

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, March 23, 1984 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 21**Insurance Amendment Act, 1984**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Insurance Amendment Act, 1984.

The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Insurance Act to permit the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations prescribing the experience, training, education, and licensing condition in examination of applications for certificates of authority or adjusters' certificates. Basically, this allows regulations to be made that will allow for step licensing, which is very important to the insurance industry.

One small part of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, relates to the transfer of the Insurance Corporations Tax Act under the auspices of the Provincial Treasurer. One small portion of that Act must be included in the Insurance Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 21 read a first time]

Bill 17**Cancer Programs Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Cancer Programs Amendment Act, 1984.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish the Alberta cancer foundation.

[Leave granted; Bill 17 read a first time]

Bill 15**Agricultural Pests Act**

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 15, the Agricultural Pests Act.

This Act is being rewritten to parallel its procedures and enforcement with the Weed Control Act. One of the main changes is to direct appeals to an appeal committee rather than through the courts, which parallels a procedure in the Weed Control Act. The title "officer" under the Act is to be amended to "inspector", similar to the Weed Control Act, and the increased penalty section will reflect the serious nature of infractions as well as increasing the deterrent value.

[Leave granted; Bill 15 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 15 and 17 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 205
Elevator Braille Act**

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 205, the Elevator Braille Act.

This would require the provision of braille indicators in all new buildings and gradual phase-in in existing structures in Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 205 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to table the annual report for the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1983.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the annual report of the Alberta Motion Picture Development Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1983.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling the annual report for the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year 1982-83, which contains the annual report of the Alberta Planning Board and the Alberta Planning Fund. As well, Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling the auditor's financial statements for the Metis Settlements Trust Fund for the fiscal period that expired March 31, 1983.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure and privilege this morning to introduce to you a group of young people from the Lamont elementary school. They are grade 6ers, and they are accompanied by Mrs. Bernedette Letwin, Mr. David Hare, Mr. Clarence Kitura, and Gloria Danyluk. I'd like them to rise in the public gallery and receive the recognition of the Legislature.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 25 grade 6 French immersion students from the Greenfield school in the Edmonton Whitemud constituency. Accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Warnery, they are in the members gallery. I'd like to ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly a group of 27 grade 6 students from Ellerslie junior high school, which is now in the city of Edmonton but still in the Wetaskiwin-Leduc constituency. They are accompanied by Dale Potter and Phyllis Olson and are in the members gallery. I'd like them to stand and receive the welcome of the House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Mortgage Company Investigation**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Now that the Thome Riddell case is no longer before the courts, could the hon. minister outline to the Assembly whether there are any plans in place to compensate the many Albertans who lost their life savings on Dial Mortgage investments?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it has never been a policy of this government to compensate people for investments that unfortunately have not turned out to their benefit.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. As noted in the Assembly last year, the method by which the government undertook their responsibilities in the Re-Mor mortgage affair in Ontario was referral to the Ombudsman. In light of the controversy concerning the government's role in the Dial affair, could the minister advise the Assembly whether she would consider referring this matter to the Ombudsman?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, while I would have to give that some consideration, I'm not sure that would be appropriate in this case. It occurs to me that there were some matters raised with the Ombudsman last year, and I believe he may have made some comment upon it. I will check that out for the hon. member.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the course of the government's responsibilities, the superintendent of insurance and real estate had written to the Dial officials, requesting that client advances be kept in trust. That was not done and, somewhat later, another letter was written to the company. My question is: apart from the legislative changes which were made, what consideration has the minister given, in her personal review of the Dial affair, as to changes in the power of enforcement by the director of insurance and real estate?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't received the full advice of the department or the Securities Commission, if you will, with respect to what matters may have been raised before the courts that would lead us to conclude that there should be some changes in legislation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. minister or the Attorney General. Has the government set in place a review of the way in which Dial responded to the directives of the superintendent of insurance and real estate, to determine whether or not there may have been a violation of sections of the Criminal Code?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I told the hon. member in responding to his previous question, I haven't had an opportunity to receive advice from the department or the Securities Commission with respect to the matters that were before the courts and what possible future policy changes there should be, in terms of either the department or the Securities Commission.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister then give the Assembly an indication as to the time frame that is in place now? She has indicated that she has not had an opportunity to review this. When will she? And can we expect an announcement during the spring session, perhaps a ministerial announcement, as to changes in enforcement procedures?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly undertake to respond to the hon. member and members of the Assembly when I have received advice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of the review that will be taking place, could the minister indicate whether that will be a review by the minister? Or are there specific staff people in the department, as well as people brought in from outside the department, to review this matter and make recommendations to the minister which in turn will come to this Assembly?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm not in a position to respond as to precisely what type of review, if "review" is indeed the appropriate term. But I will certainly be responding in the House.

Alberta Hospital, Ponoka

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and ask the minister what review has been completed on the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation report on Alberta Hospital, Ponoka.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the information I have on that is that it was delivered to the board approximately three weeks ago, and I understand the board is assessing the numerous recommendations and observations that were in there. The board also forwarded a copy to my department, and officials are going over it at the present time. It's currently all under review.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to confirm that Alberta Hospital, Ponoka, was denied accreditation on the basis of lack of staff and lack of funding to upgrade facilities?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet seen the accreditation report, so I don't know the wording of the specific observations or conclusions. As far as a lack of staff is concerned, I do know that that's been an ongoing problem, particularly at the senior administrative level. Steps are of course being undertaken and progress made in that field. The new executive director of the hospital recently came to the jobsite and is now at work full-time.

In my view, shortage of funding is not a problem. This Legislature has approved adequate funding for those positions, as well as for improvements to the buildings that have been approved.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Last October 31, in response to the hon. Member for Clover Bar, the minister indicated that he was "not overly concerned if a hospital loses its accreditation". Is the minister giving any consideration to changing Alberta Regulation 342/72, which says:

Each hospital shall strive to meet the standards for accreditation of hospitals established by the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation.

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Given concern about Alberta Hospital, Ponoka, for several years now, what initiatives is the government in a position to announce, not as a result of the denial of accreditation several weeks ago but because of the concern expressed over the last several years?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is aware of the significant changes, starting at the board level, that have taken place. The hospital was taken out of the Department of Social Services and Community Health and transferred to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, and is now being run as an autonomous Crown hospital.

In my view, we've made very significant progress in the field of board organization and appointments. We now have at

work, and working very vigorously, several good Alberta citizens from a wide variety of regions through southern Alberta, which is the catchment area for the hospital. Very shortly the new drop-in centre will be opening. Incidentally, the building, which is a renovation of an old one, recently achieved recognition by being awarded an architectural design award.

The board is going on with their plans to develop programming for the new brain-damage unit, and vigorous steps are being undertaken in recruitment to fill the vacant positions. It's not easy. The kinds of people that are needed are not readily available. I understand that alternative steps are being taken, through the universities, to see if we cannot get qualified psychiatrists who will at least work there part-time, on a contractual basis.

So I'm satisfied that the board is working very hard with a very difficult situation and is starting to show significant results for their hard work.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What assessment has the minister made, in consultation with the board, as to the impact of the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation report — namely, the denying of accreditation — on the recruitment of personnel?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there's been no specific or special meeting on the accreditation report as such. When the board received it, the chairman, Mr. Lamb, called me. We discussed the impact of the report briefly. As I mentioned in an earlier reply to a question, the board is now going through the report and assessing it, as is our department. I imagine we will very shortly be having a meeting to see what actions ought to be taken, if any, vis-à-vis the observations in the report.

I stress again that at this time, the prime responsibility and objective of the department and the board is to maintain a good level and quality of patient care. I'm told that that is happening, and in fact the accreditation report mentions that.

Water Management — Oldman River

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1983, the Minister of the Environment stated that an announcement would be made by the end of 1983 on the site of a dam on the Oldman River. When is that announcement coming?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I expect to be in a position to make a formal announcement as to the government's decision in this matter before the summer.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate what difficulties are being faced by him in terms of the negotiations? Are the negotiations with the Peigan Indians re the reserve completed?

MR. BRADLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. Some of the difficulty has in fact been the lateness in the Peigans' response to our request for a proposal from them, dealing with siting a dam on the Peigan Reserve at Brocket. We have been reviewing a concept letter they have provided to us and will be responding to them in the near future with regard to that letter. After we have finished that process with the Peigans, we as a government should be in a position to make a decision as to the siting.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not asking for budget details. But in terms of the timing of the announcement, will the minister have adequate funds in the 1984-85 budget,

or would he be prepared to proceed with a special warrant for funds to proceed with the project?

MR. BRADLEY: Those matters will be under consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated an announcement this summer. Will we have an announcement prior to the conclusion of this spring session?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to make a commitment of that nature at this time.

Seed Cleaning Plant Replacement Program

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the recent plebiscite held in the county of Minburn, which resulted favourably, can the minister advise if there are any policy changes planned or required for the seed cleaning plant replacement program in order to accommodate the Vegreville seed cleaning plant?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, no changes are being contemplated at this time, and neither are they required. Now that the vote has been conducted in the area and was indeed in favour of the plant, we are in the process of working closely with the county of Minburn and the Vegreville seed cleaning co-op association to move with all speed to see that all documents are put in place so that the plant can indeed proceed.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Considering that the end of the fiscal year is at hand, are any changes required to ensure that the funds will be available for this project?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, no changes are needed. The money for the plant is indeed in the budget and will be available as soon as the final documents are signed. I expect that within days, all those documents between all the parties concerned will be signed. The budget in my department has held that money, waiting for the day the final documents would be signed. That commitment is there and, as soon as it's done, the money will flow.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the difficulties experienced in the county of Minburn regarding the plant, is the minister contemplating any changes in the program so such occurrences do not recur in other municipalities?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, as I've stated, no changes are contemplated, because the difficulties with that particular plant were indeed local in nature. They're not the result of any deficiencies within the seed plant program.

At the present time, there are some 77 plants across the province, and they're modern and efficient. We now have a program that's the envy of all other provinces.

DR. BUCK: Speech.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: In fact, Saskatchewan would like to have one that compares.

DR. BUCK: That's some token amount of work the minister does for agriculture. [interjection] That's a speech too.

AHC Land Inventory

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing and has to do with the little loan the Provincial Treasurer has made to repay the \$340 million debt of Alberta Housing Corporation. Is the minister in a position to indicate how Alberta Housing Corporation expects to pay back the \$340 million that was loaned from general revenues to pay back to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Can the minister indicate how that loan is going to be paid back?

MR. SHABEN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it's not a loan; secondly, it has not yet been made. The order in council that was approved provided for an advance from the General Revenue Fund to AHC, up to a certain maximum. At the moment, Alberta Housing Corporation has less than \$280 million in debenture borrowings from the heritage fund. The proposal would be that the General Revenue Fund purchase those debentures.

The second part of the hon. member's question related to how those advances would be repaid. They would be repaid as a result of sale of inventory of lands held by AHC, most of which is held in co-operation with municipalities throughout the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in the minister's consideration of the value of that land, has the minister or the department done any estimates as to the actual value of that land at this time? Is it 40 percent of previous value? Is it 10 percent? What is the value? If we're looking at paying that back, we should have some idea what the land is valued at.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the programs AHC has been involved in are not short-term programs. The land banking and land development that AHC has been involved in are designed to meet the needs of municipalities over a period of up to 25 years. In today's market, it's very difficult to determine what a value is; nor would that be the intention, because of the intentions of the program to provide land for Albertans for housing over a 25-year period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate what percentage of the land that belongs to the Alberta Housing Corporation is serviced land and what percentage is raw land?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the precise breakdown in terms of acres, but I could obtain it for the hon. member if he'd like to put a question on the Order Paper.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, was the special warrant of \$52.4 million on March 7, 1984, for interest, part of this advance from general revenues? Was that part of the \$200 million advance?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the special warrant that was approved on March 7 dealt with the fiscal year 1983-84. There were two parts involved in the special warrant. Forty million dollars of that amount was to deal with the accumulation of interest costs for the inventory held by AHC during the year 1983-84. The advance deals with the post 1983-84 fiscal period. In addition to the \$40 million, I believe the \$12 million dealt with certain lands held throughout the province that are serviced lots, held for such special purposes as rural and native housing, co-operative action housing program housing sites, and so on. Those were written down as a result of our review of the current

value of that property. So that was where the dollars were involved in that special warrant of March 7.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is AHC now in the position that they are trying to unload some of this land at this time — I should say, trying to sell some of this land. Or are they contemplating holding all of it?

MR. SHABEN: I'm not clear about the question, Mr. Speaker. The AHC didn't buy land in order to hold onto it; they bought it in order to provide land for housing. So naturally the intention of AHC is to sell it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. But at the same time, if you're not building on it, you're holding it. Is the corporation looking at selling some of the undeveloped land, the unserviced land, to try to cut some of their losses? In the private sector, we call it writing down or writing off. Is some of that going on? Is some of the undeveloped land trying to be sold?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, in responding to an earlier part of the question, I believe, I indicated that the objectives of AHC were to meet land needs for housing for Albertans for a period from the immediate to 25 years. I'm not clear as to whether the hon. member is suggesting that that land be sold at reduced prices to compete with the private sector in a difficult land market.

Telephone Toll Revenue Sharing

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. Last Friday the minister filed with the Assembly a copy of a letter to former Chief Justice Milvain to obtain clarification of the matter of cross-subsidization. Is the minister in a position to report further on that letter?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, March 22, I received a letter from former Chief Justice Milvain, pertaining to the matter of Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones toll sharing. In the letter from the former Chief Justice, he stated that it was not enough that the two telephone companies be satisfied by the agreement and that, before becoming operative, the agreement must come before the Public Utilities Board for examination. Mr. Milvain went on to say that

such sharing fully recognized the principle of cross-subsidization.

The Board's role ... is somewhat akin to its function in approving or fixing rates ... so that fairness and equity prevails, for all parties [involved], including the public.

Mr. Milvain went on to state that the "Board's intervention and scrutiny is an essential part of" the recommendations of the five-member Milvain committee.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Legislative Assembly four copies of that response from Mr. Milvain.

MR. SZWENDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if he has had any response or acknowledgment from the city of Edmonton with respect to this letter?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker, although the mayor of Edmonton was copied on the response by the former Chief Justice.

MR. SZWENDER: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate when he plans to meet with city of Edmonton representatives to pursue this matter?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as interpretation of the recommendations seemed to be a major area of disagreement between the representatives of the city and us, and that interpretation has now been fully clarified by the chairman of the committee and the former Chief Justice of the province, it would be my hope that we could get back to the table very quickly.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MRS. CRIPPS: Has the minister had meetings with the members of the Milvain commission and the mayor of Edmonton?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting at Government House on February 20 this year, which I alluded to last Friday, between four of the five members of the Milvain committee, the Edmonton government caucus members, and members of city council. At that time, the recommendations were fully elaborated on by the chairman, followed by a question-and-answer session.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary to that. Was there a meeting in the minister's office between the mayor of Edmonton and the members of the Milvain committee?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the only meeting that has occurred in my office between members of the Milvain committee, the mayor of Edmonton, and me was the day before the news release of July 19, 1983. Therefore we did meet on July 18, and that was with Mayor Purves.

U of A Enrollment

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to wake up the Minister of Advanced Education. My question concerns the minister's public statement that the University of Alberta has sufficient funding and space to accommodate graduating high school students. What objective evidence is the minister able to table in this House to support this claim?

MR. NOTLEY: Your first question, Dick. Don't miff it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, our information is a collection of information flowing to us from a variety of sources, including the number of students coming from high schools, the number of anticipated students, who are so-called late starters, and the number of transfers, which are normally anticipated within the Alberta advanced educational system. On the basis of that information, I have indicated that, in my view at least, the number of students who are coming from high schools and who could be accommodated within the advanced educational system through 1984 would be of the order of about 4,700 or 4,800. That's a reasonable estimate, based on the number of students who normally go to university, who are interested, and who are qualified. That's not a confidential piece of information. It's pretty well understood and is one of the basic planning statistics used across the system.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What review has the minister made of the recent decision by the

General Faculties Council to impose quotas on student enrollment at the University of Alberta in the fall of 1985?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the so-called quotas that are referred to would apply in the fall of 1984, not 1985. Nonetheless, this is not quite a decision of the board of governors. I will wait to see just what it is they will decide, and that decision will take place April 13, 1984.

It's my view, however, that at this time when student numbers and uncertainty in the economy are before us, it would be much more in the spirit of co-operation if all institutions could shoulder this responsibility, similar to what other universities have done across the province. It seems to me that with the kinds of commitments this government has made to advanced education in the past three years, surely the amount of resources flowing to universities is adequate to allow them to cope with the student numbers we anticipate this fall.

MR. MARTIN: That's a good political speech but not quite up to the facts.

In view of the fact of the possibility that up to 1,500 eligible students will not be able to go to the University of Alberta, my question to the minister is: what response has he given to the University of Alberta regarding the motion by the General Faculties Council, blaming lack of sufficient government funding for reductions in enrollment at the University of Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is an assumption here that the entire advanced educational system in Alberta should be set by the University of Alberta. That is not quite the case. While we recognize the major contribution the U of A has made to absorbing student numbers over the past three years, it is possible for the University of Alberta to absorb about 6,000 students in the first year, as they did last year, with the resources given to them by this government. It would seem to me that that would be within the limited range which we would expect.

Of course, other criteria can be applied as to how you assign the entrance requirements into the university itself. For example, other universities have suggested that instead of taking all the first-year students, it may well be acceptable to take those first-year students coming from the university who are qualified and who are interested. Don't forget there's a pool of students out there who have already had an opportunity to go to first-year university and who have failed. In other universities, these are considered to be the second level of options; that is, the first-year students get the first shot, and then transfers and other foreign students will have an opportunity. But the continuance question is one that has to be examined.

I would go on to say that in my view, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of financial commitments we have given to the university, including expanding our base budget over the past four or five years on a very substantial basis and special enrollments for additional students which have been given to the universities, is in sharp contrast to the policy taken by the provinces across Canada, where in fact there have been sharp cutbacks. We have continued to expand. We have continued to make that commitment to advanced education, and we will continue to do so. [applause]

MR. MARTIN: We've got all the boys pounding. It's certainly unusual that those plebeians out there aren't quite as grateful.

My specific question to the minister is: is the minister saying to the House that the General Faculties Council of the University of Alberta is inaccurate when they say that they do not have the room to accommodate all potential students?

MR. JOHNSTON: Of course, that is accurate. The University of Alberta cannot accommodate all potential students. [some laughter]

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. MARTIN: Then my question to the minister is: in view of the seriousness of the problem to Edmonton and northern Alberta students, that some 1,500 potential students will not be attending — I might suggest it's no laughing matter; it's a serious matter — what does the minister plan to do about it?

MR. JOHNSTON: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the member is jumping to some conclusions and is sharing with others and ringing the alarm bells before we know specifically what's going to happen in September 1984. The history of this government has been to respond to the statistics and to the reality of the time, as we have done in 1982, 1983, and 1984, in providing special enrollment money to the universities and ensuring that those students who want to go to universities will have the loans and the scholarship funds to do so.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that the Alberta advanced educational system can accommodate all the students who want to go to university, whether it's the University of Alberta, the University of Lethbridge, the University of Calgary, Athabasca University, the private colleges, or those colleges which offer university transfer programs. In my view, there is accommodation for all those students who want to go.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary. Is the minister suggesting that students from Edmonton and northern Alberta should immediately start applying to the University of Lethbridge and the University of Calgary if they want to receive a university education?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, most students do that as a matter of course.

MR. COOK: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the House whether or not the University of Calgary is making similar noises as the University of Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the University of Calgary has a different entrance policy from the University of Alberta. In the case of the University of Calgary, as I indicated, they take those students who are coming from high school with higher marks, those students who are transferring from colleges, those students who are foreign students from other parts of the province and, finally, at the low end of the distribution, those students who, in the context of the continuance policy, have another option. In the cases of the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge in particular, they have been able to accommodate all students who made application, applying that rule.

MR. COOK: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be able to advise the House as to the level of funding available to the universities of Alberta and Calgary, for example, compared to universities in British Columbia and Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure. And I'd like to hear the minister's answer myself, but we're getting into the area of using the question period for research. Might there be another supplementary from the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway and a final one by the hon. Member for St. Albert. There are still some members who haven't been recognized.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education. I'm very concerned that the University of Alberta has changed the rules of the ball game halfway through the game. At the beginning of the school term, all students were advised that a 65 percent average would be accepted by the University of Alberta. What has happened now is that it's contemplated to be up to 72 percent. It's caused problems on behalf of children. Could the minister please advise the House whether he would communicate to the president of the University the concern that these rules should not have been changed halfway through the year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I tend to agree with the position expressed. It seems to me that earlier in the year 1983-84, when the student numbers were starting to show up, there were some rumours that the University of Alberta might have to change the enrollment percentage from grade 12. That was targeted to be 65 percent. I tend to agree that this is a bit of a breach of faith, but I suppose it's in the context of student numbers.

However, I think perhaps all of us are jumping to some conclusions before we see the information given to us by the board of directors. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member has already made that view clear by his question today.

I simply go on to say, for the record, that in fact Alberta is the highest in per-student assistance to universities [interjections] and, by any measurement, is the more ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the student increase may be of a short-term nature, regarding the number of years, I wonder if the Minister of Advanced Education would advise the House if there have been any discussions with the universities, particularly the University of Alberta, regarding either utilization of off-campus space or greater utilization of existing space, such as reverting to Saturday classes, which was the case when I went to university?

MR. MARTIN: They don't have any staff.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that has in fact been a subject of discussion among a variety of institutions in the province. I appreciate the fact that we could utilize to a much greater extent the systems which are very well built and in place now in Alberta. It may require some scheduling adjustments in terms of going to school at 8 o'clock, going a full day, and perhaps even Saturday morning, as has been suggested. That has been reviewed and, as I indicated, we will use whatever resources we have to ensure that spaces are available. In the case of colleges, it may require providing leased space to accommodate this temporary bulge in students.

It's my view, given the information we have from high school numbers, that the enrollments coming out of high schools will tend to decrease over the next two to three years and, at this period, we're probably at the highest point of student numbers in Alberta's history.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could come back to this topic. We've had a great number of supplementaries.

Spruce Budworm Control

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is aware of the serious outbreak of spruce budworm in the Battle River valley, which threatens marketable timber, farm shelter belts, and the tourist industry. My question to the minister is: will funding be available from the Department of Agriculture to help defray the costs to the agricultural service boards of Flagstaff, Stettler, Paintearth, Leduc, and Camrose of air spraying this serious outbreak?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that spruce trees are covered under any legislation which I'm responsible for. I don't think they are classified as an agricultural product; therefore, the control of that problem is out of my control.

I am aware, though, that they do have a problem in the area. The staff of my department, working with the Forest Service, is assessing the problem. As always, the Department of Agriculture will provide whatever technical assistance they can. But I must say there is no allotment in my budget to cover anything like that.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I've been trying for two days to find out who is responsible for the control of this rather serious disease. I was hoping the minister could inform me what department might be responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. Will the minister's department be monitoring that the type of pesticide used to control this spruce worm is not detrimental to wildlife or humans?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the department will be monitoring the type of pesticide used in this case. The department has been actively involved with the municipalities in the area and with other government agencies, and we've been co-operating with them with regard to formulating a solution for the concern. In any event, once an action plan is decided upon, any pesticide which would be used in the control of this infestation would require a permit under the Agricultural Chemicals Act.

MR. STROMBERG: My last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What steps is the Minister of Recreation and Parks taking to protect the spruce trees in Big Knife Provincial Park, which seems to be the centre of this outbreak?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, this concern raised by the hon. member is one I've had some interest in for some time. My research informs me that an outbreak was discovered by the Canadian Forestry Service in the winter of 1982-83, and spraying was done in Big Knife Provincial Park in the summer of 1983.

On March 12 a meeting was held with officials from a number of counties, Alberta Environment, the Battle River Tourist Association, local farmers, the Canadian Forestry Service, and MLA Graham Harle, to plan a program for 1984. I am pleased to advise the hon. member that in May 1984, a spraying program that will cover the areas affected will be conducted under the supervision of the Canadian Forestry Service. The chemical that will be used, Dipel 88, is nontoxic.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway and, if there's time, the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Meat Packing Industry

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. It deals with the problems faced recently by the meat packing industry in the province. Is the minister aware of the recent announcement by Gainers Inc. to close the killing plant in the Edmonton area, which will result in approximately 125 layoffs?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the closure. I don't know at this point whether or not it's a permanent closure or just a temporary closure. I had discussions this past Monday, at the request of Mr. Pocklington and Mr. Bolandes, his president, in which we discussed various aspects of the packing industry. But I wasn't told then, neither was it mentioned in our conversation, that they would indeed be closing their plant, whether for a short or long term. I first became aware of it on Tuesday night, prior to their announcement. So I am aware of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister contemplated taking any action with respect to this closure?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: No we're not, Mr. Speaker. I would like to clear up that it's a staff reduction, not closure of the Gainers plant.

MR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister contemplating any study of the problems facing the meat packing industry in this province?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, there have been studies in the past, but they are of course dated to some extent. In May 1983, I commissioned a study called a review of the past and current state of the Alberta beef processing industry and the implications for the future. I haven't received copies of an interim report or anything with respect to that study, but I expect it probably in late spring.

There is another that I am now in the process of awarding. It's a study measuring the competitiveness of the pork processing industry in Alberta versus processors in other parts of Canada and the U.S. That study has not been commissioned yet, Mr. Speaker, but I am looking at doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, with a final supplementary.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the magnitude of this problem, I would hope we can air it fully.

One of the concerns raised by producers in my constituency is that their hogs are going out of province, and the plants are having difficulty getting enough. Has the hog board advised the minister regarding their policy?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I've been working with the marketing council, which comes under my jurisdiction, and with the hog marketing board to assess the situation. There are concerns about hogs leaving the province, and there is even some concern with the system. That is now under full discussion between the hog board and myself, and we look to a resolution soon.

With respect to hogs moving, to some degree they have always moved to wherever the markets were, but that's about all I can add to that.

MR. SPEAKER: I realize the importance of the topic. Perhaps we can come back to it in another question period.

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

MR. LYSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're going to be back to it right now. I'd like to ask the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs if he would approach the federal government and see if we could have some of the federal inspectors who are now inspecting plants in Alberta, inspect what are commonly known as provincially inspected plants.

MR. HORSMAN: That matter should properly be referred to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, who deals, through his department, with the federal Department of Agriculture in these areas.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: At this point, Mr. Speaker, there has been no discussion of extending the federal inspection to provincial plants. We now have eight beef plants in the province that are federally inspected, but there have been no discussions as far as extending that.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary. If this plant in Edmonton closes down, we won't have any packing plants north of Red Deer. Would the minister then consider asking the federal government inspectors to inspect the local plants?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't really feel that that would be something I'd really want to undertake at this time. The hon. member is correct in stating that the closure of the beef killing operations at the Gainers plant in Edmonton does not allow for any federally inspected beef processing facilities north of Red Deer. Of course, that could cause some concerns for producers in the northern part of the province, and we're looking at that issue at the moment. As far as extending and asking for more federal inspections north of Red Deer, I don't think that would be proper at this time.

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

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. In light of the fact that the average wage for meat cutters is about \$8 an hour higher in Alberta than in the U.S., has the minister had any discussion with union officials of the meat processing industry concerning the Gainers slowdown?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I have not had discussions with the union respecting that specific plant. Very early in the year — or perhaps it was very late in 1983 — I had what I will call a casual conversation with some union leaders about a number of matters. At that time I indicated that I would be quite available to them to attend upon an executive meeting that they suggested they would be having in the latter part of February, as I then understood it. I encouraged them that there might be value in some discussion of a number of matters. However, I have not received an invitation from them nor, to the best of my knowledge this morning, have I received any other kind of approach from that particular union to discuss any item.

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 21: Dr. Carter]

DR. CARTER: I'm pleased to continue my remarks with respect to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure all members of the Assembly remember the last few words I uttered with respect to native self-government in the province, where I placed special emphasis upon what I see to be a very constructive process in the province, with regard to the Northland School Division Act in particular.

For a few moments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments with respect to the very fine constituency of Calgary Egmont, which includes the areas of Kingsland, Fairview, Acadia, Willow Park, and Maple Ridge, within south-east, south-central Calgary. As with other members of the Assembly, I have been fortunate enough to open a constituency office located in the heart of the constituency, and I'm sure other members have experienced the same kind of impact the opening of an office brings about.

The office I have is a storefront location on a major thoroughfare in the midst of the constituency. If I have any complaint, it is simply that I can't get there often enough to deal with the tremendous response we have been receiving at the constituency office. We have had a tremendous number of telephone calls and a lot of drop-in traffic. Saturday is a very special day in the constituency, in the sense of arriving at the office early and working until well into the middle afternoon before going to visit other community associations located in the constituency. In this sense Saturday is very special, because it gives one a chance to have a lot of drop-in traffic, to sit and have a cup of coffee, and to be in touch with what a lot of the issues are with respect to the constituency and the constituents.

In that regard, I would like to say a special thanks to my constituency secretary Mrs. Bunny Munch and of course to Susan Young here in the Edmonton office. The combination of having the two offices is certainly a great way to try to keep up to date with all the emergent issues on a very personal basis.

Prior to the House being convened, like a number of other MLAs, I went throughout the constituency making visits. In this respect I visited a number of schools within the constituency of Calgary Egmont; in particular, Acadia elementary school, Alice M. Curtis, Lord Beaverbrook high school, Maple Ridge elementary, R.T. Alderman junior high, St. Cecilia elementary, and Andrew Davison elementary school. About three weeks ago, I was privileged to spend an hour with a group of grade 6 students at Acadia school to speak about the work of the Legislature and to comment about the work of an MLA. It was great to sit there in a bearpit-style of physical situation and to deal with the questions, concerns, and interests of the students.

Through visiting the schools, in particular in the area of Calgary Egmont, I found that I had gone to some schools which were supposedly threatened by school closure. It is interesting to see the wide variety of programs taking place within those schools. It is also interesting to note how many of the schools in Calgary Egmont really are the recipients of students from other constituencies, such as Calgary Fish Creek and Calgary Millican, areas of the city which have had an impact of new

construction in terms of homes, which has not caught up with respect to schools. So the fact that children come from other parts of the city of Calgary helps to keep the schools within my particular constituency open.

In having visited, I am also interested to see the high level of quality facilities available, not only physically but in terms of library programs, the fact that most of the schools in the constituency have French immersion courses, and the special needs education for handicapped and people with learning disabilities. It is also interesting that there is an impact taking place, and you see it in terms of the schools, whereby the out-migration from the city of Calgary and the out-migration from the province is showing up in the number of children who are leaving the school system within the course of the year because their families have decided to move to other parts of Canada.

In terms of visiting the schools, I was very pleased to present a number of award documents for scholastic achievement, under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund scholarship program, the Rutherford program. I understand that 10,540 such awards have been given throughout the province since 1981, with a value of \$11.9 million. That is truly a remarkable achievement and is supporting the base of education within the province of Alberta.

There have also been a number of sports awards given out, the Jimmie Condon awards. I am glad that his name was attached to those sports awards, because within the constituency I represent, in the community of Kingsland, the Jimmie Condon ice arena is located. And it's here that these awards are given to postsecondary students. Since 1981, 3,058 awards have been handed out, with a value of \$2.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is here that I would like to send a message to the Minister of Recreation and Parks that I appreciate his help with respect to trying to obtain additional MCR grants. I hope he has kept up the pressure and has been quite successful on Tuesday night with the budget, that we have some programs — if they're not going to happen now, are going to happen shortly — with respect to being able to give further support to community associations who find themselves in very difficult financial situations. In particular in my constituency, I refer to the fine constituency organization and complex in Acadia. I appreciate the fact that the minister has been trying to work with that association and myself with regard to their problems.

I would also like to put in a plug to that same minister, Mr. Speaker, with respect to our having some examination as to how additional dollars can flow, either through the Wild Rose Foundation or whatever, with respect to the matter of junior hockey in this province. It is all very well and good for the NHL to be in place, and I am as a great a fan as they have. On the other hand, I am very much concerned that the National Hockey League is all too willing to pick up players from the Western Hockey League, from tier 1, if you will, and also from tier 2 hockey, without really putting sufficient developmental dollars back into the system. So the flow goes on all the way down the chain.

With the recent events at the Olympics in Sarajevo, Canadians were only too willing and too keen to want to have a Canadian Olympic team do well. But the point is, if you then have the Olympic team raiding, if you will, the Western Hockey League and tier 2 league — and even the Fort Saskatchewan Traders, if they are going to win — there is a problem in the whole system. The basic problem is that the people at the top of the really big leagues are not putting any developmental funds of any significance back into the system. So with respect to the city of Calgary in particular, we have at least one franchise, the Calgary Canucks, which is not likely to be operational

unless some kind of really quick help can be injected in terms of the system.

In terms of the constituency, in the last while we have been moving around and meeting with various people and organizations. I have made a very special point of meeting with people involved in union membership and leadership, because there are a considerable number of those people who reside within the constituency of Calgary Egmont. I have been trying to keep in contact with them with respect to the various difficult issues facing the construction industry.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with respect to tourism and how we as Albertans really need to be pushing hard to encourage Albertans to stay in Alberta and to spend money and travel throughout this fine province. I understand that within the city of Calgary, hotel accommodation has been running at about a 50 percent vacancy. That makes for very difficult pressures upon that industry. I also understand that over the past 10 years, the Canadian share of the international travel dollar has dropped almost 50 percent. So as Canadians and as Albertans, we need to give more of a push to keeping the tourism dollar within the country and certainly within this province.

In that respect, I know that many of my fellow Calgarians have been guilty of saying: Calgary Stampede is a great thing, but I leave town during Stampede week. We have to change that kind of philosophy, because in terms of the Calgary Stampede, which has helped to make that particular city so well known throughout the world, tourist dollars are a necessity. It's time all of us made certain that we aren't leaving town during Stampede but that we are staying around and encouraging lots of people to come. So in that regard, I sincerely trust that from July 6 to 15 we're going to see all hon. members of this Assembly coming down to the Calgary Stampede and having a good time and leaving some of their good dollars behind in the city.

There are a number of issues that really do affect one's constituency in terms of high technology and industrial development. There are matters which I will raise from time to time in the discussion of the budget and other areas. I've already mentioned positive comments in question period with respect to the development of the McDougall school site and the Calgary Centre for the Performing Arts. I'm hopeful that other kinds of encouragement will take place, especially with the development of all types of industry within the province, because my constituents represent a very broad spectrum of interests as well as occupations. They know full well that if the agricultural industry goes well in this province, that in turn has a positive effect on their own personal interests.

My concluding remarks are these, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion the throne speech reflects the concern of this government for some of the realities which have developed nationally and internationally. I'll just make a brief comment with respect to three. These have been pointed out in a book called *Megatrends*. It's written by John Naisbitt in the United States, who has done an analysis of where society is truly moving, especially in the United States. But it has great application for us. It's simply this: in actual fact, what has taken place at the moment is a very speedy shift from an agricultural-based to an industrial-based society.

Many of us have been involved in almost denying the fact that we're living in the midst of exceedingly rapid change, that we are indeed shifting from an industrial-based society to one that is really based on the creation and distribution of information. Of course, we see great evidence of this in terms of the availability and low cost of computers, and the fact that so many of us have computers in our offices or are even involved

in our homes. We know the full impact in particular upon our children. In actual fact we are rapidly moving into a high-technology society, which has many severe and very significant human impacts that have yet to be analyzed, let alone coped with in terms of our society.

One last comment is simply that there's no doubt that, in terms of issues that have been touched on in the throne speech here, we do not just live in terms of Alberta or Canada, but we're having to deal in terms of a whole global economy and how that impacts on each and every one of us. I believe there is good cognizance taken of these kinds of impacts in the throne speech, and I am hopeful that in the budget next Tuesday night the government will be seen to be moving forward realistically in terms of meeting the challenges of this particular decade.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to enter this debate for just a few moments prior to leaving to go back to southern Alberta to my constituents. In light of that, I am very much indebted to the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont for three or four minutes of his speaking time.

First of all, with regard to the throne speech itself. There are a number of objectives that have been established by the government in the throne speech, to be implemented through the budget that will be brought down in this Assembly next Tuesday. I will delay my remarks about those objectives until that point in time.

One of the major purposes of the throne speech debate is to elaborate or summarize the attitudes of your constituents. I must say that the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont has just done that very well in terms of his constituents' attitudes and desires. In the latter part of 1983, I made a formal survey of my constituency in terms of some of the concerns they had. Following that, I had my normal pre-session meeting and tour of my constituency as well, at which time I visit most of my businessmen, and spend a number of hours walking up and down the streets talking to various constituents about various problems. After that one-week period, and most often after two weeks of doing just that, I find I have an excellent attitude as to what my constituents feel should be done with regard to a number of matters.

When I come into this Legislature, I often find that issues that arise, which I thought may not arise in the Legislature, were raised by my constituents during those pre-session tours, and I'm able to respond in terms of their attitude. Over the last 20 years, I recall that sometimes because of time factors, I haven't done that and have often felt very disabled in responding and felt it was my response rather than the response of my constituents. So I have done that again and would like to just relate a few of my findings to this Assembly.

In terms of the survey, we sent out 800 surveys and 252 were returned, which is 31.9 percent, which is very high. The normal rate of return of questionnaires is between 3 and 7 percent. What are some of those findings? One of the first questions was: what is the most important, number one problem a provincial government should deal with? The answer was clear; unemployment and job creation. The number two problem was economic development. Fifty-six point six percent said those two items were the most important.

The second question is: how do you feel the government is dealing with those two questions? That was an interesting response. There were five categories: very well, well, fair, poorly, and very poorly. In the fair category, which is average, 40.3 percent; 6.7 percent said well; and no one said very well. In terms of poorly and very poorly, the cumulative total was 40.3 percent. So in terms of the responsibilities of the cabinet

and this government, I think that is an indicator from my constituency as to how people feel the government is performing in that area.

DR. BUCK: That's the same thing their polls tell them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I think the government should look at that with a bit of alarm. In terms of criticism of the throne speech, I don't feel that the emphasis was focussed in that area of major concern of the people. Maybe that's why they're responding as they are.

What are some of the other areas I could look at quickly? With respect to the biggest problems found in our primary education systems, the following responses were given. The major concern of 27.4 per cent of the group was teacher quality and protection of poor teachers by their union. The second concern was the lack of some basic three Rs and too many frill courses — 21.0 percent. Then there are six other items they listed in the poll for me.

When asked about how health care should be paid for, the following sources were chosen. I gave six different options, but 51.4 percent of the group that returned the questionnaires said general taxes and premiums should pay for our Alberta health care program; 16.9 percent said user fees, general taxes, and premiums. The percentages in other categories were less after that.

As well, I asked a question about government spending in certain areas and departments, and where spending should be increased and decreased. In the first department, the Department of Education, 36 percent said an increase, 10 percent said to reduce the expenditure, 54 percent said to remain the same. So, to the Minister of Education, I think that is a top priority item in the minds of my constituents. I might also say that I polled them here with regard to increases of teachers' salaries. A major portion of them indicated that they supported a 6 percent increase for teachers' salaries. A minor portion said decrease it by 6 percent, which was very interesting; I was expecting the reverse of that to be true.

In terms of housing, 21.4 percent said to reduce expenditures in the housing area, 13 percent said increase, 64 percent were satisfied. Agriculture, which is very obvious from my constituency: 50 percent said increase, 4.8 percent said decrease, 44 percent were satisfied.

One of the other areas I touch on is roads. Naturally, in the rural area, 40 percent said to increase the expenditure, 5.2 percent said decrease it, 54 percent were satisfied. One of the other areas, though, when we look at the other side in terms of decreasing expenditure: 38 percent said to decrease the spending for cultural programs, 2.8 percent said increase, 59 percent said remain the same. Civil service wages: 53.6 percent said reduce, 3.2 percent said increase, 43 percent said to remain the same.

Mr. Speaker, what I gather from that is rather an attitude that Albertans and my constituents have priorities in terms of education, health care, and certainly roads and transportation. They see at this time of restraint in budget that we should cut back in some areas such as cultural programs. And I think the indicator in terms of civil service jobs is that we must run a better and more efficient ship in terms of government itself.

One or two other areas that I would look at: the purchase of beer and wine in neighbourhood stores. This was an interesting statistic which I didn't really expect. Forty-nine percent were opposed, 42 percent were in favour, and 8.3 percent had no opinion. I expected 60 to 70 percent to be opposed to that kind of sale. I was very interested in that statistic, and I think

the government should have a look at that trend out there at the present time.

When asked about Sunday business openings, the following responses were recorded: 44 per cent said convenience and drug stores only; 30 per cent said all stores should be allowed to open, which was much higher than I expected in terms of the survey. When asked who should keep the environment clean, it was very clear: 60 per cent said the polluters and the companies.

When asked what government should do to create jobs in this province, the following response received the most support: 54 per cent that we should provide tax breaks to industries and individuals for buying Alberta products. They felt that was a very important objective that should be pursued by government. When asked how Alberta was treated in Confederation, 57 per cent said a bad deal, 19 per cent said an even deal.

Mr. Speaker, those were just some of the attitudes that I wanted to put on the record today. I would also like to say something in response to the comment of the Provincial Treasurer the other day in terms of consumer buying. My businesspeople said to me very clearly that in January, February, and March of 1984, their sales have never been so low in the last 10 years. On this tour of my constituency, a number of the owner/operators that I normally found in the back of the store looking after things, managing, and doing whatever, were up front giving the groceries across the counter and selling the goods. I said: where's the person that worked here before? They said: my cash flow is down, and I can't afford to keep the person.

I'm sure that's one of the situations that is occurring all across this province. If there's some way we can assist and encourage consumer buying, there are many jobs in that specific area that would pull up the slack to a great extent. But the businesspeople are saying: my cost of money is too high. People that normally seem to spend more have quit spending. They're complaining to me that their utility rates are too high, that their local taxes are too high. All of these costs, which often are the expense of government, in an accumulated way are reducing the amount of goods that people are consuming. That's occurring right today. I think that's a weakness in our system that I'd like to talk about a little further in the budget debate.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put those matters on the record today, and I appreciate the time spent on it. Thank you.

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege once again to rise on behalf of the people of the constituency of Old-Didsbury to speak and participate in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. I have to admit that it seems a very short time ago that I was doing this in March of last year. It just proves how fast the time flies when you're having fun, I guess.

I would like to join with other members who have offered their words of congratulations to the members for the constituencies of Red Deer and Wainwright, who so eloquently opened this debate in moving and seconding the motion adopting the Speech from the Throne. I also would like to add my small token of appreciation for your efforts, Mr. Speaker, in maintaining the decorum of this Assembly.

As other members have mentioned, the throne speech is actually an outline of the government's intentions and the direction in which we see our province moving in the year ahead. We live in a world of constant new ideas, constant reflection and analysis. My attention was drawn to a review of a book in a recent publication. The book is called the *Zero-Sum Society*, and I would like to say a few words about the contents of this book. It's written by a professor of economics. Sometimes I wonder if the professors of economics of our world live

in the real world. Having taken a number of economics courses at university, I know that often occurred to us. They seemed to live in a world of assumptions.

I think this time, Lester Thurow, who hails from the department of economics and management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has hit the nail on the head. The title of his book is *Zero-Sum Society*, and the theme of the book is that we live in a zero-sum society. A zero-sum game, for those of you who are not familiar with economic jargon, is a game in which there must be a winner and there must be a loser; there cannot be any ties. Flipping coins is a good example. Heads I win and tails I lose; I can't have it both ways.

Thurow believes that we have many problems and that often, in the case of our problems, there are in fact several solutions. Unfortunately it is a common characteristic in each of those solutions that the gain of some will equal the loss of others. Accordingly it's very difficult to come up with solutions. There aren't any volunteers for the loser's role. We always hope someone else will suffer the economic losses. That makes our decision-making very difficult.

We know of all kinds of examples. If some want lower taxes, obviously others must pay more. If we're going to be independent in terms of oil and gas in the competitive world in which we live, we must be prepared to pay a higher price at home for oil and gas to encourage the development of our own resources, and not depend on outside sources. We all want to have electric power, but no one wants to have an electric power generating plant next door. We have all kinds of protesters who object to nuclear generation of power. But then the alternative to that is coal-fired generation of power, and they don't want that either. We all agree that we should have our garbage picked up and disposed of, but how many of us want to live next door to the garbage dump? There are those who argue for better distribution of incomes. We want to elevate the living standards of the poor but not at any cost to those of us who enjoy a higher living standard.

So how does all this apply to Alberta? In our throne speech the other day, we heard the intention of the provincial government to move toward more deregulation. We all agree that we don't like government interference. But in fact, as our population increases, we really cannot avoid more interference because it is people who demand regulation. If we are to have deregulation, and if that is to go to extremes, have we looked at what the results of that can be?

Certainly it can mean lower prices. But if we're to have lower prices, it means lower wages and lower corporate and business incomes. We can't have one without the other. I might add that if we have lower incomes, lower wages, and lower corporate incomes, it means we have less income from taxation based on incomes. If that's the case, where or how do we support the services that government provides? These are the kinds of choices that are so difficult.

Some companies, some businesses, would not survive in a deregulated society. Also, the impact of deregulation in terms of, for example, the transportation industry, the bus industry, would mean that small communities would no longer benefit from the services of a regulated transportation system in which bus companies were required to service them even though they might be losing money in that particular aspect of their business, in order to make money somewhere else where they are protected. So we have the zero-sum situation cropping up again and again.

Of course, total deregulation isn't possible. Our whole legal system is really only a system of regulation. Property rights are the product of law. If we didn't have laws and regulations of that kind, without a legal definition, theft would be legal.

We would degenerate to a society of superior force being the arbiter — what we sometimes call jungle free enterprise. I don't think any of us wants that.

Having said all of that, I do believe we must address those regulations that represent an excessive interference by government in the business and social activities of individuals and groups. I'm sure I don't have to ask members to think very deeply to call to mind cases of excessive regulation and the excessive enforcement of regulations by our governments. I believe we have often come to the point where the enforcement of these regulations and the generation of regulations is only a thin disguise for some empire-building within some parts of our civil service. This is the kind of government interference that is unwanted and unnecessary, and it's this kind of regulation that we must remove. I'm sure there are many in our province who will take satisfaction from the reference in the throne speech to the efforts for deregulating our province in that fashion.

I think many in our province will also be encouraged by the reference to privatization. In my constituency, I have been told many, many times that government does not belong in business. I gather from the people in Olds-Didsbury that they feel the proper role of government is to make and enforce laws that protect individuals and groups; to carry out the functions of government that we as a society have decided to provide through group action, such as the operation of our schools and hospitals, building highways, and managing our jointly owned properties, our lands and resources; and thirdly, to create a climate in which individuals and groups can conduct their private transactions and affairs free from outside interference, and particularly from unfair competition by government. So I'm sure that privatization, in accordance with that philosophy, will be welcomed by the people of Olds-Didsbury.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

The throne speech addresses the state of the provincial economy. I'd like to say that Olds-Didsbury is, as are many other parts of the province, a microcosm of the economic side of our province. The economic base of Olds-Didsbury is agriculture. I'm pleased to see that our government is continuing to recognize the importance of this basic industry, which has such a pervasive influence in our province with respect to jobs, business income, and the many ways it impacts on our provincial economy.

It's critical to Alberta farmers that government continue to support the agricultural community. There are many ways in which the government does this, but I will mention two of them. In the area of finance, agriculture has become an extremely capital-intensive business over the last 60 or 70 years. There are parts of the Olds-Didsbury constituency where the long-established family farms are still there — land that was purchased back at the turn of the century for 25 cents and 50 cents an acre. Naturally those people are in pretty good shape. That land is paid for, and they are simply operating and conserving it and producing their incomes from it. Comparing that old 50-cent-an-acre price to the price currently or certainly a couple of years ago in the early '80s — the capital cost of farmland today, over \$1,000 an acre in that same area, has changed the picture.

I don't believe the family farm could possibly survive if we cannot address the problem of how the young beginning farmer can continue to obtain the land to farm at a reasonable price, or at least at a reasonable cost of capital. For that reason I'm pleased to see the Agricultural Development Corporation's statistics and their continuing provision of loans to beginning

farmers at an interest rate substantially below the rate they could obtain elsewhere. With the capital costs today, young farmers could not possibly start farming if they were not able to obtain that kind of interest rate. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have members speculate on the direction agriculture in this province would take if capital at a relatively low interest rate were not available, or what would be the eventual fate of our family farms under those circumstances.

The second area in which we help agriculture is education. I'll just touch on that, as we are to debate in this House a motion brought forward by the hon. Member for Ponoka, in which we deal with the matter of agriculture and agricultural education. But as Olds-Didsbury is the home of the Olds agricultural college. I feel obliged to say just a few words.

As the financial aspect of farming has changed in the last 70 years, so has technology. Last year was the 70th anniversary of Olds College, which was originally known as the Olds School of Agriculture. In view of changing technology, I believe it's imperative, if we are to maintain our position of world leadership in farm techniques, that we continue to support our agricultural colleges in the same way we recognized the need and supported the schools of trade and technology in the '70s. Olds College has been recognized as the leading school in western Canada in the area of practical agricultural education. That leadership role cannot be maintained unless we are prepared to continue to make the capital investment in the college so the more than 800 students who attend there each year can continue to have an education in the most advanced techniques. That can't happen if the college is antiquated in its facilities, or if it's overcrowded, or if it cannot find room to store, house, and provide the books from which that information and education will flow.

The oil and gas industry is the other element of the economy of Olds-Didsbury, and it too plays a significant role in employment and small business in our constituency. There are six major gas processing plants, four of them in the Olds-Didsbury constituency and two just to the east in the constituency of Three Hills. However, many of the people who work in those plants to the east of us live in Olds-Didsbury. Wells and compressor stations, the gathering system, the pipeline system: all the infrastructure make up the broad employment base and contribute to businesses and employment.

I have a view of the oil and gas industry that I detect perhaps doesn't exist in many people. We, the people of Alberta, own the resource. We should recognize the importance of the partners we have in the oil and gas industry, whom we depend on to find, bring to the surface, process, refine, transport, and market that resource. I think there may be quite a number who don't see the oil and gas industry and resource in that way. But this is the way I see it. We are partners. We own the resource and they do the work. I think we must treat the oil and gas industry as partners. When they're affected by world or national influences, we are affected. From time to time, I feel we must adjust our involvement to assist the industry in order to assist ourselves. When you consider that approximately half the revenue that flows into the Provincial Treasury is the result of our participation in the oil and gas business, I think we can understand the importance to our province. As an Albertan, I'm proud to say we have conducted ourselves as partners. We have made the adjustments when they have been necessary, so the oil and gas industry has been able to come through this tough period of adjustment as we all have. I think the industry today is leaner and tougher. I believe they, like the rest of us, needed to make the adjustment. And I think we would all agree that we're going to be better for it.

Our third industry, tourism, is also becoming a significant factor in the constituency of Olds-Didsbury. More and more

people from Alberta and other parts of the world are recognizing the rewarding experience to be had in our foothills and the mountain regions outside our national parks. We've improved our roads; Highway 22 now is nearing completion through the west portion of Olds-Didsbury. The oil and gas activity in the western regions has opened up the wildlands to our west and encouraged more hardy souls to explore those wildlands in the foothills and mountain regions — and I should say, not without reward.

The support of small business will be well received in my constituency. Small business — I'm sure those of you from urban centres will also agree — is particularly significant in the small towns of our province. They form the backbone of our small towns and communities, not only because of the services and the goods they supply and provide us, not only because of the jobs they provide but also, and perhaps more importantly, because of the effort that these people put into the community — the volunteer organizations, the churches, minor sports, and the list goes on. It is that volunteer effort that makes our small communities and in fact makes our province. I was interested to see in the throne speech that "14,000 new business incorporations were [recorded] in 1983". That's an increase of 2.4 percent over the previous year. The cost of capital to small business is increasingly significant. It's interesting to see the development of the venture capital plan by our provincial government to provide the assistance that has not always been there to finance and to fund the more risky new ventures.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to — I can't recall whether or not the hon. Member for Little Bow mentioned in his remarks that he was quoting from the Decima report; it sounded very similar. But I'd like to quote from that report. Rather than looking at percentages, I'm interested to see that Canadians across our country generally view the state of Canada's economy — and I'm not so concerned with the percentage who look at it as only fair or poor, or the percentage who see it as good, or the very small number who see it as excellent. I'm interested to note that in the past two years, people across Canada have looked at this country's economy and the state of the country with gradually increasing satisfaction. More and more people in the last two years have become more satisfied with the state of Canada's economy. I think that's an indication of the spirit of the country at this time.

Another item I've taken from the report — it's very comprehensive and deals with many, many topics and subjects. I'll only mention one other, and that is that 84 percent of Canadians still say they would be willing to practise wage restraint. I think that's very significant. It's encouraging to me to know that such a large percentage of Canadians have recognized the realities of our situation and are prepared to do their part in resolving it. I believe that's the kind of spirit of working together that built western Canada, and it's the kind of spirit that will take us through this period of adjustment and on into the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in the throne debate briefly this morning. I would like to say that it is always a privilege to stand in your place and speak on behalf of the people who have put you here. I am proud to represent my constituency. I am going to indicate to the Assembly some of the concerns that constituency has indicated to me, and hopefully I can try to suggest as constructively as possible some of the things I think the government might look at very seriously.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I was quite disappointed in the lack of initiatives, of any new things, that this government offered in the throne speech. The purpose of the throne speech

is to indicate that the government realizes there are problems and will show some initiative to solve those problems. That is the purpose of a throne speech. It gives direction to the people of this province — that the government knows that it has some leadership and will provide that leadership. As kindly as I can state it, I think that initiative was completely lacking. To me it was just a caretaker government that is a little drunk with its own power, looking at its large numbers and saying everything is fine.

The government tried to convey that impression before the election. Anybody that said the government's trying to sell you a bill of goods was knocked as a doomer and gloomer. But now the chickens have come home to roost. Albertans are finding out that things were not as rosy as the Premier tried to paint them. The people who are unemployed, the young people who cannot get jobs for the first time, are finding out that things were just not quite as rosy as the Premier tried to paint them. Mr. Speaker, the polls we have conducted in our constituencies are indicating to us exactly what the government-sponsored poll is indicating to the government: that people out there are starting to lose confidence in the ability of this government to lead.

That's enough of the politics, Mr. Speaker. In reviewing my constituency and some of the things that are happening, I would like to indicate some of the positive factors. Sherritt Gordon, a large agricultural fertilizer manufacturing complex and an ore refinery complex, is starting to make a turnaround. They have paid a dividend for the first time in a long time. Dow Chemical has taken some of its projects off hold. Esso Chemical in Redwater has gone ahead with an expansion. And the new Shell refinery will be coming on stream relatively soon.

But when the Shell complex is completed, people in the trades don't know what's going to happen next. Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is look at the statistics about what is happening to the skilled and unionized tradesmen in this province. The government didn't have to worry about trying to kill the union movement in this province; it is happening with or without the assistance or nonassistance of the government. In speaking to union people, I know they are aware that the union movement as we know it in this province may be a thing of the past within a year or two. I hope that's not correct. But the way things are going, they are concerned and genuinely so.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak to young people who are seeking jobs for the first time, they have practically given up looking for jobs. The people who have just given up looking for jobs for the first time are not reflected in the government's statistics. This is one of the major concerns of the young people coming into the work force. They say: we graduate from NAIT, SAIT, the University of Lethbridge, the University of Calgary, or the University of Alberta, and there's nothing for us to do.

I think we as citizens know that we will never again see employment like we had in the '70s. I don't think that will ever happen to Canada or to this province. In fairness to the government, our economy was overheated; there were corrections that had to be made. But I blame this government directly that the Alsands project and the Esso project did not go ahead. They can waffle, they can weasel; they can't get out of that. They can blame Ottawa all they want, but it is a lack of initiative on the part of this government that these two projects did not go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what is happening to the agricultural sector in my constituency and in the province. As a member of the former government. I know 60 percent of our caucus time was spent on discussing agricultural problems. I think this government inadvertently or by design has just sort of written agriculture off. What has happened to our hog indus-

try? What has happened to our cattle industry? Why are these packing plants closing down?

I think the government has to provide some leadership. The question of pollution: does this government really care that we have clean water, clean air, and a clean environment? We saw the answers when the local newspaper did a survey on the quality of our North Saskatchewan River. Does the government really care? I'm afraid that by their actions, we can't be too serious that they really do. It will take about seven years from the time we started studying until the time we complete the hazardous waste disposal plant. I call the minister "fast Freddie", facetiously of course, because seven years is not very fast. I think it's time the government showed some initiative.

In looking at polls, when you ask constituents and people taking polls to evaluate how well the government is doing — it's only the first time since this government came to power — it's quite interesting to find out how far down they are in those polls. I say the government got in by default last time, but the next time we hope there will be someone other than this Conservative government for Albertans to vote for. Mr. Speaker, I will do everything I can to see that next time they have a free-enterprise alternative to vote for. That may be bad news for my socialist friends, but that's their problem, not mine.

MR. MARTIN: Split the vote. I love it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the financial irresponsibility of this government. That is one of the things that's coming through louder and louder when you speak to Albertans. This government is wasting too much money. They are not handling our financial affairs prudently. When we get to the estimates of the Minister of Recreation and Parks department, I will want to know who is in charge of watching the spending for the 1988 Olympics. I will want to know at that time. Mr. Speaker, if we're going to have another Saddledome fiasco, I'll want to know what's in place.

MR. HYLAND: You probably won't be here.

DR. BUCK: If I'm not here, Member for Cypress, I can read. Just being here and keeping your butt in the saddle doesn't mean you're doing anything, Cowboy. Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned ... [interjections]

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker ...

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't speaking to him. Would he sit down while I make my speech.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If all of us were never in this Legislature, it wouldn't matter who you were, the system wouldn't work.

DR. BUCK: That's not a point of order. He well knows that and you well know that, Mr. Speaker. May I continue with my speech?

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the government's decision to use Mount Allan, come snow or no snow. People in Alberta are concerned about that. I also think that the taxpayers of this province, of this country, and of the world are concerned that it's perhaps about time we started rotating Olympic sites. I don't think we can go on spending money the way we are to provide new facilities every four years for the Olympics. I think it's time that we as taxpayers of the global community had a look at that.

I am concerned, today in question period when we were asking the Minister of Housing, that we very flippantly write an order in council for 50-odd million dollars to pay interest and say, if you need another \$200 million ... We free enterprisers on that side of the House got into the land banking business. So now, like the private entrepreneur, we're going to have to bite the bullet and waste a couple of hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money. Leave that to the private sector; let's stay out of that.

This government is talking about this tokenism of privatization. I'm glad to see that the new Solicitor General has some jam and is going to get the licence-issuing business back to the local level, where it should be. How did this government allow this to happen? Where is this great decision-making process in caucus? What happened? Privatization is just a new word this government has developed.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans are feeling that more and more this government is becoming not their government but the government's government. Every day anybody that really wants to listen with their ears open realizes that Albertans are saying this government is smug, it's self-centred, it doesn't listen. I'm not saying this to be mean to the government members; I'm saying this to them so they wake up to what is going on outside this building. We questioned the Provincial Treasurer about whether he has knocked on doors in the small-business sector to find out what's really going on. That's what you have to do if you're truly a representative of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in protection of the environment, why has the Department of the Environment cut down on what they are paying people who are looking after the collection of bottles, cans, and so on? Why don't we leave a few more dollars in the private sector? Somebody has to provide some leadership.

MR. MARTIN: Kowalski agrees with you.

DR. BUCK: The hon. Member for Barrhead agrees.

MR. COOK: On a point of information, could the hon. member reconcile his request to spend more money with his now request to give more money out and then ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It would seem that we're having some points of order or questions raised that are really not appropriate during the course of a member's speech.

DR. BUCK: Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: You're confused.

DR. BUCK: You're always confused, so that's not new. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the hon. Member for Glengarry that the private sector — and he as a red Tory, of course, might not understand that — is still what conservatism is all about. I would like to say to the hon. member that maybe he had better have a little visit with the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud and find out what conservatism is all about. There is extreme conservatism and left-wing conservatism. Maybe the two of them should get together and saw off down the middle, I'm sure the hon. member can get that education.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about tourism in this province. When you go to other jurisdictions, especially the United States, there are so many things we can learn about how to treat tourists. Those people are so obliging. They say, would you like another cup of coffee, sir? Before you even sit down, they have your water and coffee in front of you. And they smile. The Minister of Tourism and Small Business — for many years, both sides

of the House have been advocating in this Legislature some type of program. The industry, the food and beverage people, will co-operate to set up some type of small program so we can get at least some semitrained people, so when tourists and even fellow Albertans sit down at a table, the person who waits on them makes them feel like he would like to wait on them. Maybe we as the consuming public should just hang on to those tips unless the service is such that it should be tipped. Maybe that's the way to go. But that's why we have a government Department of Tourism and Small Business. Let's see some initiative; let's see that we're trying to encourage tourism.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

In that vein, in touring with the hon. Minister of Culture and the good things the government is doing at the Ukrainian heritage village, has the minister of tourism or anyone in that department said: let's set up some circle tours around Edmonton; let's have a little tour going out to the Alberta Game Farm, through the petrochemical complex in Fort Saskatchewan, through to Elk Island park, to the Ukrainian heritage village, and back to Edmonton. Is anybody providing any initiative?

MR. BRADLEY: The private sector.

DR. BUCK: The private sector. Sure. But then scrap the bloody department. We don't need it then, Mr. Minister. The ministry is there to provide some initiative and direction and encouragement. The minister stands there trying to defend the \$80 million, or whatever it's going to cost, to manufacture the snow that the cotton-picking wind is going to blow off as fast as they can manufacture. Everybody knows that. But the government has made a conscious decision that that's the way to go, and they're not going to back off.

MR. MARTIN: Peter's mountain.

DR. BUCK: Maybe we can get Mount Rushmore and start carving some faces on the side of the thing. It won't be covered with snow; you won't have to worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of a throne speech is to indicate to this Assembly and to the people of Alberta that the government is in control, that it is providing leadership, and that it knows where it is heading. The throne speech failed on all those counts. So I will be looking forward with great anticipation to how the government is going to juggle its books in the budget speech on Tuesday night.

I took the time to go to British Columbia because, I think that government — our cousins, if you wish — is providing some leadership in fiscal responsibility. I wanted to know how their proposed budget and our budget compared. In looking at our budgeting process, our last year's deficit, I can come to no conclusion other than that the government is going to have to come up with at least another \$1 billion. How is it going to do it? I want to say at this time that if this government ever becomes so arrogant that it implements a sales tax, I can guarantee there will be a new government in its place in two and a half years. But it is so tempting, in spite of the fact that the hon. member for Barrhead said that his constituency said there would be no problem.

MR. KOWALSKI: No way. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That's not at all what the Member for Barrhead said two days ago in the Speech from the Throne debate. What he did was read out a motion that said that the Progressive Conservation

Association of Barrhead opposes the introduction of a sales tax in the province of Alberta.

DR. BUCK: My apologies. That was not the way I interpreted it, and I appreciate that information. I thought there was a real split over there, that we were going to have somebody advocating it.

Mr. Speaker, it will be so tempting for this government, because of its fiscal mismanagement, to want to grab that \$1 billion with a 3 percent sales tax on selected luxury items. [interjections] Just catch a little plane and go over the mountains, go over the rocks. They will give you that information. Hon. member, compare our budget and their budget. The hon. members in this caucus had better be doing their homework, because people are not very happy with the way you are blowing their dollars.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that things are progressing relatively favourably in my constituency, but it is a unique constituency in that we are the petrochemical centre of this province. There are people who have relatively high-paying jobs, but that doesn't mean there are no problems. I am not too happy with the lack of initiatives by this government, and I will be looking forward with great anticipation to the budget that comes in Tuesday night.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I realize that at ten after twelve on a Friday afternoon members may well indicate to me what was indicated to a speaker not that long ago, that he had a request but he was going to speak anyway. The people of Calgary Currie expect me, and rightly so, to bring a number of their concerns, feelings, and suggestions to this House. I hope to do that for a few minutes this afternoon.

Before doing so, though, I would like to pleasantly participate in the tradition of this House in congratulating both the Lieutenant Governor on his speech and thanking him for his continued commitment to the province and the manner in which he carries out his job function and, Mr. Speaker, our particular thanks to you as Speaker of this Assembly. As the Member for Calgary Egmont indicated in his speech, we had the opportunity in recent months to visit other legislatures, the House of Commons, and the Senate, and watch their question periods. I might say that there is no question that we as members of the Alberta Legislature are proud to be in a Legislature that is upheld better than any that we are familiar with — the traditions and the decorum that's required in order to operate the business of the people of Alberta.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne and let the mover know that I was extremely impressed with his speech, as I have been impressed with his activity in this Legislature since he was elected in 1982. I should also tell him that I have been watching him in his riding as well as in the Legislature, having visited there not that long ago to talk to the people of Red Deer with respect to the Senate. Every individual I talked to, including an uncle who lives in that particular riding, felt, as I think members of this Assembly do, that the member has done an excellent job and is providing good leadership in that community. I personally believe he will be elected for many years to come. As well, we appreciate the good humour and sincerity that the seconder brings to the House. It certainly was evident in his speech. I look forward to working with him in coming years.

Mr. Speaker, as members of this Assembly who have been here for a while may well know, Calgary Currie consists of the communities of Altadore, Lakeview, Lakeview Village,

North Glenmore, Lincoln Park. Rutland Park and, indeed, the military community that is located there. It consists of people from all walks of life, in all economic circumstances, as well as a fairly large student population, primarily located around Mount Royal College in the centre of the riding. As I mentioned, a large military contingent is stationed at Canadian Forces Base, Calgary, including the command of western Canada, which is centred there.

I would be wrong if I did not say that the constituency has been hit fairly hard by the economic downturn which most of the country and the world experienced in recent times. There are people who have faced unemployment problems that weren't prevalent in this province in past years. There are business managers and people in small business as well as in large corporations who faced a downturn in their activity and who are suffering as a result of foreclosures and a lack of business opportunities and jobs. I would be wrong if I didn't express concern on the part of those people and indicate that as long as there is one person unemployed who wishes to work, we still have work to do in assisting the private sector to develop the economy to a point where individuals can again fulfill their goals in life.

I am happy, though, to report to the Legislature that where a year ago, asking individuals in my riding the question "How are things going?", the majority responded "Not too well", now there is an increasing number who are saying "Much better". There is indeed a small upturn in the oil and gas industry that is experienced by members of my constituency working in that area. Individuals are becoming employed who haven't been employed before. Generally, there is a cautious but more positive attitude developing in the constituency of Calgary Currie that I think is likely indicative of the province as a whole. The exception in Calgary is probably the commercial construction area and, to a large extent, residential construction, which has not improved and which does not look that healthy for the near future.

I was gratified that in the Speech from the Throne it was mentioned that the economy will strengthen in 1984. I look forward, as I know small-business people in my constituency will, to the details of the small-business venture capital program, which was announced in the Speech from the Throne. Indeed, there is a need to stimulate small business in all areas of our economy. The constituents of Calgary Currie, in a survey which I recently carried out through the *Currie News*, which we distribute there every few months, in answering the question "Do you agree that in the area of economic development, the province should concentrate on possibilities that result from our primary industry, i.e. agriculture and energy?", the response was 67.6 percent yes, 24.3 percent no. I should mention that in making that response, a number of constituents noted in the comment section that they didn't believe we should concentrate on those two areas to the exclusion of all others but that, indeed, that was the primary emphasis the provincial government should take in encouraging development.

The people of the constituency are also happy with the injection of funds into the riding in the form of a \$60 million expansion to Mount Royal College, which I thank both the former Minister of Advanced Education, now the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and the current minister for proceeding with. It took us some years to get that on the books, but that will now provide the necessary space for a growing number of students at that institution and provide business opportunities for individuals who might require them, particularly in the hard-hit construction industry.

As well, the government has indeed blessed Calgary Currie with what is, to the best of my knowledge, the largest number

of self-contained single units for senior citizens in the city of Calgary. We have two more now under construction that are just about completed. In the past few years I've managed to officially open another five of those, and I think we're now in a position where any senior citizen who desires that excellent kind of accommodation is able to get it in my constituency.

As I mentioned, the economy is improving. However, I believe we must continue to watch this carefully and deal with the economy through the private sector. Again, in the survey that was carried out with Calgary Currie constituents, they indicated in no uncertain terms that it's the private sector, not the government, that's going to lead the province out of the recession. The question was: is the government correct in its assumption that economic recovery will take place primarily through the private sector and not through government intervention? An overwhelming number of people, 75.6 percent, said yes to that, 18.9 said no, and 2.7 were undecided — a very conclusive result from a survey in my riding. So there's no question where the emphasis must lie. While we hear a variety of contradictory suggestions on this issue from the Member for Clover Bar, the direction is clearly indicated.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the economy directly, that's all I wish to deal with. In my remarks, I'm following the five points that were made in the Speech from the Throne as the primary emphasis of the government's direction in the coming year. The second one mentioned there is education. I have to say that apart from the economy, apart from the job difficulties people in Calgary Currie face, education is the single greatest issue there has been in my riding since I was first elected to this Assembly in 1979. Some of the issues are general: a concern that our educational system must keep up with the rapidly changing needs of the community and of individuals, that it must respond and deal effectively with that. In that regard, I believe my constituents have been happy with reports that have been presented in recent months and years, first of all on computer learning, indicating a need for that kind of injection in the schools. The government program has enhanced that significantly. In my riding I might mention one school in particular. Bishop Pinkham, whose parents have united with the government program to such an extent that, through the students, they have raised another \$20,000 to buy computers for their school to add to those already placed there by the government. I believe that's the kind of joint parent/school co-ordination or commitment that's required in order to make sure our educational system works effectively.

As well, there are parents in my constituency who are happy with the completion of the report on gifted children, indicating that indeed we have more to do in that area, and have done through a budget increase in those particular programs. For some years there has been a program in the constituency, at Dr. Oakley school, that deals with gifted children. While that now may be consolidated at another school just outside the riding, it's provided an outlet that wasn't there in years gone by for people with those particular talents.

Mr. Speaker, the constituents are also happy with the minister's committee to review secondary education in the province — again, because of the need to keep students up to date with the changing needs of our community and, in our secondary education programs, try to reach that compromise through our educational system between a required emphasis on the basics and an understanding of all those needs which an individual must have to go out into the community.

With respect to the Speech from the Throne, though, I might indicate that the announcement that a review of the School Act would indeed be proceeding, heartens many of the people in my constituency who are hit extremely hard by the proposed

closure of a number of schools in the riding. While we recognize this as a choice and a difficult series of decisions that have to be made by the Calgary Board of Education, the fact that in every corner of my riding there is now a school proposed for closure has really pitted community against community and has jeopardized the feeling of well-being and stability that has existed in my constituency in the past.

It's my personal opinion, recognizing that boards of education have a very difficult series of decisions to make, that the board in Calgary has not gone about the move toward closure in the best of all possible ways. I believe that parents always want the best for their children and are willing to listen to reason if a program is going to be affected in a given school by a lack of the necessary students to carry out a series of programs. That's indeed been true in one of my schools, Lakewood elementary, where the school board discussed the problems. The parents reached a conclusion, decided amongst themselves, that they had to consolidate at another school. But unfortunately that has not been the case in the majority of them. The approach has been to say: we want to close your school; what do you think of that? Unfortunately, the constituents of Calgary Currie in the affected areas have responded by feeling that that jeopardized and undermined the base of their community. Particularly with respect to Clem Gardner school and Viscount Bennett school, I still believe the board must reassess the announced inclination toward closure of those two facilities.

One has to ask why three Calgary boards have tried to move with mass closure, mass being 20 to 30 schools at one time, and have faced these problems continually, while other parts of the province haven't necessarily experienced the same difficulty, or where the separate board in the city of Calgary has not experienced the same difficulty. I have a theory, and it's evolved over these years of dealing with three different boards of education, dealing with three different problems, realizing the extremely difficult position trustees have been in, trying to represent, communicate with, and make decisions regarding an entire system of 83,000 students. It's my personal feeling that the system is no longer appropriate for the size of the community that exists.

Some studies which the hon. Minister of Education has in his possession, which he indicated in answers to me in question period in years past, indicate that the optimum size for school districts by and large is about 20,000 students. That makes Calgary the third largest school system in the country, four times the size that is indicated as optimum. There are a number of possible solutions, and I'm not suggesting any one of them as better than the others. The obvious first one is to at least bring the trustees closer to the electorate so they can represent specific parts of the community, so they can understand and have empathy with the people in those specific parts of the communities, perhaps through a ward system, electing trustees essentially as we elect MLAs and Members of Parliament. Individuals going into ballot boxes and facing 36 names have difficulty, to say the least, in choosing nine of those to sit on a school board in a citywide system in Calgary.

Many years ago I personally ran, unsuccessfully, for that Board of Education in Calgary. It was the most frustrating experience of my life, to have a minute at a forum to explain your life history and what you wanted to do for education in the city of Calgary in total, and more frustrating for the people in the audience, who had to look at 36 people basically, necessarily, saying the same thing, and make a decision on election day. I might say as well, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases there were more people on stage than there were in the audience at those forums. Just being unable to communicate what you believed made you extremely frustrated. Trying to campaign

in a city of 500,000 people at that time, now far in excess of that, is an experience that doesn't lead one to believe democracy is being fulfilled in the best of all possible ways.

So it is time, and the School Act review allows us to do that, for us to seriously consider changing the system by which trustees are elected in the city of Calgary. I wouldn't presume to indicate what this would be with respect to Edmonton, but they may wish to look at it as well. They're a smaller system but still a very large one, and they may have the same kind of communication difficulties.

The ward system is one possibility. Another is to have several school districts. That's happened in many Canadian as well as American cities. Indeed one would have to be careful that you didn't duplicate services, that you were able to centralize some of the very specific services, but it is something that should be considered as well. I do not plan to be silent on this particular issue during the review of the School Act, which I believe is of extreme importance to the parents, the trustees and, most of all, the students in the Calgary system.

Mr. Speaker, that deals with the issue of education. Just briefly on deregulation, I believe the people of Calgary Currie are ready for us to move in that direction to a greater extent than we have in the past. I think we have to admit that any government over the years — perhaps all governments in Canada — has developed more regulations than may be necessary in many regards. I know I get a number of complaints with respect to the ALCB, with respect to other government agencies and specific regulations that are encountered there. I believe we should seriously move in that direction, and I am gratified to see that that was mentioned as a priority in His Honour's speech.

Expanded privatization is an area as well that I think we should look at seriously in many areas. I was happy to see that we sold PWA, as was originally promised, at a profit to the people of Alberta. I believe we could effectively move out of a number of other government agencies, or at least reduce our involvement, without harming the good of the people of Alberta. Philosophically I am an individual who believes that the private sector best deals with services and operations to the public. That does not mean that government does not have a role in ensuring that those services are carried out and ensuring that people or systems aren't abused. But I believe we have gone too far in this government, as in others, in taking over some of the aspects better done by the private sector. We recognize that, and now we're reversing that trend. I welcome it.

I would make just one suggestion. Although he isn't in the House, I would make it to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. In the last years of the Social Credit government they had a pilot project, called request for proposals and social contracts program, in which they contracted out the single men's hostel in Calgary and a day care centre in Edmonton as a pilot project to see if private agencies or indeed individuals could operate some social service programs that didn't need to come directly under the auspices of civil servants in our department. While that program wasn't proceeded with, I believe the initial results were positive.

While we need to be extremely careful, in contracting out any kind of social service program, that the people being served are being served in the best possible way, it's my personal belief that out there in the private sector exist a myriad of innovative ideas and committed individuals who may assist those who require social services in our community, perhaps to a better extent than the dedicated individuals in our government system have, who are just one resource in our

community. I believe we should seriously consider, in that area as well as in others, that there is a role for privatization.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude by saying a few words with respect to Senate reform. Indeed the committee established by this House has been extremely active since the Legislature adjourned in the fall of last year. We have travelled, half the committee each time, to British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Ottawa, Toronto, Washington, and the Northwest Territories. We've been extremely cognizant of the need to be economically correct in what we do, to be frugal, to look after public dollars as best we can, and therefore we have not taken the whole committee with us at all times.

I might say that to date, I'm extremely gratified by the discussions we've had. I think I can report in an initial way to this Assembly that from our discussions, all of the areas visited had interest in the issue of Senate reform and, I believe, are willing to move toward the necessary changes that would give this part of the country in particular a strong voice in the federal decision-making process. I wouldn't want to mislead this House by suggesting that radical change of a dramatic nature is likely possible in the immediate future. I think radical change of any sort is difficult to get people in general to agree with, and in particular 11 governments in the country. But I do believe that change is possible; indeed, even likely. I believe firmly that the time is ripe for the change. We have chiselled out the face of our nation. We know what kind of government we now need. We have, for the first time in our history, an amending formula that tells us exactly how we can change that. We are moving toward developing a consensus in the country on how that will take place. It won't be next month, it won't be next year, but within several years, I believe it's likely and possible that there will be change in the area of Senate reform.

I mention, only because we've often disagreed with the province of Ontario on specific items, that we had an excellent set of discussions with the government of that province, indeed a crucial part of the formula which would be required to change the Senate. I believe it would be possible to work out some consensus with that province as well.

I won't go into any depth with the experiences in Washington or the details in other provinces. We'll leave that to another time when this topic is more on the top of the agenda and when we're prepared to report. I would only indicate that we look forward to the public hearings that will be held during the summer and, prior to that, to visiting the other provinces in the country, to have a full understanding of what options Albertans could look at that would also be accepted across this country. We look forward to reporting back to the Legislature on that item.

I might also give my thanks to the membership of the committee. I believe they are dedicated individuals and, without individually mentioning them, bring a good cross section of thoughts, ideas, experiences, and abilities to the discussions we have with leaders in other provinces and with the people of Alberta. That group was well chosen by this Assembly, and we have been working well together. I might particularly mention — as did the Member for Calgary Egmont, who sits on the committee — the hon. Member for Little Bow, who has added a great deal to the committee as an opposition member and as someone with extensive experience in this Legislature and with governments across the country.

MRS. EMBURY: Is he as good looking as the rest of us?

AN HON. MEMBER: You'd better leave that one alone, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: The hon. Member for Calgary North West has attributed my remarks to the visual aspects of individual members, and I can assure her that the vice-chairman of the committee is, in my opinion, by far the most attractive of all those members. [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: You're getting yourself in deep now.

AN HON. MEMBER: You'd better quit.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, having made those not so few remarks on this Friday afternoon, I would close by saying that I appreciate the responsibilities given to me as an MLA this term, as chairman of the Health Facilities Review Committee, as a member of many other committees, and as chairman of the Senate committee. I am doing my best to fulfill those responsibilities here, as well as the responsibilities we all have in our constituencies.

I look forward to debating further the details of His Honour's Speech from the Throne, the government's programs for the coming year, and to what I believe will be a positive new period in Alberta's history and indeed in the history of Canada. Thank you.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, it's my honour to participate in the throne speech debate on behalf of the constituents of Edmonton Whitemud. Before I proceed, a few moments ago the hon. Member for Clover Bar referred to my extremism, which of course mystifies me. I'm not sure whether he meant that I represent the extremely conservative constituents of Whitemud or whether I represent the conservative constituents of Whitemud extremely. Whatever the intent of the hon. member, I can assure him, although he's not now in the House, that I am not nearly as insulted as he intended me to be. I will leave the Member for Edmonton Glengarry to respond on his own behalf in that regard.

I'm not only proud but, I think, am additionally grateful for the fact that the constituents of Edmonton Whitemud are issue-oriented people; in other words, they believe and are interested in sound conservative policy. While our constituency does not have its own chamber of commerce, thus enabling me to launch into the glories of my constituency like some other members have done, I would be remiss if I did not mention that we do have an outstanding attraction in the Fort Edmonton Historical Park. Members who have not visited the Fort Edmonton Historical Park on a spring afternoon have not lived.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the throne speech debate, who did such a superb job. I add my thanks to the Member for Red Deer for his kind reference to our caucus committee on regulatory reform, which I will deal briefly with later. I'm also waiting for the Member for Wainwright, who seconded the speech, to let me in on some of those valuable lessons he spoke of which young people learn while living on the farm. Living in the city, I may have missed some of them.

Before proceeding, I would also like to add my words of admiration for Mr. Speaker in his role in this Assembly. It is my hope that the Speaker will continue to endure the fiery assaults of some members, ignore the occasional and gratuitous calls for his resignation, and continue to conduct our House as a model of reasoned debate. I am proud to be a member of this House, and much less proud to watch other Houses attempt to do the same things in an atmosphere of confusion.

Mr. Speaker, the five main elements of the speech dealt with categories of great importance to the province. While I share a vital interest in all of them, at this time I would briefly

like to address three main ones, those elements of fiscal responsibility, privatization, and deregulation.

The provincial budget for the fiscal year commencing April 1 will be an obvious highlight and priority of the session. The Provincial Treasurer will soon reveal his plan for fiscally responsible management, which is intended to stimulate growth in the private sector and, in so doing, stimulate more employment. My constituents will watch with keen interest as the Treasurer undertakes a most difficult balancing act — balancing, on one hand, the ever-growing and insistent demands for an increasing catalogue of services, with a stable or declining revenue stream. This is not a task entered upon lightly.

We have witnessed a number of approaches to budgeting lately: the somewhat draconian approach of British Columbia, which incidentally some have maintained may be the only way to bring expenditures under control, while at the other end of the spectrum we see the federal Liberal approach, which is to continue plunging down the slippery slope of deficit spending, hoping for something nice to happen on the way to the bottom. I look forward to the fiscal balance I expected, a lean and trim operation which represents a positive and realistic approach to the problem.

On the matter of privatization, building on the successful sale to private shareholders of the shares of Pacific Western Airlines, I'm greatly encouraged to see this idea being expanded. While there is a considerable amount of confusion surrounding privatization — some of it deliberately cultivated by those who prefer more centralized government control — for me, it is a good idea.

Privatization has the attraction of maintaining a high level of service and transferring some work, appropriately, from the public to the private sector to create better balance between public- and private-sector work opportunities. It has the added benefit of improving cost-effectiveness, thus reducing need for business management by government. I do not mean to imply by this that government operations are necessarily inefficient; however, it's generally true that private operators are more so. Cost savings to government reduce the pressure on the budget as well.

Privatization decisions made in the last few months are far more extensive than most people have realized. I have spoken of the well-known example of the transfer of PWA ownership, successfully sold to private shareholders, which was a good exchange for both parties. The government did well financially; so will the new owners. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the airline did nothing but enhance its reputation yesterday with all of the passengers safely and quickly evacuated from a burning plane in Calgary.

In the case of Alberta Energy Company, the last issue of shares by the company was not taken up by the government in regard to its share, thus reducing for the first time its interest in the company to less than 50 percent, which placed a larger share in private hands.

In the matter of Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones, members will recall that this government had adopted the recommendations of the Milvain committee last fall. These recommendations included the merger and eventual privatization of the combined telephone companies. Regrettably, in my view, both as a member of this House and as a taxpayer of the city of Edmonton, the mayor of Edmonton has refused to accept this particular recommendation of privatization. Should this government decide to proceed with that Milvain recommendation to privatize AGT, the implications for the city of Edmonton could be negative and serious.

Fourthly, the Minister of Housing has announced through the throne speech his intention to consolidate Alberta Housing

Corporation and AHMC and to reduce his involvement in the conventional housing sector and land banking. This will again clear the way for a return to the private sector when the housing activity once again picks up.

In addition to these, there are privatization examples from many departments. We have read that in the environmental area, a special and hazardous wastes central treatment facility, reporting to the Special Waste Management Corporation, will be operated by the private sector. There is consistent and ongoing support for business development of all types by the Department of Economic Development. Information, market data, infrastructure, personnel support: all aid in the incubation stages of new businesses in the private sector in Alberta. The Minister of Transportation announced that contracting out of work formerly undertaken by the government will be given to the private sector. The Minister of Manpower recently announced yet another program to support the creation of employment in the private sector. That is opposed to his option of creating government-funded jobs in government projects. All these projects in privatization are referred to by the opposition leader as a euphemism for feeding at the Tory trough. I trust that the beneficiaries of these constructive, productive, and cost-effective efforts will regard the remarks of that leader with the disdain they so richly deserve.

On the matter of deregulation, first I would like to thank the Minister of Economic Development, who has provided the resources to make this effort in regulatory reform effective. It is our effort to reduce or eliminate unnecessary or obsolete regulations which complicate the lives of citizens and increase the cost of operation of businesses. It's a very important initiative. I appreciate its being included in the throne speech. I have a vested interest for doing so, as the chairman of the caucus committee on regulatory reform.

Regulatory reform is a much-abused topic. It means all things to all people. Perhaps it is capsulized with a cartoon which was dropped on my desk yesterday by some unknown person. The cartoon shows two people sitting in front of the Capitol building, and one of them says: I always say that if it moves, tax it; if it moves too quickly, regulate it; if it doesn't move at all, bail it out.

The overall objectives of the regulatory reform committee are to examine, in co-operation with industry sectors and government departments, existing regulations, especially those noted by industry which have a negative impact on the private sector; to reduce the impact of regulations wherever possible and as soon possible; and to jointly determine how the ongoing regulatory process may be structured to create less economic burden in the future. Much of the economic burden associated with regulation is paperwork. We know about the problem in this House; we all have it. It is a monumental and costly problem in this country, perhaps in the whole world. In terms of paperwork alone, the office for the regulation of paperburden in Ottawa has estimated that regulation compliance costs Canadians more than \$3 billion per year. I don't wish to dwell on Ottawa's burden; I wish to get on with reducing ours.

I have sent 450 letters of invitation to businessmen in 12 industry sectors. I have asked them to advise me of the regulations which are costly and burdensome to them. We have asked them for specifics. We have invited them to attach a rough estimate of annual costs if that is available. To respond to those concerns brought to us by industry, senior department people have been assigned to the committee to analyze the briefs of industry and to give us a detailed response.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging things I have found so far about the regulatory reform effort is that so far the replies from departmental people have been very timely,

very positive, and very co-operative. These replies are referred back to the industry groups along with an invitation to meet us at a round table. Around the table will be those industry representatives, those senior department people, and those of us from the political side. At these meetings, we hope to emerge with actionable ideas which will reduce the regulations. These recommendations will then go on to the caucus, the cabinet, and the Premier, to ensure that there is an end result.

A crucial part of the project, of course, will be to help with the matter of regulatory guidelines for the future. It seems clear and sensible that we cannot keep adding on to the front-end what we laboriously chip off the back end.

Regulatory reform and deregulation represent complex challenges. Perhaps the most difficult one is the interface problem. The interface is the overlap of regulations with other levels of government. Most of the problems we've seen in our committee efforts so far derive from federal regulations. We have promised groups that we will do what we can to help them in their representations in Ottawa, and indeed may make some on our own. Many problems relate to municipal regulations, particularly with reference to matters of development. Again we will do what we can to assist with those matters.

As an example of this type of problem, a recent case came up of a winery which had proposed to locate itself in a southern Alberta city. It became so frustrated with the regional planning commission and its processes that it gave up on the southern city and now plans to locate in a northern city. I raise this example not to embarrass anyone or particularly to praise anyone but to point to the problem of frustration by regulation. This time we were lucky; the plant stayed in Alberta. It could have moved to another province. It could have moved to a more hospitable regulatory environment.

I offer another example, to put members' minds at ease. Information has been sent to me indicating that the Syncrude plant required 247 separate permits and applications before it could proceed, at a cost of millions and millions of dollars. One reasonably wonders: could the project have been approved with, say, a hundred permits, or were all 247 really necessary? We must come to grips with these matters in order to create a more constructive business environment.

Finally on regulatory reform, I must add that the effort of our committee, in my view, poses no threat to anyone. We are not seeking to dismantle adequate protection for consumers or for the environment, or safety standards for workers. Neither, Mr. Speaker, in my view is this part of a zero-sum game. Everyone gains when we eliminate waste. We're trying to make an overloaded system work more efficiently. We're seeking the best interests of the public at large. A more cost-effective and better regulated environment will help to speed the return of fuller employment, business investment, economic stability, and solid prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents have expressed to me their appreciation for the underlying private-enterprise philosophy expressed in the throne speech. But the speech isn't just business, business, and more business. I would like to close on

some matters of social sensitivity raised by socially sensitive ministers in the throne speech. I compliment the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care for his continuing and courageous defence of a viable medical care delivery system. Everyone who can read or learn from history or assess human events knows that the present direction of socialized medicine through the Canada Health Act is headed for breakdown. At times it seems as though our minister alone among his provincial peers truly realizes how to keep the care in medicare. That's an important message to the residents of Alberta, although it's contrary to the federal minister's propaganda included with this month's family allowance cheques.

Further, I want to add my support for the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, whose insights into constructive well-being of our less fortunate citizens are views that I share. The minister speaks of an increasing role for volunteers and private agencies in providing support services. He has spoken of the supporting role to be played by family, community, and church in the restoring of self-worth and true dignity to those who are in difficulty. He recognizes, and I agree, that this problem will not be solved by government programs alone. The minister wisely underlines the role of personal, caring relationships in the healing process.

Finally, I would support a similar insight expressed by the Minister of Education. He recently told the Alberta Teachers' Association, I think it was, and I quote: we cannot look to more funding to solve every problem; for the answer to our current difficulties, we have to look within ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, with these insights and commitments by our ministers and our government, it is conceivable in my mind that the social fabric of our society may not disintegrate after all. The throne speech gives me new hope on all fronts. I support it, and I look forward to its implementation.

Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the Assembly sit Monday evening. During Monday afternoon, the business will be a continuation of the debate in respect of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:58 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]