

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Wednesday, June 18, 1986 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. DINNING: With the support of my colleague the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs it gives me great pleasure today to introduce you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to other members of the Assembly, a group of Canadians who are the unsung heroes, the invisible Sherpas of federal/provincial relations in Canada. They are my colleagues from days past, deputy ministers and senior officials from eight provinces in Canada. They are in Edmonton today to prepare for the annual Premiers' conference that will take place in Edmonton this coming summer.

I'd like to introduce them to you, Mr. Speaker, and ask them to stand together after I have done so. They are Hal Stanley from Newfoundland, Don McCormick from Prince Edward Island, Diane Wilhelmy from Quebec, Gary Posen from Ontario, Jim Eldridge and Michael Dexter from Manitoba, Randy Harrold from Saskatchewan, Professor Mel Smith from British Columbia, and two very fine participants, contributors to the Alberta public service, Mr. Al MacDonald and Mrs. Oryssia Lennie. I ask them to rise, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Assembly to give them a warm, warm welcome.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw the attention of the House to a person visiting in your gallery, the former MLA for Edmonton Whitemud, Mr. Peter Knaak. It's nice to see Mr. Knaak here observing the House at work. I ask him to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 2****Department of Tourism Act**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 2, Department of Tourism Act. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of its contents, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill formally establishes the Department of Tourism as an important component in the government's overall commitment to economic diversification and job creation.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

**Bill 227****Alberta Development Fund Act**

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 227, the Alberta Development Fund Act.

This Bill will restructure the present trust fund, creating two major divisions of the fund. One division would make

long-term, fixed rate, low interest loans available to Alberta's farmers, independent business owners, and homeowners. The other would engage in equity investments in business, which would tend to strengthen and diversify the economy of Alberta. As well, the Bill would appropriate to the restructured fund 40 percent of the nonrenewable resource revenues received by the Crown, require the Legislature's investment watchdog committee to hold annual public hearings on the uses of the fund, and require any major fund investments to be approved by the Legislature.

[Leave granted; Bill 227 read a first time]

**Bill 242****Alberta Economic Council Act**

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 242, the Alberta Economic Council Act.

The Bill would establish a 30-person Alberta economic council composed of representatives of the various sectors of the Alberta economy. The council would be charged with advising and recommending to the government strategies and policies by which Alberta can achieve the highest possible level of employment and efficient production to bring about a high and consistent rate of economic growth by which all Albertans may share in rising living standards.

[Leave granted; Bill 242 read a first time]

**Bill 240****Right to Clean Water Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 240, an Act to amend the Clean Water Act.

This Bill gives the power to individuals to press charges on any polluter without the consent of the Attorney General.

[Leave granted; Bill 240 read a first time]

**Bill 230****An Act to Provide for  
Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value**

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 230, An Act to Provide for Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value.

This Bill would amend the Individual's Rights Protection Act to provide that:

No employer shall establish or maintain a difference in the rate of pay between male and female employees employed in the same establishment who are performing work of equal or substantially equal value.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation also state that as in the case in Manitoba, the first Canadian jurisdiction to introduce pay equity legislation, the Bill provides for a three-part phase-in period. Starting with persons employed in the Legislative Assembly Office and departments of government, the Bill's provisions would thereafter be extended first to all other employees of the Crown in right of Alberta and then to private-sector businesses contracting for the provision of goods and services with the Crown. No extension of the Bill's provisions would be made without there first being a motion authorizing the extension passed by the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. member realizes that she really crammed more than a sufficient amount of material into the introduction.

[Leave granted; Bill 230 read a first time]

**Bill 234  
Pollutant Spills Act**

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 234, Pollutant Spills Act.

The Bill would establish a duty to act in law by a person having control of a pollutant that is spilled and would require that person, in the event of a spill, to do everything practicable to prevent, eliminate, and ameliorate the adverse effects of the spill. As well, that person would have to notify the Environment minister and the local municipality immediately of the spill. Finally, the Bill would establish an environment compensation board which would administer and adjudicate any claims for compensation arising out of sections of the Bill establishing individuals' rights to claim compensation from a polluter or the Crown.

[Leave granted; Bill 234 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislative Assembly a series of reports pertaining to the Bow, Oldman, and South Saskatchewan rivers. The first report is titled The Limnological Characteristics of the Bow, Oldman and South Saskatchewan Rivers (1979-82) Part I; the second is titled The Limnological Characteristics of the Bow, Oldman and South Saskatchewan Rivers (1979-82) Part II; and the third is titled A Summary of Ecological Characteristics of the South Saskatchewan River Basin With Specific Reference to the Bow River (1979-82). Copies of these three important reports will be circulated to all members shortly.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the Assembly the annual report of the Health Disciplines Board for the year ended December 31, 1985.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file audited annual reports of Syncrude Canada Ltd. for the years 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1985.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of Alberta Government Telephones for 1985.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a special guest in the person of Mr. Angus Spence, mayor of the town of Strathmore and a member of its hospital board. I'll ask Mr. Spence to rise in the members' gallery to receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 100 students from the Westlock junior high school. They

are in the members' gallery accompanied by their teachers Marianne Holt, Kevin Hamilton, Bev Miller, and Ed Matas. I'd ask them to now stand and let the Assembly give them the customary welcome.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce 27 students from the grade 6 class at Laurier Heights school located in the Edmonton Glenora constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Esther Woodrow. I would ask them to rise and receive the customary welcome of this House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Natural Gas Exports**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy. It has to do with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Washington passing on June 6 a new ruling, order 451, which decontrols all natural gas in the U.S.A., including pre-1978 old gas. This could have a disastrous effect on Canadian exporters. My question is: will the minister outline the assessment of this government of the impact of order 451 on this province, and could he then enlarge on what the government intends to do about it?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Western Accord and the natural gas agreement it is the intent to proceed with deregulation by November 1, 1986, and we are moving in that direction on the assumption that that will be the date for deregulation. But in the meantime, there will be the assessment of a number of decisions, including the one the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers to and the one yesterday from the National Energy Board related to transportation of the gas. We will continue to assess the different decisions on an ongoing basis over the course of the summer.

MR. MARTIN: That's very nice, Mr. Speaker. But my question specifically to the minister, because this could be a very serious matter, something that's beyond our Western Accord ... Don't get excited, Premier; we'll get to you.

Mr. Speaker, my question is simply this: is there any assessment of the impact to our producers of this old gas decontrol and the subsequent removal thereafter of the low price cushion, which allowed our more expensive gas to be rolled into the U.S. price? It certainly is going to have an impact. What's the assessment?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the department is assessing in an ongoing way the different decisions that have been made. Certainly one would expect that if we made the decision to proceed to deregulation, not only in oil but in gas as well, the marketplace would determine what the prices are going to be. As I said earlier, repeating myself again, we are assessing the different decisions that have been made. But the decisions were made to deregulate the market on the oil and the gas side, and we're moving in that direction.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question then to the minister. Is the minister saying, other than our talking about our deregulation, that he has no idea of the impact of this

recent move by the United States? Is that what he's saying to us?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's kind of strange that the hon. Leader of the Opposition hears things that weren't said. In terms of the different decisions that are being made, we are assessing on an ongoing basis the impact of those on total deregulation by November 1, 1986.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. We could continue this. What is the assessment? You say you're assessing it. In his studies with his department — and they have a lot of high-priced help in the United States — can the minister tell us what his assessment is? How is this going to hurt our Canadian producers? It was already brought in on June 6.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we're not going to indicate assessments on a piecemeal basis for individual reports. All of them have to be taken into account together in coming to a decision as to whether or not November 1, 1986, will be the date that we will be proceeding. I'd be happy at a future time to provide members with the assessment that we have.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is the minister even aware of this particular ...

MR. SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you've had your three supplementaries. The Chair recognizes the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy. Has the minister considered in his lemming-like dash to the sea of decontrolled gas prices just what the effect would be of selling cheap gas to the U.S. versus leaving the old contracts in place for our farmers and consumers here in Alberta? What will be the difference we're going to be asking our residents to pay in order that he can sell decontrolled gas into the U.S.?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if anyone can give a response to that question right now. As I said, we are assessing the situation as we go along and looking at the impact of the different decisions. What else can one say?

### Natural Gas Deregulation

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier seemed to be anxious, so maybe we should let him have a chance to get on television. My question is to the Premier. In question period yesterday the Premier seemed to indicate that the government is finally ready to concede that we got suckered in the Western Accord and that a new energy deal should be struck. My question is simply this: has the Premier taken a leadership role in this area and communicated directly in any way to the Prime Minister that a new energy agreement is necessary?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: That's rather an interesting question. I thought this was the Premier of the province. He says that the economy is in disarray. The question to the Premier.

a simple question that even the backbenchers will understand: why not?

MR. GETTY: Because it's not necessary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: The people of Alberta will be interested in that answer, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier saying that with the price as low as it is — and he said yesterday that there was probably a need to relook at it — it's not even worth his time to get on the phone and call Mr. Mulroney to talk about this problem? Is that what the Premier is telling us?

MR. GETTY: That's not what I said, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question then to the Premier. To come back to the gas deregulation, yesterday he was a little vague about this, but we're told that former Premier Lougheed, who could answer questions in the House, said that we should suspend the rush to deregulation. Yesterday the Premier was a little vague. Can he say specifically that it is still the policy of this government at this time to move toward gas deregulation? Is that still the policy of this government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that question was actually answered already by the hon. Minister of Energy. I assume the leader is not only asking questions but trying to listen too. The government is assessing the various matters involving gas deregulation, and as the hon. Minister of Energy said, we will be explaining that to the House later.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about getting on television. I might say that one of the more disgraceful exhibitions I've ever seen in a labour dispute is the hon. Leader of the Opposition grandstanding on one. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker. I think I have one. If we're going to have this type of debate that had nothing to do with the question period, lets open it up and talk about why I was out on that picket line. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes that all hon. members realize exactly what is going on here, so we'd like to go on. I'll now recognize anyone from the Liberal Party who wishes to ask a supplementary question.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have a ruling. That is a point of privilege. That had nothing to do with the question period. If he can make that comment, I should have an equal reply to those laws that caused me to be out there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes, hon. Leader of the Opposition, that you did indeed make a comment about television. The Premier made a response. At this stage of the game, I think that both of you would allow us to continue with the business of the House. I do not recognize either a point of privilege or a point of order.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. It'll give him a little more time to stay on television.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please not allow the House to go along in that vein. Please ask your question.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: The back of your head looks good, Nick.

MR. TAYLOR: He's got the same hairline I have.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier, if indeed his idea is to continue with the deregulation of prices, whether he is thinking of running for election in Toronto next time rather than in Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: I realize that now I will go on and recognize a member from the Representative Party if you have a supplementary on this issue. You do not? I now recognize the leader of the Liberal Party for his main question.

#### Meat Packing Industry

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the natives are a little restless over there today.

I'd like to address this question to the Premier. As of last week Canada Packers laid off 100 workers in Lethbridge in the latest series of reducing task force. Will the Premier or his minister of economic development tell the Legislature what efforts have been made by this government to safeguard the jobs in the meat packing industry?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there have been some considerable problems with the meat packing industry in this province and our government is doing everything we possibly can to maintain the health of that industry and also jobs for Albertans.

MR. TAYLOR: First supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to hear that because it has been recently reported to a federal tribunal that the importing of subsidized beef from the European community will result in the takeover by Canadian banks of 15 percent of the beef producers of Ontario and Alberta. Has the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture — or are they willing to tell the House? — had any talks with the federal government on stopping the importation of cheap subsidized beef from Europe that's cutting back our Alberta production?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister of inter-governmental affairs filed with the House the communiqués from the Western Premiers' Conference, and the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon might review those to see that that item was dealt with there.

MR. TAYLOR: The second supplementary. The item was not dealt with; it was mentioned. In other words, have you made a representation, Mr. Premier, to your counterpart or to the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa to stop or curtail the further importation of subsidized beef from Europe?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the communiqué carried that to the Prime Minister.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm still trying to pin our Premier down, Mr. Speaker. Issuing communiqués to the press is like talking to Sheik Yamani. You've got to get him on the phone. The question is: has he got on the phone to either the Prime Minister of this country or the Minister of

Agriculture and asked whether they will stop the further importation of beef into Canada from Europe?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been discussed.

#### Free Trade

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Premier as well and are with regard to free trade. I'd like to ask first of all why the Premier has decided not to take more direct involvement in the discussions on free trade between Canada and the United States.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think all members know that the matter of free trade is an item for federal government jurisdiction. However, the provinces have some vital interests involved, and our government has been working very closely with the federal government. We have established our own trade commissioner. We have weekly meetings with the federal trade officials. We have ongoing meetings at the ministerial level with federal ministers on trade. We have an agreement to meet with the Prime Minister at least every three months on trade. We discussed the matter at the Premiers' meeting before the first ministers' meeting in Ottawa recently. We discussed it at the Western Premiers' Conference. As well, it will be discussed again in August at the Premiers' conference. There is constant consultation and input from our government into trade matters.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In terms of decision-making has the Premier empowered the federal government and Mr. Reisman to make commitments which could affect the interests of Alberta prior to consultation with the province or the Premier directly?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate whether there are on the table any items that are priority that would directly affect the economy or Alberta, and has the Premier asked that certain items not be on the table for discussion in those free trade talks?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the hon. leader of the Representative Party knows, when you're in the middle of negotiations, you don't make your positions public in advance.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier. Recently you have been quoted as saying that the free trade talks with the U.S. should be postponed till after the upcoming congressional elections. Is this a new policy? I understand this to be a new government policy as far as trade talks are concerned. Have you recommended this to Ottawa?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon raising this matter. I think it should be explained, as the quote he just referred to is, I think, an inaccurate one. The position I've taken is that one of the first matters that Ambassador Reisman should establish is whether or not the United States have their house sufficiently in order that they can carry on meaningful trade negotiations. If over the next two or three months he establishes that they can't because of the various protectionist moves that

are going on in the United States, because of their congressional elections, then I think it's meaningless to carry them on until after those elections. I've expressed that with other first ministers, and I think they have a general feeling in accord with that, that it would be silly to try and negotiate with someone who is really unable to negotiate.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. At one time the Premier took the very tough stand that there should be provincial participation, which I agreed with. It seems now that we don't have that provincial participation. My question is: how do the provinces know what Mr. Reisman is putting on the table at these talks and how it might affect Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there was a debate on what was full provincial participation, and there was a split among provinces as to whether or not that meant having someone in the room looking over Mr. Reisman's shoulder. There was a general agreement that for at least a three-month period we would not have someone in the room looking over his shoulder. Many of the first ministers felt that in a way that would weaken his position as a negotiator and also that reports coming back would perhaps be confusing. There would be Mr. Reisman's; there might be a different one from someone else.

We had considerable debate on the matter. I'm not convinced that there shouldn't at some time be different arrangements, but as first ministers we did agree with the Prime Minister to participate on this full-consultation basis with reports back, being asked to deal with it that way for a period of time. In order to be behind our federal government and allow it to go into the negotiations in the strongest possible position, we agreed with that.

#### **Sour Gas Health Study**

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Community and Occupational Health. I refer to the recent final report delivered by the McGill Inter-University Research Group under the acid deposition research program. This was a program initiated to study possible health problems in specific areas in southern Alberta. Does the minister intend to institute the recommendations outlined in the report, specifically the one calling for the upgrading of registration of birth defects in the province?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I must say that in coming to grips with this rather difficult, complex subject, I would like to just pass along my thanks to the hon. Member for Cardston as well as to his colleague the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest for their assistance in coming to grips with this complex matter.

I can respond to that recommendation of the Spitzer study by saying that the government has two initiatives under way right now. One is a program that's been in place for a number of years in the Department of Community and Occupational Health and in the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, and this is a hereditary diseases program, which provides counselling to those families that have been affected by genetic disorders. It also provides prenatal diagnosis to those families that are having a child. A second initiative is a pilot study that is under way, by Dr. Brian Lowry, from the University of Calgary, to put in place just such a registry for a test area in southern Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, these two initiatives, combined with this recommendation that has been made by the Spitzer group, are going to give us the information that's necessary to make the next step in deciding where we go on such a registry.

MR. ADY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. I refer to that same report and ask the question of him: does the minister intend to follow the recommendations contained in that report that emission controls not be relaxed even though the report did not contain findings of excessive health problems?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's absolutely no question about changing the emission controls. Recommendation 1 in the report calls on us to continue a sustained policy of strict protection of the environment of Alberta. It is a sustained policy of strict protection that we will be continuing. Members may be interested in knowing that our standard is the highest in the country and that we allow no more than .17 parts per million of sulphur dioxide emissions in Alberta. The comparative figure in Ontario is .23 parts per million; we're at least 50 percent better than they are.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment, while complimenting him on his low emission standards in Alberta, because Alberta is the only province in Canada that has a sulphur plant. So welcome.

Has the Minister of the Environment or his department reconciled the difference between this report that says that the gas emissions are not bothering the health of people and earlier ones that his own department did that said that white muscle disease in cattle is much more prevalent around the downwind side of sulphur plants? In other words, one is affecting cattle; the other people.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, please. You've now put two questions in, and you're starting on a third. I'll ask the minister to respond to one, please.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the recommendations put forward by the blue-ribbon panel of national and North American experts with respect to this, the Spitzer report makes it very, very clear that it's very difficult to find a connection of the type being suggested by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

I'll answer the second question as well, Mr. Speaker. In terms of all the reports that are contained in the Department of the Environment, one of the high learning curve levels that the current minister is doing in the last several weeks is trying to work his way through all these reports. I have no doubt at all that in ensuing weeks and months I'll be tabling all kinds of reports, and I look forward to any type of debate that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon would like to have with respect to this matter.

MR. YOUNIE: To the Minister of the Environment. There was talk of the pollution from the gas plant itself but not from the gas well flare-offs. In addition to the recommendations made by the health study, is the minister going to undertake or consider undertaking a study of the nature of pollutants stemming from sour gas well flare-offs and the short-term health hazards caused by those pollutants?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I'd be delighted to undertake any further

review, but the concluding sentence on page 104 of the report of this blue-ribbon panel says:

The investigators recommend that further clinical, epidemiologic or demographic studies involving new data collection on the field not be done.

#### **Topgas Debt**

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy. What is the position of this government with regard to yesterday's announcement by the National Energy Board that independent Alberta gas producers who are not part of the Topgas consortium and who are in no way responsible for the billions in debt piled up by TransCanada PipeLines and the banks should now be asked to help pay off the Topgas debt?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we're assessing that.

MR. PASHAK: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Does the government have any plan to protest the National Energy Board decision that the sharing of this Topgas burden will only be imposed on Alberta producers and not on producers from Saskatchewan and British Columbia? [interjections]

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we are having a lot of noise from across the way. I'm having difficulty — noise pollution, I guess, is what it is.

We have had a very short time to review the implications of the NEB report that came out yesterday at 2:30 in the afternoon. There are aspects of it that on a first glimpse appear to be balanced; however, there are implications with respect to the Topgas charges that we are taking a close look at. We haven't had time to assess the total implications of that, and when we do, we'll respond.

MR. PASHAK: A further supplemental, and I expect I'll get the same nonanswer. During the National Energy Board hearings into this matter the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission argued on the side of the pipeline, the banks, and the consortium, and suggested that independent producers who didn't have anything to do with the debt should help to pay it off. Why did the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, an Alberta government agency, take this position?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gave me a lot of information. In terms of what the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission or others should or shouldn't have done, I haven't got an answer right now but will take the question as notice.

MR. PASHAK: I'll try with one last supplemental. The National Energy Board made clear in its decision that it does not have complete jurisdiction in this area and that the Alberta government will have to act to help implement it. Does the government plan to introduce legislation to help implement the National Energy Board decision?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been listening to my earlier answers, he wouldn't have had such a question. The decisions of the National Energy Board, as of yesterday, would be effective November 1, 1986, when the system would be implemented with respect to their decisions. The recommendation is related to Topgas,

a situation for the Alberta, B.C., and federal governments to consider, and that's what we're doing.

#### **School Act Review**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose a question to the Minister of Education. Sometime ago a major study was published entitled Partners in Education, this being related to the School Act. I wonder if the minister could advise as to the status of this report and what further discussion, if any, is planned.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, since Partners in Education was released in February of 1985, it has received perhaps an unprecedented amount of public input toward the development of a new School Act for Alberta. I am in the process of reviewing that input, which has gone on in those ensuing 16 months. The next step in the process will be to publish a comprehensive legislative framework which will contain the results of that public input, as was committed to in the Speech from the Throne on April 3 of this year.

MR. JONSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise as to whether or not there is the possibility of a new School Act being introduced during this session?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: I have no plans to introduce the new School Act in this current session, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JONSON: One final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate to the House at what time she feels the School Act might be introduced?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am personally aiming for the spring of '87 to introduce that legislation. I think the commitment this government has to education is extremely important. As a new minister I want to be very comfortable with all the matters which have been raised by the public before I put that piece of legislation before this Assembly.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Education. During discussion of private school proposals late last year, the government circulated a document of proposals very narrowly amongst certain interested parties, which document was not available to members of the public. Is the minister prepared to assure the House that any documents that are circulated as trial balloons with respect to proposed policies will be made available to all members of the public and not just a favoured few?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: I welcome the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo's question on the matter of private schools. I think it's a very important issue, and one that I know he has a good deal of interest in. Certainly the matter of private schools and many others were part of the very comprehensive review in Partners in Education. I am committed to presenting to the public a legislative framework that will include those issues which will be raised in a new School Act, and I will do that in as open a way as I possibly can.

MR. PIQUETTE: Would the Minister of Education indicate whether necessary amendments relating to French minority language rights, guaranteed by section 23 of the Canadian Constitution, passed in 1981, will be introduced with the

Alberta School Act and possibly sooner, as francophones are demanding in Alberta?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: That's a very important matter, Mr. Speaker, and one which I am considering at the moment.

#### **Alberta Stock Savings Plan**

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has issued eight provisional certificates of eligibility under the proposed Alberta stock savings plan, one to Bryndon Ventures. Given that the government is now reviewing the terms of the plan, how does the Provincial Treasurer intend to deal with the provisional certificates already issued?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the government has issued 10 provisional certificates. Secondly, I think I have indicated in this Assembly before and the Votes and Proceedings indicate that I have given notice to introduce very soon new legislation which will deal with the elements put forward in the very appropriate Bill put forward by my colleague Mr. Hyndman which instills and encourages investment across a wide range of private-sector opportunities in this province. We will bring that Act back, Mr. Speaker.

We are a government that listens to suggestions. We have talked to a variety of people over that period, have maintained contact with those people dealing with the issues, and I think we will bring forward some recommendations which will appropriately deal with the recommendations given to us but in course will maintain the spirit and intent of that legislation.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to determine eight or 10 given that it's confidential information held by the Provincial Treasurer's own office. Is it not in order to withdraw at least seven of those eight provisional certificates of eligibility until such time as the government has finalized the terms of the plan?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the member is sending fears through the investment community with this kind of comment, and that's exactly why we're trying to get the Bill into the House as soon as possible. There'll be an adequate opportunity to see that Bill and to debate the principles therein, but in the meantime there's no confidentiality at all. You've got a research budget; you've been able to bring the information forward to this stage; carry on with it.

MR. MITCHELL: A supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: What budget?

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse us, please. The Member for Edmonton Meadowlark and the House are well aware of the fact that the Chair is having great difficulty with the anticipation rule and the fact that the Bill is on the Order Paper, so I would ask the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark to very carefully frame this supplementary question.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I respect that ruling. I would like to point out that actions are being taken under that plan.

What is the government's intention with respect to those people who've already been enticed into investing in Bryndon

on the strength of the earlier terms of the plan that are now under review?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta know that this government is a government of its word. We will continue our commitment to that legislation, as my colleague spelled out. Those people have no fear of losing their investment tax credits, nor does the company that has issued the prospectus have any fear of having this Act retroactively affect their rights as put in the legislation in the early part of April. The people of Alberta and the investment community are secure in that knowledge and secure in the knowledge that this government stands behind its commitment.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, are the people of Alberta also secure in the knowledge that we will be paying \$150,000 so that we can send \$315,000 out of this province to be invested elsewhere?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry; the Chair recognizes the Member for Edmonton Strathcona to present the member's question, followed by the Member for Wainwright. [interjections]

Sorry; the Chair has recognized the Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

#### **Infectious Disease Diagnosis**

MR. WRIGHT: My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. There appears to be a disturbing increase in the cost of testing for infectious diseases in Alberta as more is done by private laboratories and less by the Provincial Laboratory of Public Health, amounting in some cases to between a 1,000 and 2,000 percent increase in cost per test. Can the minister outline the reasons for this change?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my hon. colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care might wish to supplement anything I might say. We have in this province a first-class public health laboratory, which undertakes those kinds of diagnostic services and public health microbiology services. But we also have in this province a very, very fine private sector, which is also capable of doing an awful lot of that work. The provincial laboratories are found in both Edmonton and Calgary, and in the interest of serving the medical community both in those two larger communities but more particularly in the smaller communities around the province, we are required to take advantage of the services that are offered by those private laboratories.

MR. WRIGHT: To the minister, Mr. Speaker. That may be so, but at such an enormous increase in cost, why is the provincial laboratory not permitted to compete on equal terms; e.g. to have terminals in the hospitals, to have courier service? They're confined to service through the mail. The terms are not equal, and the increase in cost is phenomenal. Can the minister please explain this?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the public health laboratory is not confined to Her Majesty's mail. The laboratory has a budget in excess of some \$9 million that gives it an opportunity to compete as best it can with those private laboratories. But the government doesn't have a monopoly on the ability to deliver those services. Our private sector is very capable of doing an equally good job.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I'm very glad to have that reply. I'm sure the provincial laboratory will be glad to have it too. But would the minister outline his intentions regarding the further testing for infectious diseases and whether the private laboratories will continue to do a larger and larger portion of the work? What is the cost-effectiveness of this? That is the question, Mr. Minister.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm having a little trouble with the drift of the hon. member's questions.

DR. BUCK: That's because they're socialist.

MR. DINNING: I suppose that's right.

I'd be interested in having him put forward to me the concerns he has with respect to those extra dollar costs. If he has a problem with them, I'd be delighted to hear about it.

MR. WRIGHT: I should remind the minister, Mr. Speaker, that I did write to him of these very points on June 9, 1986. Perhaps the mails have been slow.

My final question, Mr. Speaker, is this. He is doubtless aware that an affiliation agreement is coming up, is proposed between the provincial laboratory and the University of Alberta. Since the laboratory is as splendid as it is — and it truly is so — will the minister not consider establishing it on its own with its own Act, much as the Research Council has been?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the representations of the hon. member. As he can well understand, this is a new job for me. It is a matter that I'm looking at, that I want to discuss with my colleagues. I only received his letter recently because it was directed to a different ministry. I appreciate the representations; those and others will be taken into account as we make our decision.

#### **Red Meat Stabilization Program**

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. There was a recent announcement of a \$54 million Ontario pork assistance program. With the signing of the national tripartite red meat stabilization program, I was led to believe that there would be no top-loading and that there would be a five-year phaseout period of existing programs to put all the provinces on equal footing. How can Ontario introduce this program and stay within the confines of that agreement?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. Member for Wainwright, I can indicate to him that the Ontario program is an extension of a program that they had introduced in 1984. At first glance, it appears this is not top-loading; it is \$49 million for upgrading or renovating their facilities and a \$5 million marketing research grant.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary then. Do they have a similar program on the cattle section of that program?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of all the programs that they do have in the various provinces, other than to say that we in the province of Alberta can be very proud of the programs that we presently have in place for our agricultural sector, because they are second to none in all of Canada.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister concerning the tripartite red meat stabilization program. Can the minister tell the Assembly what would happen in the event of the anticipated low sign-up in response to the program here in Alberta?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hypothetical question, but let me ...

MR. SPEAKER: We both recognized the hypothetical question; therefore the question is out of order.

#### **Amusement Ride Standards**

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Would he tell this House what considerations prevented this province adopting the 1983 Canadian Standards Association code for amusement rides, leaving Albertans still covered by outdated regulations of 1971?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, those were not provincial regulations. They were adopted as the basis for the inspections and procedures in this province, but they are not the only ones that are carried out.

MR. SIGURDSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate how widespread the situation is in Alberta where amusement rides do not meet the 1983 code standards, which more closely reflect current technology in the area?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the situation is that neither our 1971 or 1983 codes would necessarily be adequate for all technological advances that are made. I presume the member is referring to the incident at West Edmonton Mall. That particular ride may well involve technology that was not available even in 1983. For that reason, we use the manuals and engineering studies prepared by the manufacturer in Germany.

MR. SIGURDSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering then if the minister could indicate when we might expect to see legislation introduced to update the Alberta laws to the 1983 codes and any other codes that manufacturers may come out with?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, for one thing, we will be addressing the concerns and any recommendations that may be made by the review under the Public Inquiries Act. In addition, on an ongoing basis, in relation to any new equipment, we would of course look at the manufacturer's manuals for any new equipment subsequent to any consequential changes that are made as a result of the review by the public inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, followed by a supplementary by the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, it's not entirely coming out of the board of inquiry. Has the minister determined if the elevator and fixed conveyance inspectors in his department are qualified to inspect amusement rides and if they have received any department-sponsored, in-house, or external training in this area?



DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, all of the inspection staff in the department, to my understanding, are qualified elevator mechanics. That is the only equivalent qualification that is available in the province, and to my understanding, all of them have that qualification.

MR. SPEAKER: We are now a number of minutes past the conclusion of question period. Again, the Chair must apologize to members of the Assembly. On this day we have at least five members who were not able to participate in question period. The Chair takes all of that as rather keen participation on the part of all members of the House with respect to this certain matter as listed on Orders of the Day.

Might we grant permission of the Assembly to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to reply to a question raised yesterday in question period?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **Geriatric Care**

MR. M. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo raised a question with respect to a certain letter that was forwarded to the hon. Premier by Dr. Christine Mason from Calgary. Firstly, I want to refer to the letter — I've now had an opportunity to review a copy of it — which was received in the Premier's office March 27 and replied to by his office on April 3. That letter has also been circulated to a number of other ministers, who have either replied or are in the process of replying.

The gist of the hon. member's question was what we were doing about the fact that, as the hon. member said, there's not one geriatric doctor in Calgary. Mr. Speaker, the facts of the matter are that the field of geriatric medicine as a specialty is relatively new in Canada, and there are not more than two doctors who have obtained that specialty in Alberta. There are a number of provinces in Canada that have none.

The real facts are that very close to 100 percent of the medical care of our senior citizens is carried out by doctors of other specialties, general practitioners, and others in the system. In my review of the situation the specialties and the medical practitioners in Calgary are doing an excellent job.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, and through you to the Assembly, I'd like to introduce 50 grade 6 students from Legal school in my constituency just north of Edmonton. They are seated in the public gallery, accompanied by their teachers Eugene Krupa and Ernest Chauvet, and parents

Wanda Nonay and Donna Lessard. I would ask them to rise to receive the customary greetings of this Legislature.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly 35 students of Scott Robertson school in the Glengarry riding, their teachers Mrs. Buccini and Mr. Romaniuk, and a parent Mrs. Boll, who have accompanied the students. I would like everyone to give them our traditional warm welcome.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 23 grades 5 and 6 students from the Peoples Christian Academy in Red Deer North. They are accompanied by one of their teachers, Mr. Glenn Mullen, and by parents Mrs. C. Kirkwood, Mrs. Gaylene Pfeifle, and Karen Morgan.

Mr. Speaker, as this is my first opportunity to introduce a school group to this Assembly, I can honestly say it is the sharpest group of students I have ever been able to introduce in all my days in this House. I would invite the members of this Assembly to give them a traditional warm welcome as they rise.

#### **head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)**

#### **Bill 6 Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1986**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move second reading of Bill 6, the Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1986.

As hon. members know, this Bill provides for \$5,700,332,672, which the government will require to allow it to operate until approximately August 30, 1986. This \$5.7 billion amount absorbs any special warrants which were passed by the Executive Council previous to the House sitting in April.

Of course, the interim supply Bill provides direct operating assistance not just for the government departments themselves but also for a variety of agencies and local authorities who are dependent upon the funding requirements of this government, including — I'm not restricting it to school boards — universities and colleges, hospitals, and municipalities. These agencies and groups are directly responsible for funding from this government, and the interim supply Bill will assist on that point.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, as all members know, this Bill does follow the parliamentary tradition of allowing the government to continue to operate while the final appropriation is being passed by the Assembly. Therefore, I do encourage all members to support second reading of Bill 6, the Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1986.

[Motion carried; Bill 6 read a second time]

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

Moved by Mrs. Koper:

That an humble address be presented to Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To Her Honour the Honourable W. Helen Hunley, Lieutenant Governor of the province of Alberta:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for

the gracious speech Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

[Adjourned debate June 16: Mr. Elzinga]

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could share with you that I had concluded my remarks when I finished the other evening.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed an honour and a pleasure to be able to stand here in the Legislature and participate in the throne speech debate. It's an honour to have had enough constituents place their trust in me that I might be here today, and it's a great pleasure to see an increase in the size of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Legislature I had the opportunity to work here as a legislative assistant to the then leader of the Official Opposition, the late Grant Notley. I knew too well the frustration that both he and my new leader, the Member for Edmonton Norwood, experienced: not enough time, with only a skeleton staff to attempt to cover all of the departments or, rather, to perhaps attempt to uncover some of the dastardly deeds that the departments carried out. Mr. Speaker, should each member of the New Democratic caucus commit their efforts to do but a percentage of the work that my late friend did, then I think it only fair to warn this current government that no more will they attack the poor without our fighting back, no more will they be able to pass antiworker legislation without our fighting back. Farmers, workers, and ordinary Albertans have more friends in the opposition now, and we shall work on their behalf. On the political spectrum we may be the leftists, but it's where I find more and more the righteous coming to.

Before I make specific comments about the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer you my congratulations for not only your re-election in Calgary Egmont but also your election as Speaker of the Assembly. The Premier, in nominating you, could not have made a finer choice. I know that from time to time you're going to have a difficult time keeping some of the Tory backbenchers in order. As for me, I hope to be orderly in conduct, prepared for debate, vigilant of government activity, and mindful of parliamentary procedure. Should I fail the above, I'll be absolutely uncontrollable and take advantage of being the youngest member of the Assembly and blame my behaviour on the exuberance of youth.

DR. BUCK: We'll feed him pabulum.

MR. SIGURDSON: As a dentist you should appreciate the benefits of pabulum.

Mr. Speaker, Edmonton Belmont is located in the northeast corner of our capital city. The demographics, according to the census of Canada, are typical of the Canadian/Albertan mosaic. Ethnic origins show that more than one-third have British ancestors and approximately 15 percent have a Ukrainian heritage. Ten percent come from Germany or are German descendants. The French, Dutch, and Italian cultures each contribute between 5 and 8 percent to the population picture. The remaining 25 percent come from around the world.

We're a relatively young community; 85 percent of the more than 33,000 residents are under the age of 50. Eighty percent of us are married, with the vast majority living in single detached housing.

We have an experienced labour force. Almost three-quarters of the women who are or would like to be participating in the labour force are in the clerical field or in sales and service. Almost 70 percent of the men who are employed or want to be employed are in the construction, transportation, trade, or manufacturing sectors.

Those are the hard facts, and hard facts don't too often tell many stories very well. That may be why we have members of the Legislature: to tell stories of our communities, to personify the raw data, to explain the desires and the needs of our constituents to our colleagues opposite, who currently control the purse strings of the people.

Edmonton Belmont is a wonderful place to live. We have a great ethnic mix, which makes us fortunate in understanding our multicultural society. We have apartments and town homes for singles and young couples who are just starting out. In our established communities we have a feeling of stability, and in our new, developing communities we share a positive attitude and know that through co-operation we will get through the economic crisis we currently face.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, Edmonton Belmont is indeed a wonderful place to live and grow. It's where my wife and I live now, and hopefully in a few years it's where we'll begin to raise our family.

As wonderful a place as Belmont is, Mr. Speaker, it's not without its share of problems. In the northernmost part of the constituency the city of Edmonton is currently giving consideration to placing a landfill site on what is prime agricultural land. This part of the city already has facilities that would be considered undesirable and unwanted in many communities. The Edmonton maximum security prison is in the area; Alberta Hospital and the Helen Hunley institute are but a few institutions that are within my constituency. My constituents who live in close proximity to these institutions do not want to see the landfill site in their area. It would only erode the sense of stability and security which is already fragile within the community. The city, should it choose the northeast site for the landfill, may in fact destroy the hopes and aspirations of many of my constituents who have chosen to live in that area.

Mr. Speaker, some may ask why I would raise a civic matter in the provincial Legislature. Is it because I think landfill sites to be outmoded and obsolete? Yes, I do. Could it be that I don't care to see an already struggling community suffer yet another blow? Yes, that too is the case. Could it also be that I think it time the provincial government considered a regional site that would incorporate a responsible waste management system? Again, that too is true. More important, however, is that I want to appeal to this government to refuse to negotiate the sale of this particular piece of land.

Mr. Speaker, a quarter of this section of land is number 2 soil, and that quarter is owned by the department of transportation. The other three quarters of the section is number 1 soil and owned by the department of housing. Knowing the commitment this government has made to agriculture, I would suggest that it would be asinine for any negotiation regarding the sale of this section for the purpose of a landfill site. I would urge the ministers of housing, transportation, and agriculture to advise the city that this piece of land is not for sale. I would further urge the ministers of the environment and municipal affairs, and any other ministers who need to be involved, to sit down with the cities to look at a regional site that employs modern technology and environmentally safer methods of waste disposal.

If we make this project financially attractive to the municipalities within a region, we will end the division in the city of Edmonton where community is pitted against community. We will not have to take valuable agricultural land out of production. My goodness, with a capital project such as this, we may even create a few hundred construction jobs.

Other concerns in Edmonton Belmont are unemployment, under-employment, and low income. The 1981 census showed that 13.7 percent of the families who reside in Belmont are in the category of low income. Today, Mr. Speaker, while the actual figure may or may not have changed, I know the level of dissatisfaction with one's income has gone up while real disposable income has gone down. Real disposable income has gone down not only in Edmonton Belmont but right across our province. In the rural communities our producers used to go out and buy replacement machinery parts and on their way to the supplier perhaps do a little consumer spending. Today not only is that spending down, but many farmers are adding yet another spot weld to an almost exhausted frame.

In the cities unemployment continues its path of devastation. The statistics for May of this year show that 137,000 Albertans were out of work, up 1,000 from the month of April, up 5,000 from the month of May in the previous year. So while the percentage of unemployment went down from 10.8 percent in April to 10.7 percent for May, 1,000 more people — living, breathing, feeling people, many with families to support — were without work. In the city of Calgary 39,000 people are without work. Here in our capital city 49,000 people or 12 percent are without work. But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest it's not 12 percent where the Premier lives. I would suggest it's not 12 percent where the Government House Leader lives. And I'd suggest it's probably not as high as 12 percent over in Edmonton Glenora. I know full well that it's not as low as 12 percent in Edmonton Belmont. Living in Edmonton Belmont are people who used to work at Burns and Canada Packers. Living in Edmonton Belmont are a number of people who used to work in the energy sector. And living in Edmonton Belmont and especially hard hit are those involved in the construction trades.

Mr. Speaker, if you take the acknowledged unemployed, the 12 percent, and couple that to the number of people receiving social service benefits in the northeast area — which, incidentally, I'm told amounts to 10 percent of the overall usage in the city — and then add that to the number of people who are not statistically unemployed, those whose unemployment insurance has run out but have a spouse that works, you may find that the unemployment rate is perhaps as high as double the acknowledged rate. In a province as rich as ours, in a society that cares, how is it that we allow this to happen? The electorate want change. They sent this government a message. Should the government respond, I and my colleagues will be the first to offer our support; be successful, we'll be the first to congratulate you; fail to respond and you'll be seeking condolences elsewhere when the electorate next throw you out.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I do want to note that the new Minister of Manpower, who will soon be the old minister of the new department of career development, offers a refreshing attitude to what is considered an acceptable level of unemployment: zero percent. The attitude is refreshing; the methodology employed to achieve that end will become more important. It pains me to hear that the new minister might be content to wait for the private sector to

respond to the unemployment crisis. If the government is not willing to inject capital into this suffering economy to prime the economic pump, then I fear this new attitude in this new department may end up being a new facade wrapped around broken-down, old right-wing claptrap.

Mr. Speaker, youth unemployment is potentially more critically devastating than it may be for those who are over the age of 25. I don't want to have this statement construed as meaning that unemployment is more acceptable for one particular age over the other, because it isn't. Unemployment is not good at any age, be it 16 or 60. However, unemployment may be more critically devastating for youth. We have right here in Alberta 48,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 out of work. Of the young people who want to work, who are considered to be part of the work force, 16.6 percent are without work.

For these young people, many without skills, the tragedy of unemployment will soon take its toll. How many times can a young person, who is still developing his or her own sense of identity, be told that they have no skills before their sense of value goes down? How many times will young people be told that they have no value before they start to believe that it's true? How many television shows over how many days, weeks, and months will there be before the young mind snaps and chooses a direction that society will later have to punish them for? How many times will we say we should have done something before we actually do?

I'm reminded of the old oil filter commercial that I used to see on television, where the mechanic comes out and says, "You can pay me now or you can pay me later." I hope we invest in the energy and vitality that our youth have to offer rather than pay the future cost in judicial time and in having to build more correctional institutions.

We're going to have to make postsecondary education more accessible to those who want it. We must make sure that the cost of education is not prohibitive. University education pays off. We know from a 1982 study that the overall youth unemployment rate was 18.8 percent. For those with a university education the rate dropped to 10.3 percent. Training programs must also be improved to ensure that tax dollars are being properly utilized. Mr. Speaker, a number of programs that are designed to train youth are maybe being used to offset the cost of an employer's wage. We must make sure that the programs are being properly monitored so that both parties benefit: the youth in training and the employer in production. I have heard comments that this is not the case, that training may not occur. I hope that a more effective monitoring system might be established to prevent any possible abuse of some rather worthwhile programs.

Mr. Speaker, when I watched some of the political advertising during the recent election, I saw one particular ad showing the Premier reminiscing about bygone days of glory, the ones before May 8, and ads showing the Premier out on the football field. It would seem that those were happy times for the Premier. I wonder how many of our young people today will be able to look back in 10 or 20 years and say, "Those were the happiest days of my life." You see, every day of production lost is lost forever. Youth is not tangible. Time cannot be stored away. It is our responsibility to do everything we possibly can to ensure that we don't have a lost generation. Let's make sure that we don't end up paying higher social costs in the future for the sake of a few dollars today.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that within the April 3 edition of the throne speech, a greater emphasis is placed

on tourism. In that throne speech the Lieutenant Governor noted that

the industry will also benefit through significantly improving education and formal training programs which develop careers and jobs for Albertans in the tourism industry.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that statement followed a similar statement contained in Policy Statement #1, the position and policy statement on tourism in response to the white paper Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans 1985 to 1990, which said, "There is an urgent need in the industry to improve formal training programs . . ." I thought that the Department of Tourism was created to attract tourists to Alberta and that formal training programs would be in place to assist in the marketing strategy to encourage people to travel to or within our province or perhaps to assist in a skills-developing course that would promote repeat business due to some of the services provided. Unfortunately, that appears not to be the case.

I went through the NAIT calendar for 1986 and 1987. I looked in the index under hotel management, under motel management, under hospitality: nothing. I looked under travel and, lo and behold, a subject: travel advisor I. I quickly turned to the page that the course description was on and became instantly disappointed. This course, the only course in the calendar that has something to do with the hospitality industry, is designed to train people to become travel agents. And what do travel agents do for the most part? They usually send people out of the province. In my disappointment I turned to throne speech two, the sequel, and found tourism mentioned twice and, in both instances, contained within another sentence. Three months ago, three paragraphs in the throne speech were devoted to tourism. The sequel gives us but a passing mention. We ought to be doing more than just giving passing mention in a throne speech to an industry that has the potential tourism has.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to comment about the Gainers situation. I'm not going to spend a great deal of time on the subject as we're all too well aware of this tragic situation. This is partly a question of political philosophy and political ideology. Do we as individuals have the right to associate and, from that association, bargain collectively? Do we, in industrial disputes, have the right to withdraw our labour in a peaceful manner, without fearing the loss of our jobs? Do we have the right to protest, the right to assemble? Do we have any rights at all?

There is no getting away from the fact that the Gainers management staff failed to negotiate in good faith. It's all too obvious that they placed an advertisement asking for strike breakers. Not only did they place the ad prior to the end of the collective agreement; they offered more money to new non-union workers than they paid their current experienced workers who happen to be union members. That is not negotiating in good faith. We're all well aware of this.

What is most unfortunate is that the laws of this province allow this to happen. What are the laws that allow an employer to fire the mother of the president of the local union for protesting? Because Mrs. Ventura had the courage to stand beside her son and support his efforts and his struggle, she was fired. We ought to be outraged that this is allowed to happen in our Alberta, and we on this side of the House are outraged that it does.

Mr. Speaker, in throne speech two, the sequel, there is on the last page a statement:

A full review of labour legislation will be undertaken by my government, and necessary amendments will be proposed to assure that the laws of this province, for the present and for the future, will be responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees.

Given the record of Conservative governments, Mr. Speaker, this statement scares the hell out of me.

Bills 11, 41, 44, and 110 — the record is not good. We will watch carefully this full review of labour legislation. With the number of New Democrats elected, Mr. Speaker, should this review and subsequent legislation kick the worker down again, we will be working around the clock in this building. We on this side of the House are workers too, and the electorate of this province has sent enough of us for the day shift, the afternoon shift, and the night shift.

Mr. Speaker, as I'm about to take my seat, I'm reminded that Grant Notley in his maiden speech quoted the British Conservative Benjamin Disraeli, who said: Though I sit down now, the time will soon come when you will hear from me again. Mr. Speaker, when Grant used that quote, he stood as the lone New Democrat in this Assembly. Things have changed, and you will hear from us not only again but often.

Thank you very much.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege today to respond to the Speech from the Throne, particularly after being elected for the Three Hills constituency for the third consecutive term.

Along with other members of the Legislature, I wish to pay tribute to the Lieutenant Governor for her fine efforts throughout the province of Alberta and, of course, her very excellent reading of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, you have enjoyed your new position for a grand total of five days and the roof is still on the Legislature. I believe it is fair to say that all hon. members in this Alberta Legislature wish to co-operate with you in seeing that our Legislature can be pointed to by all Albertans with a great deal of pride.

Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for Social Services, I follow a number of ministers, all of whom have identified priorities and set an agenda accordingly. The ministry had its beginning as social development and was first held by the hon. Member for Little Bow, now Leader of the Representative Party. I believe at that time his emphasis was on prevention. The hon. Member for Edmonton Parkallen, now the minister responsible for Municipal Affairs, brought about improvements in the mental health area. A further important emphasis by our Lieutenant Governor when she held political office in this portfolio was on behalf of the disabled. The MLA for Taber-Warner initiated the decentralization of the department, bringing services and staff closer to people in this province throughout the hundreds of communities that are now served. Of course, the Member for Calgary Bow and the Minister of Energy had as a very important priority child welfare. Looking back at the programs and policies established by past ministers and naming but a few, I have only scratched the surface.

This 21st Session of the Alberta Legislature commenced on June 12, 1986. This very important Legislature will likely see us through the 1980s and launched into the 1990s. With this in mind, what should be on this minister's agenda that will lead us with confidence into the 1990s?

My agenda begins with a strong personal commitment to the family. That priority is absolutely pervasive. I will also support the right of individuals to take and hold responsibility

over their own lives. I will strive to be a representative for all Albertans. In that context, then, this minister's agenda should include the provision of high-quality day care, child care for all people who need it, maintenance of a social safety net through a real partnership with the community, and the efficient and innovative use of taxpayers' dollars. Albertans will also see action on the prevention of abuse of women and children and on fine-tuning of the child welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, to set that agenda, I think one has to make some assumptions. I assume that government should carry the greatest share of the responsibility in assuring elementary justice. Elementary justice is the basic expectation that people, families, or societies have about themselves. Children expect to be loved. Families expect members to support others. It is elementary justice to expect society to provide a social safety net by which the poor and powerless are protected against destitution and exploitation. A further assumption would be that policies and services which enhance the opportunity for development of harmonious family relationships would go a great distance in assuring the provision of elementary justice.

Mr. Speaker, as we review the agenda for Social Services, each item should be influenced by many people from all across this province. As each of us do our work daily and in particular make recommendations for policy, it is fair to say that we are influenced by events and experiences in our own lives. Obviously where I have been and what I have seen will influence me. Being a child in a small village, maturing and attending school in a large city, marrying young with the rough and tumble that that presents, the challenge of farming and raising five children at the same time, now with extended families and four grandchildren, gives me a very, very big stake in the future of this province. The examples of caring and sharing demonstrated by the community in which I live leave a very deep impression. Unfortunately, examples around us are not always positive.

As a member of the Human Rights Commission for six years, I came to know the darker side of our society and many people who were adversely affected. We must not be smug and say that just because we made it, all people should be able to. We continue to face the challenge that our individual differences and frailties present, which means vigilance and seeing that equality of opportunity is present for all people, remembering at the same time that equality of opportunity does not guarantee equality of outcome.

Mr. Speaker, to provide elementary justice we must support the role of the family as the base from which our society operates and, of course, a social safety net where the family is unable to provide that necessary support. The family has undergone significant changes over the past several decades. Let's look back as far as 1941. Our province's population was 789,000, with some 69 percent living in rural areas. It was the reverse in 1981, some 40 years later, with a total population of 2.1 million and only 23 percent living in the rural areas. Of course, that trend continues. The participation rate of females in the labour force was 44 percent in '71, 58 percent in '81, and is projected to be 68 percent in 1991. At the same time, male participation remained virtually the same, which shouldn't surprise any of us. There has always been a significantly lower rate of women from rural Alberta participating in the labour force vis-à-vis their urban counterparts. It makes me wonder if women didn't show up on the stats because it wasn't considered a paying job, and it certainly wasn't a paying job.

In general, the divorce rate is increasing significantly. The size of the family is decreasing. Families with both parents working are increasing and, of course, single-parent families are on the increase, with some 20 percent headed by male parents and 80 percent by females.

We have often heard of the significant number of seniors that will comprise our population in the not too distant future. The projections show an increase of over 43 percent in this age category by the year 2000, an interesting stat for the hon. Member for Highwood, I'm sure. Of course, the programs and policies for seniors in place by the year 2000 will have repercussions on the family. The matter of how individuals, communities, and governments handle the escalating cost also requires ongoing discussion.

Mr. Speaker, we have for two decades been building into our social services system many programs that we believe would do the things for people that a good society should do. We all want to be advocates of a good society. Alexis de Tocqueville, the French historian and political scientist who is oft quoted, said that if America ceases to be good, it ceases to be great. As Albertans we want to be good, and I assure you that all of us aspire to be great. Our problem becomes one of defining good. How often in our lives do we hear someone say to do this or take that, it's good for you. My mother used to say that about castor oil, and believe me, I remain unconvinced. However, that begs the question, in looking at society as a whole: who should define good? I have to admit that as politicians, all of us often tell the public what we believe to be good for them. The spokesmen for this group and that also tell the public what is good for them. How does the majority of the public, who are not organized into this group or that, collectively define good, particularly when it is intimated by a few of our ivory-towered types that society has become so complex that so-called experts in various fields should be the ultimate guide and authority?

There is no question in my mind about the important role that is played by many individual experts and groups in publicly providing their advice and opinions on various matters. However, our approach to issues has become fragmented as special interest groups and specialists play a greater and greater role. As a result, in my view, with all good intentions we are producing more laws and regulations that may well serve a particular interest group but have not been vetted by society as a whole with a view to determine the overall effect on our society. Is it naive to suggest that we must encourage a broader public discussion on issues that are defined and promoted by smaller interest groups? I believe that broader discussion is desirable and necessary.

Mr. Speaker, an important item on the Social Services agenda should be empowering and re-empowering of people. Empowering of people means putting the authority for most personal decisions back in the hands of individuals. To address those decisions, people require resources, resources that in some cases have been usurped by others, particularly government, in a case where we pass a lot of laws and the amount of taxation that we have. While we cannot always judge the effect that new social policies will have on society as a whole, we certainly can look at where we've been, where we are now, and what has been the positive or negative effect of social programs presently in existence, particularly on the family.

I'd like to make an analogy. To see society as a whole is like looking at a giant painting with many groups and individuals having been the artists. Do we like what we

see? Will we be the artists who add to the picture and make changes in the future? Some of us may be too close to that picture, Mr. Speaker, interested only in the portion that we are painting, not doing as the great da Vinci said, and that was to put enough distance between artist and picture that the whole scene may be visible.

As our agenda items address the family and empowering of people, so also must we re-establish Social Services as a facilitator for our citizens as opposed to being the prime mover. It seems to me that Social Services working with individuals, organizations, and communities can be a facilitator. I point to our role in women's shelters. People in various locations throughout the province have identified a need, and the department has committed to the lion's share of the funding. We do not run the shelters. Albertans are identifying community priorities and are accepting responsibility and accountability for their funding.

The government's role in day care, Mr. Speaker, has been an evolutionary one. Social services, over time, has gone from being service oriented, where support is given to the family in need, to major intervention by way of regulation and funding. Every parent, regardless of their income, who places a child in day care in this province receives indirectly by way of an operating allowance to all facilities a monthly subsidy of up to \$257 per child, depending on the age of the child. In addition, on behalf of each parent or parents below a certain income a subsidy of up to \$240 per month per child is provided. Adding those together in the cases where parents are subsidized, the maximum funds provided could therefore reach \$497 per month per child. In the previous two years day care costs to the taxpayers were \$39 million and \$49 million respectively. Last year the citizens at large in the province carried the day care users to the tune of over \$57 million. Government intervention has placed us in the position where some people no longer look at Social Services as being service oriented in support of parents' responsibility for their children. Instead, segments of our society look to Social Services as being responsible for more of what historically has been the responsibility of the parent.

In my view, every corner of our society is affected by the smooth functioning, or otherwise, of the family. Our financial support has been basically directed toward the operation of day care centres and more recently family day homes. I am now being asked by many individuals who belong to the biggest percentage and group of parents out there in our society, who either care for their children themselves or utilize a friend or family they know personally, why our exclusive support is for the more institutional type of child care. Are we assured that this is in the best interest of our infants and children?

In my view, while it is vitally important to be satisfied that standards for the more institutional type of care are appropriate, it is also vital that we review the pros and cons of the various types of care. It is absolutely critical that parents have the best information possible when making decisions about the care of their children. In making decisions, parents will consider options ranging from being at home with their child, having someone go to their home, finding a friend or family who will take their child, placing their child in a family day home or in a day care centre, and possibly other alternatives. Have we as government stacked the deck in favour of a certain kind of child care? Have we inappropriately taken options from parents, especially financially strapped moms and dads? More and more concerns are being raised that deserve consideration. Ques-

tions are being asked and answers should be provided, especially to parents. Knowledge and information in the hands of citizens is empowering. Just as children have a right to be loved, parents having primary responsibility for their children and the public at large who is paying the bills should have all the facts in order to be satisfied that reasonable conclusions are being reached.

Hopefully, we can develop undisputed factual information in response to the concerns and questions being raised publicly. These include the appropriateness and effects of group care on infants. For example, what are the effects of the disruptions of the mother/infant bonding process? What is the appropriateness of group care versus one-to-one in a home setting? And what potential effects are there on the infant's development as a result of crowding?

There are additional concerns, Mr. Speaker, respecting health. Infants, by nature, have low resistance to disease and are only partially immunized until at least 18 months. For preschoolers the susceptibility continues. What is the effect on children as a result of the spread of disease in a group setting? What can be done when sick children must be brought to day care because there is no other alternative available? These questions and others relating to child care deserve well-considered responses.

In the meantime, attention should be given to our present situation. Mr. Speaker, standards for day care and training for day care workers can and will be improved. However, as I assemble information and gather public input, I begin to feel an uneasiness relating to government's role in child care. I have made unannounced visits to day care centres, so far only in Edmonton, and have spoken to workers. I've had a number of questions to ask and naturally observed conditions that relate to our rules and regulations.

I believed an important question was how often parents visit. Generally, the answer was that they don't. Who else has a better sense of well-being, or otherwise, of their child? A licensing officer can visit with a rule book in hand, but that will never replace the experienced and loving eye of a parent. Why don't parents visit? For one thing, many children are placed in care centres located close to their home but often a great distance from their parents' place of work.

That should lead us to consider whether employers should have an interest in day care. Certainly some hon. members have mentioned that and have already put forward a motion in that regard. I believe the case can be made for this interest when considering the overall health of the family and its effect on the employee at work. Is it possible for responsible employers to consider the need for child care when locating private or public operations? The responsibility for that child care should remain with the employees. The benefits in terms of family unity are obvious. The sense of well-being brought about by such child care should be of importance to all employers.

Mr. Speaker, another area of concern is the poverty that always seems to be with us. Interestingly enough, we have changed our definition of "poverty" many times. According to the Statistics Canada poverty line, in 1961 you were said to be poor if you spent 70 percent or more of your income on essentials. In '72 we began to call you poor if you spent 62 percent or more of your income on essentials. In 1978 it was changed to 58.5 percent. Nobody likes to learn or be told that they are living in poverty. Many of us have had personal experience with it some time during our life. When I had a part-time job in 1970 through '72 doing statistical survey work, one of the surveys turned out to

be on poverty. Until I had read the guidelines as to how to determine who would be classified as poor, I had no idea that my husband Joe and I were classified in this category. It's a rotten inconvenience to be short of money most of the time, but certainly we did not feel poor.

Mr. Speaker, real poverty concerns us all and should concern us all. We certainly are aware of the large increase in the number of people accessing food banks. We are unequivocal in our support for the social safety net which means, among other things, the provision of basic food, clothing, and shelter. Legitimate questions are raised about policies in respect to our social allowance programs and, in particular, the components used in determining the allowance rates. The co-operation of the major food banks is appreciated by the department, as together they undertake to provide answers on these important questions.

I think "together" is an important word to use here, for it is my experience that nothing real can be accomplished without a sense of partnership and teamwork. I am proud to be able to lead a fine team at Alberta Social Services which is charged with a difficult assignment. The team would be nothing without its team members, and for me the most important members are those on the front lines. They interface daily with those in need or those who want. All of us are charged with the responsibility of being accountable to the people who pay the bills: the taxpayers of Alberta. Maintaining a social safety net does not give us a licence to waste, all the more difficult for our front-line staff who must do their best to ascertain the extent of need — front-line staff, incidentally, that need an infusion of the very best technology available in order that they have the time to do their job.

Another area critically important is child welfare. Again, workers face a dilemma. If they apprehend a child they believe to be at risk and are subsequently proved wrong, there is a great outcry. If in a similar instance their judgment was not to apprehend the child and subsequently the child was seriously hurt, or worse, then there is naturally also a great outcry. Mr. Speaker, we owe a great debt to those people who take part in this very, very important work.

A person hungry, a woman beaten, a child abused in any way are unacceptable occurrences in our society. However, no matter how committed we are in trying to assure the basic well-being and happiness of people, we will sometimes fail. Generally, the standard of living that has been realized in the past 20 years goes beyond all expectations, at least of my generation. But now, for those who see the so-called perfect image and life-style, especially on television, and cannot achieve it, there is a great frustration. When expectations are not met, particularly in the family, we see discord and even worse, violence.

In the past 20 years of higher standards of living — or should it be high living? — governments have spent far beyond the taxpayers' ability to pay, with the resultant huge deficit. We have heavily mortgaged our own future as well as our children's and possibly our grandchildren's. That fact should make some of us pause if we are considering postponing payments on our bills to some time in the future. We were not left with a legacy of debt by the generation who came before us. Mr. Speaker, we cannot boast about the entire legacy that it appears we will leave.

Can we improve the situation? I believe so. Commitments that touch on every part of our daily life must be made by all of us. The public has a right to know the depth of commitment of the Minister of Social Services, who takes responsibility for this very sensitive and oftentimes contro-

versial portfolio. My best efforts will be devoted to assuring the freedom to build strong families, listening to what Albertans have to say, and participating with workers on the front lines. I will encourage business to participate in the social fabric of this province. I must also provide responsive and responsible stewardship on behalf of Albertans.

I was struck by the remarks made Friday last by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about our government. He said in an accusatory fashion that our ideology makes us sit and hope for things to happen. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. We do hope, but it is with the knowledge that every reasonable effort is being expended as we meet these critical times head-on. Both ideas and dollars have been delivered by this government. A favourable comparison can be made with any jurisdiction in North America. The opposition, by advocating even more government intervention, that somehow we should stand government in the place of individual Albertans and Alberta business, presupposes a lack of activity by the people of Alberta, because the opposition does not have the confidence in Albertans' ability to be innovative and entrepreneurial. The opposition would take more money out of more pockets to pay for that government intervention. They are sending a clear message that on their own, Albertans are incapable of being part of the solution. You will not see government members making such an incredible demonstration of a lack of faith in Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, pioneers came to this province in search of freedom and opportunity. They came with great ambition, holding dear the qualities of faith, hope, and love. The very least all members of this Legislature can do is to emulate that very same fine spirit and those very same qualities.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, as is the tradition in a member's first speech to the House, I might spend a few moments on the Speaker's position and role. I would very much like to add my congratulations to those of the members who have spoken before me in response to the throne speech. My congratulations on your appointment as Speaker to this House. I was immediately impressed on Thursday and have sustained that impression of your kind and thoughtful manner in dealing with all members of the House, but especially in dealing with the rookie members of the House. You've been extremely patient with me, and I feel that even today I tested that patience. Please don't lose it too quickly; I will come around. You've admonished me on occasion, but you've never left me feeling defeated. I think that's a very difficult balance to find, and you've found it with me. Thank you very much.

If I might be light for a moment, I'd like to talk about the issue of hypothetical questions. I took your point very seriously and pursued the question of hypothetical questions with the Clerk of the House yesterday. To my pleasant surprise I found that while I cannot ask hypothetical questions, ministers are free to give hypothetical answers. I accept your ruling in good faith, but would you please allow me to envy the ministers as I listen to their somewhat vague and hypothetical answers from time to time.

As pleased as I am with your appointment. I feel a real sense of disappointment for your predecessor. I suppose I had a role in seeing that he isn't here with us these days. As I have said many times, the only regret I had in being elected in Edmonton Meadowlark was that your predecessor and mine was not elected. As I sat here on Thursday, the

first day, and had this sense of awe and excitement about being here, I had a feeling that his pain and disappointment at not being here must have been about commensurate with my feelings. He established a tradition of outstanding service in my riding which is very much an inspiration to me and which I will have to strive very, very hard to sustain. As you know, I don't know too much about the regulations of this House yet, but would it be in order for us to recognize his contribution in the past to this House? [applause] Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am to speak about my constituents, and I'd like to briefly emphasize them. I am extremely grateful to my constituents for having given me the opportunity to work in this House and to work in public service on their behalf. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to pursue a very worthwhile and important form of work. I believe not too many people get the kind of opportunity that we have in this House and in this role.

I'm also extremely grateful for the time they spent with me on their doorsteps over the last number of years, in their living rooms and kitchens, in community meetings — the time they spent with me discussing issues and giving me their insights on the problems and issues facing this province and our constituency as they see them these days.

They raised a number of local issues important to Edmonton Meadowlark. One of them is the need for a new west-end library. At this time the Jasper Place Library is the most heavily used library in Edmonton, and it draws on a population of about 100,000. The library board's own guidelines say that you need a new library when you have a population of 30,000. In fact, there are 35,000 people living west of 170th Street in Edmonton Meadowlark. It may be that we can pursue a CRC grant or that in fact this House would consider special funding for a library facility for the many young children who have moved into the newly developing areas west of 170th Street.

There is a tremendous concern in my riding as well for the Whitemud Freeway and what it represents in terms of hazardous wastes and dangerous goods transportation. The PCBs that made it past Kenora last summer in that truck that we've all heard so much about can be literally transported right through our community, up the Whitemud Freeway, up 170th Street on their way to the Swan Hills waste management plant when it's completed. Certainly there will be more of those kinds of hazardous wastes and dangerous goods that can be transported through our community. There are solutions. We should be very clear about saying no to importing those kinds of goods to this province from other provinces, and we should also consider upgrading the Devon ring route in a fashion that allows the heavy vehicles needed to carry this kind of material to skirt our city, our community, the schools, and the densely populated areas that road goes closely by on the way to the Swan Hills waste management plant. I have every confidence that this House and the ministers across the way will give that proposal its due consideration.

Of course, there are many people in my riding, and they have a range of socioeconomic backgrounds. They all share a certain concern with social issues and programs presented by this government. There are those who are absolutely desperate for a social network. If I met them before the election, and I did, I've certainly met them again after the election — women who are single parents with two or three children and just cannot make ends meet and who, unlike the Minister of Social Services, maybe aren't surprised that in fact they're defined as people who are living below the poverty line.

There are also those people in my riding who are not so desperate about their socioeconomic circumstances but who believe very strongly that the level and quality of social services in our society and offered by our government are the very measure of the quality and dignity of our society and of the government that this kind of Legislature provides our society in our province.

There are people in my riding who are very concerned about fairness to women and the ability of this government to deal with women's issues. It's no secret to them that there is a really insidious kind of prejudice about the way women are treated in our society. It's no secret to them that there is a real lack of leadership in this government that hasn't been changed or altered by the throne speech, a real lack of leadership about changing the circumstances of women and attitudes toward women in our society. I wish I could speak at some length about social concerns and women's issues, but in my caucus I am charged more with economic and financial considerations. The consolation I have is that my colleague from Edmonton Gold Bar is perhaps the foremost advocate of these issues in this province, and I look forward to her comments in the future as she addresses the throne speech.

Before I get into the body of my speech, I would like to point out that while it is our job to be critical, not all is wrong with this budget. There are some positives that I, among others, would like to encourage this government to adamantly pursue. I was very impressed and struck by the government's commitment in the throne speech to begin dealing with the federal government about redressing the imbalance, particularly as it relates to oil revenues, on behalf of this province. I think they mentioned a very important element in what can become the negotiations with the federal government, and that is the need for self-sufficiency for central Canada and for the rest of this country in the supply of oil. I think that is the key interest that can bring central Canada to a negotiating table and to negotiations that can be resolved positively and successfully as part of a national consensus in which Alberta can play a part as an equal partner.

Believe it or not, I'm also quite in favour of the Alberta stock savings plan. Although I've spent some time and effort in firming up that plan and in improving its delivery, its concept is good and I encourage the government not to lose heart — and it sounds today like they haven't — but to proceed with it. I think it will be better for the discussion we have had.

I would like to now emphasize two issues in my response that are relevant to the throne speech: fiscal responsibility and economic diversification. I will start with fiscal responsibility. The throne speech contemplated measures which have added up to a \$2.5 billion deficit. That deficit is of extreme concern to the members of my caucus and to the people of Alberta. It may even be greater than \$2.5 billion if you consider the estimation of oil revenues and consider that the government has estimated them to have dropped by one-third over last year when in fact oil prices have dropped by as much as 60 percent, and the government is also contemplating natural gas deregulation. That could in fact push this deficit to \$3.5 billion.

Let me put the size of that deficit in perspective. At \$3.5 billion, if we were to repeat that for three or four years, it would bankrupt the heritage trust fund, which has come to be seen as an important factor in the future of this province. Let me also put that deficit on a national scale. Consider that we are 10 percent of the Canadian population.



Therefore, multiply \$3.5 billion by 10 to put it on a national scale, and you have a deficit of \$35 billion, exactly the levels of federal deficit spending that have become such a tremendous concern and have built such a tremendous debt which is the burden of all Canadians today. Consider also that the \$3.5 billion deficit is after a \$1.5 billion transfer from the heritage trust fund. In fact, what we have is \$5 billion of debt funding or special funding from the heritage trust fund against a budget that goes a little over \$10 billion. So fully 50 percent of the expenditure of this government in 1986-87 could be funded by special funding arrangements.

In my mind this observation underlines certain serious management problems which have not been redressed in this throne speech. I believe there to be an unwillingness on the part of this government to really hold itself accountable. I saw that last night in the debate in which a number of members across the way suggested that the problems which have led to this deficit are really problems created by central Canadian interests grasping our oil revenues.

It seems to me to be faulty management and to have other broader implications that a government won't take responsibility for its own deficit and its own actions. I know that as an employee at the company I've left, I wouldn't go to my employer and say, "Sorry, I couldn't get this done, Mr. So-and-So, but John down the way wouldn't do what he was supposed to do and inhibited me from doing it." He would say: "That's why I hired you. That's exactly why we need you." That's exactly why the people of Alberta hired this government, as it were.

I believe there is a real propensity in this government to manage with money rather than to manage with determination and creativity. On many occasions I've heard ministers of this government defend Alberta and their government programs by saying that we spend more money on these programs than any other provincial government in this country. I don't want to hear a government in Alberta saying that. I and the people of my constituency want to hear this government say that we spend less money more effectively than any other government in this country. That's why companies like the company that I came from are still here, and it's probably why companies like Nick Taylor's companies are still here. In fact, it's why many of the successful companies in this province are still here. They have a focus on managing creatively and with determination and not with money.

Instead, we have a government which I believe to be stuck in the '70s, stuck in spending patterns which are consistent with the '70s, as though it were 1976 and there were unlimited revenues. In fact it's 1986, and revenues are not as unlimited and cannot be taken for granted. I'm not criticizing the past; I just don't want to see this government and this province stuck there. I believe we have a condition of poor management foresight. We didn't have to be geniuses in this province to know that oil prices could decline and probably would decline. You only have to look at the history of this province, its boom and bust nature, to know that what happened in the early '80s could have been anticipated, and a government that was responsible should have planned and anticipated that. I don't see that in fact being redressed in this throne speech. Quite the contrary.

So much now hinges on a deficit that should be recovered, in the government's estimation, once oil prices rise towards the end of this fiscal year. However, there's no clear indication of why this government expects that they should rise towards the end of this fiscal year. My concern, and

that of my constituents, is that lack of management foresight may once again become an issue to be dealt with by this province.

Economic development: I'm sure my two colleagues will be talking about economic development from the point of view of energy and agriculture. I would like to talk about economic development as it concerns everything other than those two things. It's called economic diversification.

In 1966 analysts were lamenting the fact that this province was extremely dependent upon resource revenues. Today, after 15 years of trying to do something about that, we are in fact twice as dependent upon resource revenues and resource activity in this province. Worse than that, I don't see that this government has made a strong and effective commitment to changing that. Forestry and sulphur are mentioned in the throne speech as means of diversifying this economy. In my estimation, forestry and sulphur do not represent a diversification from a resource base. They do not represent any kind of definition of diversification that I would hold to be true, unless you consider that the kind of "diversification" enjoyed by British Columbia represents anything that goes contrary to the cyclical nature of our economy and their economies.

They've made an effort to create some new departments. I understand, and we all do, that there's a new Department of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. It seems to me the danger is that the only diversification that will accomplish is diversification of public-sector jobs. While we've been more or less obsessed with oil and have become — I believe there was a time — reasonably good at nurturing the oil industry, I think this government has missed other extremely important opportunities to broaden the economic base in ways away from energy and agriculture.

Let me discuss for a minute the financial industry in this province. It's not just the CCB and the Northland Bank. It's Dial Mortgage, Tower Mortgage, and Ram mortgage. It's one-third of the credit unions, which are currently being managed by the government and which have just received or will be receiving under this budget a new \$30 million bailout, a band-aid solution. It's Fidelity Trust. It's Financial Trustco, which is leaving this province now. It's a number of other trust companies that have received or will be receiving government help. There are very, very few Alberta-based financial institutions which are thriving. Those that are are thriving due to the business acumen of their management and, I believe, not due to any kind of creative approach by this government to encourage the development of a financial industry. It's such an important industry because it's clean. It is intrinsically diversification, but more than that, it permits the private sector to stimulate diversification and economic development in other ways.

Let me put the consequences of this banking situation in perspective for you. Please consider for a moment that only banks and Treasury Branches can do commercial loans. Trust companies, of course, can loan against assets. They can do mortgage loans, which can be used for commercial activities. You know there's a real problem with doing that at this time and a real reservation on the part of trust companies to in fact do it. But in Alberta there is only one indigenous bank, one regional bank that has that special sense for this region and this province. That's the Bank of Alberta, and that is a fine institution. I'm sure they would be glad to see that the only commercial enterprise that goes on in this House does not advertise that bank or any other financial institution or company indigenous to Alberta but in fact advertises yet another central Canadian institution.

So we are left with one bank, which is a fine institution but very small — \$113 million in assets the last time I checked. We have lost two major banks and with them \$6 billion to \$8 billion that would have grown to a sum that could continuously be invested in this province to create jobs, employment, and economic diversification. Yes, we have Treasury Branches, and they can do commercial loans as well. But they are, of course, government-based, and we know our reservations about government intervention in the economy.

We've missed opportunities in the financial industry. Although it's very difficult to find out who exactly manages the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and certainly impossible to find out what they're paid, it's been brought to my attention that Morgan Grenfel from London, England, has a contract to manage money from the heritage trust fund and that Montreal Investments Ltd. from Montreal has a contract to manage the heritage trust fund and that no financial institutions in Alberta have contracts to manage the heritage trust fund. One has to ask the question: why would we export those fees and that opportunity to develop expertise in that important area from this province?

We can learn something from the federal Conservative government at this time. Barbara McDougall brought out a green paper, which was a forward-looking paper, for the financial industry. Rather than dealing with the past and getting hung up on details, she stepped out to create an environment for financial institutions in this country that would allow them to grow and develop in a creative and successful way. We have seen none of that kind of leadership in this throne speech and in this budget from this government. I think a serious mistake has been made if we allow our regional-based financial industry to atrophy, to wither, and to die.

Do you know that we didn't even ask for international banking? International banking went to Montreal because all central Canadian governments want to get votes in Montreal and in Quebec. International banking went to B.C. because the B.C. government fought tooth and nail to get international banking. We didn't even ask, not because this government has bad people, because they're not, but because they are obsessed with oil and with agriculture. Believe me, I think we can have a government that can walk and chew gum at the same time and do things other than that.

It's not just banking; it's also Gainers. Gainers is going to be building a plant in Saskatchewan, and it's going to create 600 jobs in Saskatchewan. While we've been getting very good — or it seems at times we've been good — at oil, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, and B.C. have been getting very good at nurturing other forms of industry. We're going to be scooped. For as little as the \$10 million to \$20 million which the Saskatchewan government is willing to put up, they're going to grab 600 jobs from us while we're spending \$40 million to \$100 million a year subsidizing the Joffre ethylene plant which creates 150 jobs for Albertans and which may never be economically feasible.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to establish and acknowledge that there are no easy answers, but we need to have a commitment to answers and to solutions from this government. We have to have an energy and a determination and a will to do whatever we have to do to get this economy going and to diversify this economy so that we're not on a roller coaster ride with our economic development. As I read this throne speech and as I consider the budget that came shortly after it, I don't see that commitment from a government that I believe to be stuck

in the past and that is committed to easy solutions. I also believe that we once again need vision and leadership in this province, economically and otherwise. I believe we had some of that in the '70s, but I think it's lost now. I will make the commitment to this House on behalf of my caucus and on behalf of myself that we will do whatever we have to do and whatever we can do to contribute to the vision and leadership that this House can provide this province in the future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WRIGHT: It seems that this is my maiden speech, notwithstanding that I said something in a debate yesterday. The technicality of this eludes me, but I'll stick with it anyway. It is customary to compliment the House on choosing such a splendid Speaker, so it seems. And I certainly think you are the greatest, Mr. Speaker, but I'm afraid that my opinion counts for very little, because I've known no other.

The next custom is to speak of one's constituency as being the finest in the province, with the smartest people and the finest institutions. They're the smartest of the people, the implication is, being evidenced by their having elected the member.

MR. TAYLOR: They had to keep them in school for eight years, though.

MR. WRIGHT: I tried for 20. But I say nothing like that, Mr. Speaker. I do advert, however, to the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona as indeed being a very pleasant place to come from, because I do come from it as well as represent it, with many of the finer things in life available in short compass: the university, with its many delights — intellectual, visible for the ear and eye, and cultural — and also in terms of buildings. I remember there was a worldwide conference concerning winter cities that took place in Edmonton last year. Much was made of a street in Sweden which was covered in. This was the way of the future for northern cities. Nothing was said about HUB Mall, which is a covered street, as I'm sure all of you know, built one storey up and with all the usual things that a city street has: dwelling places, shops, bookshops, record stores, those places where those dreadful machines are played, and so on, right on the doorstep. It wasn't mentioned at all. That's one of the many delights.

At the other end of the constituency, but yet no more than 10 minutes by bicycle from here, or if you have to make do with a car rather longer, lies Old Strathcona. Members will remember that the Calgary-Edmonton Railway reached this part of the world from Calgary in 1892 and did not actually cross into Edmonton. So a town sprang up at the end of it, which became the city of Strathcona shortly afterwards. Then when the railway did pass over to Edmonton, the times passed Strathcona by. So we have a couple of blocks of turn-of-the-century buildings and shops in that Old Strathcona area, which has been developed under the auspices of the province and the Old Strathcona Foundation and which is a delight to be in from the point of view of its theatres and the excellent restaurants there — I commend them to you — excellent small shops, taverns, all places that would suit people with a short purse. You don't have to be wealthy to enjoy the delights of this particular constituency.

To turn from the pleasantries to the business at hand, Mr. Speaker, this address is in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The measures this government proposes to deal

with the crisis that is out there, when our major industry of oil is in a shambles and agriculture is in a deepening crisis, are inadequate to the task and make one wonder whether they realize the extent of the problems. I believe government members do realize the extent of the problems, but their philosophy is such that they are crippled in their attempts to deal with these problems.

It's no good simply throwing money at these problems. Much more is needed than that. We have to intervene more strongly, to right temporally as best we can the ills in the energy industry. I adverted yesterday in my few remarks at that time to the necessity for a provincially owned and operated oil company to deal with the things that need to be dealt with in the oil industry and which private enterprise cannot do, principally because of the low world oil price. There are other things that may be done, but certainly direct employment can be had in the oil industry under the auspices of a provincially owned and operated company.

It is true that the products will currently have to be sold at a loss if it is to be exported. If there is a made-in-Canada price, that is not necessarily so, but then the products can also be stored for the future, since oil and gas do not waste in the ground. In the meantime, the producers have been paid and will enjoy the money to spend in the economy in Alberta. Also, it will be a further step in Canadianizing and indeed provincializing the industry, which the national energy program made a good start in doing. The hon. members opposite decry that program as if it were some alien imposition on them, forgetting that they were party to it and forgetting also that prior to its inception, some 75 percent of the oil industry was foreign-owned in this province, and that is scandalous. It's not tolerated even in Third World countries, Mr. Speaker, and to bad-mouth the national energy program for its partly successful attempt to remedy that, amongst other problems in the industry, is extremely shortsighted and indeed a negation of one's duty to the citizens of Alberta.

It's the same picture in agriculture, in my respectful submission, Mr. Speaker, in that the most pressing problem, which is that hump of debt which so many farmers accumulated in the high-interest years in 1981, 1982, and 1983, remains as an insurmountable burden to so many of them. It's no good coming up now with programs to assist farmers in their day-to-day problems. Those are certainly necessary to deal with current problems. But the fact is that this accumulation of debt for land, machinery, or operating which cannot be tackled by farmers is a very tough problem. The least that can be done is a debt adjustment board to deal with rescheduling of the debt, and if that is still insufficient, at least some program that will assure farmers who have to sell out that they will not be driven off their land and that they can stay there on some other basis, presumably as tenants, so they will continue to be productive members of the community, and the family farm will be saved.

That's not the area I have been assigned in this caucus, Mr. Speaker. The area is that of justice, i.e. the Attorney General's department and the Solicitor General's department, and I will come to that very shortly. In the meantime, my next remark is on the lack of meaningful and effective attempts in the Speech from the Throne to deal with the gross unemployment rate in this province, generally running between 10 and 15 percent and in certain industries, such as the oil industry, three times that amount. Again, it is only a government that's prepared to enter into at least a measure of direct employment and involvement that will

make much of a dent in this problem. Goodness knows, there are problems which need correction that will be socially useful to transact.

We have the idle men and women who are prepared to do these things. We have the idle plant that may be employed to do them. I understand there are some 15,000 miles of unpaved primary roads in this province, Mr. Speaker. There is one obvious example of an investment that will provide employment and at the same time provide a legacy for the future. There are the rivers to be cleaned up and, once they have been cleaned up, better sewage treatment plants to be built in so many localities.

There is the whole area of research into alternative energy. We have so many engineering graduates from the university in my constituency who are without jobs and who are driving taxis. They and other scientists can be put to work in research against the day when oil and gas does run out and alternative energy is very much needed. We have over 300 days per annum of sunshine in this province, Mr. Speaker. It is an obvious place for solar research, and yet there is no initiative by this government in that area. Coal gasification, i.e. synthetic petroleum from coal, is another. We have finite resources of oil and gas. We have almost infinite resources of coal, and yet it is being left to a German firm to come in and take the first steps in synthetic petroleum from that source. I see in the Speech from the Throne that there are expert studies on the Lloydminster upgrader. There is no firm commitment to even that, Mr. Speaker.

I have to say that these are all strong deficits in the speech that has been delivered by Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor. The Genesee power plant is of surpassing interest to Edmontonians. Surely there is a way of generating the power there using the coal that is environmentally safe. We should push ahead with that and not protect the profits of TransAlta Utilities and other privately owned public utilities in this province by further delaying the start-up of Genesee.

Light rapid transit is another obvious area in which the cities of Edmonton and Calgary can provide employment within their boundaries to a socially useful instrument, environmentally sound given the willingness of the province to provide the necessary funding. Going out into the rather longer term, in our party we have proposed using the government's own studies as our foundation for the high-speed rail link between Edmonton and Calgary. Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas of diversification which a committed government that is not doctrinally handicapped from the idea of government initiative could propose and put into effect for the purposes of sustained employment.

Turning to my area of the Attorney General's department and the Solicitor General's department, the single biggest blot on public life in Canada, in my respectful opinion, Mr. Speaker, is the appointment of judges, particularly federally appointed judges. They have to have done their political service before they are even considered. Once they get onto the list, then that list is circulated around the law societies of the respective province. But you don't get onto the list until you have done your political service. That is a scandal and does not exist in other countries in the Commonwealth.

I have to say to the government that the situation is better in Alberta. If one wishes to be a provincial judge, I understand one applies to be one and you go before a selection committee that makes recommendations. However, the recommendations do not have to be accepted and in

fact are not accepted on occasion, and those with some political pull get in.

We in our party believe there should be a uniform system of selection boards both federally and provincially in which those who wish to be judges apply and are selected in the same way that we select other people. The government should not be absolutely bound by the result, but if they decline to accept the recommendation, the person who has been turned down should be entitled to know why, and he or she will be at liberty to release the reasons when given.

Within the Department of the Attorney General, there is still a malaise. I understand it was extreme last year and has improved since, but there is still too much of a political atmosphere. I don't mean party political atmosphere; I mean the other kind of small "p" politics within the department that is destructive of morale and results in promotion not on merit. Our proposal is that the strongest steps be taken to make the running of that department more efficient in that respect.

Also, since the Attorney General has control over the provincial judges in point of their training and their exposure to newer ideas in sentencing and otherwise, they should be encouraged to more imaginative sentencing of convicts and guilty persons. The options are already there. The public doesn't realize that so many options — for example, community service as a condition of parole or even civil judgments at the conclusion of criminal cases — are there. The judges just don't use them enough. They're not encouraged to. So if someone comes in and steals goods from your garage, for example, and is caught, I suppose he or she will be sentenced when convicted but never, never is a judgment rendered against that person — which it is quite possible will be within the capacity of the person to satisfy in the future — in favour of the victim. In other areas of socially destructive crime, the idea of the punishment fitting the crime should be more closely encouraged by the Attorney General.

In the Solicitor General's department, our party will be anxious to get to the bottom of what appears to have been a considerable and foreseeable waste, running into millions of dollars of computer funds, concerned with the problems that had been foreseen but the warnings on which were disregarded on the changeover from annual licensing to monthly renewals throughout the year.

In the area of prisons and treatment there is, in our respectful submission, a certain amount of underfunding and unimaginative actions, or lack of them, on the part of the government in this area.

As for human rights, which I guess is within the purview of the Attorney General's department, we must increase our efforts in favour of women in point of pay equity and, topically, in respect of the advisory council on women, which should be a more powerful body with teeth — less of a Quango, I think is the word.

On the Individual's Rights Protection Act, in my respectful submission, one glaring omission is the prohibition of discrimination according to sexual orientation. All these things have to be attended to, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that our party and I myself, insofar as it lies in my power, will attempt to lay out a course of action for the government which will prefigure our actions should we be fortunate enough in the future to become the government ourselves and which will give every opportunity to Albertans, regardless of their condition, to equal access to the good things and, at the very least, to a minimum standard of decency and health

and wealth in this province. We will do it without doctrinaire considerations which hold one back from succoring those in need and from doing what is necessary to put people back to work in times of considerable unemployment. I firmly believe it is the members on the other side who suffer in their view of government from doctrinaire considerations and that we on our side, Mr. Speaker, are free from preconceived notions of how particular problems should be tackled.

I would go forward, Mr. Speaker, I pledge you, in the confidence that the way I believe in — fair shares for all, I think, is the simple way of putting it — based on ethics and a point of view that I suppose is essentially Christian in its outlook but shares its principles with all the great religions, is what is needed for a successful government and is in fact embodied in the principles of the party I support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRADLEY: In rising today, Mr. Speaker, I'd first like to congratulate you, sir, on your appointment as Speaker. I have enjoyed working with you as a member of the government caucus since your first election, and I would like to say that I think it has been an excellent choice of this Assembly to appoint you to the position of Speaker. I recognize that you're going to have some very interesting challenges in the performance of your duties over the next term of office, but I wish you the very best because I know you are an able person and that you will bring to the office those special talents which it requires in overseeing the business of this House.

I'd like to congratulate the Member for Calgary Foothills in moving the Speech from the Throne and the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey in seconding the Speech from the Throne in terms of the fine remarks and ideas which they brought forward to the House. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the people of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest for their support in the last election in returning me for a fourth term in office.

I had initially intended to speak about my constituency and some of the concerns there, but the remarks of the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark and the Member for Edmonton Strathcona have brought me to bring forward some remarks and the other point of view in terms of their comments and some of the ideas they put forward.

There are some myths that are being created or perpetuated in terms of public affairs in this province and what this government has done. The first was the remark by the Member for Edmonton Strathcona, who said that this government was party to the national energy program, that we somehow signed the national energy program. There is nothing further from the truth, Mr. Speaker, in terms of that type of suggestion in this Assembly. As I recollect, this government responded very strongly to the imposition of the national energy program on the people of this province and the oil industry. To suggest that we were somehow party to it is just absolutely inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that after the efforts of this government in changing the direction of that very devastating policy, we entered into a pricing agreement which we felt at the time was appropriate in terms of where this province was heading and the direction of the energy industry. To not have taken some responsible action at that time — and it tried to change the devastating effects of that program by bringing in an energy pricing agreement — where would this province have gone, and where would the energy industry have been had we not come into an energy pricing

agreement? We would have seen absolute and total disaster in the energy sector. It was a necessary step to enter into a pricing agreement. That in no way was an endorsement of the national energy program.

This government has worked consistently over the period of time the program was brought forward to see that national energy program removed and dismantled. With the signing of the western energy accord last year, we saw the dramatic change in the circumstances of the industry. Last year we saw the best level of activity that has ever been experienced in this province in the energy industry with the removal of the national energy program. If we can get rid of the petroleum and gas revenue tax, we will then have seen that devastating policy dismantled. I would like to get that out of my system first, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, there was a suggestion again from the Member for Edmonton Strathcona that we can solve the ills of the energy industry by setting up a provincial petroleum company, and that is somehow going to solve the problems of the energy industry. I guess he wants us to model that along the lines of PetroCan, that great socialist idea which was supported by the New Democratic Party in its establishment. PetroCan hasn't really created any new jobs in Canada. All it did was go out and buy up service stations — you know, small businesses. That's not in any way creating jobs in Canada.

There were some other items which the member raised in terms of new ideas he had for job creation in the province. He was suggesting that somehow we should spend more money in cleaning up rivers in the province. Perhaps hon. members aren't aware, but since 1979 this government has expended some \$650 million in assistance to municipalities to upgrade their water and sewage treatment facilities. We have some of the highest standards in sewage treatment in the country. We have assisted here in the Edmonton region with the Edmonton regional sewage treatment plant at a cost of some \$160 million which will add to and improve the quality of sewage treatment in the Edmonton region. We have assisted the city of Calgary in phosphorus removal. They have tertiary treatment of the effluent going into the Bow River, and that was assisted by this government. In fact, in a report card last year the Canadian Wildlife Federation gave this government an A in terms of our assistance and support of pollution control, which is basically aimed at cleaning up our rivers. The next province was Ontario, and they got something like a C. They spend five times less per capita than this government does in terms of those programs. We have the Alberta environment employment program, which has been used to clean up river valleys and remove garbage and car bodies from the rivers. So there have been efforts made in that particular area.

Then the hon. member made some suggestion that we as a provincial government should get on in terms of Genesee. I ask him: who is going to pay? He said we should support Genesee in ensuring that we don't see TransAlta Utilities guaranteed profits, et cetera. It's my understanding that Genesee power would come on and be more expensive than what the current generating plants in the province have, so what the hon. member is really asking is if the consumers of Alberta will have to pay more to see higher cost electricity come on stream. I don't think that's acceptable to the consumers of the province of Alberta.

The hon. member also made references to coal research. Perhaps he's not aware, but we do have an excellent coal research facility out at Devon which is looking at all manners of upgrading coal in this province, looking at ways in which we can use that very vast resource. I'd just like to make the hon. member aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

I intended to carry on with a number of other remarks. Last night I made a motion which resulted in the first standing vote this Assembly has ever had on that type of motion, so it's with great trepidation now that I again move the same motion. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has moved adjournment of the debate. All those in favour of the motion please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any, please say no.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: The House congratulates the member on his motion being carried.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the business of the House tomorrow evening will be the continuation of the debate in respect of the address in reply to the throne speech. I move we call it 5:30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader that we call it 5:30, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:26 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

