

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, June 27, 1986 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

## Bill 12

## Farm Credit Stability Fund Act

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 12, the Farm Credit Stability Fund Act.

This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation forms a key part of the government's legislative program for this year. This legislation sets in place the farm credit stability program, provides for the establishment of a special fund to allow the transfer of resources from the province to the financial institutions and then on to the farming community, and also allows for the making of regulations to establish this 9 percent long-term financial program. Of course, this program is important to the farm sector, strengthens our Alberta economy, and is unique to Canada.

[Leave granted; Bill 12 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have three returns to table this morning. First of all, the Alberta Municipal Financing Incorporation Act for the year ended March 31, 1985; the government land purchases report, including the auditor's statement for the same year-end; and the financial statements of the Alberta Resources Railway for the year ended December 31, 1985.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the 80th annual report of Alberta Education, for the fiscal year 1984-85.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of students and their teachers from Bonnie Doon high school in the lovely riding of Edmonton Gold Bar. These 23 students with us are studying adult English as a second language. All are new to our country, and a number of them are new Canadian citizens. The teachers accompanying them are Mary Buzinsky, Audrey Martyn, Elizabeth Highet, and Vania Paproski. They are seated in the public gallery, and I'd ask them to rise in order that they may receive the welcome of this House.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 18 students from the Career College here in Edmonton Centre. They are with their director, Liz Pyle. They are legal assistance students, and with so many lawyers around the Assembly, I hope they brought their résumés. They're in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## Federal Energy Minister

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. What was the Premier trying to accomplish yesterday by scooping the Prime Minister in a federal cabinet shuffle? Is he confused as to which government he represents, or did Mr. Mulroney ask him to make this announcement?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it must be a quiet news day. Only the *Journal* could contrive to get a headline from a three-month-old story.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary. We always appreciate when the Premier opens his mouth and creates the news for us. Whether it's three months or not, when we checked in Ottawa, the people there weren't aware of it, Mr. Premier. My question is this: in view of the fact that this government is trying to get federal help for our ailing energy industry, what possible purpose did the Premier have for spreading rumours about a possible cabinet shuffle?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there was a question about whether or not the meeting could go on with the federal energy minister, and there was some question about whether or not it would be cancelled because of developments in Ottawa. I mentioned that one of the possibilities was the potential for a shuffle. That has been discussed for two to three months now. If the members opposite don't have good sources, maybe they should read the *Journal*.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Premier, I'm told the federal people don't find it quite as amusing. Now that he has succeeded in turning Miss Carney really into a lame-duck minister, my question to the Premier is: could he indicate what possible expectations he has now about this particular meeting that's being held this weekend?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker. I can't in any way believe that Miss Carney would be a lame-duck minister. I thought it was helpful for our Minister of Energy to discuss with the minister of energy in Ottawa her views and the views of her department and get a reading of the federal government's views on general energy matters and on the potential for working together with the federal government on future assistance for the Alberta energy industry.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. The Premier says he thought it would be interesting. What would the purpose be if he's already said that she's not going to be the minister of energy? Why have the meeting?

MR. GETTY: I didn't say it, Mr. Speaker. As I just answered, I also thought our minister and the federal minister

might have a good discussion about thinking in her department, her views, the cabinet's views, and the government's views. I think it would be quite helpful.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier, in a complimentary sense in terms of his futuristic thinking. Could the Premier confirm that Miss Carney will eventually be leaving the portfolio?

MR. GETTY: I will also confirm that eventually it will rain.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Now that he has done something for the farmers, I'd like to get back to oil and gas. Acknowledging that the energy portfolio is a very complex one and that it will take time for the new minister to become familiar, what steps has the Premier taken to go directly to the Prime Minister to solve our problem right now?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if it appears that that is necessary, I'd be very happy to do it.

#### Energy Industry

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Premier. He doesn't need to talk to the Prime Minister; he talks to the birds, so we won't need to worry about that. I'm sure they report to Mr. Mulroney.

My question has to do with a recent report tying in to energy. I am sure the Premier is well aware that the Senate committee on energy has proposed a variety of measures to support our energy industry, including temporary price support of a floor price, which is something we've been advocating. Has the Premier had a chance to look at that report, and what is the government's assessment of that report?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, on a preliminary review of that report, headed up by a senator who completely supported and recommended the national energy program, it looked like a lot of it was the same old baloney.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, when I was in Calgary, that's not what a lot of producers said to me. I happened to be there when it was announced. Instead of calling it baloney, I'm sure they would have something to say about the salami that's being produced around here.

To come back to the floor price. When I have asked him this question before, the Premier said they would be prepared to look at all options. There seems to be considerable support for a floor price. Why is the government still rejecting this particular proposal?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the floor price suggestion is way down on the list of options.

MR. MARTIN: Let me alert — I am sure the Premier has heard of the Western Accord. Clause 9 states:

In the event of international oil market disturbances that result in sharp changes to crude oil prices, with potentially negative impacts on Canada, the Government of Canada, following consultations with provincial governments, will take appropriate measures to protect Canadian interests.

My question is: would the Premier indicate to this Assembly what the purpose of that clause is then?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, for protection purposes it is a clause that was felt wise to put in there. I understand the position of the NDP. They want as much government control as possible. The energy industry doesn't flourish under those conditions. I know they dislike having the energy industry free of regulation, and they badly want to remove that freedom and get the regulation again, but we do not want to do that.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Whenever they don't have the answers, they always revert to right-wing ideology and give us lots of rhetoric. We talk about deregulation, and this government of course always thought it meant going up. My question is: does the Premier believe that if all of a sudden the prices started to shoot up, the federal government would allow this to happen? Is that not why clause 9 is in there, so we have deregulation when the price is low, and we will have regulation when the price is high?

MR. GETTY: I understand that is what the NDP would want, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplemental to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Given the Premier's blind faith in the free market — which may be commendable to his own backbenchers — can the Premier tell members of the Legislature when he will come up with some concrete energy policy that will help the small oil and gas producers of this province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity yesterday to outline that the government is moving in a variety of ways to help our energy industry. We've moved with a \$100 million royalty cut, mainly to help small producers. We've moved with a \$300 million exploratory drilling program, which helps all producers. We've moved with a \$200 million activity program, which helps all producers. This government has \$600 million, and we are still prepared to help in any way we can. It's a tremendous commitment to a very important industry in this province.

#### Labour Legislation Review

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. The government has assured this House that a full review of labour legislation will be undertaken. That was in the throne speech, on page 7 as a matter of fact. But in view of the fact that the inquiry into the Gainers' dispute has been granted a two-week extension, is the Premier now prepared to establish an independent committee to review labour legislation in this province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier when this was raised, the so-called independent committee was certainly something to think about. I invited all members to express their views on how they thought the review might be carried out. Unfortunately, so far there haven't been any suggestions, so we will consider the one of the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon and others.

I might say — and my colleague the Minister of Labour may want to amplify on this — that the chairman of the disputes inquiry board requested an extension. He had good reasons for doing that, and it was granted.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the first supplementary to the Premier. But the promise was made. When will this review committee take place? When will the action take place?

MR. GETTY: It will be conducted this year, Mr. Speaker. We will do it as quickly as possible but with the condition that we do it as thoroughly as possible. Therefore, we would welcome any suggestions by any members as to how they feel that should be conducted.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. We got it within a year or this year. I think he means by December 31. Can the Premier assure the House that the committee he will establish before December 31 — which I submit is too late — will be independent?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon's view of the term "independent" is. I don't think he would say that members of the Legislature would not have a role in it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier. I think it's obvious that we don't want an in-house committee or a Legislature committee. But can the Premier assure the House that the committee formed to review the labour legislation will be set up so there will be ample time for public input?

MR. GETTY: I gather now the member is asking for more time, ample time. There will be ample time for public input.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. He says there have been no suggestions. I take it that his high-priced help reads him the Orders of the Day. We have presented two private member's Bills, and Motion 9 under my name on the Order Paper gives precisely the directions the Premier has asked for. Has he had a chance to peruse this? If so, what are his answers to, say, Motion 9?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, Motion 9 deals with the issue. I don't really think it goes into how the review should be conducted.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the Premier. In the establishment of the committee, whatever form it may take, could the Premier assure the Assembly — I'm sure he can — that there will be equal representation from the employer sector or the ownership sector of Alberta as well as the employee sector?

MR. GETTY: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. It's extremely important that the review be balanced so that we have input from labour and management and then try to devise and develop legislative changes that will make the legislation fully responsive to current conditions in Alberta.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, perhaps to supplement the answers the hon. Premier has just given to the House. Since I was appointed as Minister of Labour, I have said that we intended to review the labour legislation thoroughly and how it has worked over a period of time, covering different parts of the business and economic cycle. That review would be the fullest of reviews, and we would involve employers and

employees from both the organized and unorganized segments of the labour force and employer representatives to cover the same aspects. I don't know how much more clearly we can put it. We intend to do it, and it will be done with reasonable speed. The commitment as to when it will be completed is rather difficult because we don't know before we start what we will get into.

#### Toxic Waste Disposal Plant

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister of the Environment with regards to the Swan Hills disposal plant. Despite the best efforts of the Alberta government, Bow Valley Resources, which has entered or is entering into a contract, continues to suffer financial losses. I understand the company is now selling off assets. My question to the minister is: does the memorandum of intent signed in March of this year between Bow Valley Resources and this government allow Bow Valley Resources to use its ownership position in the joint venture as security for the purpose of borrowing funds?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be wise on my part to have a thorough review made of that just so that I would convey the proper information to the hon. member. I would be happy to accept that question as notice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In his pursuit of information, could the minister also check to see whether there are any restrictions preventing Bow Valley Resources from borrowing their entire portion of the capital requirements on the basis of the agreement?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, to ensure that I would convey to all members of the House completely accurate information, I would like the opportunity to review that as well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister also confirm that the agreement guarantees Bow Valley Resources a minimum rate of return above the cost of this capital investment?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the rate of return that was agreed to in the memorandum of understanding earlier this year was a rate that was based on a Royal Bank of Canada prime rate plus a return of 3.114 percent based on a 47 percent income tax position for Bow Valley Resource Services. I think that perhaps conveys the information to the hon. member in that regard, but I would again like to accept the question as notice to ensure that there's completely accurate information with respect to this.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of the Environment with regards to the payment of taxes. Has Bow Valley Resources made a commitment to place their books before the department to indicate whether or not taxes are paid?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be with the Department of the Environment that Bow Valley would be negotiating. It would be with the Special Waste Management Corporation. It's my understanding that's so but once again with the caveat that I've asked for the other three questions to allow me to have this matter reviewed so that there's

completely accurate information with respect to this. I'd appreciate that indulgence.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Is it the government's intention to guarantee the loan for Bow Valley in order to keep the interest rate down?

MR. KOWALSKI: In my regard there's no understanding with respect to any of the principles contained in the memorandum that there would be a guarantee in place.

MR. YOUNIE: For the Minister of the Environment: in view of the lack of stipulations in the agreement, is there any assurance the minister can give that money that goes to Bow Valley Resource Services from the government will in fact be used to run the plant at Swan Hills and not to service the debt load that Bow Valley Resource Services has recently taken on?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the point I was making with the hon. Member for Little Bow this morning is that the memorandum contains numerous stipulations, very contrary to the premise that was put forward by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. My difficulty is that there are so many clauses in the contract that I've asked for the indulgence to review that on a clause-by-clause basis to ensure that the information I would provide to the House is completely accurate.

#### **Agricultural Income**

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Agriculture Canada has released its projections related to farm income in 1986. Could the minister indicate whether our numerous provincial agriculture programs have been taken into account in these figures and what impact they've had?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in replying to the hon. Member for Wainwright, I'm sure he would concur in allowing me to express our appreciation to the hon. Member for Vegreville for the honey that's on our desks and to indicate our thanks to him for this lovely gesture and token for the acknowledgment of the government's commitment to our agricultural sector and to the honey producers.

If I can respond directly to the hon. Member for Wainwright, I'd indicate to him that, yes, our many numerous programs, especially at the provincial level, have had a direct impact on the net farm income rise as is projected by Agriculture Canada.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary. Would the minister be more specific and tell us what direct impact there is on the various sectors of the industry and whether or not the U.S. farm Bill has been taken into account in these figures?

MR. ELZINGA: Again, Mr. Speaker, I can share with the hon. Member for Wainwright that, yes, the U.S. farm Bill has been taken into account as it relates to these figures. Specifically, the projections by Agriculture Canada show that net farm income will rise by some 5 percent in the province of Alberta. That's mainly due to the decreasing of the input costs of some 8 percent in this province. If he wishes me to get into specifics, unfortunately, I'm sure the time of the House will not allow it, but we have the

many worthwhile programs under hail and crop, our farm fertilizer, fuel adjustment program, and the water grants. There are numerous programs that have had direct input into the lowering of the input costs.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary. How do these figures compare with other provinces across Canada?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba they have shown a greater increase, and we're happy for the farming population in Manitoba. [some applause] I notice the New Democratic Party applauding. We're thankful that the acts of God were not as severe on them as they were on our province. I acknowledge the NDP think a great deal of themselves, but I've never known them to think of themselves as God before, Mr. Speaker. The figures show that actual production in the province of Manitoba increased by some 33 percent in the previous year, when it declined in Alberta by some 4 percent.

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

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. I recently attended two meetings about the tripartite meat stabilization plan, where cow/calf operators were nearly 100 percent united in their criticism of the cow/calf stabilization plan. Is the minister aware of this, and is he ready to indicate that immediate review and changes to that portion of the plan will take place in full consultation with the cow/calf operators of Alberta?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, I can assure him that in everything this government does, we have consultation prior to the implementation of it. It was the cattle producers themselves who pushed very strongly for our participation in the red meat stabilization program, and as he is no doubt aware, there are provisions under this program for an annual review with a major review in 1990.

Just this week we had officials in discussions with the other partners in the tripartite agreement, so hopefully the concerns that have been expressed by the farming population can be resolved. I should share with him that the acceptability of this program has been very great. The applications are coming in in the vicinity of 600 a day, and we're hopeful the farming population will participate in this very worthwhile program, whereby themselves, the federal government, and this government are participatory partners. [some applause]

MR. PIQUETTE: I wouldn't applaud too greatly on that plan. I am a cow/calf operator, and I personally think — and a lot of farmers have shared this information with me — that the cow/calf stabilization plan is not fairly based on the cost-of-production formula of 95 cents a pound like in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Quebec. Why should Alberta cow/calf producers, Mr. Minister, participate here in Alberta at only 82.17 cents a pound?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, might I respond? He was referring to other provinces, and if the hon. member has done his homework, he will acknowledge, in the event that he is willing to be forthcoming, that this province contributes more to the agricultural sector on a per capita basis than any other province in Canada.

MR. PIQUETTE: I don't think that's an answer to the particular question I had. I understand that the majority of

cow/calf operators have decided not to participate in the beef stabilization plan or the cow/calf plan. What level of participation is required if Alberta is going to take part in the stabilization plan?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I didn't answer the hon. member's question, but in his verbiage I must have lost the question because he had so many. Let me indicate to him that this reminds me of the debate that took place as it related to the western grain stabilization Bill. At that time it was the New Democratic Party that indicated that people were also not going to participate in it. Today we have 80 percent participation in that program. We're looking forward to the wide participation of all our producers, and in the event that we need to make changes, we're open to making those changes. As I indicated to him earlier, there is a provision for a review on a yearly basis, plus a major review in 1990.

MR. PIQUETTE: A last supplementary. I'm glad you're indicating that we're going to have a chance to change the plan, because one of the major plans that should be contemplated is the time of the year when the farmers have to be putting their money in the plan. Could the minister indicate the reason for a plan that involves farmers having to come up with money for their share of the stabilization plan at this cash-starved time of year? Why not the fall instead of June 30? Will the minister extend that deadline?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member. You're now asking a third question on this particular supplementary, and you are taking too long to get into the supplementaries. I invite the minister to respond to the first supplementary in this series please.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have recognized the difficulties that all of agriculture is facing with their cash-flow problems, and that is why we have been so consistent in supporting the agricultural sector. I should share with him, as I mentioned earlier, that if he does have legitimate concerns, my office is always open to him. I'm more than happy to discuss them. I should also indicate to him that in the event there is an extension, it requires the agreement of three parties. We have discussed this possibility with the Hon. John Wise, and we're more than happy to discuss it further in the event that we feel it does merit it. I gather from his representations that he feels it does. In the event that he is sincere, I share with him that my door is always open.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Can he assure the House that he will give an extension until the autumn to those farmers and cow/calf operators who want to sign up so he can get a respectable number to sign up for the program that he's so proud of?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could ask the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon what that number is, because today we don't know it. We haven't had a chance to finalize all the applications, so I'm not about to answer a hypothetical question. We don't know the number. If he knows it, I hope he would share it with us.

MR. TAYLOR: If he can't answer it, I'll answer it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, you're out of order. Can we continue, please? The next question is for the Member for

Calgary Buffalo followed by the Member for Edmonton Centre.

#### Natural Gas Deregulation

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Premier, who will consider this issue to be more in the nature of a boomerang; it won't go away. Mr. Premier, yesterday the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada stated that it is concerned about declining gas prices and that it now opposes deregulation of gas markets on November 1 unless Ottawa and the provinces get together and ease access to export markets. Does the government support the industry in this position of delaying deregulation on that basis?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before in the House, the government is reviewing the matter of deregulation as of November 1. With the recent events of the decisions by the National Energy Board, this is another factor to consider. I was interested in the position being taken by IPAC. It built its position based on conditions which it thought might happen in the future, and I think it is something to give serious consideration to.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Premier, let's get away from the National Energy Board and into the heart of the Western Accord. Does the Premier support the position of the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada in opposing maintenance of a 15-year to 22-year supply of gas for Canadian requirements, because this maintenance will prevent the industry from realizing the benefits of price deregulation?

MR. GETTY: As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it is the National Energy Board that introduced these new conditions, and that is what has caused IPAC to reconsider their position. As I said, I'm interested in their position, and we're going to give it serious consideration.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier stating that the maintenance of a reserve of gas for Canadian gas requirements was not at the heart of the Western Accord to which the government agreed?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be very clear that the government of Alberta has consistently had a policy of maintaining reserves on the following basis: first, we maintain a reserve for the foreseeable future needs of Albertans; secondly, we support the federal government in maintaining a reserve for the foreseeable future needs of Canadians; then if there is a surplus, we support the position of exporting that surplus to the United States or other markets.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier agrees that there is a need to maintain a reserve, why does it blame the National Energy Board for refusing to allow exports to the United States, which are in fact contrary to the concept of deregulation to which it indicates it favours?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, that's not so. Deregulation does not involve the supply of gas for the future of Albertans. We have consistently maintained, as has the ERCB, that Alberta will have its foreseeable needs protected by a supply before we will allow export out of this province. As a matter of fact, all exports that we approve had within them

the condition that we can cancel them should it appear that the needs of Albertans are at risk. After we have determined that there is a supply for the foreseeable needs of Albertans, we then wish to have that surplus go to Canadians. After Canadians are protected, we support the position that the surplus should go to markets outside of Canada.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Has the government considered the impact the scheduled deregulation for November 1 will have on Alberta's petrochemical industry? If so, what steps does it plan to take to protect this very vital Alberta industry?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the member might know that the government moved last year to assist the petrochemical industry in acquiring its feedstocks in this province at below the markets they were forced to in the future. We will be working with the petrochemical industry to make sure they can purchase gas on a market basis in this province so that they will have the lowest feedstock cost possible and be able to build the petrochemical industry in this province as we've been working to do over the years.

#### Extra Billing

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, now that Alberta has been completely ostracized within Canada in the Canada Health Act in its position of continued support for extra billing, support which continues to frighten Albertans as they see physicians' incomes soar. . . [interjections] Getting nervous, are you?

Can the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care clearly outline for this Assembly and the over 70 percent of Albertans who are opposed to extra billing his reasons for not legislating an end to it in this province?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. Leader of the Opposition on five occasions, I think it was, during a question period earlier this week, we are in fact discussing the matter of extra billing with the Alberta Medical Association. In due course I expect to be in a position to advise the House of the results of those discussions.

REV. ROBERTS: Would the minister please indicate what services might still be available for extra billing when his secret negotiations with the AMA are finished? As an absolute minimum, could he assure this House that no basic medical services are on the table?

MR. M. MOORE: Again, Mr. Speaker, as I've previously indicated this week, when we've had an opportunity to complete our discussions with the Alberta Medical Association and also had an opportunity to finalize our discussions with the federal minister of health relative to the Canada Health Act and the penalties being imposed upon Alberta, we would then be in a position to let the opposition know exactly what it is that we plan to do.

REV. ROBERTS: It's not the opposition; it's the patients who are concerned here, Mr. Minister. It's outrageous; I cannot believe he is getting away with this. We'll debate it on Thursday afternoon when we get to it in a public debate.

Mr. Minister, my supplementary is: once we have ended extra billing in this province and received the withheld \$25 million, what procedure is the government contemplating

that will allow a woman in my constituency, who on the birth of her baby was extra billed \$300 by an obstetrician, and many other thousands of Albertans extra billed under this system, to put in a claim to be reimbursed?

MR. DAY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Being a rookie, I could be out of order on my point of order; I'd be willing to stand corrected. I'd appreciate your suggestion on keeping our speeches of the order that we would not have to read them. The questions also become lengthy when they are read. I wonder if we could address that.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, the point of order should come up at the end of Oral Question Period. Thank you very much. The hon. minister please.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the funds which are being withheld by Ottawa are moneys which we have always felt should have been provided to this province for the health care system, but the Canada Health Act has prevented that. In the meantime, we have had to utilize funds in the General Revenue Fund of the province to make up the shortfall that has occurred because Ottawa has been withholding these funds.

When those funds are returned to us, they should properly go back into the General Revenue Fund for the benefit of all Albertans. There would be no consideration given to trying to somehow or other construe that these funds should be the property of those people who've been extra billed, because there's no relationship whatsoever between the funds that are being withheld by Ottawa from our province and those who've been extra billed.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will not read it, but my supplementary question is this: once this battle has been waged, what assurance will the hon. minister give us that there will soon be an end to user fees in this province?

MR. M. MOORE: I'm not exactly sure what the hon. member is talking about, because I'm not aware of a situation regarding user fees in Alberta at the present time. Maybe the member would wish to elaborate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister of hospitals. Discussions are currently on with the Alberta Medical Association. Could the minister indicate why the other groups covered under medicare are not part of those discussions; for example, chiropractors, optometrists, physiotherapists, podiatrists, and maybe one or two others, I believe?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the reason is this: the Canada Health Act speaks to physician services, hospital services, and services provided by dentists with respect to surgery. That applies with respect to dentists only in hospitals. So I have in fact been meeting with the Alberta Dental Association with respect to their involvement and also with the Alberta Medical Association. The other groups that the hon. member refers to are not required by the Canada Health Act to end extra billing, and in many provinces are not in fact even covered by the health care plan.

Alberta has the most generous health care insurance plan of any province there is when it comes to covering other forms of medical care not provided by what's defined in the Canada Health Act as medical practitioners. So that's

the reason why we're not having any discussions with those other groups. We have covered a certain amount of their fees. In particular, some chiropractors have been extra billing very large amounts in other provinces. In many cases, they have to bill the entire amount. But they are not affected by the demands of the Canada Health Act to end extra billing.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I defer because the hon. Member for Little Bow read my mind rather than his question.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Does the minister have any documented cases whereby Albertans have been refused medical treatment by physicians in Alberta due to a lack of ability to pay?

MR. M. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, and I don't believe there are any cases where that's occurred. At least, none have ever been brought to my attention.

#### **Municipal Recreation/Tourism Areas Program**

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. There were a number of applications recently made for municipal parks under the municipal parks and recreation area program. I wonder if the minister could inform the Legislative Assembly on what the status of this is, and have any of those municipal parks been approved?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to clarify any misunderstanding and to update the Member for Bow Valley and members of the Assembly. The municipal recreation areas program is a four-year, \$10 million, local municipalities and community program that's designed to build and operate 100 recreation areas. It's the department's intent to develop 25 of these areas over the '86 fiscal year and to phase in the remainder in the three final years. All of the locations have yet to be finalized, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member, and I'd be prepared to review these in the forthcoming estimates of the department.

MR. MUSGROVE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could give us a date on when we would know when the priority list would be finalized?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I'd undertake for the hon. member to have that in preparation for the department's estimates when they would appear.

#### **Grain Transportation**

MR. FOX: My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who indicated to me on Wednesday an answer to a question of mine regarding the request of the extension of delivery quotas for plugged elevator points in Alberta. For the benefit of the Assembly, could the minister advise of any update on that situation?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for Vegreville for raising this question again. I took the liberty of photostating and couriering down all the worthwhile questions that were asked by the hon. members opposite.

We couriered it to the Hon. Charlie Mayer so that he would have the benefit of your wisdom.

We also inquired with the Canadian Wheat Board. They indicated to us that in the event that any farmers are having difficulties in delivering, they will contact the Canadian Wheat Board. They have given us the assurance that they would be more than happy to extend on an individual basis the opportunity for them to deliver.

MR. FOX: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the producers appreciate that, Mr. Minister, and I do too. Could you give us any indication of the extent of the problem in Alberta at this time? Do you have any idea how widespread it is?

MR. ELZINGA: We are aware that some of the farming population are experiencing difficulties, because the elevators are plugged. I quite frankly can't indicate to you to what extent, except to say that we again received the assurances from the Canadian Wheat Board that they're going to attempt to alleviate the concerns as best they can.

MR. FOX: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think we both recognize that the problem is a transportation problem. Is the minister prepared to recommend to the Canadian Grain Transportation Authority and the Wheat Board that a review be undertaken regarding car allocations, given the fact that the panacea of pay-the-railways compensatory rates has not provided producers in Alberta with better and improved delivery opportunities?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, again in responding to the hon. Member for Vegreville — and my hon. colleague the minister responsible for economic development might wish to supplement my answer, as we are working very closely on this. That is part of the reason why we as a government also introduced the feed market adjustment program, to offset some of the difficulties the hon. member has spoken of, and it is an ongoing concern which we are working on.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and I will be meeting with members of the review committee who've been dealing with the Western Grain Transportation Act. I was pleased to hear the NDP indicate that they now support the pay-the-producer, which has been the position of the Alberta government.

MR. FOX: Can I get a point of order, Mr. Speaker? A check of *Hansard* will confirm that that's an absolute distortion of what I said.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I can understand why other members have difficulty trying to understand him. Bearing in mind that I have no federal Member of Parliament, did I get clearly from the hon. minister that the minister in charge of the Wheat Board will extend the period for delivery to those who cannot deliver to the elevators now or that he is only thinking about it?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated he had no Member of Parliament. Let me assure him that the representation in Pembina is much the same as the representation at the provincial level in Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. SPEAKER: On that interesting note, we are beyond the end of question period for the day. The hon. Minister of Social Services would like to supplement information given in an earlier question period. Do we have the unanimous consent of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any?

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, I heard a no. Were you serious, hon. member?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I am. On a point of order. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair simply asked a question of the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. Was unanimous consent given to the House, or did you oppose?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### head: **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

10. Moved by Mr. Crawford:  
Be it resolved that the report of the special committee, appointed June 12, 1986, under Standing Order 49, be now received and concurred in and that the committees recommended therein be hereby appointed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move Motion 10 which will establish the committees of the Assembly as proposed in the report by the committee of members who made the recommendations yesterday.

[Motion carried]

#### 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 25: Mr. Chumir]

MR. CHUMIR: Unaccustomed as I am, Mr. Speaker, I rise to resume my comments on the throne speech. I had indicated in my previous comments that my constituents wish me to raise issues in this House. Accordingly, I have decided to deal with a number of issues that I think are very important to this province at this time.

I had spoken the other day, Mr. Speaker, about government mismanagement of our finances. The House will recall that

yesterday the Minister of Advanced Education got off the funniest line of the session to date when he told the House that the government had been a good manager of our finances. I'd like to dwell on this issue, but this statement is so hilarious that I am deterred from further comment by recollection of a little anecdote of Kurt Vonnegut's, in which he told about how there was a time when he was a speech writer and he was asked to write the funniest joke he knew for his boss. The boss proceeded to read his speech without having previously noted the joke, and during the course of reading the speech, when he came to the joke he laughed so hard that he got a nosebleed and had to be led from the hall. The next day Mr. Vonnegut was fired, so I don't want to cause any harm to members of this House and, accordingly, I won't comment any further on the government's record of management of our money.

One thing has disturbed me, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the government side of the House, and that is the response that we continually see when the issue of home care and service for our seniors is raised. Whenever this issue of home care and gerontology is raised, we hear laughs and catcalls. This unanimity shows a mind-set which I consider to be unhealthy. It reflects the fact that many members of the government side of the House have stopped thinking. It's like the stock market. When everybody gets in, the smart money gets out. I would like to assure the members of the government side that those who raise this issue, and particularly myself, do so not in a partisan sense. It is not a partisan issue, and my constituents elected me because they wished me to be effective and persuasive on the issues and not partisan. Although eloquence may fail me, I hope that over the course of the deliberations of this House, my ideas and arguments will bear up.

I intend to try briefly to transmit to the members of the government side of the House what is truly at stake in this home care and gerontology issue, which I was not aware of a year ago, but I've become informed about it. When I went on the campaign trail — I'm sure you've all had this experience — we encountered a number of senior citizens, elderly ones, many 80- and 90-year-olds who were at home. Unfortunately, many more of our senior citizens were in nursing homes, and the difference in the style and humanity of their lives was very obvious. When a senior gets into his 60s and 70s, and when we reach that age — I don't believe many of us are at that stage, although many of us may feel that way — we will be faced with health situations, the resolution of which will mean the difference as to whether we are able to join those who stay in their homes or, alternately, will end up in institutions.

The determining features of this issue, the things which will decide that, may very well be the nature of the specialists and the experts who are available to deal with this issue and the degree of home care available. We now have a program in the city of Edmonton, at Youville, which by all accounts, notwithstanding its problems in keeping staff, has been very successful in enabling citizens who might otherwise have to move into institutions to remain in their homes. This is a situation and a type of program, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have in Calgary or in other parts of the province. The Youville program itself is very, very limited in Edmonton. Accordingly, at the present time the odds are that seniors, including ourselves in the future, will likely end up in institutions rather than be able to remain in their homes when these very delicate health issues arise.

During the campaign period, statistics and our own eyes told us that we have the highest proportion of seniors in



nursing homes in the western world. We are aware, Mr. Speaker, of the very high expenditure on our institutions. We are aware that we know very little and have very few gerontology programs. We know we have an aging population. We know that we ourselves will face the issue of institutionalization. All our common sense tells us that this should become a major focus of our policy. It is not only more humane but it makes economic sense. I hope that we will cease to hear catcalls, laughs, and roars from the other side of the House when this issue is raised, because this is a policy that requires changing in the interests of this province, not on a partisan basis but on a basis of reality.

I would like to move on to comment on an issue in the realm of education that is of concern to me, Mr. Speaker. That is my belief that the most significant error the government has made in education policy during its tenure was its decision in the mid-1970s to commence the generous funding of private schools. When I refer to private schools, I would like to make it clear that I am speaking not of those private schools which serve children with learning needs and disabilities but those schools where children go because of a matter of the clear choice of the parents.

The public school system, Mr. Speaker, is truly a treasure of our community. It not only has served to educate our children but has had a social mission, that of helping to overcome the traditional barriers of race, religion, and wealth which have so long plagued and divided mankind. The public school system attempted to overcome these barriers by having children of all races, religions, and economic classes go to school together and get to know each other by providing them with an equality of opportunity to receive an education.

On the other hand, the hallmark of private schools is that they segregate children on the basis of religion, race, or wealth. Such schools are indeed not open to each and every child. There is a condition precedent to entry, whether it be an orthodoxy of belief in a certain religion, membership in a particular race, or the ability of parents to pay fees. The decision in the mid-1970s by the government to generously fund these schools was a change in the sensible direction of our education policies in this province from 1905 when the province was founded.

Public grants to private schools have escalated to the range of approximately \$1,400 per student at this time and have encouraged the growth of such schools in Alberta. Shortly after the United States has gone through the agonies of desegregating its school system, we now find ourselves moving in the direction of a society in which our policies would have children of different religions and races — Christians of different sects, Mormons, Sikhs, Muslims, East Indians, or Orientals — all segregated from each other in our school system. We are moving in a direction in which children of different economic strata will have unequal educational opportunities.

This is the wrong direction. It's the direction of future social divisions and of a class system in this country. These are not problems which our generation will face, Mr. Speaker. We're all right. They are problems which are going to appear 100 years from now. The issue concerns the kind of people our children and grandchildren will live with, and it directly raises the question of our responsibility to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I must ask where the New Democratic Party has been on this issue over the years. That party has represented itself over the years as a party which encourages tolerance and understanding and opposes class distinctions.

Here we have a policy which is putting at risk the very structure of our public school system, which so directly stands immediately at the centre of this battle for equality and tolerance and opposition to a class system. I say that there is no single issue that will have more impact upon our society than the shape of our school system. They should closely note the direction in which we have been moving and end their silence. So should those many members of the government, who I know share my concerns over this matter.

I am not unmindful, Mr. Speaker, of the desire many parents have for a more ethically based education. There is a tendency in the school system for the public to look to it to solve the many problems of our society. This is in many ways an unreasonable expectation, but we can do better in our school system. I for one am supportive of efforts to improve and emphasize the teaching of values which are common to all decent people and to all religions, namely those based on the golden rule and which emphasize honesty, charity, and that of making contributions to the community. But let us do this in the context of an integrated public school system and not by segregating children. The encouragement of segregated schooling has no place in a sensible, farsighted public policy, and it must be phased out.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech was a major disappointment in the realm of oil and gas. This is not a surprise, because the government's policy on oil and gas has made us used to such disappointments. In the Western Accord the government has produced a policy which has been a major disaster for the oil and gas industry. It has applied a free-market ideology. It has combined this free-market ideology with the boom-market psychology which prevailed in this province, a failure to recognize that prices could fall dramatically. It has combined this ideology and this psychology with the euphoria of having the federal and the provincial Tory governments patting each other on the back in congratulations. The result of this combination has been the Western Accord, which has totally failed to protect the interests of this province.

The primary reason the Western Accord is such a disaster is that those who were entrusted with looking after the economic interests of this province didn't take them seriously and accordingly didn't provide for a precipitous price decline in the agreement. Why didn't they? Economists were talking about the possibility of such a decline. The economic press was talking about it. The supply/demand statistics were enough to give cause for concern, yet we entered into an agreement in which deregulation was to proceed on a skydive schedule without provision for a parachute landing. Yes, there was some provision in clause 9 of the Western Accord for a change in prices, but the clause looks like it was structured to protect national interests and not those of Alberta.

The federal government press release of March 28, 1985, dealing with this clause states:

Miss Carney said that Canadian consumers will be protected from the volatility of the international markets. I emphasize "Canadian consumers."

if world prices escalate rapidly, not fall, or if security of supply is threatened, the federal government in consultation with the producing provinces would take appropriate measures to protect Canadian interests.

Where is a similar clause protecting Alberta interests? Who was negotiating for the people of this province? Why were the minister of energy and our Premier not saying to Miss

Carney, "Look Pat, we've been selling Alberta oil to the rest of Canada for lower than world price for years, and the country has benefitted to the tune of \$56 billion." That's their figure.

This may have been reasonable, because we've had a very good time of it. However, there are storm clouds on the horizon, and if the price drops, we have to have a clause which provides a parachute for us to get some of that money back into our economy. That is what we should have been saying. We should have had some of that clause. The key reason why we should have had that clause in the Western Accord is the \$56 billion credit, which is the figure provided to this House by the minister of energy.

How do you rationalize the logic? How do you fail to recognize the logic that when consumers are protected against rising prices, the producers in this province should not be protected against a sudden oil collapse? This protection should have been the key goal of our negotiators. One suspects that it was left out because of the naivety of our minister of energy and our government thinking that they could rely on fellow Progressive Conservatives to do the right thing by us. We can see that that just is not so.

Mr. Speaker, our first priority, one which is supported by the former Premier of this province and one which is now being asked for by the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada and other industry members, is that deregulation of oil and gas must not proceed on November 1. There has to be a delay, and we have to reconsider our policies on this issue. Aside from the \$56 billion, one of the fundamental reasons we have to reconsider our policy on this issue is that the basic premise of deregulation is not fair, because we have a provision in the Western Accord and we have a national policy which provides that we are not able to export gas in an unlimited manner to the United States, which would be at the heart of a free-market system. What we have is the maintenance of a supply of gas for the benefit of this country. That is all very reasonable, but as long as we have that need of that maintenance of supply, we cannot recognize the benefits of higher prices, but we will certainly enjoy all the disadvantages of lower prices in terms of competition. This is a fundamental imbalance. It's at the heart of the agreement. The government has not represented the people of this province by agreeing to deregulation under those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the final issue that I would like to speak of — not because of a shortage of issues but because of time — is that of the workers' compensation system in this province. This system has lost the confidence of a substantial portion of the working people in the province. Complaints about delays and arbitrary decisions have led to a series of hunger strikes in Calgary. I have spoken to affected workers and to others dealing with the system, and I'm convinced that nothing less than a public inquiry with respect to the operation of this system can restore much-needed confidence.

These and other important issues have not been addressed in the throne speech. Rather, the government has shown every sign of continuing in the direction of the same uninspired and unimaginative policies and with its habit of spending without getting value for money. That is not good enough. It is our duty as members of the opposition to point this out and to present alternatives. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I, as an opposition member, will do my part in order to advance the interests of the people of this province.

Thank you.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise to address the speech given by Her Honour a short time ago. That lady, as we all know, has served this province very well for a long period of time as a businesswoman, a municipal politician, a provincial politician, and now as a superb representative of Her Majesty in this province.

It was also a pleasure to listen to the speeches by the Member for Calgary Foothills and the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey when they moved and seconded acceptance of that throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address some remarks to yourself particularly. Tuesday was the 672nd anniversary of the battle of Bannockburn. For the benefit of members of the House, the battle of Bannockburn was an occasion when Scots lopped off several heads, mostly of Englishmen. I'm not accusing you of being an Englishman, but the remark that was made by the Member for Clover Bar brings to mind a long-standing tradition of the parliamentary democratic system which goes back several centuries. On occasion the Speaker of the Assembly, on bearing the messages of Parliament to the king or queen of the day, did indeed lose his head. I would like to assure you that I will not use my surgical skills or my Scots background to take part in that process with yourself.

The word "doctor," commonly misused as meaning physician, applies to many people. It depends on the type of doctorate degree that they have and the justification for it. But we have to look at the origin of the word, which is "teacher." I would like to compliment you on the capability you have shown so far as a teacher of this Assembly. We have many new members in the Assembly, and I'm sure they all appreciate your capability as a teacher during the time that this Legislature has sat under your chairmanship.

Because time is of the essence today, Mr. Speaker, and I know that there are members who would still like to make their maiden speeches, I'd like to briefly address the throne speech and the reactions of some members of the opposition to it.

If one takes the throne speeches of both April 3 and June 12 as a unit, those two speeches certainly address the concerns, the aspirations, and the needs of Albertans of all groups in society. They address agriculture, our primary industry and, in many ways, the reason why the province existed. They address the energy industry, the forestry industry, the tourism potential of the province, and specific job creation needs. Especially, they address the needs of individuals, of the people of the province. Whether it's programs for young people in education, programs in health care and home care — to the hon. member for Calgary — or the review of labour legislation, which I will address in my remarks when the estimates of the department are introduced, the whole gamut of commerce, economy, and human needs and aspirations is addressed in those two speeches.

On the other hand, listening to the members of the Official Opposition over the last two weeks, it has become obvious that they really think that that party and the members of it have a monopoly on human emotion. We have heard everybody berated, we've had pontification, we've had self-righteousness, we've had outrage, and we've had disappointment. In all cases they have been addressing it as if they had the monopoly on the human emotions of caring, love, sorrow, and concern for others. I can assure the members of that caucus that they do not have such a monopoly.

All we need to do is to look at the province that I came to 30 years ago. It has in the past had governments of a liberal nature, the farmers formed their own government — subsequently Social Credit — and it is now under the party that I'm proud to belong to. Over the 81 years this province has never shown a lack of those human emotions under any government. If they feel that they can go out to Albertans and present themselves in the way that they have done so far, then Albertans will be able to judge whether or not they deserve their self-righteous nature.

I'd like to briefly address the constituency that I represent, the constituency that I went to out of choice 30 years ago. It was originally part of what was called the Stony Plain constituency, which extended from the limits of Edmonton to the British Columbia border. Because of developments in farming, the energy sector, forestry, tourism, and of course the development of railroads, the population west of this city has grown enormously over that period of time. Successively, there was the Edson constituency carved out of Stony Plain, to a large part based on the development of the Coal Branch. Subsequently, there have been the constituencies of Drayton Valley and Whitecourt.

At the last boundary change, the constituency of Edson had its name changed, because although Edson had been the predominant community west of Stony Plain for so long, it was no longer so. Indeed, there are four major communities in the constituency, and for that reason the boundary commission decided to go to a more historical name, that of West Yellowhead. I am not going to go into the story of Tête Jaune, or Tay John, as he as was referred to. It is a suitable name for the constituency. There were other suggestions, like overlander, in the history of the area, but West Yellowhead is a suitable nomenclature for the constituency.

There is another interesting thing that perhaps describes that constituency to some extent, in that the boundary commission removed 1.4 million acres from the borders of the constituency — an enormous area in any country. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that in that process they did not remove one person, one elector, or one voter from the rolls of the constituency. They took from the constituency of West Yellowhead an area north of Grande Cache and south of Grande Prairie. Why they did it, I do not know. I understand it met with the approval of the Member for Grande Prairie. But it does indicate the kind of countryside that we have in this province.

The town of Grande Cache, which is now close to the north border of the constituency, was born out of a natural resource: coal. It has had its economic ups and downs more than most communities in this province because it was a one-industry community. I made some remarks earlier on about the caring nature of this province. When that community got into economic problems and the people there were looking at a somewhat bleak future, there were successive actions by this government to try and stabilize that community and to provide employment opportunities outside the coal industry.

Successively, there has been the development of a sawmill, British Columbia Forest Products, which was based on the Berland-Fox Creek hearings of 1979. That did something to stabilize the community and create alternative employment. The next action of the government was to place a new correction centre in Grande Cache, and I should point out that it was done before I was the Solicitor General. That decision, again, helped to stabilize an isolated community that was very dependent on resource extraction. The final

action, of course, has been the commitment of the government to build Highway 40 from Grande Prairie to Grande Cache, a project that is slated to be completed this year. I think those actions are typical of the actions of this government in looking after not only economic needs but personal and social needs.

The other communities in the constituency are much longer established. Edson and Hinton have a similar nature, in that they have major forest components and oil and gas components. Coal mines are based in the communities, with coal miners, and that industry has had its problems. Of course, they both derive considerable benefit from the tourists going through to Jasper and British Columbia. The community of Jasper, as we all know, is a tourist mecca; Jasper National Park is known around the world. Mr. Speaker, that community also has a large component based upon the railroad. It is not only a tourist town; it is also an industrial community. Indeed, of the permanent year-round jobs, about half are based upon the railroad.

Mr. Speaker, what I've been describing is a microcosm of Alberta, a history that goes back a long time before the province was founded, a history of resource extraction and, in the east side of the constituency, farming. That constituency has had its economic ups and downs. Most Albertans know the story of the Coal Branch. But throughout that long history of 81 years, there has been a response by government to needs of the area. That response continues.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address two issues which may be somewhat difficult to address in this House. The first one is the extremely successful Winter Games held in Edson this spring. The community of Edson is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year with a homecoming from August 1-4. I would encourage any previous residents of Edson to go to the community on those dates. I would base my confidence in inviting them on the response of that community to hosting the Alberta Winter Games in late January and early February.

It's most interesting to note that that community and the immediately surrounding area, with a population of some 10,000 or 11,000, had 2,500 volunteers involved in the Winter Games. To put that into perspective, it would be the equivalent of Calgary or Edmonton having 150,000 people involved in either the Commonwealth Games, the university games, or the upcoming Olympics in your home community. It was a tremendous response. The games went very well. By and large, we had an excellent response from the media of this province. They came out. Most people will remember seeing videotapes of the games on the community channel in Edmonton and elsewhere in the province.

But there was one notable lack. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country a national Crown corporation called the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That corporation is subsidized by the taxpayers of this country to the tune of over \$800 million a year to provide a national service. That's its *raison d'être*. When they were invited to come to Edson to record and to spread around Alberta what was happening there, the response was, "Oh, we don't have a camera available for an event like that." Mr. Speaker, Albertans contribute \$80 million a year — \$200,000 a day — to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. For a four-day event, with 2,500 volunteers, with over that number of athletes involved, this Crown corporation based in Ottawa doesn't have a camera available. I would suggest that the federal government should maybe take away the subsidy, as they are not performing the duties for which they were created.

If the private-sector companies can provide the service, there is no justification for a Crown corporation.

The other item I would officially like to address in this Assembly is what has become known as the Hinton rail disaster. Judge Foisy has just concluded his inquiry into that disaster, but I want to address it from the human standpoint. None of us who were there that day — and there were a number of people from Hinton, Edson, and Jasper — will ever forget what we saw. Whatever the cause may be, whether it was technical failure, a combination of human errors or failures, or a combination of both, it is almost irrelevant to the victims and their families. To be there while the wreckage was still burning, to be in rail cars that were still burning to make sure there were no survivors was an experience that I don't want to take part in again. Those of us who were there — firemen, rescue workers — came from the community of Hinton ... The tremendous response by industry, by volunteer firemen, by the town crew of Hinton, and by ambulance services from Jasper, Hinton, Edson, and indeed the city of Edmonton, who sent out the large bus, paramedics, and physicians, showed the nature of Albertans. There was no question from industry, from the communities, or from the city of Edmonton on who would pay the bills. It was a very human response. The response of the media people who were on the ground on the site — when I asked them to keep away until we were sure that there were no survivors, they responded to that request absolutely. For that I would like to compliment the media of this province.

What we saw was a total effort on the part of small communities that indicated that with the facilities that are available in this province — the disaster service facilities, the facilities of the railroad itself, and the hospital and medical facilities — we can indeed deal with disasters of that scale very adequately. The small hospital in Hinton had 93 survivors go through it in a matter of 2 hours. They have been complimented by people other than myself for the efforts they made. I was not at the hospital that day. The response and the ability to cope with numbers of that scale indicate that all the efforts that go into all the disaster practices — the programs that exist in all of our hospitals — are worth while. I would encourage everybody in every hospital in the province to take part in those practices in the future, because when the event happens, you cannot go on an ad hoc basis.

Mr. Speaker, I also went to the individual family services in Jasper and to the memorial service in Jasper for the four train crew members and the other resident of Jasper who were killed. On those occasions I saw the total response of that community, which, as I already said, has a large railroad fraternity, to the members of the community and their families. It was a moving experience. We had people there from all walks of life, and they went as one small-town family.

In Edson at the Winter Games we saw people in good times — how volunteer Albertans can enjoy themselves, how they can take part in activities — and at Hinton and Jasper we saw the response of Albertans in other times. I don't want to put a sour note into what I have said, Mr. Speaker, because I have already complimented the media at the site of the accident, but on behalf of the people of Jasper I would like to criticize those members of the media who regarded the tragedy that happened just east of Hinton on February 8 as a media event. It was not. It was a human event. The response of those members of the media who badgered and hounded the families and the people of

Jasper deserve the utmost of criticism from this House and from the people of Alberta.

In closing, I would like to relate just briefly that the priorities of the throne speech address every concern that I know of when I have spoken about the diversity of the constituency I am privileged to represent. Not completely, Mr. Speaker — that is impossible — but they do address those concerns and, in the process, ensure that the people of Alberta know that the government of this province and indeed the Assembly of this province represent a caring population.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to introduction of special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a special guest in the members' gallery. The Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc is not able to be in the House at this moment, but on his behalf I would like to introduce Mr. Lee Bussard. Mr. Bussard is a private businessman and consultant who, through his contracts with various school boards throughout the province and with the assistance of Alberta Education, has travelled extensively to meet young children and their teachers in their classrooms. He explains to children through their teachers what disabilities mean. Many times children will say to him that he looks funny, that he walks and talks funny. But he says to the young children in grades 3, 4, and 5, "You look funny from my eyes; you walk funny to me." He is an example of Albertans everywhere who consider that problems are opportunities, who consider that there are no handicaps. There may be disabilities, but it is ability that counts. Mr. Bussard has cerebral palsy, and he is one of about 30 North Americans with that afflicting disease who is able to drive a motor vehicle. Would members welcome Mr. Bussard to the Assembly.

#### head: CONSIDERATION OF HER HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S SPEECH (continued)

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, before I begin, by way of explanation, it's a pleasure for me to present to the members here a sample of Alberta farm produce, marking the transition for me from one full-time career to another. I hope you enjoy it, and before the recently anointed Louisville lip beats me to the quip and tells me to buzz off, I'd like to tell members opposite and adjacent that that's about as sweet as I'm going to get.

It's a pleasure for me to rise and speak on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, my maiden speech, if you will. I'd like to extend my sincere congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. I really appreciate the strong yet sensitive hand with which you guide our deliberations. I'd like to also congratulate all the members elected to serve in this 21st Legislature, especially those who, like myself, are here for the first term. I pause every

once in a while in the midst of what I'm sure is a very busy schedule for all of us to consider just what very special responsibilities we have all been charged with.

Mr. Speaker, it was a year ago Tuesday that I, along with my colleagues for Athabasca-Lac La Biche and Edmonton Mill Woods, was nominated to run for the New Democrats. I had a strong feeling at that time that I would be successful in my bid to represent the Vegreville constituency. I'm very happy that June 24 turned out to be a lucky day for them as well and, needless to say, delighted that we have so much company here to join us in our struggles.

I'd like to single out a couple of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker: the hon. members of our Calgary caucus. As someone who spent the first 17 years of his life in the jewel of the south — you've got a lousy hockey team — I take special pleasure in noting that the voters in that city did not all feel obliged to merely rubber-stamp the Tory choices and were willing to look at alternatives, much to the surprise and consternation of observers and pundits around the province.

Speaking of my past in Calgary, I'd also like to congratulate a member whose nine children I used to play with at Ghost Lake, west of Calgary, some 22 years ago. I refer, of course, to the prolific and persistent Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. While casting a charitable eye to the right, I must also recognize another familiar face, the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, who was a classmate of mine in an introductory course in political science in 1968-69 at the University of Alberta. I'd like to think that my being a New Democrat and his being a Liberal is proof positive that I learned my lessons a little better than him, but I'm sure he feels that the opposite is true.

I'd also like to congratulate the members elected to serve in constituencies adjacent to Vegreville. I refer to the members from Camrose, Lloydminster, Vermilion-Viking, St. Paul, Redwater-Andrew, and Clover Bar. I feel surrounded, Mr. Speaker, but given the needs and requirements of rural constituencies, there are many opportunities when MLAs must work together to solve particular problems, and I look forward to those occasions.

This speech, Mr. Speaker, my maiden speech, is directed to the people who elected me. I've been alternately moved and inspired by some of the addresses I've heard, and I'm not going to try and duplicate that. I'd like to begin by thanking the people of the Vegreville constituency from the bottom of my heart for giving me an opportunity to represent their interests in this Legislature. It's a privilege and certainly one of the greatest challenges of my life.

I'd like to talk a bit about the communities that make up the Vegreville constituency and tell you about some of the people, places, and activities that make this a special place to live. The Vegreville constituency is named for its largest community, the town of Vegreville, located just one hour's drive east on the Yellowhead Highway. It's a beautiful town, Mr. Speaker, and has become synonymous with the preservation and enhancement of Ukrainian culture in Canada. Vegreville plays host to the annual Pysanka Festival, the showcase of Ukrainian culture. I would like to invite you, Mr. Speaker, and all the members present to attend this fine show to be held next weekend on July 4, 5, and 6. *Vitayemo* or welcome to the town with the world's largest pysanka easter egg, erected as a tribute to the proud history of the Mounted Police in Alberta.

In addition to the festivals and facilities such as indoor swimming pools that make Vegreville a must in anyone's travel plans, it is an active and progressive town with a

very healthy business sector centred mostly around the agriculture industry, as is the case with most rural towns. Vegreville is the home of the federal soil science research station and the Alberta environmental research centre. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that the many new people brought to our town by these fine facilities have greatly enriched the life in the community. One of the pressing needs felt in the town of Vegreville is for additional space for auxiliary, nursing home, and lodge accommodations for patients, to provide for the many pioneers and original settlers who call Vegreville home. There have been ongoing negotiations with the department of hospitals, and we look forward to future developments.

The village of Lavoy is located farther down the Yellowhead, Mr. Speaker, close to the eastern boundary of the Vegreville constituency. The Lavoy community school, a kind of unique institution, sets the tone for many of the activities in the village which are family based and community oriented. It was my pleasure to participate in the opening of the new Lavoy senior citizens' Golden Centre last week, built with assistance from the Department of Culture.

Driving north on Highway 36 brings you to the county and town of Two Hills, an area rich in tradition and of unparalleled beauty. The residents of Two Hills are very pleased with the new hospital just recently opened there. There are many good locations for businesses wishing to come to town, and there are several modern, recently constructed homes available to new residents. Two Hills is home to a well-known egg processing plant called Highland Produce. The town is well serviced with two major highways, highways 36 and 45, and offers many opportunities for development. There's also an airport, as well as a railway. Like many medium-sized towns, it is not only seeking development and growth but needing it to provide some stability for the future.

While in Two Hills one could drive a few miles east to the hamlet of Musidora to see the stone post office or the old stone community hall, or drive north to the hamlet of Duvernay, located on the shores of the North Saskatchewan, and eat one of the famous buffalo burgers served at the hotel there. The drive from Two Hills to the village of Hairy Hill takes one through some of the prettiest country I've ever seen, Mr. Speaker. I don't mean this to sound like a travelogue, but after being cooped up in meetings for the last six weeks, this boy misses the sweet smell of clover in the country. There are some transitions that are difficult. I've earned my living these last several years looking after bees, driving over the roads that I described to you, and delivering honey to many of the communities in northeastern Alberta. You're going to have to bear with me.

Hairy Hill is home to not only the plant that produces the honey that I hope the members will all enjoy but also the very popular Hairy Hill hot mustard and was the birthplace of the Thompson Canoe Company, one of the very few companies in Canada to have manufactured wood and canvas canoes. The village council in Hairy Hill has some interesting plans for a much-needed combination fire and community hall building which I hope to discuss soon with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

On the way to the town of Mundare, one could stop in at Tiny Tym's Poultry, a unique operation processing chicken and selling a variety of smoked chicken products. Mundare is a well-serviced and pretty town, noted also for the food and process shipped from there: the famous Stawnychy kobasa

— I think members have tasted its delight, presented by the former Member for Vegreville — and Jan-Lee's sausage. You'll notice the food theme here, but good food is the tradition in the Vegreville constituency, and almost everyone is tied in some way to the production of it.

The hamlet of Hilliard and the village of Chipman also invite people to move in and make their homes there. Chipman has several modern homes available and also boasts a glider airport just north of the village. While only a few people actually participate in the sport of glider flight, almost anyone can enjoy watching, and we urge some of the city-bound members to drive out to Chipman and give it a try someday.

In the southern part of the constituency, Mr. Speaker, the community of Bruce, though but a hamlet, boasts one of the most famous stampedes in western Canada, which features some of the best horseshoe players you'll ever see.

The village of Holden has many businesses built around the needs of the agricultural community and also has a fine lodge for seniors and a unique facility called the Beaver Regional Art Centre, a building renovated to provide a facility for the performing arts. Like Bruce, Ryley, and Tofield, Holden is located on the CNR main line and welcomes development from outside.

The signs on the highway beside the village of Ryley induce the traveller to "live the life of Riley." How many villages in the province have an indoor swimming pool? Not too many. Ryley is also the administrative centre for the county of Beaver and has been in the news lately because of the council's attempts to have a solid waste management plant built there. This is a proposal we have been working on, and I look forward to discussions with the hon. Minister of the Environment about this issue. The village also has plans for a civic building, which I hope to bring to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the very near future.

The town of Tofield and the rural area north and west were just added to the Vegreville constituency. The town has approximately 1,600 residents and the immediate surrounding area about 2,000. This very large rural population is due to the many acreages in the area. There are many young families in the district who are there trying to build their futures, and this means there are a number of very skilled and qualified people there. This makes Tofield an excellent place for business and industry to consider moving to. The town is also looking forward to the opening of a beautiful new hospital. There is need for an airport in the community, and I hope to be able to work with the hon. minister of transportation to submit a proposal to the federal government for its consideration.

In welcoming the Tofield area to the Vegreville constituency, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was initially a little worried or concerned about the impact that might have on the election, given the only 8.5 percent the New Democrats were able to garner in the 1982 election. Our former leader, who was a member of the commission to redraw the boundaries, assured me in his characteristically prophetic way that I need not worry, that the people there supported the Member for Clover Bar because of his excellent record of service to the community and his personal style, not because of the party or lack of party that he represented. It was a thrill indeed when we won five of the seven polls in that area in the recent election, and I thank the new electors for their personal support.

I've finished with the prepared part of my text, and with the indulgence of the Assembly I'm going to try and wing it from here. I think how a person with my background

would come to be the M.L.A. for a constituency like Vegreville and be the agriculture critic of the Official Opposition, given my background as an s.o.b. from Calgary — that's son of a banker — begs some explanation. My father, though a banker and working in an office, was a charter member of the Cariboo cattlemen's association, honorary life president of the Canadian Hereford Association, and an honorary life member of the Alberta Cattle Breeders' Association. While that doesn't qualify me for my role as agriculture critic, it stimulated in me an interest and a desire that I was to realize some years later.

I worked for one year at the hospital in Ponoka and then went to university in Edmonton to study political science and psychology — again, an interesting sort of background for an agriculture critic. [interjection] I'm going to need to borrow your hearing aid so I can hear that. I realized while a student that I had a very strong desire to be a farmer and, upon marrying my dear wife in 1972, moved to the Vegreville area to try and build a future. We wanted to not only farm and engage ourselves in that most noble of professions but also raise our family in the country. We sort of moved there by choice. We found a farm that was available. Little did we know at the time that we were choosing an area that was very productive, developed, and with fine and accepting people.

As far as my being *lysej Angelick*, or a bald Englishman, to my neighbours, I want you to know that I fit right in, Mr. Speaker. I might say *Ja ne znayu jak dusze dobre hovyty po Ukrainske ale ja dusze skoro vchusia*. I'm sure my friend from Redwater-Andrew knows what I mean. I might not speak Ukrainian well, but I learn quickly and my heart's in the right place.

I might speak briefly about the election and the history of the Vegreville constituency. It did have the distinction of sending a CCF member, Stan Ruzycski, to this Assembly in the 1950s. Though represented by Conservatives since 1971, we've always had a good battle there and good election struggles. The New Democrats have traditionally been a strong force there, second only to the Spirit River-Fairview constituency in terms of party memberships, in fact.

It was a special thrill for me on election night to know that the dreams and efforts of many fine and decent people had finally been realized. Viola and I were cooped up in a little room waiting for the results to be transmitted to us, as nervous as I'm sure all members are in that situation.

I should tell you about a couple of our older supporters, a couple of women well into their 70s, both widows and both teetotalers, who told me prior to the election that if we finally won, they would have a drink. The first indication of our success was when they came in with smiles of apprehension and delight on their faces with their little vodkas and orange juice, devilishly thinking about downing them and worrying if they might be sober in time for church on Sunday.

In contrast to many of the constituencies in the province, I'd like to say that the people in Vegreville are very active politically. We had a 71 percent voter turnout, and I think that bears testament to the interest that people in the constituency take in politics. It makes me feel so much better and a little more secure in my position.

Mr. Speaker, I think I must address a concern that I have expressed to me often, and I'm sure other members have heard it. That is that when a constituency goes ahead and elects a member in opposition, they will be punished for it and somehow the supply of government money will

be dried up. I mention it because I'm sure that that kind of insinuation has cost this Assembly one of its brighter lights, and I refer to the previous member from Spirit River-Fairview. If we examine it philosophically, I think we can see that it just could not possibly work. If it were true, we would not need a democratically elected Legislature. We would dispense with elections and would just need a central government that appointed representatives to administer their will. I know it's not the case.

I've had the privilege of meeting many of the ministers, and I can honestly sense their sincere desire to work for people all across this province. I'm surprised that people even try and propagate rumors like that. I have to refer to the Member from Little Bow, who very soon will become the longest serving member in the history of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we can all agree that it's because of his service to the constituency, not because of the lack of it. I think the best way to subvert this insidious kind of rumor in the future is to try and ensure that the overall outcome of the election will not be able to be predicted with any accuracy before. I think we can all agree with that, and if the government pursues in rote their plans laid out in the Speech from the Throne, we'll be in a more seesaw sort of position next time.

My campaign in Vegreville was based on a theme that motivated me to run, Mr. Speaker, and that was to build a better future in rural Alberta — a feeling that we have something very special in our way of life out there. There are perhaps things that threaten that way of life that we all cherish, and there is a real concern amongst people in rural Alberta for not only their futures but the futures of their children. We would like to be able to provide some sort of opportunity for them so that if they so desire, they can set roots down in the community and build their futures and raise their families close to home rather than feeling that they need to move off to one of the two major cities.

I ran strongly on an agricultural theme because, though someone not raised on a farm, I've earned my entire living on the farm these last several years, and it's taught me many things. I realized soon after I moved to the farm that many decisions that governments make impact on the farming community. I didn't like some of those decisions, and I had a desire to learn more about the process and maybe get involved in the future and try and change some of those things.

Agriculture is certainly the most basic concern in rural Alberta, and I know all members recognize that. My concern for agriculture comes because of the value that I place on our rural life and the realization I have about how essential a healthy and strengthened agricultural industry is to that vital sort of growth that we want to provide. If I may be forgiven an analogy, if the roots are strong and healthy, I think the tree will grow tall, provide shade, and bear fruit. I think we all recognize that a strengthened rural economy would in large part help abate the very serious 12 percent unemployment in the city of Edmonton.

There are problems in rural Alberta that are not unlike problems we face in the cities, unemployment being one. We tend to think of unemployment as something that impacts only on people in cities, but it is a problem and increasingly so in rural Alberta. There is a desperate need for development and industry in these towns. We'll certainly be making suggestions at every opportunity to try and foster that sort of development.

I'd like to address education, as I did so many times in my campaign. I know that the Minister of Education

will take these points into consideration. I'm impressed with the sincerity of her concern for the future of our children's education, realizing that that is our most precious resource.

There has been a concerted attempt on the part of the government to reduce the level of funding for education. In rural Alberta it used to be that 85 percent of the costs were covered by provincial funding; it's now something less than 65 percent. That's had several impacts, Mr. Speaker. It has meant that it's more difficult for our local authorities, our local boards and teachers, to provide the kind of top-quality educational programs that are not only demanded but required by our children. It's had an impact on the business community as well, because the supplementary requisition that the towns, counties, and villages have to collect from their taxpayers to make up the difference has meant that the taxes are higher than they need to be, and it's been a disincentive toward business in terms of being able to attract business and also for the communities being able to provide the kinds of services and facilities that are needed to make the communities more attractive for people in businesses to move to.

Another problem we share in common with urban areas — and I alluded to it earlier — is waste disposal. I'm sure other rural members are familiar with situations where counties are trying to come to grips with the problem of waste disposal. I'm hoping it's something that will be actively discussed in this session. I think it's a very topical item.

Getting away briefly from my own campaign and the priorities I have as an elected member, I want to refer directly to the throne speech and what I've seen happening in Alberta in a general way over the last several years. When this government was first elected in 1971, I think they provided a much-needed fresh face in Alberta political life and replaced a pretty well worn-out and tired, stagnant dynasty. There was a very exciting mood in the province, an exciting kind of optimism amongst Albertans, with so many new and energetic MLAs being elected.

I think we all realize that early in the Tory term the Arab cartel known as OAPEC made oil a valuable commodity, raised the price to previously unheard of levels. Mr. Speaker, because good fortune had provided us with an abundant supply of gas and oil, we were able to benefit. We appreciate our good fortune, and I think we should recognize that it was as much luck as direction. The resultant good-news/bad-news stories of the boom in the mid- to late-70s are well known. On the one hand, we had excitement of new money and new activity and attention focussed on our province; on the other hand, we had social upheaval and economic dislocation that few had predicted.

Since 1980 the Alberta economy has floundered. Unemployment levels, I believe, Mr. Speaker, are a provincial disgrace. Farm foreclosures and business bankruptcies continue at high rates. The number of Albertans forced to live on social assistance of one form or another climbs steadily. The government response in large part since the '80s has been to project a kind of persistent Pollyanna attitude toward the economic situation, saying that the recovery is strong, that we've turned the corner, that we get positive economic news every day. I think that's created an unfortunate kind of cynicism amongst the voters in Alberta, who expect a little more from their governments. It's almost that people have become distrustful of their elected officials, because what we hear being said and what we see happening are two very different things.

I think that for too long we've had a government that spends too much time looking in the mirror and feeling

good about the past when what we need to be doing is looking out the window and feeling concerned for the future. I hope we can count on the new Provincial Treasurer and this government to be more frank with Albertans, to tell them where we are, why we're here, and where we're going.

I realize that I'm running out of time, Mr. Speaker. I'll refer directly to some provisions in the throne speech. Referring to agriculture as the government's number one priority: I'm happy with that. I have some concerns about the Alberta farm credit stability program, some of which I've mentioned and some of which are transmitted to me not only by individual producers but by farm groups. We appreciate the intent of the program, to provide fixed long-term financing for Alberta's farmers; it's long overdue and welcome. I think it's good that the source of funds is provincial revenues or moneys that the government borrows. It can be seen as a program of direct investment in the future of our province's industry rather than interest shielding, as some would advocate, because interest shielding merely acknowledges the banks' rights to charge exorbitant interest rates and forces the taxpayer to subsidize it, whereas if we can direct investment into the program, the province actually garners some return, albeit slightly lower than returns on other investments. At least it's a return, and the cost is kept relatively low.

I'm concerned about the rate; I've expressed that before. I believe 9 percent is too high to have the desired impact on the agricultural community. I'm concerned about the way the program was announced, because it's not a \$2 billion program; it's a program with a limit of \$2 billion. Taxpayers had the feeling that farmers were being given \$2 billion to solve their ills, and that's not the case. It's not a giveaway; it's an investment.

We're concerned also, Mr. Speaker, with the \$200,000 limit on funds. I think we can recognize that when we try to average out the total indebtedness of Alberta farmers, we're averaging those that are seriously in debt with those who have no debt at all. What we need to do is look at the particular needs of producers who have crippling debt and have to be able to cope with that.

I'm encouraged by the commitment on the part of the government to review the mandate and role of the Agricultural Development Corporation, and I hope that we and farm groups have direct input into that. I think the corporation though well-intentioned in the beginning has — is my time up, Mr. Speaker?

Perhaps I could get into some of these things later, in a more specific way. I'd like to say that I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here and serve. Though I may disagree with members on occasion, I will never impugn their motives. I know we're all here to do our best for the people of the province of Alberta. Please forgive me if you see me in a critical role sometimes. I wasn't sent here to be a cheerleader, but I do come to give credit where credit is due, and I appreciate the opportunity to work with you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this Assembly.

Thank you.

MR. STRONG: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I recognize that the Member for Red Deer South is going to be speaking next: could I be recognized to speak after him?

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. The Chair has difficulty because of the Standing Orders. At 12:30 today the debate must conclude on the throne speech. In terms of past experience,

I would hope that all hon. members who haven't been able to get into the throne speech debate might be able to work with their material and bring the bulk of it in with respect to the budget debate.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise on this occasion to address this Assembly with my maiden speech. I too want to join in the accolades on your election as Speaker of this House. I believe that your sincerity, humility, kindness, thoughtfulness, honour, and temperance have already gone a long way in establishing an appropriate mood for this Assembly. I say these things not out of a sense of duty or obligation but because they are true and they help to express the sense of trust and confidence we in this Assembly feel for the job you have done to date and that we know you will continue to do.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a third-generation Albertan. My grandfather Arthur Oldring came to Calgary in 1890. He went from there to farm just east of Innisfail and from there moved on to clear a homestead near Wimborne. Tough times came upon my grandfather, and he was forced to sell his livestock and his team of horses to support his family. Not to be deterred, though, my grandfather later sold the homestead and moved to the metropolis of Mirror, in anticipation of the railway coming through. The railway did come, and Mirror became an important terminal. My grandfather owned and operated a successful butcher shop in Mirror until he volunteered for service in the First World War. My grandfather lost his life on the battlefields of France six weeks before that war ended. This left my grandmother to raise eight children in the booming town of Mirror.

There weren't an awful lot of social agencies in downtown Mirror at that time. After giving it some careful thought, I asked my father, "How did you manage in those times?" You can appreciate that this was a good question coming from me — the today generation. No government agencies, no forms to fill out in triplicate, no counsellors to tell them that they were below the poverty line and that it didn't look good — how did they manage? My father said that it was difficult but they managed well. Adversity was not new to my pioneering grandmother. My father said three things: one, that they were still a family, a single-parent family yes, but they were still together. The older children went out and worked. The younger children shared in the responsibilities, and together as a family they worked things out helping each other. Two, he said that food was plentiful in those days and that the rural community was very generous and they never went without a meal on the table. Three, my grandfather did leave them with a home that was paid for, a small home and crowded with eight children, but it did provide the very necessary shelter that they required.

Sure it was tough, Mr. Speaker, but my grandmother successfully raised eight children, all of whom led and are leading productive lives and have made significant contributions to their communities as well. My father, Reverend Edward Wright Oldring, like many Albertans volunteered for duty at the outbreak of World War II. After serving a number of years in active duty overseas as a pilot in the Royal Canadian Air Force, he returned to Edmonton with his bride Patricia Joy Oldring. My father went to the University of Alberta and St. Steven's College, receiving a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Divinity degree, and became a minister for the United Church of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the accomplishments of my parents. They have both served Alberta and this



country well, my father through his duty at war, his ministry, as well as being an author of two books; my mother as a teacher, a principal for the school for the mentally retarded, a businessperson and, most importantly, a wonderful mother to five children. Both of my parents have touched the hearts of many people, and I know that this province and this country are better because of them.

My parents have provided me with a great deal, Mr. Speaker. Most importantly, they raised me with a sense of values. They taught me the importance of honesty, justice, fairness, tolerance, and standing up for the rights and privileges that both my grandfather and my father fought for. My roots in this province and country are deep, as is my sense of commitment.

Mr. Speaker, Red Deer South is special, and I want to say thank you to the citizens of this constituency for their confidence in me and for the mandate my party and I received on May 8. The responsibility I've been entrusted with is something that I do not take lightly. I shall do everything within my means to live up to the high expectations my constituents have of me, and I shall try to live up to the high standards that have been established by the members who represented Red Deer prior to me: Jim McPherson, the late Norman Magee, and James Foster. Red Deer has a track record for strong, dedicated, and hard-working representatives. I've only been here for two weeks, but I know I have a big job ahead of me to live up to the standards set by my predecessors.

Serving the citizens of Red Deer South is not new for me. I've had that pleasure and privilege for 12 years, and they've been exciting and challenging years, I might add. During my tenure on council the city of Red Deer almost doubled in size. The city had issued over \$650 million worth of building permits. We tripled our water treatment facilities. We tripled our sewage treatment. We doubled the capacity of our existing bridges. We built a third bridge, and we started on a fourth bridge. We've moved our Westerner Exposition and expanded it. We have a new Red Deer museum and have expanded it. We have a new regional hospital, a new provincial building, and a new provincial courthouse. We have added some of the finest senior citizen facilities in this country. We have added major new day care facilities. We have pioneered the community school concept with the G. H. Dawe Centre. The Red Deer College has just undergone a major expansion, and it's preparing to open one of the finest fine arts facilities in this province today.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we are just completing the finishing touches to the most incredible network of paths, trails, parks, and facilities: our Waskasoo Park. At a cost of \$28 million, this park's network is the pride and joy of our community. It truly is a heritage trust project and no doubt will be enjoyed by generations and generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, we managed to accomplish all of this in 12 years and at the same time maintain a reasonable level of municipal taxation. I say this partly to brag a little about our city and partly because I'm proud of our city, but I also say this to recognize the province, for it was largely due to the co-operation, the initiatives, and the assistance of a Progressive Conservative government that we were able to accomplish all of that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the city of Red Deer has blossomed and matured into one of the nicest and friendliest cities in all of Canada. To paraphrase former Premier Peter Lougheed, I wish there were 12 Red Deers in this province. But there can only be one Red Deer. It's a city I love, a city

I grew up in, a city that cares — it takes time to live — a city that still has some of that hometown folksiness we all cherish and appreciate. I can think of no better place than Red Deer for my wife Bonnie, whom I love very much, and I to raise our two daughters that I am very proud of, Lori Michelle who is eight, Kelly Lynn who is six — a family that shares and enjoys life together.

Mr. Speaker, Red Deer is special, and part of what makes Red Deer special is its people. Red Deer and central Alberta are blessed with an abundance of talented people in all walks of life. Our professional community offers some of the best teachers, doctors, lawyers, architects, and accountants in this province. Our city has some of the most astute businesspeople and some of the most skilled tradespeople.

We have an active multi-culture ethnic community. I would extend an invitation to all of you to attend the Red Deer folk festival this weekend. Over the years we have had more than our share of championship teams. Olympic athletes, championship bands, top students, and top artists. I might add that recently in Toronto 14 year-old Margaret Langrick of my constituency received a Genie Award as Canada's top actress in 1985 for her role as Sandy Wilcox in the film *My American Cousin*.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of accomplishments are largely a result of the quality of life we enjoy in Red Deer. They are indicative, though, of the educational system, from our kindergartens right through to Red Deer College. They're indicative of our volunteer network: people helping people and people helping themselves. We turn too quickly to government these days. "Let government look after it; let government provide the solutions; let government find the answers" — always looking to take the easy way out. It's time all of us as Albertans start looking within and start to accept responsibility for some of our own actions, an attitude of helping ourselves and others more. Bring back the volunteers. Too often we have crowded out the volunteers with government agencies. We need those volunteers. It is good for them, and it is good for the communities they are so willingly serving.

Mr. Speaker, I have served the citizens of Red Deer for 12 years at what I consider to be the grass-roots level. Working at the front lines of government has taught me a lot, but knocking on thousands of doors during the recent campaign has given me some added insight. Jobs and the economy were the overall concerns of my constituents, but the underlying and most important message my constituents asked me to convey to this Assembly was that they are looking for new initiatives and new ideas. They are looking for a more responsive government: a government that has time to listen to them, to hear them out: a government that will open the doors to receive their input, their ideas, and their suggestions; a government that will allow for frank and open and fair discussion. I believe with all my heart that this government can meet that challenge, that this is a government of new initiatives and new ideas.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne which we received gives rise for optimism in Alberta's future. The throne speech recognizes a situation that Albertans and the government see as a short-term situation, a situation brought on by circumstances well beyond our control. Yes, this government is tuned in to some of the very real hardships and some of the cold realities created by the world situation. The Speech from the Throne addressed the current situation in a meaningful and responsible way. Yes, I am concerned — in fact, I am alarmed — at having more than a \$2.5

billion deficit. Under normal situations I could never support it, but given the situation today, I believe it is an appropriate and responsible course of action.

Mr. Speaker, like my friend and colleague from Red Deer North, I too am disturbed and disappointed with the role of the opposition to date. I don't want to have the opposition thinking that we in Red Deer don't appreciate them or that we don't understand them. It's not that at all. I'm sure their hearts are in the right place. But it's socialism that we in Red Deer don't appreciate, and my constituents made that very clear on election day. You seem to be interested in election day messages.

In terms of understanding, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I'm getting the gist of the socialist technicolour dream for Albertans. They want to spend the heritage trust fund, get rid of it, blow it. Thank God that my government, the Progressive Conservative government, had the courage and stamina and foresight to see that there was a heritage trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition represents an exploitive group, exploitive in a way that pains me. [interjection] Your turn will come, don't worry. My hon. colleague for Red Deer North has already made reference to the grandstanding they have done over the labour situation, but I too want to comment on the audacity, the hypocrisy, the inconsistency, and the sham that they put on. They were on everyone's side. What are we going to do for the strikers? How about subsidies for the hog producers? They, of course, sympathized with those workers crossing the picket lines. While crying out in all directions, where were they? They were on the picket lines, instigating and encouraging the strike, stopping farmers' hogs from going to market, watching the violence, and exploiting a situation that none of us like to see. After their heavy-handed involvement in all that, they pointed their fingers in this direction. Everyone's side — sure you are, and your favorite colour is plaid.

Mr. Speaker, members of the opposition insinuate that there has been no diversification in this province — rhetoric I heard from the NDP candidate in Red Deer South. I can understand members opposite not knowing better, but don't try to tell my constituents we haven't had diversification. Too many of them are employed, thanks to a world-scale petrochemical industry just east of Red Deer. Approximately \$1.4 billion has been invested in this industry to date. Over 600 people are employed here, and another 100 are employed as a direct result of spin-off. The employment that has been created indirectly probably reaches closer to 900-plus jobs.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents have seen the positive effects of diversification in megaprojects right from their doorsteps. The initiatives undertaken by the Progressive Conservative government have been good for Red Deer, and my constituents recognize and appreciate what this government has done. I might add that the jobs created at Joffre meant that a number of young people and friends that I went to school with could return from central Canada and the United States to practise their chosen vocation at home. There were long-term jobs available to them in Alberta and Red Deer.

This is not to say that we can't do better, Mr. Speaker, and I believe we are. This government under the leadership of the hon. Premier is developing and announcing further diversification initiatives which build on Alberta's natural advantages: the pulp mill at Whitecourt and the magnesium plant at Aldersyde. I believe the establishment of the ministries of Tourism, forestry, and technology and research show initiatives encouraging further diversification of Alberta's

economy, and I stress "further diversification." These are sectors that Albertans can build upon, and I am confident that these measures will broaden the economic base in this province and will help to create long-term employment.

Jobs, agriculture, fairness: that's the broken record I keep hearing from across the way, the innuendos that we are not aware of these three concerns but this is the big secret the NDs have. We've overlooked all three. Take off your blinders over there. Have a look. This government has reacted in this budget with the largest job-creating effort in the history of this province, and we're doing it in partnership and in co-operation with farmers, small business, the energy sector, and our municipal counterparts. We are creating more employment through continued diversification and through the support of some major megaprojects. If you think megaprojects are not working and are not important, come to Red Deer and tell my constituents that. Go to Fort McMurray or Lloydminster and tell the people there that they're not working. This government is tuned in to the current job situation, and I believe we are taking the appropriate action in response to the situation. Our actions are not just short-term, quick-fix, knee-jerk solutions, as proposed across the way. Instead they are long-term solutions, intended to create long-term, permanent jobs. I'm proud of the way this government is approaching the economic diversification of this province, with the primary goal of creating stable, long-term employment.

Mr. Speaker, I listened the other day to the Leader of the Official Opposition whining and whimpering in his usual doomsday fashion. He kind of reminded me of Henny Penny — the sky is falling. I don't know Mr. Penny, but I quote the hon. member in *Hansard*: "I don't know why the people in rural areas supported the government after what's been happening in the rural areas." I'll tell you why they voted for us. They voted for us because they are not doomsdayers. They have more confidence in Alberta and in themselves than what you across the way do. The people of rural Alberta voted for us because of the high priority this government has placed on agriculture. They voted for us because of the efforts we have made to reduce their input costs, and I'd like to point out that it's a result of this government's initiatives that we have amongst the lowest farm input costs in North America.

Lastly, these people voted for us because of our new initiatives and our strong commitment to work out the current problems facing Alberta's agricultural sector today. The farm credit stability program is a responsive and a long-term program, not a shallow, ill-conceived, quick-fix approach as offered from across the way. Agriculture is a vital industry to my constituency, Mr. Speaker. My constituents are pleased with the priority given to agriculture by this government, the past dialogue, the responsiveness, and the fairness — yes, the fairness — in which this government has dealt with agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, there is no vision on that side of the House, only news of gloom and doom. At times I couldn't believe it was our province they were talking about. I thought maybe they had started a new sect, and I was waiting for their ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Chair is immensely pleased that everyone is dying to get out of the House so that everyone can have a happy and productive long weekend.

Under Standing Order 19(1)(c) I'm required to put the question to dispose of this motion. Members in favour of the motion please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

Hewes  
Laing

Pashak  
Piquette

Wright  
Younie

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

Totals:

Ayes — 41

Noes — 18

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Motion carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Anderson	Gogo	Payne
Bogle	Heron	Reid
Brassard	Horsman	Rostad
Campbell	Hyland	Russell
Cassin	Isley	Schumacher
Cherry	Johnston	Shaben
Cripps	Jonson	Shrake
Day	Koper	Stewart
Dinning	Kowalski	Stevens
Downey	McCoy	Weiss
Elliot	Mirosh	West
Elzinga	Moore, R.	Young
Fischer	Oldring	Zarusky
Getty	Osterman	

Against the motion:

Barrett	Martin	Roberts
Fox	McEachern	Sigurdson
Gibeault	Mitchell	Strong
Hawkesworth	Mjolsness	Taylor

# head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

(continued)

## 9. Moved by Mr. Getty:

Be it resolved that the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne be engrossed and presented to Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor by such Members of the Legislative Assembly as are members of the Executive Council.

[Motion carried]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as members have already voted on the motion, they are aware that we will return to the Assembly on Thursday next. By way of government business for Thursday evening, I can advise members of the Assembly that it is proposed to deal in Committee of Supply with estimates.

I would move that we now call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader has moved that it be called 1 o'clock. Does the Assembly agree with the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:44 p.m., pursuant to Government Motion 8, the House adjourned to Thursday, July 3, at 2:30 p.m.]

