level of technology, the more attention we must pay to the human interaction that goes on in our province. I also see in this building a continuing commitment to the quality of higher education in our province.

When we think about the process of deregulation as it's explained in the Speech from the Throne, I believe it's another indication to me of the government's responsiveness and sensitivity to the changing times — not just in Alberta but world-wide.

For years, we've been in an expansive mood. We've been building, and I think it's time all of us took a look at what we have built, what we have done, and where we're going in the future. I believe this speech has certainly put that into words for us. Some of the legislative changes needed will be very much like the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Wainwright today, Bill No. 4, the Municipal Land Loans Repeal

Act. This Act is no longer needed. Other Acts are going to be introduced, like the child welfare Act to be brought forward by the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Changes must be made in this Act in order to keep in touch and in tune with the changes in society. I'd like to commend the minister, not only for the Bill and the changes it will likely be making but for the way it has been introduced to Albertans. I believe this is a really fine example of open government. People have been asked to let us know how they feel about what we are suggesting. After the Cavanagh report was received, after the Bill was let die on the Order Paper, we had a lot of reaction from the public and, hopefully, that will be incorporated into the new Bill. I really admire the minister for taking this approach.

Mr. Speaker, the expansion of privatization of some segments of the operation of some departments of our government will also be most welcomed by my constituents. This again reflects a change in Alberta's position. During our period of rapid growth, I believe we responded to needs that could not be looked after by the private sector, because they were too busy building. Right now, I hope this privatization will help the small-business man. I also hope we see the continued encouragement of the entrepreneur and that we show people with creative ideas that we're ready and willing to encourage individual initiative. Through all this, though, I feel it's extremely important to remember the words from the Member for Lethbridge West, when he told us that the role of government is to help those who cannot help themselves.

I'm also extremely pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the comments from the Member for Lethbridge West regarding education and schooling. In our province, we have divided the responsibilities in our goals for basic education. Education is looked at as something that all of society participates in, and schooling as a reserve of the school. I think now it is time for us to recognize a holistic view of the person in society. I think schools should provide foundations on which people can build for the rest of their lives, not just pass exams while they're going to school. I think the skills of schooling are going to be more in demand than ever before, and that is why I commend the minister on the review of the School Act and the secondary school program reviews. As an elementary school teacher, I can see nothing more vital than to try to put together a secondary school program that recognizes the whole program and ambitions of a student, rather than segmenting 40-minute periods per day for each student, with no direct relationship, no direct connection to any teacher, any human being other than the ones they select themselves.

I think the day has gone when there are discrete bodies of knowledge that don't overlap and integrate with one another. I think the day has gone when we say there are some children that can't learn. I believe all can learn, and I feel all can learn with enthusiasm and develop an enthusiasm for learning generally. The timing of these reviews is extremely important. We've often spoken in this House about the information revolution and how we're just entering this stage. We're in a stage of high technology. We've got to understand it; we've got to learn to control it. We're also in an age of service to one another. In the future I think robots will be doing work that human beings should never have had to do in the first place. Education should be adjusted to recognize this fact and must encourage the creativity that is going to be needed and even vital in the future to soar beyond the narrow confines, the narrow definition of schooling as it now exists. Creativity is what we must focus on. It will be a vital part of our futures as we've got to create new jobs. We can't possibly solve problems of the future with old answers from the past. Creativity — it's something we haven't bothered with.

I think right now the computer can help us extend our functioning by complementing the skills that we as human beings do so well. We can think; the computer can't. But it can certainly do the arithmetic that we spend so much time teaching right now. In this day and age, there is no way that the mathematician would ever stop to do any mathematical problems himself. They can't function without a computer. Calculations are encumbering our minds, and I think it's time we freed ourselves. Let the computer develop with us — a kind of symbiotic relationship — develop our creativity as it looks after the menial tasks that it can do so well.

Also, as we enter this age and with these reviews of our education system, I think we have to consider that with high technology comes high touch. More is not the answer — more time, more teachers, more evaluations, more money even. I think we have to emphasize the human connections in our school and work together to build an education system that is the pride of all.

For years, Mr. Speaker, we've concentrated on building in the petroleum industry and the agricultural industry in our province; we've worried about our economics and the development generally of our province. I think the Speech from the Throne shows an awareness and a deep sensitivity to the increasing need to recognize problems of human interaction. We've mentioned the child welfare Act and the new young offenders Act. I think also important, and certainly well recognized, are initiatives in medical research, the nursing research foundation, the establishment of the Women's Secretariat in order to enable women's concerns, their hopes, their aspirations, to be taken into account when policy is being considered by our government.

I'd also like to mention AADAC, Mr. Speaker. I know the hon. Member for Lethbridge West couldn't talk about it too much, but I am so impressed by the program initiatives that

are taken to combat drug and alcohol abuse, a major health care cost to our society, much greater in fact than the profits gained from the sale of alcoholic beverages altogether.

I hope our government will take further steps in the prevention of illness, particularly as it relates to cancer. It's proven that lung cancer can be prevented. It's proven that a good diet can prevent colo-rectal cancer. I hope our government will seize this opportunity to work and encourage the medical profession to focus on responsibility of the individual for caring for their own good health.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud and pleased at the focus on people contained in the Speech from the Throne. As was mentioned by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, I think the fact is that the strength of Alberta is its people and their freedom to pursue the opportunities provided in our province. We're at a space in time where we must pick up the challenge of working together with what we have and get on with the work of building a strong province. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of being here in this Legislature.

Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely overwhelmed. This is the first time I've ever heard anyone quote the Member for Lethbridge West. Because of that feeling and the hour, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will not sit tomorrow evening. On Wednesday there will be a continuation of the debate in respect of the address in reply.

[At 10:02 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

