

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Monday, April 16, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a very distinguished visitor to our Assembly this afternoon, in your gallery. I suppose I could say that he is junior to me both in years, by very little, and in time at the bar, without any noticeable effect. The fact of the matter is that the Hon. Roy McMurtry, the Attorney General of Ontario, is one of the distinguished legal minds and parliamentarians in Canada, much known to Canadians across the country for his participation in so many areas of federal/provincial relationships; a distinguished representative of his province, so welcome here today. I ask him to stand and be welcomed by members of the Assembly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, one of three Japanese teachers visiting Canada this year, each of them for a three-month term, so that they can assist teachers in Canada with the development of curricular materials about life in Japan. As it happens, two of these teachers are in Alberta. One of them has earlier been in the province, and the guest I'm introducing this afternoon has just arrived and will be with us until the end of June.

All hon. members know that Alberta is twinned with the prefecture of Hokkaido, Japan. For the purpose of that relationship, as well as for the benefit of our students, it is important to have these opportunities to develop materials that can be used in our school system.

I'd like to welcome Miss Wakako Nakano, from Sendai City in Japan, here under the sponsorship of the international teachers' internship. She is accompanied this afternoon by Mr. Michael McCarthy of St. Francis Xavier high school in the city, and they are seated in your gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly two young ladies who are here under the sponsorship of the International Organization for Moral Rearmament. They are Miss Catherine Hutchinson, from Great Britain, and Renate Assam, from Austria. They are accompanied by one of my constituents, Mrs. Joy Newman. I ask them to rise to receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following petition that has been received for a private Bill: the petition of the town of Grand Centre for the Grand Centre expropriation Act.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation for the calendar year ended December 31, 1983.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation for the year ended March 31, 1983.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Public Service Commissioner's annual report for the calendar year ended December 31, 1983.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 27 fine young Albertans from Eleanor Hall school in the village of Clyde, in the Redwater-Andrew constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Truckey and Mr. Kane. They are in the members gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive a welcome.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to introduce to you and to members of this Legislative Assembly some 75 students from Chester Ronning school in Camrose. They are seated in the public gallery. Before I ask them to be recognized, I might add that this grade 6 class visits the Assembly each year. In June of this year they will have their annual camp-out on their principal's farm, and I plan to take part in it. I now ask them to rise and be welcomed by the Assembly.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and to hon. members 55 grades 5 and 6 students from Pines community school, situated in the constituency of Red Deer. The Pines school is one of three schools in Alberta that have been awarded designated community school status by the interdepartmental community school committee. This fine award, this circumstance for Red Deer, has developed after about five years of very extensive voluntary participation by members of Pines community in Red Deer.

Mr. Speaker, our students are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. Opatril; teachers Eleanor Coene, Rick Moore, and Kelly Buday; and bus driver Peter Huebner. I ask them to rise in the members gallery and receive the cordial welcome of the House.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, the first committee established under the Health Occupations Act to govern the practice of the occupation of respiratory technologists in the province of Alberta. The members are: chairman Mr. James Harold Coward, Dr. Frank Alexander Herbert, Ms Marlene Elaine Irwin, Mr. Albert John Maiani, and Mr. Keith Wilson. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Education**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to inform the House and all Albertans that the Great Trade Show of China, which opened in our city last Saturday, will be providing more than 40,000 of our students with a very significant educational experience. My colleagues have already informed you of this remarkable trade show, so further elaboration is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker, through Alberta Education, arrangements have been made to bring students in grades 6 through 9 to Edmonton to visit the fair. Travel subsidies exceeding \$65,000 have been provided on an equitable basis so that students from every corner of the province are able to be involved.

For the students, this visit will complement the social studies unit on China, which is offered to all our grade 6 students. The unit has adequately prepared the students to obtain maximum benefit from the visit.

Mr. Speaker, let me take just a brief moment to outline the scope of this unit of study. It requires three months of study in the social studies curriculum. It deals primarily with modern China. In an appropriate way, it encourages children to think about what the Chinese people can learn from us and what we can learn from them. It covers in detail the Chinese family, the community, industry, commerce, and technology. It discusses the ways in which the modernization of China has been occurring.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that our people have recognized this very important fair and have encouraged and made possible visits from as many of our students as possible. Further, our teachers and our students have responded to the occasion. Active participation will reinforce in these young Albertans the recognition of international trade as vital to our future.

Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to the ministerial statement today. I think all Albertans will join with some sense of pride in the fact that we have in this city the Great Trade Show of China.

As we ponder this important trade show for just a moment, perhaps it's worth noting that a good deal of history has gone past which has made a show of this nature possible. It's interesting that the hon. minister identified a section of the curriculum for grade 6 students. Mr. Speaker, Alberta Education might want to reflect on a little bit of our own history as it relates to modern China.

Over the weekend I had an opportunity to attend a banquet in Toronto, our honoured guest from Ontario's capital city, honouring one of the great Canadians, Tommy Douglas, a man who argued and fought for recognition by Canada of the People's Republic of China. Members of the government will note that the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, who was Minister of Agriculture in the first Diefenbaker government, was renominated over the weekend. We have trade links with China today because Mr. Hamilton, a Conservative, departed from traditional policy and sold wheat to the People's Republic of China. Then I suppose in this atmosphere of ecumenical recognition of our relationship with the People's Republic, we had the decision of our present Prime Minister to recognize the People's Republic in the early part of his term. A number of years of history, but history which has made it possible, as a result of changes in our attitudes, to host an important trade show today.

In adding to the ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker, the only comment I would make is that while this trade show underlines the importance of international trade to the future — no question about that; all members agree — just as it is important to recognize international trade, so must we emphasize international understanding. At a time when the world faces so many great problems, perhaps it's well that we put international understanding and give it the focus it deserves.

## head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Abacus Cities Investigation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the hon. Attorney General, with respect to the administration of justice, and ask whether or not the government has received the Alberta Securities Commission's investigation into Abacus Cities' collapse.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check into that and let the hon. leader know. I'm not aware of it having been received.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, so that he brings back as much information as possible, could I ask the minister a supplementary question. When he does that checking, could he also check back as to whether, in that investigation, there is a recommendation that charges be laid for regulatory violations of the Securities Act?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate enough to indicate whether or not recommendations were made with respect to charges in the sort of respect the hon. leader referred to. I might gratuitously add, of course, that no names of citizens would be involved in any such remarks I would make.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could supplement the answer of my hon. colleague, I would inform the Leader of the Opposition that the Securities Commission has a team of people going through what I understand is a very voluminous report, and information from that group will be coming to both me and the Attorney General.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs update the Assembly on the cost of the Securities Commission investigation into Abacus Cities? Last October 25 we were told the cost was about \$3.5 million. Is that still accurate, or have there been additional costs?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that information is still accurate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or the hon. Attorney General. With respect to the Securities Commission's Abacus Cities investigation, will the government still stand by the position outlined on April 7, 1981, that should charges not be laid, the investigation will be made public?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would have to look up the obligations that were assumed at the time by the minister of the day.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, April 7, 1981.

I would ask either hon. minister to outline for the Assembly what policy decisions the government has developed with respect to the time frame for Alberta Securities Commission investigations. This was originally announced in 1979; it's now 1984. Justice delayed is justice denied. What policy considerations has the government developed with respect to a time frame for studies of this nature?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that, for my part, obviously I'm very concerned about the amount of time

it takes for such an investigation to be concluded. However, it is obviously in the hands of that person or those people who are appointed to conclude such an investigation. To put some parameters, in terms of time, ahead of the eventual report may in fact put some constraints on someone charged with such an onerous responsibility, in terms of fully completing such an investigation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister advise the Assembly what move has been undertaken by the commission with respect to section 167(3), which I will read for the minister. I can't expect her to have it before her.

The Commission may . . . certify the day on which the facts referred to in subsection (1) or (2) first came to the knowledge of the Commission.

Given the five-year time frame of this particular investigation, could the minister advise whether or not the commission has issued that certificate?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Has the government given any consideration to the overall policy with respect to time frames — and I'm dealing with section 167 of the Act, which basically sets out a one-year statute of limitations from the time the facts first became known to the commission:

No proceedings under this Act shall be commenced . . . more than two years from the day that the facts upon which the proceedings are based first came to the knowledge of the Commission.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: if we have five-year investigations after facts become known to the Securities Commission, on what basis can there ever be any prosecution for violation of the Act?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure that's a question that could be addressed to every member of the House. I don't think that analysis has anything that is specially within the duties of the hon. minister.

MR. NOTLEY: Then let me rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, and ask the minister whether, given the five-year investigation into Abacus Cities, there is any intention to amend the legislation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in saying there is no call to amend that particular section at the present time, I can respond in a brief way to the hon. member's other question. When an investigation is undertaken, surely it is precisely the facts that come to the attention of the investigator in the course of those inquiries that are spoken of as being the ones that may be the basis for some steps the Securities Commission would want to take. If that is so, it clearly means that as the process goes on and as facts evolve from an inquiry, as distinct from innuendo or other indications that may be around at any particular time, I would think the argument could safely be made that that is the time when those matters come to the attention of the investigator.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney General and I will have an opportunity to debate this section.

I'd like to direct my second question to the hon. Attorney General too, also related to the administration of justice and to

Abacus Cities. Is the minister in a position to confirm that the Attorney General's department has received recommendations from the RCMP commercial crime division that charges be laid?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in any position to comment with respect to that matter today. I think the hon. leader would know that the way matters like this are handled, it would be some time before the fact of any actual report or recommendation would come to my attention. If that is the case and if any recommendation has in fact been made, it would be made at another level of the department.

### Education Quality

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Education is a follow-up to a question I asked last Thursday, in terms of the report from a Canadian Teachers' Federation study. Just to refresh his memory, the minister's response in terms of the relationship of economic recession to quality of education indicated that

the circumstances are derived from conditions in the community beyond the responsibility of the Department of Education or of the local school boards.

My question is: when a force external to the department decreases the quality of education, does the minister not have a responsibility to explore the avenues that address or counteract these forces in some way? Or is the minister's intention just to ignore it and say, that's the way it is?

MR. KING: The government doesn't ignore anything that is important to education, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What steps will the minister be taking to address that concern?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we are taking steps to address that concern continuously. The only point I attempted to make last Thursday afternoon was that we were not taking those steps in direct response to any particular study. Other studies, the common experience of people in education, are quite enough to tell us what issues we need to address.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, to be more specific. In the minister's answer to a question last Thursday, referring to the relationship of cutbacks in budget affecting class size, and the quality of education as well, he indicated: "The conclusion does not follow from the evidence that is offered". Can the minister clarify what he meant by that statement? Is he saying that the increased class size, due to lack of funds, is not responsible for the lack of attention given to students?

MR. KING: No, Mr. Speaker. I'm saying that increased class size is not necessarily related to any hypothetical lack of funds.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question which relates to the study as well. What steps has the minister recently taken in the province to determine the level of teacher morale in Alberta, and is the minister satisfied with that teacher morale at this time?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we have not surveyed teachers as to the morale among educators in the province. On the basis of our interaction with teachers and other educators, we believe we've got a pretty good feeling for the morale within education

in the province. On the basis of our interaction with them, we believe that morale is good.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister had recent discussions with the Alberta Teachers' Association with regard to teacher morale, and is he considering any type of co-operative study of teacher morale in Alberta with the Alberta Teachers' Association?

MR. KING: I have not had any recent discussions with representatives of the Alberta Teachers' Association on the question of teacher morale. The Alberta Teachers' Association has not raised the issue with me and has not raised any suggestion to me that we should be involved in a joint study. Therefore I think it's fair to say that we do not have it under active consideration.

#### **Health Spa Membership Sales**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has to do with the high-pressure techniques of selling memberships to certain health clubs. Is the minister in a position to indicate if any complaints have been brought to the minister's department as to the coercive actions of some health clubs to sell memberships, especially to young people?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, nothing has crossed my desk, but I'll certainly respond to the hon. member by checking with the department.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if there have been any thoughts or discussions in the department as to the use of, say, a 24- or 48-hour cooling-off period after these young people have signed contracts that they really didn't want to get into? Has there been any look at this type of approach?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of. But once again, I'll check.

#### **Mount Allan Olympic Ski Site**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. I know he likes to talk about Mount Allan, and I'd like to give him another chance. Can the minister inform the Assembly when it is anticipated the master plan for Mount Allan will be approved and presented for public review?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the master plan, which is now in the final stages of completion, will be presented to the Canadian Olympic committee and, after that, filed in the Legislature and made public. As I've said probably eight or 10 times already this spring session, that will be made public as soon as I have received it and had the opportunity to review it and make the presentation to the Olympic committee, and then to make it public. I suggest it will probably be in the early or mid part of May.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the government chosen a private-sector developer for Mount Allan at this point?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the choice of words is not necessarily appropriate. We've been negotiating with a member of the private sector, and those negotiations continue.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Has any decision been made about how the project should be funded? In other words, is it government policy that approximately \$20 million in public money will be spent developing Mount Allan?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I read the same news article. As I said, the negotiations continue. If the private sector build it, they will be using their funds. If for some reason we're not able to reach a satisfactory conclusion in the negotiations with the private sector, I have said on a number of occasions that we would then ensure that Mount Allan is prepared and built by the government of Alberta, so it can meet the commitments we made some years ago to the Olympic committee that made its presentation to the International Olympic Committee.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will the government make decisions about how Mount Allan should be developed before the master plan is presented for public review and comment?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not sure I understand the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Let me rephrase it so that the minister understands it. Has any construction work of any sort necessary for the project, road construction for example, started at Mount Allan?

MR. ADAIR: Road construction is not part of the actual master plan relative to the construction of the hills. There is some work going on with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Tourism and Small Business, relative to alignments that may be used for approaching that site when we get the final plan completed.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question to the minister. Is it not unusual to begin this type of work before a master plan is introduced?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not aware of the actual problem having occurred previously. But in the case of the Mount Allan site, no. We've been working with the consultants who are preparing the master plan. All the parties involved have been working with them, so it's known to those who are involved in the project.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can the minister assure this Assembly that no public money will be spent on the snowmaking equipment for Mount Allan, but rather left to the private sector?

MR. ADAIR: I can't at this particular point, Mr. Speaker. As I said, we're in negotiations with the private sector. But should those negotiations not reach fruition and the project [not] be developed by the private sector, the government of Alberta will in fact build the hill and look for an operator or lease purchaser.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, and then the hon. Minister of Economic Development wishes to reply to a question taken as notice.

### Telephone Toll Revenue Sharing

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications. Is the minister in receipt of a brief from the chairman of the city of Calgary gas and power committee, in which there is expression of a desire for a specific form of input to the process with regard to the current discussions between AGT and Edmonton Telephones?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Friday afternoon we received a brief from the city of Calgary, entitled Fair Telephone Rates for All Albertans, and that brief is currently under review.

MR. LEE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is action contemplated with respect to an acknowledgment of the substance of that brief by the Calgary gas and power committee? If so, will the minister apprise members of the Assembly from time to time as to progress being made?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYSONS: I'd like to ask a supplemental question. In the event of Calgary having higher costs with increased fees, has the minister considered moving the AGT office from the city of Edmonton to Calgary or another outlying point?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker.

### Syncrude Contracts

MR. PLANCHE: On Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Edmonton Norwood asked some questions of the Premier. Perhaps I could take this opportunity to supplement the answer.

Before an industrial development permit is issued on major projects in Alberta, we satisfy ourselves that the proponent will adequately source manpower and materiel within the province and within Canada. We assure ourselves that that will happen on the basis that there will be no premium paid for manpower and materiel in the province but that it will be preferred, providing that all service and quality are equal. We do that, Mr. Speaker, because exports are so important to Alberta, and indeed to Canada, that we don't think it's appropriate to tend toward protectionism on that issue.

Specifically in the case of the \$1.2 billion expansion Syncrude has announced, so far there have been four contracts issued. There have been two to the PBS group, which is Poole-Braun-Simons. Two-thirds of that consortium is Canadian. The head office is in Calgary and, almost without exception, the engineering will be done in Alberta. The second one is let to Partec Lavalin, which is a Canadian company, and the engineering for that will all be done in Alberta. In the case of Lummus, which is the fourth one, the project let is not a \$200 million project; it's a \$3 million project, for design only. It will be done in Canada, and it was for proprietary engineering that simply was not available here.

Just to conclude, we're very proud of the response Syncrude has given to this issue. In fact, 75 percent of that overall \$1.2 billion expenditure will be made in Alberta, 15 percent in the rest of Canada, and 10 percent outside Canada.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. As usual, the minister must be reading press reports rather than *Hansard*, because no figures were mentioned. Would the minister confirm that Lummus is a foreign subsidiary of an American company?

MR. PLANCHE: Why is Lummus a foreign subsidiary of an American company?

MR. MARTIN: Confirm.

MR. PLANCHE: Yes they are. They've had an office here for some time.

As I said originally, I'm only answering the questions that are credited to the Member for Edmonton Norwood in *The Edmonton Journal*, which is not always known for its reliability. It does indicate that the question was about a \$200 million contract. For the record, it is only a \$3 million contract.

The reason Lummus was selected is that there were only two people who had the proprietary engineering; they were both American. Lummus has agreed to do it in Canada.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. I suggest he read *Hansard*. Would the minister confirm that all a company has to do to become an Alberta-based company is secure an Alberta business address and register with Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is giving advice which might also come from a solicitor.

MR. MARTIN: Then I'll ask the question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: But the hon. member is asking about incorporating companies in Alberta and the legal effect of that — he's not asking, he's telling. I'm saying he is giving advice which could also come from a solicitor.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Could the Premier indicate why two of the first contracts have gone outside Alberta when, in a letter to Mr. Bleiken of the Edmonton Economic Development Authority, the Premier made two key points:

- the capabilities of Alberta engineering firms have increased such that they can handle a wider range of work, and
- Alberta and other Canadian suppliers are now competitive with industry at large for price, quality and service.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there are obviously exceptions to that, and perhaps the Minister of Economic Development wishes to elaborate.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I seem to be having a communications problem here. The fact is that there are four contracts let. Three of them will be done almost exclusively in Alberta, and the fourth is a very small one, for design, which will be done in Toronto.

MR. MARTIN: There's some debate by businesses about how much of it is being done in Alberta.

My supplementary question follows up again to the Premier. One of the questions I asked on Friday the 13th had to do with:

... confirm to the House that two contracts went to international companies.

The Premier said in *Hansard*:

I would just say that we've never sort of put regulations on Syncrude or any organization that in fact they have to do it in a particular way.

My question to the Premier is simply that this seems to contradict the official policy with Syncrude. Could the Premier explain to the House: is there a preference for Alberta-owned businesses or not, dealing with Syncrude?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I guess that really is a matter of clear debate or communication, because I don't see it as contrary to the policy. Perhaps the minister would like to elaborate further.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, one more time. All things being equal. Alberta suppliers, manpower, and materiel are preferred.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar has given notice of a motion for emergency debate. If we call Orders of the Day, the opportunity for that is gone. So we'll have to make an exception. I have noticed that an hon. member would like to revert to Introduction of Bills. Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill Pr. 6

##### Concordia Lutheran Seminary Act

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 6, the Concordia Lutheran Seminary Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to incorporate a seminary which is currently being operated by the Canadian Lutheran church.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 6 read a first time]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would just like to bring to the attention of the Assembly the matter that the way the rules work, a person could very easily lose his place to ask for an emergency debate, in that you don't really know when the question period is over if it doesn't go to the appointed hour. So I would like to say that I think we as members of the Assembly should look at that section, because you could very, very innocently miss the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, I agree with the hon. member that the standing order would be a little more practical if it were to provide that a matter for emergency debate might be raised immediately upon calling Orders of the Day. As Standing Order 30 stands now, it has to be done just before calling Orders of the Day. That's why, on this occasion and on a previous occasion, I have drawn an hon. member's attention to it, actually during the end of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the Government House Leader has been listening to the comments, and maybe both sides of the House can get together and look at that rule.

#### Request for Emergency Debate

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have given notice to you that I'll be requesting leave to adjourn the ordinary business of the Assembly to discuss a matter of urgent public importance: the decision of the University of Alberta to impose across-the-board restrictions on freshman enrollment.

I know that everyone who moves this motion quite often gives their speech without really getting permission to give the speech. This may be different for me, but today I'm going to

really try to indicate to the Assembly and convince you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the House, why we should have the emergency debate. That may be a bit of a departure for me, but I will try to stick to the rules today.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the situation, announced on Friday by the University of Alberta, that there will be a 7.6 percent tuition increase and that 72 percent will be required for entrance. This is the first opportunity to bring this to the attention of members of the Assembly. This is also the first time that we have had an across-the-board imposition of quotas. We've had quotas in certain faculties before. Looking at an across-the-board quota system at the University of Alberta is setting a precedent.

The emergency situation also applies to the fact that at this point in time, high school students are about three-quarters of the way through their school year, and we are really changing horses in the middle of the stream. Students who were looking at getting a 65 percent average and going on to university, now may not have time to gear up so that they can get the 72 percent mark to get into the University of Alberta. We also have to look at the fact that in light of the very high unemployment in the province at this time, students who will be excluded from going to the University of Alberta cannot get into the job market. Conversely, people who were looking at going into the job market now find that if they had a 65 percent average, they could have gone to university if they had the choice. But now, with a 72 percent entrance, they cannot get into the University of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I well know that the budget of the Department of Advanced Education has been passed. But the entire budget has not been passed. If we in our wisdom decide to give the University of Alberta sufficient funding so they do not have to impose quotas, it is not too late to do that.

So with my brevity, which is unusual, I would just like to say: number one, I believe this is the first opportunity to present the case; number two, it is an emergency; and number three, I am sure that all members of the Assembly would welcome an emergency debate on this issue at this time.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, Will Rogers once asked a friend of his: if you call the tail a leg, how many legs does a dog have? The friend said, five. Will Rogers said: no, four; calling the tail a leg doesn't make it one. It reminds me of my hon. colleague, who said that he was going to limit his remarks to the question of whether or not we have an emergency situation under the rules, and then proceeded to talk about the situation rather than about the emergency nature of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the emergency does not arise in the decision being made but in the immediacy of the implementation of the decision. The question that we have to consider, in determining whether or not to grant an emergency debate, is whether or not the House will have any other opportunity to debate the question before we are faced with the consequences of the question, whatever those consequences might be. Since we are debating a resolution of the board of governors which I understand will have effect with the commencement of the school year in September, it is quite clear that there are many opportunities for the House to debate the question by resolution of the hon. member, by a Bill, or by other means. I don't believe he has made the case that there is any urgency to the debate itself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in addressing several comments with respect to the request the hon. Member for Clover Bar has made. I respectfully suggest that, first of all, this is a reasonable time to have a debate. It certainly wouldn't be if

we had the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education before the House. That would be the appropriate time for the debate. However, as you recall, Mr. Speaker, the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education have already come before the House. Several members of the House raised the prospect of quotas. We were concerned about the possibility that quotas would be imposed. But at the time we held the debate in the House, we were simply forecasting the future, and were not in fact in a position to know the decision of the board of governors.

Mr. Speaker, we still have the budget before the Legislature, but the estimates of the relevant department have been passed. In order to convey to Executive Council, Her Majesty's ministers — especially the Minister of Advanced Education — the underlying importance of this matter to the members of the Assembly, in my view an emergency debate is in order.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar has cited a number of reasons in terms of the impact this quota decision is going to have on students now in grade 12 throughout the province. The fact of the matter is that we have a situation where there is no obvious general debate. We've already gone through the Speech from the Throne debate; we've gone through the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education. Therefore it seems to me that the hon. Member for Clover Bar has made a good case.

Should you rule that an emergency debate should proceed, my hon. colleague and I will be more than pleased to participate in the debate. We think the fact that the university has now been forced into this unfortunate decision is something we as members of the House must be mindful of. We must have an opportunity, in unequivocal terms, to bring our concern to the attention of not only the appropriate minister but the appropriate ministers.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion by my hon. colleague from Clover Bar. We all recognize that in question period in the Assembly, we raised the matter with regard to changing the ground rules for entrance to the University of Alberta. The answer was continually that the board of governors had not made a decision. On Friday the 13th, that unfortunate decision became public. Today is the Monday following that Friday, and the issue is now before not only this Legislature but the people of Alberta. The matter is an emergency.

First of all, if the board of governors is to reverse their position, they would need input from this Legislature as soon as possible. The cabinet would need to reconsider the finances with regard to Advanced Education, which in turn supports the University of Alberta. The priorities of government may have to be shuffled to meet this commitment. That means we have an emergency, in the sense that decisions must be made, hopefully this week, to change that matter. If we leave the matter until next week or on into May — because that's when the House resumes after the debate this week — or into June, time has passed and I don't think any adjustments can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge you to consider the position of my hon. colleague from Clover Bar as to the urgency and need for debate, in terms of the emergency being that now is the time for changed decisions by government as well as the board of governors, to meet the needs of students in the fall of 1984.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would just debate the question of the emergency somewhat, under the emergency motion provided by the Member for Clover Bar. I acknowledge that during the past couple of weeks, we discussed this issue on many occasions. On those occasions we always said: subject

to the board of governors' decision, we will consider various implications of public policy.

I simply want to draw to the attention of members of the Assembly the fact that this motion essentially was discussed during consideration of my estimates on Monday, April 9. Page 371 of *Hansard*, for example, clearly states that if the board of governors does make an assumption with respect to enrollment criteria, in particular the 72 percent which in fact has become the board's decision, then certain events would unfold. We went on in this Legislative Assembly to give a very wide consideration of that public policy problem. So in terms of the *Standing Orders* we adhere to in this Assembly, section 30(7) — the question of an emergency — this motion has in fact been discussed before.

I suppose the question of the definition of emergency is contingent upon the student numbers showing up in the various institutions. In that context I submit that the emergency itself is somewhere off in the distance, perhaps sometime in September or October. So in the event that this House considers it today, it is considering information which is probably not even relevant to the total information which will be provided as enrollment numbers start to accumulate. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that I would provide some accommodation to the enumeration of those numbers, in the broader consideration of the numbers themselves.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think ample consideration has been given to this issue before, one week ago today as a matter of fact. Secondly, the emergency is some distance away. In the definition of emergency, I think it is a speculation, not an emergency. And finally, I think there will be ample opportunity for proper discussion of this, should the member want to initiate a motion on the Order Paper.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Not in an ordinary debate nor a question period, but I suppose on the . . .

DR. BUCK: Will the hon. Minister of Advanced Education entertain a question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Anything for you, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if the minister would promise the University of Alberta the funds that are required, we would not need the debate. Can the minister assure the Assembly that that will happen?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've always had respect for the hon. Member for Clover Bar, and he knows that he has fallen into the classic trap. I simply will not respond to that. I have already made the arguments about funding. I know that to try to further the arguments with respect to an emergency is simply a red herring at this point. In fact, that is not at all part of this consideration.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, one other point ought to be brought forward to the House; that is, the board of governors would have to review the decision it just made Friday, and it does not meet for another four full weeks. So between now and those four weeks, there is no urgency for the board of governors to review the decision it just made.

DR. BUCK: For the students there is.

MR. NOTLEY: Ask the young people in your riding, Rollie.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a couple of points that I think are relevant to the debate. First of all, it's clear — the hon. minister has alluded to it — that even in question period it was hypothetical. We were led to believe that all these Tory appointees on the board of governors would come through in the end, but they didn't. The fact is that this is the first time we have dealt with it.

I think the key reason it is an emergency — to say that a month from now the board of governors may review it is irrelevant. The emergency is not to the board of governors; it's to the students of this province. I remind hon. members that the university is sending out and accepting some people at university right now. It's not a decision that many young people can necessarily wait for, that they may change it and the hon. minister may bring in money later in August or September. Decisions are being made right at this very moment. That's the key point. I know some people who have been accepted at university already.

The other point I would make is that the Official Opposition asked the government. As the House leader knows, at one time we were going to put Advanced Education on Wednesday, because then we would have the board of governors' decision. But in its wisdom the government had Advanced Education on the very first day we had estimates, as is their right. So I think if we'd followed our suggestion, a debate at this point would not have been needed.

MR. NOTLEY: We could have amended the estimates; got you some more money, Dick.

MR. MARTIN: But the fact is that they didn't do that. They pushed ahead when they knew full well that the board of governors was meeting on Friday. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I don't want them to get excited. The hon. minister might have a heart attack, and we'd have to get another one. But that is in fact the case.

Two reasons: number one, students are making career decisions right now and, secondly, everything was hypothetical up to that point. Now we have a chance to have a debate about a very serious issue in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: You're going to have to learn how to quote Will Rogers better.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank hon. members for their assistance in dealing with a decision which I find to be a little difficult. I did some review of the authorities in regard to this matter. I must say that I omitted to consult Will Rogers. But apart from that, I looked at a number of others.

There's no question about the importance of the matter. As distinct from some other proposals for emergency debate, it involves a topic or concern which is really not ongoing, something that has perhaps been in effect for some time and has perhaps aggravated or changed slightly. As was pointed out, this is something which arose last Friday. I think this point must also be considered: the possibility of quotas or limitations is something different from the actuality of quotas or limitations. So the debate might well have been of a different nature previously, when only the possibility was being considered.

I looked at the Order Paper to see what sort of opportunity there might be for an early debate, and I found one motion by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, Motion No. 214, which might deal with part of the topic. But if the debate on

that motion were strictly relevant, it couldn't deal with the topic totally.

I realize it could have been dealt with and debated further, and I reviewed the discussion when the estimates for the Department of Advanced Education were before the committee of the whole House. I feel that at that time, there was still just the possibility of this occurring. I noted what the hon. minister said about this matter being given serious consideration. At least, I construed his remarks to mean that. But I would interpret that as indicating that if it is going to be given further and serious consideration, perhaps the debate should take place before that occurs.

I also considered the possibility of the motion being put on the Order Paper and then being designated but, with the Easter break facing us, that would mean it wouldn't likely be reached for perhaps two weeks. Under the circumstances, it would seem to me that the motion does qualify under Standing Order 30. Therefore it is my duty now to ask the Assembly, shall debate on the urgent matter proceed? Would the members in favour of the debate proceeding please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: There being lack of agreement, or there being objection, the next duty I have under Standing Order 30 is to ask the members who favour the debate proceeding to stand.

[Four members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: There being fewer than five members standing, I believe the procedure under the *Standing Orders* has been fully covered, and there is nothing further to be done with regard to it, at least insofar as the emergency debate today is concerned.

DR. BUCK: We won, but we lost.

MR. NOTLEY: Students will remember this one.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

7. Moved by Mr. Crawford:  
Be it resolved that when the House rises at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 18, 1984, it shall stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. on Monday, April 30, 1984.

[Motion carried]

### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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



### Department of Transportation

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a number of hon. members who had indicated that they wish to speak. We have kept a list and will call those if they are here. The first is the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I thought I would carry on with my remarks. We are dealing with an extremely important department — Transportation. Therefore it is only appropriate that we have full and adequate discussion of the issues.

At the time, I hadn't received the letter from the hon. minister with respect to the road projects in Spirit River constituency. However, I have subsequently received it. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to say that there are several of these projects that I would like to urge somewhat faster progress on. The first is Highway 64. The commitment that has been made by the minister at least redeems the promise the Conservative candidate made in the 1982 general election, so we are going to get the road as far as the Worsley turnoff about 35 miles to the B.C. border.

Mr. Chairman, considering the fact that you have people who have to haul grain a very considerable distance, either to British Columbia or to Hines Creek, I would simply say that notwithstanding the many strongly held views among people in the northwestern section of my riding, one matter that brings everyone together, regardless of where they sit politically, is that for a government that can spend the money on Highway 40 quite frankly there are some roads in the northern part of Alberta which have priority, at least in the minds of local people. I want to make it clear that I share that sense of priority that people give to the completion of Highway 64.

I am not arguing that over the long run there won't be some tangible benefits from the new highway south of Grande Prairie. But when you have people who have lived, not only for a generation but for generations, in a region of this province that still doesn't have a paved road, when their forefathers during the years, in some cases before World War I — these people still don't have a paved road in Worsley. We simply [not recorded] the importance of that kind of [not recorded].

I also want to emphasize the need to get under way the paving of secondary road 733 south of Wanham. Mr. Chairman, several years back we were told by the department that this particular road had high priority. For some reason, that priority has been dropped. I want to say that it is certainly the feeling of improvement district 19, the village of Wanham, and I want to underscore my view too, that this road should be proceeded with on a priority basis. Having driven over that road many, many times, the fact is that if we are going to pave part of the southern end of it — I realize that part of that is through the county of Grande Prairie and money that has gone from the department to Grande Prairie county. Nevertheless completion of 733, in my assessment, should be given high priority by this government.

Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday I dealt with the issue of privatization. Just to underscore what I said then, let me say to the committee this afternoon that there is no point in talking about deregulating private enterprise if in fact we are going to impose all kinds of rules on local governments. Surely the best way to get the best value for our dollar is to let local governments make the decisions on how this money will be used. It may be that it's patching in one area as opposed to a new road project. It may be that it is making use of county equipment or municipal equipment as opposed to farming it out to the private sector. Or it may be using the private sector.

But surely that decision is most competently made by the village, town, municipality, or county, as opposed to the provincial government coming in a "big daddy knows best" way, imposing all kinds of rules and regulations and forcing local governments to follow a preconceived course of action determined by the caucus, as opposed to the best judgment of locally elected councillors. It seems to me that if we hearken back to what this party used to talk about when they were the Official Opposition, they argued the case for a partnership with local government; they stressed the need for local government to be able to make sensible decisions on the basis of developing priorities. Mr. Chairman, I supported the position of the then opposition. As leader of another political party, I thought some of the arguments that Dr. Homer especially made in the House, when he was the Member for Lac Ste. Anne, were very persuasive.

As a matter of fact, I remember the great debate we had over freezing municipal grants at \$38 million and the arguments the government made about an arbitrary approach at the centre and all kinds of big daddy rules that we were imposing against local government. The arguments presented a dozen years ago — more than that now, 14 or 15 years ago — by the then Member for Lac Ste. Anne are equally valid today. This government wants privatization in terms of its view of its functions, where in fact it is in a position to spend money administered by the province; that is one thing. But when we are acting as a transfer agent, if you like, using public funds and transferring them for local purposes, surely it makes sense to let that decision be made by the town, village, or municipal council. If the arguments in favour of privatization are so strong, then hon. members can make the case to their locally elected councillors in their own ridings. But people came back from the convention in Red Deer and told me very clearly that they don't want to be forced into a policy of privatization when it's up to them, in their assessment, to determine what the policy will be and to make the best use of resources.

Last Wednesday the minister suggested that perhaps local governments could sell their equipment, perhaps even to the men who have been operating the equipment. Mr. Chairman, that is very nice if you have a buoyant economy. I don't know what the situation is in other parts of the province, but I certainly know what the situation is in the north for some of the private business people with heavy equipment who have gone broke. It is certainly not a sellers' market. You have municipalities that at their fall and spring conventions gave a lot of consideration to meeting with various suppliers of one kind or another to get the best possible investment, and now they have a significant inventory of equipment. Surely they should be allowed to determine how best to spend these dollars, and not get themselves locked into a policy the Minister of Transportation determines here in this committee or in this building.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the issue of urban transportation. Right now I suppose we can argue that with the slowdown, especially the fact that our two major cities are not growing any more, perhaps we can sidestep the whole issue of significant expansion of light rapid transit. I say to members of the committee that, if we make it today, the investment in modern high-speed transportation, especially in our two cities, will pay dividends generations ahead.

I think it is testimony to the prudence of the council of this city between 1968 and 1974, when a good friend of mine was the mayor of Edmonton. In the debate that took place over the first leg of light rapid transit, we had all the arguments about why we shouldn't proceed. Mr. Chairman, I predict that a generation down the road, the decision Edmonton council made and the decision Calgary made, the fact that we were able to

play a role with provincial co-operation — the decision my friend Ivor Dent made to push light rapid transit in this city in the face of strong opposition from people who opposed it at a time, I might add, when energy prices were much less favourable for light rapid transit than they are at the moment . . . One thing higher energy prices have done is to make the use of light rapid transit much more economical and much more cost efficient. When I see the systems we have in Edmonton and Calgary, I am proud of the fact that we had some local officials who took the initiative.

It is worth noting for members of this committee that the initiative did not really come from the government, from the collected wisdom, the collected thoughts, of the members of the Tory caucus over in Government House. The initiative for light rapid transit in Alberta came from locally elected officials, the same kind of officials whose autonomy we are gradually, but nevertheless in a very important way, undermining and eroding with some of the policies which are implicit in this particular budget. I offer these observations because I think they are important if we're going to properly evaluate this vital budget.

I want to say just one other thing in closing. We can talk about road transportation and about our airport program, but one thing we aren't dealing with in the Department of Transportation is the impact the change in the Crow rate is going to have on our rural road program. There's absolutely no doubt that over the long haul the decision to dump the Crow, to abandon it, is going to have very significant costs for the Legislature of the province of Alberta. I think the decision the government made a year ago was totally wrong, because it's going to lock us into the wrong way to move grain. It's going to lock us into much more trucking of grain when in fact we should be using energy-efficient rail service.

Mr. Chairman, however much I fought against the abandonment of the Crow and hope that a new Parliament will reconsider that very foolish policy, particularly now that there seems to be some evidence that the railroads are backing out of the commitments they made before the last decision by Parliament courted us with all the promises of better rail services — now all of a sudden they are reassessing their commitments, the same way they did when they got all kinds of commitments from the taxpayers for passenger service and then systematically destroyed the passenger service in the province. The railroads have a lot to account for in the way in which they have reneged on historic responsibilities.

Having said all those things and making it clear that I for one would want a new Parliament to repeal the Pepin-Axworthy legislation, the fact of the matter is that in this province at least we're going to have to look at more efficient movement of grain. More efficient movement of grain does not mean trucking grain. It doesn't mean taking grain from the Valleyview area down to the government elevator in Edmonton. It doesn't mean trucking grain 50 or 60 miles from areas north of Vauxhall to Lethbridge. Mr. Chairman, it means that we should use our common sense to make an investment in rail links where those rail links have merit. If this province is genuinely interested in the development of northern agriculture, at least at a little faster pace than we've had evidence of on the part of this government in opening up to date. I think expanding our land base should be an important initiative.

We're going to have to make sure we have in place a proper transport system to move that grain. That means we should be looking at the rail links to Dawson Creek or, as Unifarm recommended, we might even take a look at the Tumbler Ridge connection in the Peace, because we have enormous volumes — and I say "volumes" deliberately — of federal and pro-

vincial dollars invested, and a rail link to Tumbler Ridge, then out to Prince George, and thence to Prince Rupert would be an important move to save a lot of time and turnaround time for northern farmers.

Mr. Chairman, when we had the Crow rate, maybe it wasn't quite as important. But now that the Crow has gone, we're gradually moving toward user pay. We cannot lock our farmers into a system of either trucking or rail transportation, which takes grain much further than it should. It may be convenient for the C.N., who now operate what used to be the N.A.R. But with the Peace being one region, surely it makes sense for us to reach across those provincial boundaries and work out an arrangement which would lead to the investment in rail links now, which would put people to work in the short run and improve our long-term transportation in a much more significant way than airports. The minister vigorously defended his airport program — fair enough. But I'm saying that if he were to put the airport program to the farmers of the north — the Milk River-Warner airport, for example, or even the Eaglesham-Debolt airport — and contrast it with a rail link to either Tumbler Ridge or Dawson Creek, I have absolutely no doubt as to where the vast majority of permit holders sit, including, I suspect, the vast majority of farmers that support the hon. minister's party.

Mr. Chairman, apropos of that, before I close I want to say that there is one additional problem that I think needs to be raised during the estimates. For many years we've had a policy in British Columbia where the department of transportation has basically looked the other way when Alberta farmers have been trucking grain to Fort St. John or Dawson Creek. That sort of ability to look the other way and not jump on these truckers in terms of gasoline tax is something which has been beneficial both to the farmers in that part of Alberta, who have to go over terrible roads to begin with, and also to the two communities of Dawson Creek and Fort St. John. Unfortunately, as the minister probably knows, in the north Peace — not out of Dawson at the moment but out of Fort St. John — we have a department of transportation in B.C. which has found the rule book and is applying the rules, if not in a rigorous way, at least warnings have been issued. I guess that would be the most accurate way of putting it: warnings have been issued.

I hope that we could see some action undertaken by the Alberta government to make representation on this particular matter, especially since the roads in the north are not going to get the priority we'd like to see in the next several years. At the very least, it would be useful if the minister could talk to his B.C. counterpart and suggest that we go back to square one; that is, officials of the B.C. department carry on their interpretation of enforcement, which is quite all right with my constituents as long as things stay the way they were. What they don't want is the approach we've seen followed in the last few months.

Mr. Chairman, in my normal gentle, positive way, I've made a few recommendations that I'm sure my hon. Conservative friends will endorse thoroughly. I hope there will be some action, especially on some of those critical northern highway priorities.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few brief comments. First, I'd like to compliment the minister and his staff and department on the excellent job they've done since I've been elected as the member representing Drayton Valley. Transportation is one of the departments I have a great deal of contact with, and I can't speak too highly of the co-operation I as a member receive with concerns raised by my constituents.

We really do appreciate the improvements made over the past five years.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to highlight for a minute. One of the members asked me about the Transportation budget. I said, well, if you reflect the amount of the Transportation budget to 1979 when I was elected, it has tripled. So I went back and did a little bit of review of the budget estimates for Transportation. In 1976-77 the budget estimate was \$272 million, in '77-78 it was \$313 million, and in '78-79 it was \$330,979,489. When you compare that to the budget we have today, even with the cutback from 1982-83 when the estimated budget was \$967 million — this year it's \$842 million — I think one can see that we have a substantial increase in the Transportation budget. Even though we've had to cut back, with the kind of work and the quality we're getting today I'm sure we'll be able to achieve the same amount of construction as we did in 1982-83. I know we were all pleased with that.

My priority this year will be the development of the west Brazeau road and the Elk River road, which open up the area to the Pembina oil field, which, I might say, has supported this province very well over the past few years. Since that road is a right of occupation road, I think it's important that the government take a look at carrying some of the obligation of maintaining and upgrading that road.

I have one question, and that's with regard to deregulation. I had a phone call this morning from a constituent at Lodgepole who said that the bus service into Lodgepole will be terminated. I'd like to know if the deregulation decision on bussing has anything to do with the discontinuance of regular routes or if that just related, as I understood it, to charter service?

Other than that I don't have anything else to say, except that I really want to compliment the department and the minister and thank them for the co-operation I have had over the past five years.

MR. MUSGROVE: I just have a few comments to make about the Transportation budget.

First, I'm happy to see that the twinning of Highway No. 1 is proceeding and that it is on target. I have one question to ask. Is the twinning of Highway No. 1 going to be completed for the Olympics in 1988? I believe we should recognize the volume of traffic that will be on Highway No. 1 during the time the Olympics are in Calgary and in the Kananaskis.

I certainly appreciate the improvements we're getting in Bow Valley. In particular, the Bassano and Brooks airports are getting some upgrading and a section of 550 is being paved. It's a secondary road that was built some years ago by the Department of Transportation, I believe, and has been oiled for several years. In conjunction with the improvement district, part of 884 north of Suffield is to be paved also.

I would like to mention a very important piece of road that we should be considering in the near future; that is, part of Highway 36, north of Highway No. 1. I say that for some reason. Secondary road 873, between Brooks and Duchess, has a traffic volume of up to 2,500 vehicles a day. It's a narrow road with a 26-foot top and no shoulders. It has been recommended by the local Department of Transportation that the county buy right-of-way so that road can be widened and have shoulders put on because of the volume of traffic. I would like to point out that if we were to pave the part of 36 north of the No. 1 that is not paved, and also a three-mile extension on the end of secondary 544 to 36, we would reduce that volume of traffic considerably, and it probably wouldn't need to be widened and have shoulders put on.

I get a lot of phone calls and discussion about Highway 56. I believe there are 12 or 13 miles north from No. 1 that are

not paved; it's all in my constituency. Then Highway 56 is paved from there north to Edmonton. There have also been some requests, and I have received letters from people south of Highway No. 1, who feel that Highway 56 should be extended to the United States border.

One of the things that was suggested to me in a recent discussion with some of the municipal districts and counties about the minister's press release on the fact that for transportation grant money they have to hire private contractors was that we revert to a formula that was used some time ago: if the county used their own construction equipment, their grant was reduced to 90 percent. In other words, they got a 10 percent penalty, whereas if they used private equipment, they would get the entire grant.

One other thing I would like to discuss, Mr. Chairman, is that a year ago I got a petition from a group of people discussing the service road on the south side of Highway No. 1 east of Brooks, the twinned portion of it. At the present time, there is no provision for a service road on that side of No. 1, and the old No. 1 is probably about a mile away at points and then joins the new highway at Tillebrook park. If we were to upgrade it and pave it as a service road to accommodate traffic on the south side of No. 1, it would serve several really important purposes. One of them is that people staying at Tillebrook park and wanting to use facilities in Brooks would not be required to go onto No. 1. That is a fairly busy intersection and could be quite dangerous. If we could keep the people off No. 1 on their way into Brooks, we would considerably reduce traffic into that intersection. Also, the provincial horticultural station borders on that road, and so does the Brooks Wildlife Centre, which employs quite a few people. They would then not be required to use No. 1 as a method of going into Brooks. When Brooks college is built, it will also border on this service road. So I concur with what the people were saying in that petition. If old No. 1 were upgraded and paved, it would serve a very useful purpose for traffic from Tillebrook, the hort. station, the wildlife centre, and Brooks college.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister and his staff for a very good job on the budget in a year of restraint. We seem to be paralleling what has happened in previous years and, in this day and age, I believe that's a very good accomplishment.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, I think the primary reason I'm rising to speak to this particular topic is really just to thank the minister and indeed his executive assistant, who works with me very closely, for past accomplishments. To the member that just spoke: I think you and I should refer to past ministers from a long, long time ago, for the simple reason that this country has come an awfully long way in the nature of roads in the last 50 years, and you and I were here to watch most of it.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that when I entered this province in 1936, there wasn't a paved road anywhere — not anywhere. Everything was gravel, at best, and most of it was dirt. In fact it took a war before we even realized there was anything bigger than a four-horse Fresnel to build a road with. We finally decided that there are D-8 Cats and D-7s and earthmovers and Letourmeaus and so forth, and we could start building roads. Indeed, during that period, we built the Alaska Highway, which in itself was no small feat.

In the meantime, the province was growing with great numbers of people, and more demands for highways were everywhere. Of course the ministers ahead of the present minister had to work hard and seriously to get the money and equipment

to build the necessary roads that we now enjoy. The extent of our highways — just for the fun of it, I sent down to the library for a map. Of course I can't tell you the countless thousands of miles of paved road that are here, but it all has taken place in the last 50 years. It's just amazing.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

On the other hand, you can say that in places in the United States, like Pennsylvania, where I visit quite a bit, there is no road that isn't paved — absolutely none. I don't know how long that has been going on — probably for several hundred years — and the last 75, I'd have to guess, is when they started really paving roads. And they've paved them all. They've got a little weather advantage on us down there, and the frost doesn't break up their roads. . It's usually a good idea to pave a road if you can keep it paved and not have it breaking all to pieces. When we discover that part in this country, Mr. Chairman, we will probably pave all our roads and save ourselves a lot of maintenance costs at some point in time. We're forever gravelling, maintaining, and working away on our highways, whereas if you had paved roads everywhere, that problem would literally be over with except for scraping off the snow in the wintertime.

With regard to the present administration, Mr. Chairman, I'm proud to say that anytime I'm in a real bind — sometimes it's or a weekend — all it takes is a couple of phone calls to the proper spots, quick decisions are made, and progress can go ahead. I refer particularly to an auction market in my constituency that would have been shut down completely had it not been for a real snap decision on the part of the minister to grant egress — what is the word? — coming and going on that highway.

We've got a lot of needs in Highwood for improved roads. Indeed I guess I get a lot of flak with regard to how we handle our highways, our primary needs, and so forth. But I'm pleased that we're moving along pretty good, Mr. Chairman. With the co-operation of the minister, we've improved our pavement situation in the last two years; we've got really good highways running through the county. We have a dandy sign program now in progress. I'm working with most of the better towns for improvement in their signs. Of course for the MD pavement, the municipal districts work closely with our minister.

All in all, I'd have to guess that in the district of Highwood we're fairly happy with the paving program. Of course we're like everybody else; we could sure stand a lot more. But as I pointed out earlier, it's taken us 50 years to get this far, and I'm sure in the next 10 we'll go an awful lot further.

To the minister, I only have to say this much. Through my years of pushing tools, I've been everywhere from Dan to Beersheba. I've travelled every road in this province. I've hit most of them at 90 miles an hour and, believe me, they're not in bad shape. To end this particular topic, Mr. Minister, I'd like to say that I've been everywhere, boy; I've been everywhere.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think the county of Lacombe is one of those counties that does their work entirely by county equipment. I'd like to advise the minister that even though I felt we were in for a lot of trouble with his announcement in Red Deer a little while ago, it has been fairly well accepted in that county. So if the privatization part of the system can be accepted in the county of Lacombe, I think it should go across the province. Now in 1983 . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Be careful now. The sun doesn't rise and set in Lacombe.

MR. R. MOORE: I realize the sun doesn't rise and set in Lacombe. But it's the centre of the province, and so goes the rest, the two ends.

Mr. Chairman, the maintenance program last year was excellent. We never had a mile of highway in the constituency of Lacombe go behind; we maintained the level of maintenance there. We came out of that year of hold the line as well as we went into it, in fact better off I think. So again, the minister and Department of Transportation should be thanked for not allowing our highways to go behind in times of constraint.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the minister stated in his opening remarks that the practice of putting down base coat was satisfactory, and they would eventually have to pave some of these roads. That's exactly what we have in the constituency of Lacombe. We have Highway 51 that goes west from the town of Bentley to the secondary road coming north of Leslieville. For years, year after year, they put down base coat, and the next year it broke up. That road serves the entire western half of the constituency. It's a market road. It's a road utilized by the recreation people coming into Gull Lake from the west. If it were paved and maintained at a higher standard, it would also be a link from No. 2 through to the David Thompson Highway, thereby relieving pressure on Highway 12. I draw to the attention of the minister that Highway 51 goes right along with his opening statements that we need to pave these roads rather than put down further base coat.

We have another concern in the constituency of Lacombe, and that's Highway 597. We started at Blackfalds, took it into the petrochemical industries at Joffre, and ended it there. The other half of that 597 linkup from Joffre to Highway 21 remains to be done. I draw that to his attention because it's a priority to all the towns to the east of us, and it's a priority to the county of Lacombe. They've maintained it as their number one county priority in transportation for the last several years. When the hon. Member for Vegreville was talking the other night, he said, you realize that counties change and then their priorities change. Not so in this particular case. The completion of Highway 597 from Joffre east to Highway 21 remains the top priority of the county and has for successive counties. The towns of Alix, Mirror, and Stettler have echoed the need for this link to be completed so their access to the market area of Red Deer would be an all-weather type of road, rather than having to go around through Lacombe on Highway 12.

Those are the two concerns I have, Mr. Chairman. I hope the Department of Transportation will give consideration to these two points — the paving of Highway No. 51 and the completion of Highway 597 — in the months ahead and in plans for next year.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd forgotten I was on the list, but I guess since I do have a chance, maybe I'd better say a few words about the Department of Transportation.

First, I would like to say that over the last few years in our constituency, the counties, the oil industry, and the taxpayers have worked together with the government and have built a lot of roads that were necessary. An example is 564. They built 17 miles: a third paid by Sundance Oil, a third by the county, and a third by the government. The people are working together. The oil industry realizes that they use the road system and that they are responsible for its upkeep and some of its capital costs. It's worked very well in that department.

Mr. Minister, you've suggested several times that we should be privatizing some of our transportation systems. I was out this weekend talking over the privatization Bill with the MDs and counties in my constituency. They asked me to drop out and were even willing to meet with me on Sunday. They do

have some concerns on this. I believe that when we all sit down together, their concerns over this can be ironed out. I think they're willing to go part of the way; they're liable to keep some of their own outfit too. With reasonableness on both sides, I think there can be some privatization in that area.

I am also wondering if the minister has ever had his department look at privatizing the land-buying department in his area, in Transportation. With the slowdown in the oil industry, it seems that there are lots of land-buying agents in private industry looking for work. Maybe it wouldn't be a bad idea to look at that end of his department and see if he couldn't privatize that some.

I guess we have one concern in our constituency. It's not really in my constituency; the hon. Member for Bow Valley mentioned it. That's Highway 56. We would certainly like to see that paved, or at least a base coat, down to Highway No. 1 by 1985 when the museum in Drumheller opens, so that we have some type of an access into Drumheller for that very fine museum we're building, which should bring in a lot of tourists. We certainly hope we have access to Highway No. 1 by that time. We're all going to be pushing for that. As far as continuing it on down south, I think that could be done under the secondary system with co-operation from the county. It's needed for the good of our country, to get our rapeseed to the crushing plant and to shorten the distance to Lethbridge.

The hon. Member for Highwood said he's been everywhere, and I guess I'm one of those fellows who's been around a long time too. He's right when he says that we've come a long way in the last 50 years. We've come a long way in the last 10 years. Our budget now for secondary highways is much higher than it was, and I'm glad to see that.

MR. KOWALSKI: We finally got some pavement.

MR. CLARK: Yes, we finally got some pavement on some secondary roads in the Drumheller constituency, and we're making progress. I hope that in the years to come we will keep our priorities on the secondary system high. With the railroads going out, there's no doubt that we're going to be hauling farther. On my own farm, we're hauling 35 miles to market, and none of it's paved except the last portion of 56, which is about 10 miles. The rest of the county roads are in good shape most of the time and are quite able to handle the traffic. I believe this is going to be a better system than having people haul every 10 or 12 miles. I think it will help our transportation system in the rural area. It will give us roads, which we need anyway; and it will also bring more economy to our agricultural transportation than keeping all these small points open.

I think that's about all I have to say, except that I too admire the work that was done in 1942 between Norman Wells and Ross River. I had occasion to go up where they put the pipeline in the Alaska Highway over in Norman Wells, and a couple of years ago, we drove 150 miles back. That's as far as we could go, because the Bailey bridges they put in had washed out from there on. I guess it was quite a thing to have that happen in 1942. It was such an isolated place that the machinery was left there. The old trucks and everything else are still there. They're all '42 models, so you know what year they were there. They just walked off and left them there rather than transport them out, and they're still there.

Mr. Minister, I appreciate the work we've done in the past. I would like to see Highway 56 completed some time before 1985. I would like to say that in the near future we're going to have to build some type of a tourist road down the river, and I would like to see that in the next few years. But on the whole, our highway system is improving; it's improving all

through the district. Highway 1 is now twinned through almost my entire district, and I'll be glad when that project is done. I think there's one more year after this year, and it will be out of my area completely and into Tom's, if they keep it going. As the member said, I think when the Olympics come in 1988, it's going to be needed even more than it is now.

With that, I'd like to just say thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. SZWENDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's pretty hard to add any really substantial comments after the rural members have spoken, because they're all such experts on highway construction. However, I think some of us urban members may want to bring up a few points to the minister. We certainly have concerns in the urban areas as much as in the rural areas. A couple of the members have mentioned that most of the roads built in Alberta have been constructed over the last 50 years. Something Albertans don't often take into consideration is the old adage: Rome wasn't built in a day. Certainly our province has only been around since 1905, barely 79 years. Yet we've got a roadway system which is probably equal to any in Canada and is certainly serving its purpose.

Those rural guys are always looking for something, Mr. Chairman. I drive the highways, and those roads look pretty nice to me. They all seem to be leading nowhere anyway, so I wouldn't be too concerned about the urgency expressed by many of the members so far in the debate.

Mr. Chairman, just a few quick points to the minister. First of all, on behalf of many of the truckers who are located in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont, I'd certainly like to offer my appreciation and thanks to the minister for the wise and considerate moves he made in the policy affecting truckers, particularly gravel truckers, and their employment in Alberta. I think it was causing undue mental hardship for many of the truckers, and I think the problem was in perception rather than with the situation as it existed. Since the announcement by the minister, certainly many of my truckers are feeling much more comfortable in the belief that they have an equal opportunity to contract or to do the work for government.

On the matter of roads in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont, we've had some excellent roadway connections provided in the last few years. I think all Edmontonians, especially in the north end, appreciate the widening of 97th Street. More important is the construction of the Yellowhead Trail, which is really an extension of Highway 16 through the city of Edmonton. However, I think the minister is quite aware that the total construction of that roadway has not been completed. In the constituency of Edmonton Belmont particularly, there are some traffic snags caused by the heavy volume of traffic going on the Yellowhead Trail and the arteries feeding into it. Most specifically, Mr. Chairman, it's the 82nd Street and the 66th Street entrances onto the Yellowhead, where you have a lot of trucks trying to get on the freeway. We call it a freeway; I don't know if the city of Edmonton allows that. I think they changed that to expressway or something less offensive. But we call it the Yellowhead Trail. I would like to ask the minister if any consideration is being given to providing proper entrances and exits on 82nd and 66th streets to alleviate the traffic congestion which occurs quite often and has in fact resulted in a number of traffic accidents.

The other area I would like to raise for the minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, is the completion of the Capilano freeway. Again, I don't know if the city of Edmonton allows me to call it a freeway. I think they've changed the name a couple of times, but I still refer to it as the Capilano freeway. The Capilano freeway does a beautiful job of connecting south Edmonton with north Edmonton, except for the fact that it

hasn't been completed. People going from south to north race up that freeway and suddenly find themselves in the middle of the old Canada Packer's parking lot. From there they have to turn either left to 82nd Street or right to 66th Street and again tie in with the regular heavy volume of traffic. I was wondering if the minister could indicate what contingency plans or program he has in place in order to complete the Capilano freeway through north Edmonton. I believe it was originally designed to connect with the Manning freeway, thus allowing complete and free flow of traffic from north to south.

With those brief words I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments with regard to light rail transit in the two cities of our province. The minister — I don't have to tell him — has recently been approached by the city of Calgary to try to speed up the program. I want to make a couple of comments and maybe ask a couple of questions with regard to light rail transit, particularly in the city of Calgary, which I am familiar with. I say I'm familiar with it, because I was on city council at the time the decision was made to proceed with it in the first place.

MR. MUSGREAVE: You voted the wrong way.

MR. OMAN: There is another member over there who was speaking and just missed out on that by a few years, because he came to this august body a little prematurely. Of course we missed his good counsel on the council, but we seemed to get along as well as before, some way or another.

In any case, to be serious, I recognize that as the city of Calgary went into it, it was warned by the province that it should make the first leg — from the south into the city — an experimental leg and take a couple of years to evaluate that, which has now been done. I think we're aware that that has been a phenomenal success as far as ridership is concerned and has taken the pressure off particularly Macleod Trail to the south of the city.

The city made application to the province for expansion of its other two proposed lines, one going northwest and one northeast. Again, I'm going over old ground when I recall that the one to the northwest was shelved because of a conflict with the community of Hillhurst-Sunnyside. So they proceeded to the northeast. I personally thought that was a mistake, because it made a lot of sense to go north to some of the more common day uses such as the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, the Jubilee Auditorium, the North Hill Shopping Centre, the university, and so on. It's certainly true that the system would be much more efficient in the sense that if one takes the LRT downtown from the south end, he has to transfer to a bus system to get to either the northwest or the northeast.

So I agree with the concept, I guess, that once you have started a system, it's going to be hard to stop it. I suppose that would be true of both Edmonton and Calgary. I think the question now is only one of timing, not "if". I say that with some reservation, because the one thing that worries me about public transportation and perhaps particularly light rail transit is the operating cost. I don't know if the minister has any figures to indicate what the operating cost would be for the city of Calgary if it had a full-blown system.

I recognize that the city of Calgary itself has done a study and indicated that the cost of moving a passenger per mile from the south end of Calgary downtown by way of light rail transit is cheaper than by the traditional bus system and, obviously, much faster. However, I don't think that takes the whole picture into account, because in a city like Calgary, which is not a concentrated or highly dense city, you have to have two things

in operation which are now there; that is, a large parking lot or several of them around LRT stations where people can park their cars and take the train downtown, or you have to have a bus feeder system. I don't think the cost per passenger per mile that was quoted took those costs into account. I suspect that, all things taken together, it would find the operating costs relatively high unless we can build up concentrated apartment nodes around the LRT stations.

Of course the other thing that's a factor right now is that the growth projections for the city are not what they were a couple of years ago. Therefore perhaps the need as far as urgency is concerned isn't quite as great as it might have been.

The Calgary transportation authority made a study, and the study which was conducted under the minister's immediate predecessor indicated that if the cities are going to have a full-blown system, the likelihood is that the province is going to have to get more into the operational side. What I'm wondering is whether or not the province, as it looks down the corridors of time, say, five to 10 years, feels that it can afford to get into this, because I'm rather persuaded that the cities by themselves could not afford full-blown LRT systems across the board.

With those unanswered questions, I don't know if the minister can shed much light on it. But I think they are ultimately important, because in most projects the capital costs are not that important; it's the operating costs. I think we've seen that in the construction of new hospitals, and I'm sure this is another one. Public transportation has never been very cheap.

On the other hand, if it is ultimately true that those systems are going to be completed, I guess I have to ask myself and the government: does it not make sense to enter into completion at this stage, particularly when we have great need right now in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary for construction activity? Because we have been so oversupplied in the area of building particularly, our construction people by way both of those who are employed and of companies is sadly sagging. It seems to me that the city of Calgary makes a good point that inasmuch as contracts that would be let now would likely come in far under their original estimates, it makes good sense to do it now. Because of high unemployment and high lag in the construction industry, we should take effect of that. It would help the economies of our two cities.

So, Mr. Chairman, all other things being equal, if we can answer the question of the operating deficits, which are unquestionably going to come, and settle that as a policy, I think I would be in favour of looking favourably on the city of Calgary's request to speed up the LRT systems. I don't think the argument of the Olympics is a good argument, because we know they can handle the movement of people for some 10 days to two weeks in another way. It doesn't justify building a full-blown system on the basis of the Olympics alone. I guess it does provide a springboard or a target at which to aim. I would appreciate the minister's comments on some of these things.

I should ask one thing before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Some members of Calgary caucus met representatives of both the separate and public school systems' boards of education. One of the complaints or difficulties under which they are operating is the increasing cost of transportation for pupils within the systems. They are only able to recover something like a third to 45 percent of their operating costs from the present grants coming through the Department of Education.

One of the questions raised was whether or not we ought to be considering a global grant rather than separate ones from Transportation and Education. That ought to be lumped into one system and the city of Calgary, as the city of Edmonton,

ought to be considering more favourably, rather than hiring private school buses or the case, whether that might not offset some of their operating costs. The more people you have on a bus, generally speaking — and they're somewhat off hours, a little bit off peak hours — would help the system in its operating deficits. So the question really has been raised as to whether or not we ought to consider that in one block rather than two blocks and see if we can get a little more co-operation between the provincial government, the cities, and the school systems.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, in my earlier remarks I made reference to the Capilano freeway ending in the middle of Canada Packers' parking lot. That was an error, and I'd like to correct it because a constituent of mine has quickly brought that to my attention. The Capilano freeway ends in the Bums' parking lot. For the benefit of *Hansard*, I'd like to make that correction.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, some of the comments that are made regarding transportation, whether roads are more important in the rural part of the province or whether upgraded streets are more important in the cities, sometimes reminds me of the old story of the city mouse and the country mouse, the city mouse feeling that he was far more important than his country cousin but then, getting out to the country, realizing he wasn't nearly as self-sufficient as he thought he was or as he was within his own environment. Roads and transportation policy across our province are very similar. The roads that are used in the rural areas are not simply used by those that reside in the rural areas. On the weekends we see a very large percentage of our urban counterparts travelling on rural roads to recreation properties and stamping around Alberta. We have to remember that tourism is the third largest industry within our province, and roads facilitate the development of that industry.

I would like to say how pleased I am with the progress we've made, particularly within the last five years. We have paved and developed a very large number of roads within the constituency I represent, St. Albert. The pressure has been removed dramatically from the road system that was there previously that was not adequate. The progress is really remarkable, and I would like to express my appreciation to the minister and to his department for the consideration that has taken place.

Within this current fiscal year, the minister has announced the improvement of Highway 2 from St. Albert just north of secondary Highway 635, which will be a four-lane development of that roadway that the minister has said on a number of occasions is busier than Highway 16. This is going to be very welcome to those people that travel this highway daily and to the commercial transportation that uses Highway 2 north.

One suggestion or comment that I made some years ago was regarding lay-bys on some of our busier highways to facilitate the movement of traffic past slow-moving vehicles. I am wondering if there has been any consideration for the development of a third lane or a lay-by, which is less expensive than the upgrading of an entire highway — particularly Highway 28, which I know is slated for improvement sometime in the future — particularly in the summer months when there are a large number of weekend vehicles moving. The hazards that build up are, in my opinion, often caused by some vehicles moving very slowly, other vehicles or other drivers becoming frustrated and maybe taking chances trying to get past the buildup of a very large number of slow-moving vehicles. I would appreciate any comment on what has happened to the suggestion of lay-bys.

I would like to compliment the minister on the tremendous amount of work that his department has done to develop our province as a whole, urban and rural dwellers. We are all the beneficiaries. I want to thank him very much for the work within our constituency.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments and basically four general questions in four general areas. First of all, I don't think it's any surprise that this is one department where we were trying to help the minister out from time to time, suggesting that he needs more money. We see this as an important department in terms of stimulating the economy, when we have a huge unemployed. When we get into public works, Mr. Chairman, we still maintain that now is the best time to do many of the things he has to deal with, like roads and LRT, in terms of putting people back to work, and it is the cheapest time to do it. The minister is well aware of our proposals there.

I will make a couple of general comments and ask some questions. First of all, to deal with the LRT, I know that in the budget we are not to expect much more. In fact we have actually had a decline over the years in how much we are prepared to spend, and we are told it is because of restraint. I am sure the minister would like to update us, if it has not been brought up. I happened to notice a story today in *The Calgary Herald* about a meeting that he had with the mayor. The mayor seems to be very happy, very positive. If the reporting is correct, he is very encouraged after a positive meeting with provincial Transportation Minister Marv Moore to discuss the \$100 million Calgary needs to build the LRT. I take it that part of that discussion had to do with advancing \$3 million to \$4 million for the engineering work that must be done, and of course it had something to do with the Olympic deadlines. Perhaps the minister could fill the Assembly in on this very important meeting. Along with that, I would ask the minister — I understand that Calgary has specific problems getting ready for the Olympics. Is the same sort of discussion going on with Edmonton about perhaps an advance of something to do with engineering works, or is this just particular to the Calgary situation?

The other area I want to ask the minister about is that in the past there has been some discussion by some top people in his department, one person in particular, about the advantage of using lighter-than-air balloons. I saw a proposal, and I know the minister is aware of it, specifically dealing with construction equipment. Some people even went as far as to say that they could be used for passengers. Is the government doing any feasibility studies on this? I know it has been advanced to the minister a number of times.

The other area I want to generally look at, which I think perhaps the minister has alluded to in the past, is to see if there are any studies going on for the high-speed corridor rail plans between the two major cities, Edmonton and Calgary. Are there any studies going on or any thought that we might move in that direction of having the LRT, the beds upgraded, and centre to centre of the city, instead of having airplanes that take a lot of fuel and inconvenience. I know it's not going to happen overnight, but are there any plans in that direction?

The fourth and last question I would like to ask the minister is, I suppose, a philosophical question. We have had many debates in the House about seat belts. I understand there is a split in the caucus about it, if my information is correct. But at this point the government has decided that basically it's a matter of individual freedom to decide whether to buckle up, although the government advertises and encourages seat-belt use. We know that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care

has complained a lot of times about the high cost of medicare. We know that seat belts save lives; they also save money in the long haul. Seeing as we haven't gone the route of making it mandatory — I know we have had some discussion about even doing it for children. I believe we have heard this minister and perhaps other ministers say that we will use education instead. We will educate the people to the need to use seat belts, that this would be desirable in saving both lives and money. If we are going to use education instead of making it mandatory, my question is: why has the Department of Transportation's 1984-85 communications budget, Vote 1.2.5, been cut by some 30 percent? It seems to me that if we believe in seat belts and believe we have to go the education route, this is perhaps where we might do it. I would ask for the minister's comments on that specific question.

Mr. Chairman, with those few comments in four general areas, I will leave that with the minister. Thank you.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, a number of areas have been covered this afternoon. I will not take up too much time, but I would like to highlight a few items for the minister.

I have mentioned it before, and it has to do with the Dawson Bridge corridor. It was a political issue in the last civic election; and the citizens are concerned with regard to how the traffic is being channelled into the city from Strathcona county and Sherwood Park, along the Baseline Road, north on 50th Street, and west along 106th Avenue. The Dawson Bridge improvement is considered a vital factor in terms of increasing the volume of traffic along this neighbourhood. They are concerned that if there was support for improving the Dawson Bridge, the present traffic flow through a neighbourhood community would increase to the extent that it would destroy the community as they have known it.

Likewise on 50th Street, towards the southerly part from the Baseline Road to Sherwood Park freeway, the dangerous goods route is a concern to the people in that particular area of the city. They've been promoting the idea of rerouting the dangerous goods route to 34th Street which, as a result of the new annexation decision, is now the boundary between Strathcona county and the city of Edmonton. With the easterly leg of the Whitemud freeway and the Sherwood Park freeway channeling traffic up 50th Street, they're looking at possibly going through the industrial area so that the carriers taking products from Refinery Row could use 34th Street. That would probably mean that 34th Street would have to be upgraded somewhat, but it's a question as to whose jurisdiction it is. Does 34th Street fall within the confines of Strathcona county, or does it belong to the city as a responsibility? I would like to know if any representation has been made by either jurisdiction with regard to 34th Street to allow the big carriers to move in this direction.

Mr. Chairman, the third item is still with 50th Street. Residents have been trying to obtain some attention from the city fathers in order to get some noise barriers, because the increase in traffic flow certainly has made a noticeable change in this regard. Since they have proven very effective in other parts of the city, through provincial co-operation with the city, they're wondering if this could be given some priority, because 50th Street has certainly become a major artery in the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, I guess my underlying concern is that if there is to be any funding with regard to these projects, I would appreciate being consulted before, so that there is an awareness as to what's happening and how things could be prioritized with regard to funding for the traffic problems of that area.

The twinning of Highway 16 has been mentioned before. I don't know if it was a reconsideration from the announced

cutback or if twinning is now proceeding maybe at a reduced pace from what had been anticipated as a 10-year program. Certainly I see evidence of work being done, and it is greatly appreciated. I think the Yellowhead route is very vital for the transportation of goods and services for the city of Edmonton. I'm sure the hon. gentleman sitting in the Chair would also recognize that as being very important for his constituency.

With regard to LRT, it has been brought up in terms of Calgary. I would just like to know from the minister where we are with the next leg of Edmonton's LRT. It's my understanding that submissions have been made with regard to the extension of the leg from the Corona station to Government Centre. Has anything come forth with regard to that?

With those very brief comments, Mr. Chairman, I await the responses from the minister.

MR. LEE: Mr. Chairman, I'll just address a few succinct remarks to the minister and congratulate him on the extent of his budget. There's no question that \$631 million is a significant achievement by any minister for any project, and I think it's a credit to the minister's ability to bring forward the priority of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, when I address this particular area, I think it's important to stress the importance of balanced transportation for an urban community. By "balanced" I mean an adequate combination of both public and private transportation, because in many respects an urban transportation system is very much like two rails of an LRT system, it requires one rail being the public sector — buses, LRT, those components — and the other rail being the private sector. We should recognize in the city of Calgary the importance of private transportation. Despite the economic times of late, the city of Calgary still has the highest rate of automobile ownership of any municipality in North America. I think that's significant. Calgarians truly love the automobile.

Mr. Chairman, there is a new love affair taking place right now, and I'm sure the Minister of Transportation has recently become keenly aware of that. The city of Calgary has fallen in love with its system called the C-Train. They've even created their own name, the C-Train. I think it's an attractive name; it's a fun name. It reminds us of the old song. Take the A-Train. Well, in Calgary we have the C-Train. Six years ago, as I was elected to the city council of Calgary, I'm not certain I could have said there would have been a love affair. There was a great deal of concern and skepticism by the taxpayer, the potential user, about the utilization of the system. But we've seen a tremendous response since the system began. If we look at the number of passengers carried during Stampede time alone, it's an indication of the tremendous capacity of the system.

I address my remarks to the Minister of Transportation with respect to funding particularly for the northwest leg, as my colleague mentioned earlier. Mr. Chairman, it's estimated that this particular leg would cost \$100 million. The city of Calgary is asking that the partnership between the province of Alberta and the city of Calgary to fund this project continue. The key ingredient for the successful completion of this project would be the continuance of the present public transit capital grant of \$25 million a year through to and including the year 1991. So we're not asking for the creation of a new capital grant program. We're simply saying, take the program that's been successfully in place for the past five years and continue it through to 1991.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of building this project is not excessive when we compare it to the original estimate of three years ago. In fact it looks like there's a potential benefit, a saving, of some \$30 million because of the recent changes in the labour



scene, particularly the changes in the cost of land acquisition and the cost of labour.

It's estimated that in order to complete this project in time for the 1988 Winter Olympics, the city of Calgary would require interim financing of \$2.5 million in 1985, \$6.6 million in 1986, and \$8.9 million in 1987. That's for the construction engineering costs. The actual capital expenditures would be \$5 million in 1984, \$49 million in 1985, \$30 million in 1986, and \$16 million in 1987.

What are the advantages of proceeding right now? If we look at the area that is of course of great importance not only to all Calgarians but to all Albertans, this project would create 1,600 direct man-years of employment and over 2,000 indirect man-years from other sources as well. Potentially 3,600 man-years of employment are related to this project, Mr. Chairman. There is of course the importance of the unique destinations necessary for this extension. Over 15,000 full-time students at the University of Calgary and the research park at the university would have an opportunity to utilize this extension; 13,000 full-time students plus an equal number of part-time students at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology; the Jubilee Auditorium, an extremely successful project undertaken by the government of Alberta, 3,000 seats; and McMahon Stadium, soon to be expanded to 50,000 seats. Mr. Chairman, clearly there is very strong evidence that the extension of the northwest LRT would bring the current two legs and this system together. We would in fact have a system.

I was on city council when there was a proposal to change the alignment from the northwest to the northeast. I must say I wasn't very enthusiastic, because it was evident to me, as to some of my other colleagues, that we ought to proceed with the northwest leg first. The city of Calgary in its wisdom chose not to. Now we have an opportunity to complete the system. I think we should look at this as a system. Without that third leg, we're simply not finished building this system. It's necessary to have all three legs in place at least to complete it.

What about market conditions, Mr. Chairman? I'm sure the minister is aware of the benefits that are taking place in the construction of anything, any road system, in the province of Alberta today. It's estimated that as a public project, the cost of construction at this time would take advantage of prices 70 to 80 percent of previous levels experienced in the city of Calgary. Since we're talking about a project that is going to be servicing and in fact is going to be a legacy to the city of Calgary for the next hundred years, here's a tremendous opportunity for us to grasp a temporary advantage in the economic situation and build the project substantially cheaper.

Mr. Chairman, extension of the northwest line for the downtown core would realize additional ridership of over 40,000 trips per day. I know the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill raised the question of the efficiency that would be brought about. With an additional 40,000 trips a day, we would see 120,000 trips on all three lines. In other words, one out of four Calgarians per day, given this ridership, would be utilizing the system — a significant factor to be considered in terms of the efficiency of public transportation.

Mr. Chairman, what are the long-term benefits to the city of Calgary? Clearly, when the decision was made to proceed with LRT, a deliberate decision was made not to proceed with the \$250 million capital expenditure project for roads. If in fact the city can proceed with northwest LRT, it can defer the need to widen Crowchild Trail at a substantial cost. The cost of the free-flow interchanges and the ramps would be significant. Clearly there would be the preservation of the quality of life within the inner city. Many of the inner-city communities are looking forward to the advantage of an LRT extension as an

alternative to widening the freeways that threaten the stability of their current neighbourhoods.

Thirdly, there would clearly be a giant step towards a balanced transportation system: a system to the south, a system to the northeast, and a system to the northwest. Finally, a significant long-term legacy would be provided to all the citizens of Calgary, in fact all the citizens of Alberta. I think in some terms we look at LRT as just a system that is an advantage to the urban dweller. But how many of our neighbours from rural Alberta drive into southern Calgary, park their cars at the large parking lot, and take LRT downtown so they don't have to fight the traffic or fight for an opportunity to find a parking spot?

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the minister's attention the importance of the relationship of this project to the 1988 Olympics. If we were to look at this from a strictly engineering point of view, I think it could be said that Calgary could host the Olympics quite adequately without the extension of LRT. We could utilize our existing bus system; we could borrow buses from other municipalities in Alberta and British Columbia. But here is an opportunity for Calgary to become a showcase to the entire world, and all of Calgary will be on show during the Olympics.

MR. SCHMID: Alberta.

MR. LEE: How will we be able to explain an LRT system that services the southern part of Calgary, where very little related to the Olympics takes place, services the northeast part of Calgary, an important part of our city but clearly where no major portion of the Olympics takes place, and yet we haven't completed the leg to the very part of the city where the major focus of the Winter Olympics will take place — the University of Calgary and McMahon Stadium?

Timing is of the essence in terms of building the project in time for the Olympics; timing is of the essence in terms of taking advantage of the current economic climate to save the taxpayer significant amounts of money; and timing is of the essence in bringing together the city and the province to finalize and complete a showcase project that all Alberta can be proud of.

To the minister, Mr. Chairman, I ask for comments in terms of the timing of the construction and the completion of this project. I would ask the minister if he would care to comment if he accepts the deadline that June 30 is in fact the final time frame in which a decision could be made. Secondly, I'd like to ask the minister if he would care to comment on the appropriateness of not just a meeting between the minister and the mayor but perhaps a joint meeting between Calgary caucus, the mayor, Calgary city council, and the Minister of Transportation. Perhaps by all of us getting together and putting our heads together, we can look at some other financing options that may be possible, other than just what is being proposed presently by the city of Calgary. I for one would like to look at the possibility of the Olympic Organizing Committee participating in the financing of this project. They now have a commitment from the federal government for \$200 million; they have a commitment for the sale of the TV rights for some \$330 million. Perhaps there could be some role for involvement by the Canadian Olympic Association or the local organizing committee as well.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the interest that the current minister has taken in this project. I must say that I'm encouraged by his remarks privately, and I look forward to his response to the questions I've asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister like to conclude?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments. First of all, there have been a number of very good representations with respect to various projects that members would like to see the Department of Transportation undertake, complete, or start. All rural members have received from me a listing of the projects which are planned for the 1984 construction season. As well, some of you are aware — in fact I've made public a number of programs wherein we are planning on rebuilding or building a highway over a period of years. Examples are the twinning of highways 1 and 16 and the construction of Highway 40 and the rebuilding of Highway 21 and so on.

For the balance of the comments with respect to construction work that members would like to see undertaken, Mr. Chairman, I trust that it's sufficient for me to take those as notice of what should be in the budgetary estimates for 1985 and to squeeze the odd one in if our construction expenditures allow for it during the current year. I would like therefore to dwell more on some of the policy comments that have been made by members with respect to a variety of areas.

First of all, the Member for Cypress asked about negotiations between the city of Medicine Hat and decisions with respect to the twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway through Medicine Hat and Redcliff. My information is that the city hopefully has ironed out the difficulties with the local business community and is in the process of presenting a new plan to my department for the construction of Highway 1 through Medicine Hat. I should also advise that we have concluded that that highway can be constructed on the current alignment through Redcliff, and I hope we'll be making progress in 1985 on that particular part of the twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway.

In terms of comments made by other members, I only want to briefly mention a couple that were made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Highway 64 from Worsley to the B.C. border was completed last year to a gravelled stage and is an excellent highway for the traffic that is currently utilizing it. Obviously, many people would like to see it paved. First of all, though, we have to complete the base coursing and paving to Worsley corner on Highway 64 from Hines Creek, and hope to be able to do that at least by the end of the 1985 construction period. The base coursing should be completed this year, but then there's still final pavement remaining.

The Member for Drayton Valley mentioned bus service into Lodgepole. We did not make any changes with respect to scheduled bus services except to require that the major carrier, Greyhound Lines, seek approval from the Motor Transport Board for the abandoning of any lines, and that before such abandonment occur, the Motor Transport Board have a procedure for advertising that may or may not, depending on the interest, result in public hearings. I'm advised that the current passenger level from Lodgepole to Drayton Valley on that section of Greyhound's route is under one passenger per day each way, so there needs to be some concern as to whether or not we can insist that that route stay in place. Obviously, Greyhound Lines is in a position where they have a responsibility, a very great responsibility, for providing service on routes that are not all that lucrative at times, because they have almost a monopoly position, if you like, on the rest of the good routes in this province, which they have been provided for under terms of the Motor Transport Board legislation, which requires anyone else to show cause why they should be awarded regular scheduled runs on the same lines that some other bus company is presently providing.

If I could just move briefly to the matter of — the hon. members for Edmonton Belmont and Edmonton Gold Bar and some other hon. members made reference to urban transportation matters. Perhaps I could deal with Edmonton and Calgary a bit separately, in terms of the issues, first of all with respect to the overall urban transportation program. As hon. members know, that program expires at the end of this fiscal year. It was a six-year program. We have not yet been able to conclude discussions and decisions with respect to a program beyond this fiscal year. I hope to be in a position by this fall, if not sooner, to announce what we will do beyond the end of this fiscal year. It is therefore difficult, if not impossible, for me to have a crystal ball and say what might happen to 1985 construction.

I can say this: it would be my present intention, if we do have a continuation of the program, to continue it on much the same basis as we have in the past. That is, it is the responsibility of the city administration and the mayor and council to make a decision with regard to where those funds are expended. This province did not suggest that they should be spent on LRT or on arterial roads or any other aspect of their particular transportation network, with the exception of the major continuous corridors, which was a separately identifiable project, constructing the Deerfoot Trail in Calgary and Highway 16, the Yellowhead Trail, in Edmonton. The balance of the funding, however, was largely a decision of city council.

It's therefore difficult for me to answer the questions about what we're going to do on certain streets or avenues that fall outside those two major continuous corridors and within the city, although I have taken note of the hon. members' requests and I'll try to have my staff get some comments from the city administration as to exactly where they're at with respect to the matters that have been raised by a number of you: 34th Street and 50th Street in Edmonton, the 82nd Avenue-66th Street interchange as well.

I want to speak about the situation with regard to the comments that have been made to me by the mayor of the city of Calgary and some members of council that I met with last week. Very simply, we're in the same position there as we are with Edmonton or any other city. We have a program that is ending at the end of this fiscal year; there's been no decision on a new one. I advised the mayor and his council of that fact. However, I did suggest that we should be looking at their deadline of June 30 on the basis of what's required after June 30.

My brief discussions on that indicated that largely \$3 million to \$4 million — I'm not certain of the figure, of course — of engineering had to go on this summer, throughout the course of July, August, September, and October, in order to keep the LRT northwest line project in Calgary on track so that it can be completed prior to the '88 Olympics. As other members have recognized, I don't suggest that that's a priority for the Olympics only. But if you're going to construct it and are going to proceed on some time frame that is imminent, it may as well be completed before that event. I did discuss with the mayor the possibility of the engineering work being carried out, at any rate, and wait until October or November for a final decision. If it was positive in terms of funding, it could go ahead. If it was not positive, the engineering could go on the shelf — it isn't going to be wasted — and pulled down again when the funds are available to proceed with that project. So that's where we left that, and I said I would get back to the mayor by the end of June with respect to further discussions on that matter.

If I were the Member for Calgary Buffalo, particularly if I were a member of that council, I too would be seeking an explanation for the reasons why a council proceeded, without

funding and without knowing how they were going to finish a project, to do two legs of it and leave one important one out. I will leave it to those members of that council to provide the reasons for history. Perhaps they're better equipped to do so than I am.

If I could move to a couple of comments by the Member for Edmonton Norwood, I think I've referred to the matter of LRT in Calgary already. The matter of lighter-than-air ships is still one that's under active consideration. There is some considerable interest outside of Canada in developing lighter-than-air ship factories in this country, and there are still some discussions going on. I believe there is indeed a great future in that area, particularly for freight movement and to gain access to more remote areas of the province, with heavy equipment and that sort of thing. While some people sort of scoff at the idea that there could be something in lighter-than-air ships, there very definitely is a technology there that could fit one mode of transportation that probably could be utilized in Alberta a great deal more than most provinces, because with our oil and gas industry in particular we need access to almost every square mile of this province.

High speed rail between Edmonton and Calgary, Mr. Chairman: in my view there is very little validity in a high speed rail system at the present time because of the number of passengers that would have to be moved to make that economically viable. The member may wish to raise it under the Department of Economic Development estimates, as that department has undertaken a study, the results of which were partially made public, I believe. The minister may be able to elaborate on it.

My concluding remarks, Mr. Chairman, are in terms of seat belts. The last time I surveyed the Conservative caucus on this matter was a few months ago, and they appeared at that time to be almost bang on with public opinion. Slightly less than 50 percent favoured mandatory legislation for everyone, and some were undecided. That's about what we get from surveying the public across Alberta.

The matter of mandatory child-restraint legislation to protect children, particularly those five years of age and under who are riding in automobiles, gets quite a different reaction, both from our caucus and from members of our political party, as was evidenced by our recent meeting in Calgary, and also from the general public. The attitudes run from 80 to 95 percent or more of the public being in favour of some mandatory legislation with regard to children riding in automobiles. I'll be guided to some extent by the discussions we have in our caucus before presenting any legislation in that regard to the House. I have no doubt that in some form, it is necessary to ensure that there is more protection for children riding in automobiles.

Mr. Chairman, I think those are the major matters that were addressed by members. I'll just close by saying that I appreciate both the representations and the comments that have been made with respect to the good working relationship that many members have with the staff of Alberta Transportation.

MR. MARTIN: Just one question flowing from the discussion of seat belts. I've seen advertisements by the department before. If you're not going to make it mandatory, the line has been that we'll educate the public. My question was specifically: there seems to be a cutback in the publicity budget of the Department of Transportation; I wonder if that would affect the amount of education that will be going on in terms of using seat belts for adults as well.

MR. MOORE: Hopefully not, Mr. Chairman. It's my view that if we were to come to a conclusion in this Legislature that there ought to be mandatory legislation with regard to child

restraint systems, that fact, that legislation, that enforcement, that advertisement, would probably do more to get adults to buckle up than the current programs we have in place. Those current programs are going to continue at a fairly good level. The reduction in that particular section of the department's vote doesn't have directly to do with the advertisement that was going on with respect to seat belt wear.

#### Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$186,809
1.1.2 — Deputy Minister	\$313,114
1.1.3 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Engineering	\$223,214
1.1.4 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Regional Transportation	\$295,845
1.1.5 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Administration	\$114,636
1.1.6 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Urban Transportation and Planning	\$126,873
1.1.7 — Legal Services	\$53,783
1.1.8 — Special Projects	\$126,295
Total Vote 1.1 — Executive Services	\$1,440,589

1.2.1 — Computer Services	\$6,547,727
1.2.2 — Equipment and Supply Administration	\$1,578,450
1.2.3 — Finance and Administrative Services	\$3,155,094
1.2.4 — Personnel and Management Services	\$1,205,141
1.2.5 — Public Communications	\$245,676
1.2.6 — Purchasing Administration	\$262,888
Total Vote 1.2 — Administrative Services	\$12,994,976

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$14,435,565
--	--------------

2.1 — Program Support	\$34,772,775
2.2 — Improvement of Primary Highway Systems	\$248,129,800
2.3 — Improvement of Rural-Local Highways	\$136,000,000
2.4 — Financial Assistance for Rural-Local Highways	\$35,238,600
2.5 — Maintenance of Primary Highway Systems	\$72,229,851
2.6 — Maintenance of Rural-Local Highways	\$18,863,027
2.7 — Apprenticeship Training	\$3,393,265
2.8 — Rural Resource Roads	\$38,129,596
2.9 — Pavement Rehabilitation	\$45,000,000
Total Vote 2 — Construction and Maintenance of Highways	\$631,756,914

Total Vote 3 — Construction and Operation of Rail Systems	\$9,645,000
---	-------------

4.1 — Construction of Airports	\$9,485,405
4.2 — Maintenance and Operation of Airports	\$2,374,759
Total Vote 4 — Construction and Maintenance of Airport Facilities	\$11,860,164

5.1 — Transportation Planning and Research	\$6,619,403
5.2 — Highway System User Services	\$10,805,586

Total Vote 5 — Specialized Transportation Services	\$17,424,989
6.1 — Program Support	\$824,570
6.2 — Financial Assistance — Capital	\$137,000,000
6.3 — Financial Assistance — Operating	\$19,300,000
Total Vote 6 — Urban Transportation Financial Assistance	\$157,124,570
Department Total	\$842,247,202

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. Government House Leader, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again:

Be it resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, for the department and purposes indicated. Transportation: \$14,435,565 for departmental support services; \$631,756,914 for construction and maintenance of highways; \$9,645,000 for the construction and operation of rail systems; \$11,860,164 for construction and maintenance of airport facilities; [17,424,989] for specialized transportation services; \$157,124,570 for urban transportation financial assistance.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Government House Leader, I move that when the members reassemble at 8 this evening the House be in Committee of Supply and that the Assembly do now adjourn until the committee rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Acting Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:27 p.m.]

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

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**  
(continued)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

**Executive Council**

**1 — Executive Council Administration**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a number of ministers who have responsibilities for the various votes. If someone has specific questions regarding a particular vote, perhaps they could ask those at the time that vote is called.

Are there any general comments anyone wishes to make at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, normally the Premier leads off. Would he like to do so?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, I have no comments on Vote 1. I'm prepared to answer any questions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear that things are in such great shape that we don't have a leadoff report on this particular vote. But as we deal with this vote, I think it gives us an opportunity to deal with a number of issues that are important to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I may raise some technical questions relating to the ministers as we come to their particular responsibilities. But when the questions deal with overall government policy, I think the place where those matters should be raised is quite appropriately during the estimates of Executive Council and, in particular, with respect to the estimates of the Premier.

Mr. Chairman, tonight I'd like to offer some general observations first, and then perhaps we can get into detailed discussion. Before I do that, I'm sure I can have the concurrence of members of the committee as I introduce two people. I'll introduce them, and I ask that they stand and be recognized by members of the committee: Chief Bernard Ominayak, chief of the Lubicon Band, and Mr. Larry Ominayak, a band councillor. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery; I ask that they stand at this point and receive the applause and welcome of the members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I'll be dealing with a number of issues relating to the Lubicon Band in a few minutes time, but I certainly wouldn't want this opportunity to pass without offering some observations on four other items: our health care system, the question of some frills that could well be delayed, the matter of jobs, and the issue of how we appointed the deputy minister of Executive Council. Then I want to deal with the Lubicon question.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might begin by talking for just a few minutes tonight about the health care system. I raise it under the Premier's estimates deliberately, because the policy of this government is a policy for which the Premier himself must be ultimately responsible. When we get to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, we'll ask detailed questions on this hospital or that hospital, this program or that program, but the issue of this government's approach to health care is appropriately raised under this particular estimate.

Last year my colleague and I made it abundantly clear that we are unequivocally opposed to user fees and extra billing. What I think is important now is that we have the federal Parliament moving on important legislation that has the endorsement of all three national political parties. Under the terms of that legislation, those provinces which permit user fees or extra billing stand to lose a lot of money. We had the suggestion last week in the House that in the case of Alberta, our potential loss would be \$14 million to \$20 million. That's with respect to extra billing. But if we have the introduction of user fees, the total loss to this province could be close to \$60 million.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you and to members of the committee that when I hear member after member poor-mouthing it in this House about social programs and when we had the Minister of Social Services and Community Health come in a year ago with a policy to cut back on shelter allowances for lower income people because we have to try to make our dollars go as far as possible, I ask what possible legitimate reason would command a government which is apparently in financial trouble to risk the loss of up to \$60 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think the dubious privilege of paying up to \$20 a day for a stay in hospitals is worth that kind of loss, especially when we have yet to hear, other than a tub-thumping speech to the Tory convention in Calgary, any compelling arguments as to how user fees are going to keep hospital costs down. We have the suggestion in the budget speech, the suggestion in the Speech from the Throne, and a lot of rhetoric in this House that user fees are already keeping costs down, yet according to the government's own admission we have no hospitals adopting user fees at this point. If no hospitals are adopting user fees, how is it possible to rationally argue at all that user fees are keeping hospital costs down.

In actual fact, Mr. Chairman, the government's position on this issue is not supported by the people of this province, it's not supported by the Alberta Hospital Association, and it's not supported by people in the health community. What concerns me is that hospital boards faced with the serious funding problems which exist right across the province, may well have to introduce user fees during the course of this fiscal year. But as they do that — and the Premier should know this — we are then going to face the prospect of losing a large amount of money from federal transfer payments. That makes absolutely no sense at all. I don't care how excited the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or the Premier get about preserving provincial rights; on this issue the people of Alberta do not support the Tory party. They do not support the Premier's position. He may feel very happy that he has the support of a few delegates in the city of Calgary at a Tory convention, but let me tell you that as those delegates go back to their respective constituents, they will know that user fees are not accepted by the vast majority of Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, I think the proof of the pudding is in the position one sees taken by the federal Conservative party. All of a sudden, when the issue of the Canada Health Act came before the House of Commons, Mr. Mulroney, who more than anything else wants to be Prime Minister of Canada — exceeded only by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry wanting to be Premier of Alberta — suddenly became, at least in public, a champion of the national health Act.

Mr. Chairman, what I thought was interesting, however, the other day . . . [interjections] I always welcome a few comments from the Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. MARTIN: He had his chance to debate today.

MR. NOTLEY: I wish we'd had an opportunity this afternoon to deal with his comments.

Nevertheless, it's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that here you have the federal Conservative Party becoming latter-day converts to medicare. During question period in the House the other day when my colleague asked a question about medicare, we had a very interesting observation from the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. That observation seemed to imply that with a new government, Alberta would be able to carry on with user fees and extra billing. I specifically put to the front bench, and to the Premier in particular, whether there's any private arrangement with Mr. Mulroney when he comes

to talk to those \$100-a-plate fund raising dinners or \$200-a-plate or whatever fund raising dinners cost, whether or not there's a private understanding that should the Conservatives win the next election, they'll champion the cause of medicare before the vote and then quietly make a little arrangement after the fact to allow extra billing and user fees to become part and parcel of the whole system. I think that's going to be the kind of question that will be raised over and over again in the next few months, and appropriately so.

Mr. Chairman, a little while later tonight, my colleague will be discussing some of the frills. It always amazes that when we have cutbacks in people programs, bread and butter programs, we've got all kinds of money for frills. That will come a little later.

I'd like to deal with the issue of jobs. We've got all kinds of members in the House tonight chattering away. Here we have 150,000 of people out of work. That's no smiling matter to the people who are out of work, Mr. Chairman. That's not a chattering matter to the people who are out of work. They expect some sort of action from this government and all they've got to date is a lot of rhetoric about privatization but no clear-cut program at all as to how we're going to stimulate employment in this province. We have objective indicators, the Conference Board of Canada, pointing out that while there may be some recovery in other parts of this country, there's certainly not going to be any recovery in Alberta. On major proposals, proposals that at least one would think could command some attention by the government — whether it be heavy oil development, the coal proposal of the United Mine Workers, opening up new agricultural land, or even programs which would forestall bankruptcy proceedings against so many of our small businesses — we have a government that is studying the matter, that is waiting, that is not taking any clear-cut action or stand.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that for a government that talks incessantly about the private sector being the engine of recovery, the fact of the matter is that under Conservative government in this province in 1984 that engine is stalled, and there is no effort to even turn on the ignition switch. But before we do that, we're going to have to recharge the battery, because there's not much hope of getting the car started otherwise. In addition to the impact of encouraging private-sector job creation, we're not doing anything in the public sector. In fact we're backing off; we're going to be creating more unemployment in the public sector.

I suppose there are some people in this province who would like to go back to the 19th century, back to the days when we had unregulated private enterprise. I remember in one of the first speeches I made in this House in 1972, I drew attention to the fact that, like it or not, we have a mixed economy in this province. A mixed economy is based on a recognition that there must be a vibrant and effective private sector, but there is also a legitimate role for the public sector. All we're doing in this budget, Mr. Chairman, is cutting back on the public sector. We're cutting back in a way that will simply create more unemployment. In the case of secretaries who are laid off the temporary services of the government and will have to go to private agencies, where they will get lower wages, what we'll be doing is opening the grounds for more profit by middlemen but not creating extra employment at all. I say to the members of the committee that Conservative members may like to ignore that; they may be oblivious to the impact of it, but Albertans are not oblivious. For the first time in 13 years, Albertans are beginning to ask themselves whether or not this government represents their interest anymore. More and more and more, a larger number of Albertans who have traditionally supported the Conservative Party are coming to the conclusion

that maybe the time has come to change their political allegiance.

Tonight I'd like to move from there, Mr. Chairman, and discuss two issues that I think need to be properly evaluated in this House. One issue is the question of ethics in government, and the other issue is whether we are really committed to human rights and fairness. Maybe the Premier and Tory members would rather talk, but I think Albertans want to hear where we as members of this Committee of Supply stand on these two issues.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let's deal with the question of accountability, with the question of making sure that when people are selected to positions of importance, a proper evaluation of their merits and of the pitfalls of their appointment is undertaken. We all know the controversy that has surrounded this government's handling of the Dial Mortgage affair. I intend to raise some of the details of that particular issue when we get to the Attorney General's estimates. But let me say that last summer, when Mr. de Rappard was appointed deputy minister of Executive Council, if the Premier was not aware that he was under investigation, he should have been. Someone should have made that information known to the Premier.

In our system, members of the committee, myself included, are obliged to presume innocence until guilt is proven. The fact that charges were not laid ends the particular matter in terms of what Mr. de Rappard can or cannot do as a deputy minister, but it does not end the proper debate over the Premier's method of appointment. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to simply allow the estimates of Executive Council to slide past without saying bluntly in this House that I'm not prepared to accept the answers we received a few days ago, when questions were put to the Premier, that somehow normal police records checks on possible appointments of senior deputy ministers are wrong. And I challenge the Premier of this province to debate his policy anywhere, not only inside this House, where it's 75 to four, but outside this House.

Mr. Chairman, last summer in the federal House of Commons, we had an interesting situation where Prime Minister Trudeau had appointed a gentleman from Newfoundland to the cabinet. It was discovered afterward that there had been an investigation of that particular member for tax evasion. When he discovered the investigation had occurred, Mr. Trudeau, to his credit, asked for that minister's resignation. The difference between the position taken by our Premier and the caucus members, who applauded with such gusto, and the federal Conservative Party is put rather well on page 2765 of *Hansard*. The hon. Allan Lawrence, Durham-Northumberland, a member of the Conservative Party, a former member of the Clark government in Ottawa, raises this question.

Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. A necessary ingredient of the many factors to be considered prior to a Cabinet appointment has been, among other things, a police check and tax check of the potential appointee and a searching verbal examination of the candidate by the Prime Minister himself. These are essential to the integrity of Government and the morality of the whole system, I suggest.

Mr. Lawrence is absolutely right, and Mr. Lawrence is a Conservative. He's a federal Conservative, Mr. Chairman, but he's right. But when we raise that suggestion, somehow we are led to believe that it's a great violation of civil liberties. We're not appointing someone who's going to run a liquor store someplace. We're appointing one of the most important advisors to this government, a deputy minister of Executive Council, one of the most important deputy ministers one can select.

I don't agree with the Premier's position. I've argued with this during estimates of Executive Council in other years, as I recollect. I don't agree with his position on elected members and a code of ethics. But at least elected members have the stamp of approval of the voters. Senior civil servants, who are crucial in developing any government's overall policy, are not selected by the voters. I really wonder on what possible basis we can sit back in this committee and say that potential members of the top echelons of the civil service are not to have something as simple as a criminal records or credit check done. Conservative members can argue the case of civil liberties if they choose, but not too many civil libertarians are going to take that very seriously — maybe one member of the editorial board of *The Edmonton Journal* but, apart from that, no one of much credibility on the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I look at the conflict of interest certificate which was proposed on August 7, 1979, by Mr. Clark when he was Prime Minister of Canada, outlining a series of strict guidelines, a certificate that prospective appointees would have to sign: ministers and staff members and senior deputy ministers. I think members of the committee should reflect carefully upon two points. This is the thing the individual has to sign. If hon. members wish a copy, we would be glad to give them one, because I'm always interested in the education of the Tory caucus.

Furthermore, I certify that I am in compliance with the Guidelines, and

1. I have no contractual or property interests of a business, commercial, financial or other nature that could conceivably be construed as placing me in actual, apparent or potential conflict with the duties of my position

OR

2. In particular, I am in compliance with Guideline 6 which requires me to disclose to the Minister "all business, commercial or financial interest where such interest might conceivably be construed as being in actual or potential conflict with my official duties".

Mr. Chairman, I won't upset the Tories too much by adding a ministerial statement made by the Prime Minister on the same matter. But for the edification of members of the Legislature, let me point out that in the province of New Brunswick, public service employees, including senior civil servants, have the option of signing a conflict of interest statement. The statement includes assurances that the employee does not have financial holdings that would be in conflict with the employee's position. The government of Saskatchewan asks in the interview of any senior civil servant, including deputy ministers, if there is any potential conflict of interest, investigation, or financial holdings that should be known before the individual is hired. In the province of Manitoba — members may like to dismiss this because it's an NDP government — there is no security check, but all government employees, including deputy ministers, must sign a conflict of interest statement.

Mr. Chairman, I raise these points because I don't think it is good enough to say that all potential candidates for the deputy minister's position are honourable people, and therefore we don't need to protect the public interest. When people are appointed to a position of public trust, and a deputy minister is in a position of public trust, there must be a proper evaluation of anything that might prejudice their ability to serve the public as a whole. Again, we're not dealing with minor officials. We're dealing with people who make and shape the policy of government.

Mr. Chairman, it always amazes me that it takes a long time to push this Conservative Party along the road to reform. For many years the Conservative Party resisted any kind of disclosure on the part of candidates seeking electoral office. Finally after Mr. Camp, the former president, served on a commission with a number of other distinguished Canadians, including the former leader of the national party I happen to represent, M. J. Coldwell, we came out with the Camp commission report, and we saw a recognition, slowly but surely, that the public has some right to know who is putting up the money for candidates when they seek office. That's reasonable. It was argued against at first; there were all kinds of arguments presented 20 years ago. It's accepted today. Candidates may not like it very much, but it's accepted today.

Similarly, the kind of simple approach that I suggest, that other provinces have instituted, that the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark insisted upon when he was Prime Minister of Canada, that Allan Lawrence has so eloquently raised in the House of Commons over the Simmons appointment, that kind of approach which protects the public interest is well overdue in this province. I say to the Premier: while you may not pay much attention to a tiny opposition of four, on this issue the people of Alberta do feel that some protection should be afforded them in the appointment of people whose judgment affects their everyday lives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes tonight to deal with one of the most important policy issues that relates to the question of fairness. That's the issue of Lubicon Lake. When we get to the estimates of the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, we may have detailed questions. But I put to the Premier of this province a request to show some leadership on this particular matter. Let me just take a few moments of the committee's time and give you some background. This is not a new question. This matter has been plaguing the people of Lubicon Lake for more than 40 years.

Just after the Second World War broke out, the first proposal of a 25 square mile land transfer to the people of Lubicon Lake was made. But for a thousand different legal reasons, the kinds of legal reasons that frustrate our aboriginal people, one thing after another delayed any decision. A quest for simple justice which started more than a generation ago got stalled numerous times.

The first time I had an opportunity to go to Little Buffalo was in 1981. I had a chance to meet with the chief, who is here tonight and who I'm sure would hope that if we don't show any courtesy to members of the opposition when we discuss this issue, at least we would show courtesy to him and his colleague on the band council. Perhaps we might just set aside the kindergarten atmosphere for a few minutes and show courtesy to them, if not to the four of us.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, during those 40 years one legal barrier after another was thrown in the way. When I had a chance to meet the chief in 1981 and get a little bit of background, I discovered something about the government's so-called land tenure policy, the two-acre lots which were being offered. The people of the band didn't want the two-acre lots. They were worried that if they accepted the two-acre lots, it would jeopardize their land claim. And can we blame them for being worried about their land claim being jeopardized, after honestly searching for 40 years and running into bureaucratic roadblocks? Not all of them were the province of Alberta's fault, but at least some of them were the province of Alberta's fault.

When I was there I also learned a little bit about the Lubicon Lake people. As one of the isolated areas of this province, it was a band that recognized the value of living close to nature.

Some of our sophisticated city members may not realize that there's some intrinsic value in living close to nature, in hunting, trapping, and fishing. They were and are a proud people and have every reason to be proud.

Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we raised a number of questions in the House; so did the then Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Member for Little Bow. The government argued that the land tenure program should proceed, that all was well, that there was no attempt to jeopardize the land claims. In the meantime, however, we have the report prepared by the World Council of Churches. Whether one agrees with everything in the report or not, there are some very serious allegations made in that report about the way in which the land tenure program was undertaken by this government.

To his credit, Ombudsman Ivany is looking into those allegations, so I won't deal with them tonight. But I want to deal with the larger issue of the land claim question. I want to deal with it specifically under the estimates of the Premier because it's my assertion that the Premier himself should become directly involved in the issue. Comments have been attributed — I don't know whether fairly attributed — to the minister with respect to his position outside the House and whether or not, once a validated land claim is made, land transferred should not include the mineral rights. With the Premier here, I want to make it clear that no one in this province should be under any misapprehension about what the facts are.

The legislation of 1930 that the minister commented on in no way, shape, or form gives the government any basis to suggest that a land claim settlement should not automatically include mineral rights transfer. It is the position of this government subsequent to 1977 that they are questioning the mineral rights transfer. But, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the facts you find there have been a number of cases: the Janvier Band, the Chipewyan Band, the Bigstone Band, the Slaveys of Upper Hay River, the Sunchild Band, the O'Chiese Band, the Little Red River Band, and the Tall Cree Band. Some 233,000 acres have been transferred since 1930, which have included the transfer of the mineral rights. I can go over each of these transfers individually and will if members wish, but I think the point simply needs to be underlined. Since the Act, we have transferred land pursuant to that Act, and we have also transferred oil and gas rights. The only thing that's exempted is silver and gold. But mineral rights, oil and gas, have been transferred.

Why then, Mr. Chairman, do we have this holdup? Why do we have a provincial government that is not prepared to at least act on Mr. Munro's suggestion of a 25 square mile interim settlement? After all, that's the proposal that was made 40-some years ago. Why are we not at least prepared to move on that and include the mineral rights? As I look over the information, I can only assume that what is really at stake is the money. If it isn't the money, then I think we'd better have a response, not from the minister but from the Premier, as to what it is. Mr. Irving — backbenchers may not be aware of this but most Albertans are — whose Conservative credentials are impeccable, has acted for the province, and the former minister of Municipal Affairs even referred to him in one of these letters as counsel for the province on the issue. In one of the documents, Mr. Irving itemizes the wealth in that particular area and cites a figure of a \$188 million loss if we don't keep the mineral rights. Mr. Douglas used to say: when somebody says that it isn't the money, it's the principle, you always know it's the money. I can't help but think that one of the reasons we have this dragged-out process is that there is a lot of money at stake.

The reason I said that I wanted to deal with fairness tonight is that it is easy to be fair, Mr. Chairman, easy to back the

Human Rights Commission, easy to take popular stands when you're dealing with the protection of powerful people or with the interests of popular people. The test of fairness, though, is not in protecting the strong, who can look after themselves, it's protecting those who maybe aren't in that strong position. The reason the church people have become concerned about Lubicon — and it's not the concern of a tiny group of militants; it is a concern that goes much deeper than that — setting aside some of the issues of rhetoric which have got in the newspapers, is the simple question of fairness.

Mr. Chairman, I say to members of the committee that the Premier of Alberta has to get involved directly, not simply leave it, with all great respect, to a rookie cabinet minister. What we need is action to deal with a problem that has been festering for 40 years, that has attracted the legitimate concern of people who are interested in ethics and morality, what is right and what is wrong.

In the question period the other day the hon. minister suggested that when the bishops were touring the north, the reason they were almost run off the road is that there is a rule in the north that when a big vehicle comes upon the small vehicle, the small vehicle gets off and then the big vehicle pulls the small vehicle out of the ditch. And all the members pounded with enthusiasm. But I talked to the chief. It is an interesting thing about that vehicle. The vehicle the chief was driving, in which the bishops were present, was his van. The oncoming vehicle was not a large truck but was a pickup. A week ago the chief told me that the other vehicle came directly at his van and forced him to go into a tailspin on the road.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to bog down this important debate in what happened in a particular accident. But I want to reinforce and underscore for Albertans and for members of this committee the issue of settling the question honourably and quickly and not allowing a thousand more red herrings to be dug up by ingenious lawyers to prolong even more a just settlement.

I want to say one other thing. There is a lot of money at stake; there's no question about that. Mr. Chairman, if we can transfer 233,000 acres of land pursuant to that legislation, with the mineral rights — the old Social Credit government did it — then I say to members of the committee, why the change today?

Mr. Chairman, I have a good deal of confidence in the integrity of Ombudsman Ivany, and I am sure the specific complaints will be properly investigated. But what is important for this committee to consider is not what happened, lot by lot, in a particular example of a land tenure proposal. What we have to consider at this juncture is how we move forward to make sure there is a just and equitable solution, one that recognizes the aboriginal rights of the people of a very remote part of our province. I say without exaggeration that, in many ways, the way in which we respond to this issue, Mr. Premier, will be considered far more carefully by the people of Canada and civil libertarians around the world than the way in which we respond to your much publicized commission, the Ghitter commission, which I support incidentally. I don't want to have any question about that; I support the undertaking of that commission. But I want to make it equally clear that the way we are perceived in terms of our commitment to equity and fairness is quite properly going to be determined by whether we are prepared to move quickly and honourably in dealing with the concerns of the Lubicon people.

MR. MARTIN: I was waiting here with bated breath for the Premier. It's one of the few times we happen to see him in the House. I thought he'd have some important words to give us

in terms of the economy, Lubicon Lake that has just been raised, a number of issues. Before we go rushing through the votes, I for one would like to hear from the Premier. I would like to sit down and hear from the Premier on these issues. If not, I will proceed with some questions. But I would like to hear his stand. I'm sure he has some very important things to say about the issues that have been raised.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I welcome any questions the committee wants to direct my way.

MR. MARTIN: In that case, I'd be glad to, because we'd love to see the Premier participate in the House. I'm sure the Member for Little Bow would like to hear from the Premier too.

As I say a few general comments. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is typical of the attitude of this government. Most people come in and tell us a vision. One of the few times he's in the House, the Premier should give us a vision, and he sits there while most of the other people sit and talk and look around. There are important things to discuss, and I know the Premier is well aware of this. As I say — many people not even listening, turning their backs and looking around — I don't think this is what Albertans expect from this body at this time. I for one get a little tired of seeing this particular attitude.

I'll go through three questions. To begin with, the economy: has the Premier recently looked at the Canadian Mental Health study about the social implications of high unemployment and what unemployment does to people? Has the Premier looked at that?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't seen that study or a particular reference to it. Unless there's a question that perhaps the hon. member wants to raise directly with it, there's no comment I could make. I'd be happy to take it under advisement.

MR. MARTIN: That's nice. I'm glad the Premier will take it under advisement. It's a rather important thing that's happening in this province right now with this city having a 15.1 percent unemployment rate. I think we should see what we are doing to people when we say that we're going to sit around with the economy, that everything is going great and everything is wonderful. I think we should be looking at some studies to see what is going on, and that's the point I'm making.

I refer a whole report to the Premier, because the policies and decisions that are made in this body are affecting what the employment rate in this province is going to be. We in this House have tried from time to time to talk about public works, to get on with that job, to put people back to work. But no, we can't do that; that's big government. We went through the private sector; they're not prepared to do anything there. We hear about an economic resurgence plan that never comes about. These are the questions that people want to hear about. If this government knows people that are unemployed, then the Premier is well aware of the despair that's out there right now. If he's not, he'd better get away from some of his advisors and go out and see what is really happening. There is example after example after example of social breakdown.

Let me ask another direct question, because I'm sure he likes to stay on top of things. Is the Premier aware of the social cost accounting of unemployment? There is a study by Mr. Deaton on it. Has he looked at the Social Planning Council study on any of the economic effects of unemployment? I ask the Premier that.

MR. LOUGHEED: It's not a study that has come to my attention that I could respond to in any specific way.



MR. MARTIN: I would think that it would be. My next question: I notice that \$528,000 is spent in the office of the Premier. I ask the Premier: how many staff does he have and what do they do?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, if you want to go into detail of the people that are involved in my staff, I'd be happy to do that. The people working in my operation involve the executive director, the secretary to the executive director, a research officer, four people in the correspondence section, the executive secretary, who handles my scheduling, and two secretaries that work with me.

MR. MARTIN: My next question to the Premier is: who is the person that advises you on important issues of the day? Because if you haven't heard of studies like this, that are relevant, you'd better fire them.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can of course take his own view of what studies are or are not important. The advice I get comes through Executive Council, and he has his opportunity to get his views in the Committee of Supply, as we progress through the estimates.

MR. MARTIN: My other question to the Premier. This is obviously a waste of both our time because we're not going to get answers. But I suggest he might want to look at this book, take it home sometime and read it. It might be good for him; he might have a little more compassion about what's happening in the province at this moment.

To look into the whole aspect of medicare, we've heard a lot of rhetoric from this government about the need to cut back expenses. We've tried many times to show the frivolous spending that's gone on in this government. Before they start giving us the rhetoric about cutting back, when I went through the budget, department by department — I won't bore the Premier, because of course I'm sure he reads *Hansard*; well, I'm not sure anymore — without any difficulty at all we could have cut half a billion dollars in frivolous and useless spending out of there. We've even tried to advance suggestions in health care to the minister. We've tried to say that there are ways to cut back and still keep a better health care system. You don't need user fees; you don't need extra billing. If you do, look at some possible things. Is the Premier aware — he's been doing a lot of talking about medicare, certainly made it a keynote speech when he was speaking to a bunch of well-heeled Conservatives, where everybody was cheering — has he taken a look at other ways we could cut back on some of the costs of medicare? For instance, has he looked at the whole aspect of community clinics? Does the Premier know anything about community clinics? Have his people, his high paid staff, looked into that at all?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, we're in the process of reviewing a number of alternatives. That of course is why the budget provides the improvement in home care, which I think is a very important element in terms of trying by way of preventive health. I'm sure the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care would be prepared to discuss any suggestions the hon. member has during the course of his estimates.

MR. MARTIN: There are many other ways, and I hope the Premier does talk to his minister. If he wants to look at seat belts — I know that's too politically hot for his government. We understand some people like it and some don't; they're taking polls, and they're not sure if they might lose a few votes.

We know that would also save a lot of money. We also know that we have the highest institutionalization rate in the country, far ahead of anybody else, for senior citizens. That costs a lot of extra money. We also know there's a report out on fees for surgery. Even doctors are questioning that there may be a lot of unnecessary surgery produced. We also know that there are unnecessary hospitals around.

My point to the Premier is: as leader of Executive Council, what budgeting process has gone on? Has there been zero by zero budgeting right across each department to look at new ideas? Surely, as the Premier, that should have been one of the things that was set out to each department. It's not that we're not spending money; we're spending a lot of it. It's the priorities of where we're spending it that we want to know about. How did that final decision come? Does Executive Council make those decisions?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, again it's a matter of the alternative ways to constrain health care costs, and I'm sure the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care will be prepared to go into it in detail.

MR. MARTIN: It seems to be the Premier that has been doing most of the talking about medicare, but maybe that was just to whip up the troops a bit at the Tory convention. But one confusion I am having: on the fight to keep user fees — that progressive move by this government to keep user fees and extra billing — the Premier said in question period that was \$14 million to \$20 million. We're seeing new figures now. My question to the Premier: has the Premier talked to his minister recently, and can he update those figures?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, yes, I did have a discussion with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care about that \$14 million to \$20 million that was an estimate of cost with regard to the matter of extra billing. Obviously there was no estimate of cost with regard to hospital user fees, because there aren't any hospital user fees, as yet anyway, instituted in the province.

MR. MARTIN: Are there any other figures that he's been talking about? Surely in your discussions, when you're making him fight Ottawa — we're going to make this a major issue. As the Premier said at the convention, you're not just going to fight without knowing the ultimate price tag. Surely you must have a budget as to how much that is going to cost in five years. If not, I would say it's pretty irresponsible to be fighting over something when we have no idea how much it's going to cost us in the future. How much is the minister projecting in user fees? He must have some idea what's coming about.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I don't think he is projecting any particular amount — and you'll have to take them up with him in the course of his estimates — because we believe the hospitals in this province are adequately funded. We do not believe that hospitals should require user fees. If events occur that require any particular hospitals to go above the very generous budget that's been provided and put on user fees, yes, that will be an element of penalty under the Canada Health Act, but it's certainly not something that we're estimating today.

So there's a clarity on the matter, the question the hon. member asked me in the House a number of days ago about the estimated cost, I said \$14 million to \$20 million a year. I was referring to an estimate of what that would involve in terms of extra billing. There's no amount involved in terms of the

estimate for hospital user fees. It's the position of the government and of the minister of hospitals that there is not an intention to forecast that. It is our view that hospital user fees should not need to be placed or instituted by any particular hospital clearly because we feel that the provision of financing to hospitals is adequate.

MR. MARTIN: There seems to be some debate about that, because we now hear new figures from the minister of hospitals saying it could be up to \$58 million in the future. So I think the two of you better get together and start discussing it in a little more detail.

I'd like to come back to the economy. There is a lot of despair; that's the point I'm trying to make. That's what is so frustrating in trying to deal with this government, and that's why people are frustrated right now. This is what I would expect when Executive Council, the most powerful person in this province, comes and talks to us. People are waiting to hear. What message can you give at this moment to the over 150,000 unemployed? That's official. What message do we give them? What message do we give to young people, who carry a much higher proportion of unemployment? Right now, when we're having quotas at institutions and all the rest of it, it's probably one in four in this city. What hope can you give them? This is what people want to hear from the Premier now and what I'd hoped to hear today. What message would you give to these people right now?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, it's the same message we've presented on a number of occasions. As concerned as we are with regard to people on unemployment, I think the saddest thing we can do is give them some expectation that the problem is going to be resolved by governments, or by governments coming out with massive spending programs. That's not going to work.

Our view of where the situation is at the moment in this province is clearly this. We believe the unemployment situation in this province will continue at or below the national average. With regard to unemployment in this province, we believe we will continue with the position of having more people employed in relationship to the population than any part of Canada. And that's very important. We believe what we're facing — and there's no easy way around the situation — is that we had overbuilding, particularly in construction, of office buildings, commercial buildings, and apartments. That overbuilding partly created an in-migration of people from other parts of Canada. That abnormal in-migration, together with the overbuilding in construction, is a situation we're going to have facing us for some period of time. And that's a reality.

In terms of jobs and opportunities, they're going to come from the private sector. As the budget speech points out, there is a multitude of situations and circumstances in which primary industry and other industries in this province are clearly in an area of recovery. Subject to the variables that are mentioned in the budget speech, we believe 1984 will be a year of recovery. We note very clearly in the budget speech that the unemployment rate will continue at about the present rate for a period of time. But we look again at the targets of what we're looking at, and that target will continue to be that the unemployment rate in this province will be either below or at the national average in Canada.

MR. MARTIN: You may excuse me, Mr. Chairman, if there are a number of groups that don't agree with you. It seems the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier are the only optimistic people.

Yes, I think there are things that could be done to turn it around. If we had the doers here that the Premier used to talk about, I think we'd get on with doing it rather than sitting there waiting for a private sector that's not going to diversify. We don't have a diversified economy. All we've got at this moment is oil and gas, and they're not going to invest when the price of oil and gas is low. How does the Premier think the private sector is going to invest? When I talk to them, they're not going to invest in this province in the next little while unless the price of oil and gas goes up. That's the reality of it.

We can talk about overbuilding. One of the reasons there was overbuilding is that instead of letting the private sector move on with the job in the boom time, we were competing, building buildings all over this province with government money. There were overruns — \$1.2 billion out of the heritage trust fund — that were going on it. We were competing with the private sector in the worst possible times, in the boom times. Now when we could use some of those public works to put people back to work, we refuse to do it.

Mr. Premier, I think there's only one group that can be blamed. It was easy enough to take credit when times were good and everybody was rushing out to vote Conservative, but at least there should be some admittance now that they made mistakes. But, no; I see business as usual. We have the strongest economy; we quote participation rates, which the Premier and the Treasurer well know mean nothing. All it means is that we have a younger group of people generally than in the rest of Canada. That's all that means, which probably makes it worse.

My questions — and I have to do it; I'd just like to say this to the Premier; this is what is bothering people now, sort of an Alice-in-Wonderland attitude, we'll just wait; and about unemployment; the tragedy that it isn't.

I point out — I now brought the book here: *Unemployment, its impact on body and soul*. They go through study after study, Mr. Premier. They talk about a police study in Toronto in 1980 that showed that out of 100 wife beaters, 80 percent were unemployed. In the U.S.A. in 1980, a study showed that unemployed people had a divorce rate seven times higher than employed people. Windsor: unemployment soared to 20 percent. I could go on. They know that for every 1 percent rise in unemployment, you end up with more people in mental asylums, more people commit suicide, and more people are put in prison.

The point I'm trying to make is that there's a social despair factor. We end up paying the economic costs of that much later and in much greater detail. We don't save money. It's a short, silly policy, if I may say so, because we end up paying a horrendous cost, Mr. Premier. The social and economic costs are probably — at this point we're losing billions of dollars directly out of the economy in terms of people not having purchasing power and in terms of paying it out in welfare and unemployment insurance, which nobody wants, plus all the social things we have to pick up. This is why this makes no sense to people at all. It may make sense to people at a Tory convention, but it doesn't make any sense here.

We can go on and on. I know the Premier will just stand up and talk about the participation rate and all things that don't matter to people. But I would say this to the Premier: there are a lot of people out there who are now, for the first time, looking around at this government. It's easy to govern when times are good. As a Conservative government, I know they're making choices. They're spending a lot of money; it's where they're spending it. I for one get a little annoyed when I see the leader of our province come and sort of flippantly sit there and not come up with any new answers or any message at all to people. I think that's wrong. I think this government's going to pay

for this attitude, and I for one am going to work hard to make sure that they do pay for it.

The other question I have follows up from my colleague. I would like the Premier to tell us about Lubicon Lake, where he sees the land claims. I'm sure he's talked to the minister over there. We know that minister doesn't have any power. We know the power is right in you. What is being done in Lubicon Lake right now? What are you going to do? What is this Premier going to do to solve some of those land claims?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, just to correct a false impression by the hon. member, the decisions we make in our government are made by consensus. As the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs has noted, in due course we will be assessing the presentations made as to whether or not there is a validated land claim. When we do, we'll assess our response to that and the nature of the terms and conditions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question, if I could. Could the Premier first of all tell the House, since apparently he wasn't aware of this unemployment study, whether or not he was made aware of the economic impact analysis of a potential interim injunction in north central Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of the document the hon. leader is referring to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's presented here during the legal wrangling that took place. Perhaps we could ask the Premier, given the fact that mineral rights were transferred in the cases of the Janvier Band, the Chipewyan Band, the Bigstone Band, and the Slaveys, the Sunchild, O'Chiese, and Little Red River Bands, why was there a change in policy on April 27, 1977, that in no case would mineral rights be transferred along with surface rights when entitlement lands are granted? What prompted the government to change what had been a long-standing policy — 233,000 acres of land with the mineral rights? Why was that changed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, my recollection of that is that it was a policy we discussed with regard to land claims. We looked at the history of how land claims were considered and validated. It was a matter of decision of the government at that time but, as the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs has said, it's not a matter that we're fixed on. It's certainly a matter that is under review, and we're prepared to consider arguments on both sides of that question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that would be nice if it had just been a matter of discussion over a few weeks, but this took place on April 27, 1977. That's seven years ago. A few weeks later we brought in legislation retroactively, removing the right to file a caveat on unpatented Crown land. My question is: when the government for its first six years of office had apparently been governed by the policy of the previous administration, which was to transfer mineral rights, why was that changed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, it was the view of the government of the day — and I think that has been expressed in *Hansard*, although obviously I don't have that document in front of me — that that was the decision the government was taking on native land claims. As I said, we're prepared — and I think the minister has made that clear — to consider that as a matter that is under review by our government, as we consider this land claim that's been raised here tonight and others.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the Premier, we're not talking about the fact under review. We're talking about something that in the case of the Lubicon people has dragged on now for 40 years. We had a policy. That policy changed. I'm asking the Premier why the policy was changed. There had to be a reason other than an assessment at the time, whatever that means. What was the reason? Was the reason the money?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the *Hansard* document in front of me. From memory, the basic reason it was taken at that time was that we took the view that native land claims at that time were a matter of negotiation, and the issue therefore was a matter of negotiation. Hence we looked at it in terms of assessing the surface rights differently from the mineral rights.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the question I would put to members of this government, and to the Premier in particular, is that the long-standing policy had been for the first — what would it be? — 47 years since the legislation, that the mineral rights be transferred. If the matter was then subject to negotiation, mineral rights separate from surface rights, what discussion did the Premier have with Mr. Irving re the Lubicon case?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I've had no discussions with Mr. Irving.

MR. NOTLEY: What instructions has the Premier given the minister — and, since we're dealing with a policy that's been in place for the last seven years, not only the minister but the ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, you'll have to raise that with the Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not raising it with the Minister responsible for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would seem that a number of the questions being asked could more properly be directed to the minister specifically responsible for those types of things.

MR. NOTLEY: With great respect, on a point of order. When we get to the minister, we'll ask specific questions the minister can handle, but it certainly would not be fair to ask a current minister — as a matter of fact, there's even a rule that we can't ask a current minister to report on something that a former minister had responsibility for. We can, however, ask the one person who is constant to this whole little drama, and that's the Premier. I'm not going to ask Mr. Bogle. I'm not going to ask Mr. McCrimmon; he's not even in the House. The one person who is in the House, who was here in 1977 and is here today, is the Premier.

I want to know on what basis this policy was developed and what instructions the Premier gave or what discussions were given in terms of dealing with outstanding land claims and, in particular, this claim.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I have no knowledge of any such instructions that were given by me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, then what we have here is a bottleneck over a policy on April 27, which now says that in no case would mineral rights be transferred along with surface when entitlement lands are granted. If nobody has discussed

this with the people affected, how can this government have any credibility at all? Did the Premier delegate this minister or his predecessors to meet the chief sitting in the gallery to discuss this policy? We obviously have a change of policy. We're not going to be negotiating it band by band. I think that's a completely ridiculous way of doing it, I might add. But even if that's going to be the policy, one would think that we would at least dispatch the minister to sit down with the people and say, this is the policy.

Was there ever any formal communication with any of these bands where land claim questions are at stake?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't have any direct knowledge of the nature of that communication. He'd have to take it up with the ministers involved. We have a committee of cabinet responsible for native land claims that's chaired by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. The Minister responsible for Native Affairs plays an important role on that committee.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, frankly that isn't an adequate answer at all. I'm not sure if the present minister was even in the House in 1977 — I think he was elected in 1979; I could be wrong — so I can hardly expect him to respond in this House to a decision that was made in 1977. Mr. Premier, I find it unbelievable that we are taking a position that says we are going to negotiate totally different packages for different bands. I just find that unbelievable. Here are all these other bands who have got their mineral rights. How in God's name are we going to be credible at all with anybody, when we say: from here on in it's going to depend on your skill as a negotiator? What kind of policy is that? What kind of policy is that when we don't even send someone to meet with the people to tell them that's the policy?

Mr. Chairman, no wonder the federal government doesn't take our position very seriously. I doubt that a federal Conservative government would either. But far more important — I don't care what the federal Conservatives or federal Liberal government, the politicians in Ottawa, think — I'm concerned about the people who are affected by this. I'm just amazed that we have a policy where we're now going to negotiate mineral rights separately from surface rights, but we don't even take that to the people in question. Open government, Mr. Chairman. What kind of open government is that? I think that's just astonishing.

The Premier has indicated that the subject is now open to review. What do we mean by that? In what way is it open to review? We know there's a lot of money at stake. We know this government is grabbing money wherever they can because they're giving away all this money because we aren't prepared to live by the principles of the Canada Health Act.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the Premier means by open to discussion. Can the chief who is visiting us here tonight have some assurance that the precedents that have been set with all these other band settlements since 1930 will in fact be honoured by this government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I can't clarify it more than I did earlier, and I'll just take the statement as I presented it to the committee. The matter is open to review. I wouldn't want to say anything more than that. We'll just have to see how it evolves.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the Premier, I'd be very interested in the process of that review. The other day we had a discussion in the Legislature with regard to the utilization of the total

caucus. Would the cabinet committee that's involved in hearing the presentation and the issue being discussed bring that matter back to the caucus with a recommendation? Would the caucus in that sense be involved in the continuous negotiation with the band? Is that the way the band negotiates with the government? I see it as rather a cumbersome process. I'd be very alarmed if that's what happens.

I'd appreciate some clarification on that because my historic involvement with cabinet to government was somewhat different to that and, right or wrong, it was on the front line a little more with regard to some of these decisions. I'd appreciate clarification from the Premier.

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That wouldn't work that way. The native affairs committee of cabinet would meet and discuss the issue in terms of basic positions including the question of mineral rights, reach a conclusion as to a recommendation, and take that recommendation to the full caucus. Caucus would then respond and, within parameters of negotiation, return it to the native affairs land claims committee of cabinet, who would then charge, for negotiating purposes, the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and perhaps another minister. But it would be quite right the way the hon. member describes it. That would clearly be cumbersome; it wouldn't work that way.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the Premier. In terms of the role of the Premier involved in that type of discussion, does the Premier act then as a member of the Legislature representing his own constituency? In terms of that caucus discussion, are you just one member out of 78 in terms of input, or is there some special role for the Premier in that type of conversation? As I see it, there isn't.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, we operate differently from the government the hon. Member for Little Bow was involved with. We work as a team, and caucus is the decision-making concept we have. I'm the chairman, and I suppose as chairman one has a certain minor degree of influence over what is involved. That's the role I play; it's teamwork. They are consensus-making decisions we reach in terms of our caucus. That's the way we functioned and continue to function.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the policy of almost half a century on land claim settlements, which involved transfer of mineral rights, is in fact now going to be subject, case by case, to this caucus behind closed doors. All I can say is God help our native people in this province.

Mr. Chairman, what I am interested in, however, is setting aside this so-called caucus input, which we all saw as being a dramatic, well-known aspect of the income tax increase. What I am interested in from the Premier is whether or not we're prepared to move ahead boldly on this issue. Frankly we've had what seem to me to be hitches between Mr. Munro and the current minister. Is the Premier prepared to meet the Prime Minister — he received a letter from the World Council of Churches — to expedite a speedy resolution of all the outstanding issues?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can give an undertaking in that way, except to say that representations have been made, allegations have been presented, and assessment is now under way, not just by the native land claims but also with regard to other allegations that are involved. It's in the process of consideration by government. I suppose that whatever comment I make to the Leader of the Opposition on a

time frame he would probably find unsatisfactory. That's the nature of legislative debate. All I can say is that there's no intention on behalf of the government, the ministers, and the caucus involved to in any way delay the matter. It's a matter of reaching a conclusion.

I might just point out that with regard to the policy change in Bill 29 in 1977, my recollection and my advice is that the basic reason, of course, that amendment was made at that time had to do with the dispute with the Metis settlements with regard to their mineral claims and the legal advice we received at that time. But as I said, that was based on those sets of circumstances, and whether or not it should be altered in terms of these present native land claims is a matter—I use a similar phrase that I used a few minutes ago—that is under review.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting that we expect the Premier to act on allegations that are now being investigated by the Ombudsman. That would be wrong. No one is suggesting he should do that. Those investigations should be proceeded with by the Ombudsman, and he will issue a report.

However, that's not the issue, Mr. Premier. Whether or not the land tenure program was properly done, whether or not forest fires were allowed to rage is quite irrelevant to the settlement of the claim itself by the two people who are most able to do it: the Prime Minister and the Premier. The major hang-up on our part is the question of whether, once we get a validated land claim, we are prepared to transfer the mineral rights. That is not something—let's not kid ourselves—that the minister is going to decide. That's something the leader of the Alberta government is going to decide. My point is whether you are prepared, in the interests of fairness and equity, to meet with the Prime Minister at an early occasion, the earliest possible occasion, to try to reach a settlement of this long-standing claim—now for more than 40 years.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, certainly if there was a circumstance that would warrant a meeting of that nature, I'd be prepared to do so. But I think something has been missing entirely in this discussion, and perhaps it now needs to be raised. We should be clear that there are other interests and other people involved here. We have received communication from the Metis people. We have received communication that holds quite a different point of view from the way it has been expressed here by the Leader of the Opposition. It's been expressed here by the Leader of the Opposition as though up in that area there were just the people involved in the band and just the view of the people who were there with regard to the claims and allegations that have been made in this House. That's not true. It would be nice if it were as simple as that, but there are a number of people who have communicated to this government—Metis people have communicated to this government—who have a much different view on this matter from the Leader of the Opposition.

So when we talk about fairness and equity on this issue, let's keep in mind the fairness and equity of other people who are living in that area. It's our responsibility as a government to balance that fairness and equity. I think that in all fairness and equity their position should be presented to this House as well. They're equally Alberta citizens.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm not going to let the Premier get away with that comment. No one is arguing that. Of course the Metis are equally citizens of this province. If this government wanted fairness and equity for the Metis, they would move quickly on

settling the long-standing mineral claims of the Metis settlement in this province. That's what they would do.

So let's not drag that red herring across. The Lubicon people are not asking for all of northern Alberta. They are asking for a settlement of their aboriginal rights and their land claims. We have an initial offer from the federal government, a suggestion that we go back to the 1940 or '41 suggestion of 25 square miles. Twenty-five square miles is not all of Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite wrong to allow natural differences that are going to occur among people to stop us from dealing quickly with a just solution of this claim. There are a number of these items that I say to you, and I've said to the Premier, we can't deal with because they're before the Ombudsman. But moving ahead on the land claim question and getting a clear definition from the Premier on what this government is going to do on the mineral question is something we can do.

I simply say tonight to the Premier and to the members of the committee that 40-some years is too long. If we're really concerned about fairness, then that meeting will take place. Of course when the Premier meets with the Prime Minister he has to balance various factors; no one suggests he doesn't. That's one of the responsibilities of being Premier. The question was whether or not that meeting would take place, and I suggest it's time we have it.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I take objection to the view that it's a red herring. Metis people living in that area, communicating with us, are very alarmed indeed at the position being taken by the Leader of the Opposition and are asking us to look very carefully at the position we take on this matter—looking at it very carefully, too, in terms of what the equities really are in terms of the whole question of the history of the development of that area. This is no red herring. If we want to deal with fairness and equity, we'll deal with fairness and equity with all the people in the region.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the issue is whether we deal with it fairly and equitably and soon. Justice delayed is justice denied. The fact of the matter is that I've been to that area, and I've talked to the people in Cadotte Lake. As a matter of fact, my colleague and I rather like the results that frequently come from that area in elections, but that's quite irrelevant to the issue. The Metis people in Cadotte Lake have concerns. Some of those concerns, frankly, are shared with the Lubicon people. Some of them are different, but some of them are shared.

Mr. Chairman, the question that I believe has to be dealt with is a 40-year festering problem; a problem that has got worse since 1977. We have gone through all kinds of legal battles. I would like to know—and I'm not suggesting anyone is going to have this at their fingertips, although we might raise it when we get to the minister's department—how much we have spent on legal fees in this case. I bet the members of this committee that we could put a lot of people to work with the money we have spent on legal fees on this issue. No, it is time for the leadership of this province and the leadership of the government of Canada to move on this issue.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about allegations of fairness and equity, and the need for government to respond to them. We have received a communication to Mr. Koziak, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, dated April 12. I think that document needs to be filed in this Legislature. I'll just read one part of it:

We dare say, what will happen to all of these Metis people if the Lubicon Lake Band succeeds in getting a Reser-

vation in the Little Buffalo-Lubicon Lake areas. Someone has to speak for their rights now.

That's the other side of the issue. I wish it were simpler, but it isn't. I think that letter should be tabled to make sure that we have a fair presentation of both sides of the points of view.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, no one argues that. [interjections] Some of them laugh; some people haven't the foggiest idea of the issues up there. The fact of the matter is that this long-standing problem has been allowed to fester. I know something of the problems of the Metis people in that area, Mr. Chairman. When I was in Cadotte Lake, I had told to me the plight of the people in that community. Many years before — I can't blame this government — well-meaning civil servants took their community, bulldozed down all the houses and brought them into Cadotte Lake. I was shocked when I heard of it. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that because the government moved the Metis people from where they were to Cadotte Lake and now some of them are in the Little Buffalo region, surely does not allow us to drag our feet for God knows how many more years on the Lubicon land claim.

Yes, I think I do have some grasp of the justice and equity of this issue — only some. I don't pretend to know it all, like Conservative backbenchers — but some grasp. Forty years is too long, and another 40 years is just unjustifiable when some action can be taken and should be taken by this government.

MR. MARTIN: I just have a couple of other comments, Mr. Chairman. Being the fine person that I am, always trying to help out the people of Alberta, which I was elected to do, I was quite surprised that the research people had not bought this particular book from the Canadian Mental Health Association, *Unemployment, its impact on body and soul*. Because we want to help out the Premier, and we know he needs some reading, our research department hands it over to the Premier and to Executive Council. It is now the Premier's. I would like to give it to the pages, so they can give it to the Premier. I am sure he will read it, take it to heart, and perhaps change some of his policies.

In the meantime I have one suggestion to the Premier. It seems to me that you have been given some bad advice in Executive Council. It seems to me that you probably have too many of them. In the nature of restraint, Mr. Premier, I would suggest that we can take about half of it — that should still leave you a pretty good staff — and take off about \$1 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please address his remarks to the Chair?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, it would take off \$1 million. That will put people to work, and that will help in terms of the report. It seems to me that many of his advisers are not doing the job anyhow. So I would take it that he will read that, cut off a lot of these people for \$1 million, and that's at least a start in job creation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the Premier, on a different subject area and more specifically on the office of the Premier. In terms of the vote itself, the increase is down 12 percent, and the Premier's office is staying the same. I believe that in 1984 there would be some expenditures to be faced that may increase the Premier's budget: the visit of the Pope, I understand in 1984 — would that be correct? — and the renovations to McDougall house in Calgary, for example; that will have to be staffed. Are there positions within the budget that

do that, or is that in another vote somewhere? Those two specifically.

The third area is with regard to travels of the Premier in the coming year, '84-85. Will there be any trips such as the one taken in the 1983-84 fiscal year? Are such items budgeted for in this budget? There are not expected to be trips but there may be. Will the budget be added to in terms of special warrants to take up that responsibility?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Chairman, first of all, with regard to McDougall school, that is in the votes of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. I am sure the minister would be pleased to respond to that at least on a . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: What about staffing?

MR. LOUGHEED: There wouldn't be any staffing for some considerable period of time, certainly not well beyond the present fiscal year.

With respect to the papal visit, most of what we are involved in, I believe, is the secondment of the key personnel who are assisting the voluntary group that is involved. There may be some expenditures. I don't think they would be large. They may come through the protocol portion of the vote, or they may be provided in other ways. But it would not be large. My understanding is that the group that is involved in organizing the visit has done an exceptional job in terms of receiving volunteer support, in terms of both people and goods, and to cover their budget as well.

Mr. Chairman, on the other question of travel, during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, I don't have any intention of being involved in any major mission comparable to the one to China, Japan, and Hong Kong last August and September. I obviously will be travelling significantly, though, and would intend to, particularly with regard to the United States financial situation and of course the natural gas market in the United States, which may again include California and Washington. I anticipate that I would do as I have done in the past and have another trip to Europe, which would involve briefing myself, as up to date as I can be, on international financial issues, particularly with regard to energy. But I wouldn't think that travel outside Canada would be any greater than that that I have discussed.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Office of the Premier	\$528,068
1.02 — Administrative Support	\$1,674,514
1.03 — Office of the Lieutenant Governor	\$98,436
1.04 — Project Management	\$558,972
1.05 — Protocol	\$550,748
Total Vote 1 — Executive Council Administration	\$3,410,738
2.1 — Program Support	\$1,114,059
2.2 — Worksite Services	\$5,070,058
2.3 — Occupational Health Services	\$3,849,462
2.4 — Research and Education Services	\$2,743,565
Total Vote 2 — Occupational Health and Safety	\$12,777,144
Total Vote 3 — Workers' Compensation	\$16,448,400
Total Vote 4 — Support to Native Organizations	\$4,375,641

Total Vote 5 — Personnel Administration	\$18,871,285
Total Vote 6 — Natural Sciences and Engineering Research	\$21,463,000
Total Vote 7 — Energy Resources Conservation	\$22,000,000
Total Vote 8 — Interdepartmental Co-ordination of Women's Issues	\$225,000
9.1 — Program Support	\$3,328,000
9.2 — Development and Production	[\$6,930,100]
9.3 — Media Utilization	\$5,874,900
Total Vote 9 — Multi-Media Education Services	\$16,133,000
10.1 — Program Support	\$1,019,650
10.2 — Disaster Preparedness	\$1,672,100
10.3 — Dangerous Goods Control	\$1,204,150
10.4 — Emergency Response	\$86,800
Total Vote 10 — Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response	\$3,982,700
Total Vote 11 — Public Service Employee Relations	\$328,313
12.0.1 — Native Venture Capital Corporation	—
Total Vote 12 — Financing of Native Venture Capital Funding	—

### 13 — Public Affairs

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to pass by this particular vote. Absolutely no disrespect to my friend the minister, but basically I think we could totally eliminate this department, and the world wouldn't come to an end. It probably wouldn't be noticed in east/west relations; it wouldn't be brought to President Reagan's attention; the president of the Soviet Union would not be shocked to learn of it. What we would do is save \$10 million. However, I did happen to hear the hon. minister last week . . .

MR. MARTIN: Keep the faith, spreading the faith.

MR. NOTLEY: I had to leave the question period a little early, but on my way to the airport, I heard this new definition of propaganda — spreading faith. I think that's very interesting, Mr. Chairman, but I really wonder whether we need \$10,399,368, plus a capital budget of \$32,500, to spread faith. In these tough times when everybody has to hunker down, buckle up, tighten their belt, and everything else to try to make dollars go as far as possible, I really wonder if we need to spend \$10 million to keep the faith. [interjection]

The hon. Member for Calgary Egmont talks about the churches. As a matter of fact, if we were to give this \$10 million to the churches, quite frankly that would be a much better investment. I'd even be prepared to do that. If we gave it to the people who keep the faith and spread the faith . . .

MR. MARTIN: They need it for the food banks.

MR. NOTLEY: God knows, anybody has to have it with this government. Anyway, the spreading of the faith — I really wonder.

I note another interesting thing about this budget, Mr. Chairman. At a time when school boards don't get any increase, the minister gets a 13.9 percent increase. I wonder whether spreading the faith has a higher priority with this government than our school system or our university system, or the hon. minister in charge of spreading the faith has more clout in the cabinet than these other ministers.

It could be that the Minister of Education spends so much time quoting Will Rogers in cabinet that he's become a little bit of a pain. There are only so many times you can run that joke past the Premier. I'm just wondering if perhaps what's happened is that our skillful minister of propaganda, or keeping and spreading the faith, who certainly has a lot of experience in public relations, has not in fact done a public relations job on his cabinet colleagues. He's getting a 13.9 percent increase when these other poor people either have to justify decreases or no increase at all. So we either have this unique initiative of the Conservative government to waste even more money or in fact we have hidden talent that some of us may have missed in the last few years seated as we are in this chamber.

I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether we see a budding leadership contender who is going to displace the Minister of Education, the Minister of Advanced Education, and the Member for Edmonton Glengarry from the leadership stakes that will alter the future of this province. It may well be that the Cook-King machine is going to have to do a nomination search in Calgary whatever-it-is. Nevertheless, I'm not sure whether I should congratulate the minister on his ability and adeptness at converting his cabinet colleagues or criticize the entire caucus for wasting money. If in doubt, I think the latter is the best course. At a time when we can't meet so many programs, the necessary increases that are required, when we've got food banks all over the province, we've got a minister here with a 13.9 percent increase to spread the faith. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't have quite enough faith in this government to want to spend \$10,400,000 on this Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total amount to be voted?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to support the arguments in a nonpartisan way, I think the minister should stand and at least advise us why there is such a significant increase.

The other area I'd appreciate the minister defending very clearly in this Legislature is: are the polls that are taken through this expenditure . . . In this Legislature, we asked for the questions that are being asked and can't get them. The results — when have they ever been tabled in this Legislature? I think it would be interesting to hear if the minister has maybe updated his attitude with regard to that type of thing. The expenditure of public funds, supposedly for public information that is necessary to every member of this Legislature, and not made available concerns me very much.

In terms of the portfolio itself, I think some subagency of some subdivision of some other department could clearly look after this without it being the full-time responsibility of one minister. When it happens that way, it becomes very partisan and suspect. I must say that that's the way I look at this particular portfolio and this allocation of funds. And an item that's way down the list of priorities — it certainly shouldn't be getting an increase now; it should be getting a decrease. Ten million dollars — think of how many highways that would build in southern Alberta. If we could have \$10 million to build some of our highways — even \$2 million, \$3 million — think what that would do for some areas of special need. But that's not where this government puts its priority; it's on taking care of its image and telling the people what they should hear, not

what the people really need or delivering the services that are best for the people. I think the minister must take a little bit of time and defend his position and defend this particular portfolio, because I certainly am not going to stand up on his behalf and do that.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would respond to a couple of questions. First of all, I see that he's responsible for the review and approval of hospitality grants. I'm of the view — and I'm talking now from the Lethbridge West constituency — that they are very meaningful to our volunteer groups in southern Alberta, who have visitors from across Canada for various conventions. To have the government sponsor one of the meals is a very significant thing, and I want the minister to know that those people deeply appreciate that. I do have some concern about the funding level. I understand that the composition has to be national in scope and not just from other provinces. I wonder if the minister could give some thought or maybe respond: if a particular group came just from Quebec or just from Saskatchewan, for example, and not be national in scope, would that be eligible?

A second question, if I might, Mr. Chairman. I think the regional information telephone inquiry system, or the RITE system, has done so much to make government available and accessible to the people, certainly from the Lethbridge community. But we continue to get complaints, time after time, particularly on a Monday when a telephone has to ring some 25 times before it's answered locally by the RITE operator. I wonder if the minister is considering that we have some type of intercept system, such as we have in Edmonton. When I dial from my office, someone very quickly comes on the line and responds. If we could have a system that, for example, would intercept after the fourth or fifth ring, saying: we appreciate your calling; we're very busy this morning; could you just hang on, et cetera, et cetera. I continue to get complaints that people try endlessly to get through on that line; that is, to the local operator. Then they're advised, particularly on Monday, as there are only four trunk lines to Edmonton, that they just can't get through. If the minister has been approached and is looking after it, fine. But if the minister could give some consideration to increasing the number of trunk lines to the capital — and I'm sure this is applicable from all over Alberta, but particularly southern Alberta, which is routed through Lethbridge. There just do not seem to be sufficient trunk lines.

Mr. Chairman, if the minister has the information on those two points, I'd appreciate it. If not, he can get back to me in writing.

MR. MARTIN: I won't be very long, Mr. Chairman, but being the very helpful person I've tried to be tonight, I would like to make a suggestion in this time of restraint. I'm sure the minister can find another portfolio. I'm sure he's much more able than some of the other ministers around. I suggested before that in this time of restraint we nail it down to about 18 ministers. We have more ministers than any other province in Canada. But I think this is one we certainly can do without, even with all the skill of the minister. In terms of restraint, I have a suggestion on how to help us out of this dilemma of spreading the faith.

First of all, we'll take this \$10 million and put it into job creation, which will do a lot of good at this particular time. To make up for spreading the faith, which I know the minister needs to do and the Conservative Party wants to do — spreading the faith of supply-side economics throughout the land and bringing out their hero Ronald Reagan — if you just look through the PCs' election budget, Mr. Chairman, \$10 million

is just three or four more corporations; they'd have the same amount of money. They can collect it from the PC Party. Then we'd have \$10.5 million for job creation or to help some food banks, all sorts of useful things.

MR. NOTLEY: You should become executive director of the Tory Party.

MR. MARTIN: Maybe that's true; that's probably a more powerful position anyhow.

But it becomes very difficult, and we make it a laughing matter here, but that is a lot of money in terms of a time of restraint. It's this type of expenditure that's frankly turning Albertans against this government. We seem to have money for this type of thing, but we don't have money for job creation. Mr. Chairman, to the minister: I think this is a double standard that is bothering many, many Albertans at this particular time, including Conservative supporters.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the wise and kind words of the Member for Edmonton Norwood, I'd like to bring out a few points which he may find rather interesting. I don't think Conservative members are nearly as concerned with the expenditure of money as with what that expenditure is going for.

The Member for Edmonton Norwood had some brilliant ideas that he was sharing with all of us, but I think you'll agree, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a fantastic idea if all the people of Alberta knew about his ideas. How is he going to transmit those ideas on food banks or some of the other suggestions he made, unless there is a system in place to do it? We have a large government, a large majority; it's doing a lot of good work. But what is the point of achieving all these programs to help the people of this province unless they know what is available to them?

Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is doing an excellent job in communicating this vital information, so that Albertans can take advantage of the programs which are being offered. I'd like to give just one example. Against my better judgment, I do read the newspapers occasionally. There was a story in one of the newspapers last week, by someone whose name easily escapes me. It was something like baba's dilemma. A lady who had been living in Edmonton for a number of years as a widow, had sort of kept herself in isolation since her husband's death, could not speak very much English, could not read, and really wasn't aware of all the programs that were available to someone in her position. By chance she stumbled into city hall, and one of the aldermen there put her on to her M.L.A. Her income, which I think was \$190 a month over the last 10 years, very quickly tripled, simply because she was able to apply and qualify for the various programs that were available. How very important that this communication of information is made to the citizens of Alberta so they can all take advantage.

I'd like to make another point, and maybe the minister could comment. I believe a survey was done at some point over the past year on the uses and origins of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. One of the things I really found quite amazing was that a number of people — I don't remember the exact proportion — believed that funds for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund came from a gasoline tax. That just shows how misinformed many of the people of this province are and once again reinforces the need for the minister's role in communicating programs and information for the benefit of the people of this province. I commend the minister and welcome his response.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that it's now 10 o'clock and I assume that the hockey game is over — if it is.



I'd appreciate being advised of what the score was. Four to two? I regret asking the score.

I recognize that in the remarks of the three members of the opposition in the House tonight there was a fair amount of facetiousness and partisanship but, underlying that facetiousness and partisanship, I think there was a legitimate search for truth, and I'm happy to respond.

MR. MARTIN: He's going to spread a little more faith.

MR. PAYNE: I'm prepared to spread it, if they're prepared to keep it.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the 13.8 percent increase in the budget, 9.4 percent of that increase is in fact attributable to manpower inflation; which is to say that even though we were able to reduce our manpower complement by four positions, I believe, it was a matter of contractual obligation — the results of previous negotiations — that gave rise to a 9.4 percent factor. The remainder of that increase can largely be attributed to the need to publish increasing volumes of legislation, but I would like to point out that these costs are largely recovered through sales of these various legislative publications to the public. It might interest members of the committee tonight to learn that revenues from the sale of these kinds of publications in fact flow to the General Revenue Fund of the province.

As far as the Member for Edmonton Norwood's quite inappropriate comment that I enjoy a disproportionate amount of clout in cabinet, let me reassure him that that is not the case. Each of my cabinet colleagues enjoys influence appropriate to his or her departmental responsibility, and I'd like to reassure the members opposite in paranoia corner that there is very little jostling for clout comparisons amongst my colleagues.

To the Member for Little Bow, on the question of public opinion polls. There was debate, of course, earlier in the spring sitting of the House with respect to a motion for a return. I can only repeat this evening what I said on that occasion. It simply wouldn't be appropriate to enunciate or declare a policy for a public opinion poll results for time immemorial. I think there will be rare occasions or circumstances when it would not be appropriate to divulge the results of a particular survey. My clear preference, as I enunciated then and do so again tonight, is that they be treated on an individual survey basis. I'm sure I speak for my cabinet colleagues; under most circumstances, they would be prepared to table the results of such questionnaires. In response to that amended motion for a return, before the conclusion of the spring sitting, I will of course be tabling in the Assembly a list of all the surveys that I'm aware of that have been conducted over the past 15 months, which I believe was the suggested term of the motion for a return.

To the Member for Lethbridge West, I appreciate the positive observations he made with respect to the hospitality grants. I suppose, as a proportion of this government's total spending, it's a miniscule amount, but it goes without question that in making their decision to host or convene their conventions and seminars in the province, dozens, if not hundreds, of volunteer organizations of a wide variety are influenced positively by the availability of these hospitality grants.

I would like to correct a misconception on the part of the Member for Lethbridge West. It is not a requirement that that particular seminar, convention, or what have you, be national in scope. In fact the way the hospitality grant guidelines are presently worded, a convention that draws its delegates from Alberta and two other provinces would be given serious consideration for hospitality grants.

If I might also respond to the Member for Lethbridge West's comment and suggestion for the RITE system, I guess it's a question of a good thing being perhaps too widely recognized. It has now been almost a full decade since the regional information telephone enquiry system was put in place and, over that decade, we have seen a steady, marked escalation in the use of that system by the citizens of Alberta. It has been widely used. It has been widely appreciated and recognized throughout the province, but that in turn has given rise to certain demands on the people, our staff, our switchboard operators, of whom there are about 70.

I might interrupt myself in mid-flight here, Mr. Chairman, to point out to the members of the opposition who have suggested, albeit with a smile and a smirk, that we somehow jettison the public affairs bureau — I'd like them to seriously reconsider that suggestion, given the widespread assistance given to the citizens of this province, from one end to the other, by our 70-odd regional information telephone enquiry switchboard operators.

Because of the success and the demand on that system and because there are peaks and valleys, it's simply not possible to put equipment and people in place to deal with the peaks. We simply have to make value judgments, if you like, to try to accommodate average demand. There's no question that periodically the demand for the system will exceed our capacity. In those cases, we have to make *ad hoc* or temporary adjustments. One adjustment the member has suggested tonight — that is, the use of an intercept that would be triggered by a predetermined number of rings — is one that bears further examination, and I will undertake to do that and report to him on another occasion.

Perhaps one final response to the Member for Edmonton Belmont. I was heartened by his reference to the heritage fund survey results, because I would like to cite those to the Member for Little Bow as one illustration of an important survey whose questions, results, and tabulations thereof were in fact tabled in the House. The Member for Edmonton Belmont is quite correct when he points out that one of the more glaring revelations, if you like, of that particular survey was the widespread misunderstanding, both in our rural and urban constituencies, as to the source of heritage fund revenues. That's a particular misconception that we attempted to deal with in the heritage fund annual report that was circulated to the citizens of Alberta at the end of last year.

MR. MARTIN: Just a point of clarification, if I could, to the minister of spreading the faith, to make sure I'm perfectly clear. In one of his statements, Mr. Chairman, I believe the minister talked about the increase in the budget having to do with the inflation rate; was it 9.4 percent manpower inflation? The minister is saying yes. Then my question is — I'm a little confused then, because I see the permanent positions went down from 234 to 230. The only conclusion I can come to is that there must have been some pretty hefty raises in terms of his department. I would like him perhaps to tell me what the average wage increase was then. I would remind the minister that we've been told that everybody has to tighten their belts, that private-sector people are cutting their wages. Certainly negotiations are going on with government employees; basically what we hear is that they've been offered zero and in some cases cuts. I'm a little interested in what the wages were and how and why they arrived at that much in this time of restraint?

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I question the Member for Edmonton Norwood's use of the adjective "hefty". In fact our manpower inflation and our salary data are provided by Treas-

ury. They reflect the formula, if you like, and the increments from across the public service. The Public Affairs Bureau was treated no differently in that process. The 9 percent figure primarily reflects the incremental increases to the 200-odd employees of the Public Affairs Bureau and does not represent a unique or preferential calculation. In effect, it simply reflects the calculation methods used for the manpower inflation component for the entire public service.

MR. MARTIN: Just a supplementary question on that, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister give us some example of the increment. Certainly a lot of negotiation goes on at the lower level, the secretarial level. We have an idea of what those people are achieving. But I remind the minister that we are down from 234 positions to 230. There was a decrease in permanent full-time positions, but he says we have a 9.4 percent inflation rate in the incremental level. I would think that that incremental level would be the top-paid people in the department; is that correct? What is the range of salaries? What are the top-level salaries, and what did the top people get? What did they have the previous year, what did they end up at, and what were their percentages?

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I do not have that data with me tonight. The salary data I have is an aggregate, but I would like to disabuse the Member for Edmonton Norwood's notion right now that there was some preferential treatment for management staff as opposed to nonmanagement. That is simply not the case. The increments that I referred to were not necessarily management increments but increments that accrue to members of the public service who are in nonmanagement positions.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary. I suppose I can put this on a motion for a return, and we will if necessary, but I would just ask the minister — I'd be very interested in this breakdown. I suppose the place to follow up, and I will, would be on a motion for a return.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, before we conclude, I just want to make a comment with regard to the minister's position on tabling of polls and documents where they're discretionary. A decision is made by the minister as to whether we get them in the Legislature or the public sees them or they don't. One of the weaknesses of that position is the fact that the government then can screen the kind of information that goes to the public.

The Heritage Savings Trust Fund poll came available to this Legislature because we made a request for it. The items of that poll supported some of the government's thinking and didn't really embarrass the government in any way. Some of the other polls most likely are doing just that. I think any current polls would certainly be raising some very interesting questions about the government's support in various areas. As members of the Legislature, I think we should be privileged to that. I want to just put this on the record to the minister; the position will be inconsistent in its application. The discretionary powers of the minister as to what kind of information we get and don't get, I think is a very vulnerable position. It's unacceptable to me; there's no question about that.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 13 — Public Affairs	\$10,431,418
Total Vote 14 — Water Resources Advisory	\$254,800
Total Vote 15 — Designation, Regulation and Licensure of Professions and Occupations	\$616,360
Department Total	\$131,317,799

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

[Motion carried]

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, the House will sit in committee tomorrow evening for consideration of the estimates of supply for the Department of Culture, followed, if we complete that department, by the estimates of supply for the Department of Economic Development.

I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, for the department and purposes indicated. Executive Council: \$3,410,738 for executive council administration; \$12,777,144 for occupational health and safety; \$16,448,400 for workers' compensation; \$4,375,641 for support to native organizations; \$18,871,285 for personnel administration; \$21,463,000 for natural sciences and engineering research; \$22,000,000 for energy resources conservation; \$225,000 for interdepartmental coordination of women's issues; \$16,133,000 for multi-media education services; \$3,982,700 for disaster preparedness and emergency response; \$328,313 for public service employee relations; \$10,431,418 for public affairs; \$254,800 for water resources advisory; \$616,360 for designation, regulation, and licensure of professions and occupations.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, while in Committee of Supply, I gave some advice about the business of the House tomorrow, but perhaps I should repeat it for the benefit of all members. The House will sit tomorrow evening in Committee of Supply for consideration, first, of the estimates of the Department of Culture, followed, if those are completed, by the estimates of the Department of Economic Development.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

[At 10:16 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]