

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, March 20, 1987 10:00 a.m.**

Date: 87/03/20

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Each day in this place, each one of us is expected to face the ongoing challenge of representing the concerns of all Albertans.

May God grant us strength and wisdom to carry out these responsibilities.

Amen.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have several tablings which I would like to do today. First of all, all members have received copies of the public accounts, volumes 1 and 2, supplemental and financial information, the budgetary summary; I am formally tabling those today. Secondly, the annual report of the activities under the government Land Purchase Fund, including financial statements, is tabled. The Alberta Treasury annual report is being tabled and, as well, two sets of statements which are pursuant to the Legislative Assembly Act with respect to payments to MLAs.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table, for the information of members of the Assembly, copies of the text of a petition that was presented to the Minister of Advanced Education this morning from University of Calgary students, some 3,500 of them, indicating their concern that funding cuts will mean larger class sizes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please, hon. member. Tradition is to table, give the title, give the topic, then have the tabling transpire.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table with the Assembly the response to Question 152/86. I would like to table with the Assembly also a copy of the telex which I recently sent to the Hon. Charles Mayer, Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, which I referred to yesterday.

MISS McCOY: I wish to table the annual report for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1986, and for the same period the annual report for the Alberta Securities Commission.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table a response to Motion for a Return 154.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't often have the opportunity of introducing guests from Medicine Hat, but today I am

pleased to introduce two students who are here to participate in the Alberta debate championships. They are Simon Muller and Tracy Morris, who are seated in the members' gallery together with their coach, Mr. Barrett Pashak -- who is well known to at least one member or two of the Assembly -- along with his son, the grandson of a member of the Assembly, and I would ask that they rise and receive a warm welcome from the Assembly.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this morning to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of grade 10 students, 104 in number, from Holy Trinity community high school. They are accompanied by four teachers, Mr. Guglich, Mr. Neth, Mr. Robert, Mrs. Schumacher. They are seated in both the members' and the public galleries. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Native Affairs**

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, as part of the Alberta government's continuing effort to work together with native groups and communities to develop practical solutions to the concerns and aspirations of native people in Alberta, I wish to report today on the progress of negotiations regarding a significant and unique initiative.

Members of the Legislative Assembly will remember that on June 3, 1985, Premier Lougheed introduced a resolution concerning an amendment to the Alberta Act to this Legislature. The resolution was passed unanimously. It committed the government of Alberta to propose a revised Metis Betterment Act, to grant existing Metis settlement lands to the Metis, and to confirm this grant of lands in the Constitution of Canada. These actions were to be undertaken on condition that the Metis established fair and democratic criteria for settlement membership, land allocation, and the composition of governing bodies.

The Alberta Federation of Metis Settlement Associations responded to Resolution 18 in their July 1986 document, *By Means of Conferences and Negotiations We Ensure Our Rights*, which provided background and principles for further discussions and new legislation.

The presentation of the federation's document to the Minister of Municipal Affairs was followed by months of extensive negotiations with the provincial government. These have included numerous discussions between the Hon. Neil Crawford and the president of the federation, Mr. Randy Hardy. We have agreed in principle on fair and democratic criteria for settlement membership and land allocation and on unique and appropriate governing bodies subject to agreement on the nature of the land grant. We have been engaged in discussions on the nature of the land grant and remain committed to reaching an accommodation.

We are working on a draft of a new Metis settlements Act, which we will discuss with the Metis settlements and hope to table before the end of this session. Following enactment of this Act and transfer of the land, we will then table a proposed resolution calling for an amendment to the Alberta Act in order to confirm the grant of existing settlement lands within the Constitution.

I believe that we are at an historic moment in terms of recognizing the contribution which Metis people have made and will continue to make to the development of the province of Alberta.

We are recognizing this contribution through preparation of a new Metis settlements Act and the transfer of 1.28 million acres of land to the Metis. This initiative is unique in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I believe our actions demonstrate the strong commitment that the Alberta government has to enhancing opportunities for native people in Alberta to play a greater role in controlling their own affairs.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to the ministerial announcement. It's my understanding that the negotiations have been going on since last summer, and I think there is some disappointment by the Metis settlements association about the slow pace. I believe they would have wanted the legislation introduced before the First Ministers' Conference, and I would have said that would have been desirable. I suggest to the hon. minister that that could have been a showcase for all over Canada. I think their fear is that after the First Ministers' Conference there will not be the same political will to entrench their rights in the Constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding, too, that now the Metis settlements association would like to get two promises from the government. I think they'll be talking probably to the Premier about this, and I would like the government to consider it. First of all, will the government announce in the Assembly and at the First Ministers' Conference that land settlements belong to the Metis and that the government has come to an agreement with the Metis, agreeing to their concept of territorial integrity? For example, that the province can have jurisdiction but not ownership of road allowances, rivers and lakes -- if that could be accomplished, I'd think it would be a vast step forward. I would ask this to be taken into consideration before the Premier goes to the First Ministers' Conference.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Official Opposition look forward to a speedy resolution of this matter that has dragged out, I think all of us would agree, long enough and that a new Act favourable to the Metis settlements association will soon be a reality.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

### **Research and Development**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. It concerns what we think is a possibility of a severe brain drain from Alberta. Budget cuts at the Alberta Research Council will force 72 people, including 24 research scientists -- I'm told some of the best in the world -- to lose their jobs before the end of the summer. Now, these people are looking to Alberta and Ontario and other parts of the world. My question is: will the Premier inform the Assembly just how many Alberta research scientists he expects to leave the province as a result of the government's budget cuts?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the budget hasn't been presented yet.

MR. MARTIN: These have already been announced. Perhaps the Premier could be a little more specific. Is he not concerned that these types of cuts -- and I go back to 24 research scientists who have already been told that they are going to lose their jobs and go to other places -- will in fact hurt our diversification plans?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the minister responsible for

the Research Council to respond, except to say this government has the greatest commitment to research of any part of North America and that people would hardly leave the province of Alberta when we have that kind of a commitment to research. The other places aren't even close in the amount of research they are doing in the various areas that really mean something to Alberta.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, just to elaborate on the Premier's response, I would point out to all hon. members that from time to time the Alberta Research Council does readjust its priorities. In the announcements to which the hon. leader is making reference, in fact, there is an adjustment that removes a part of the program dealing with the atmospheric sciences to programs which are considered to be a higher priority of the council, and that is going on at all times.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, readjust the priorities? The result is that 24 of the top people in the world in that area are leaving the province. How can the minister then say that this does not have an important role in diversification? If there is this brain drain out of the province, this is going to hurt us in the future. Does the minister not agree with that?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the comments to which the hon. leader is referring are not comments coming from the Research Council in terms of where these people are going to go. I reiterate that at least part of what has underlined announcements by the Research Council is a shifting of the priorities. It is a shifting of priorities to focus on areas where we believe the future for diversification is greater, and that's in the area of biotechnology and in the area of microelectronics.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has he in fact been in contact with the Research Council? Because the people that we've talked to say the morale is extremely low and that other people that even have jobs are thinking about leaving the Research Council and looking for other places in North America.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the question was whether I've been in contact with the Research Council, and of course I've been in contact with the Research Council on a very regular basis. I've had several meetings with the president of the council, at least a half a dozen if not 10, since the beginning of January. If that's the information the hon. leader wishes to find out, I'm happy to confirm to him that the channels are open, that we've discussed the priorities of the Research Council, that I've had one meeting with the executive committee of the council, and I also confer regularly with my colleague in the Assembly who is the chairman of the Alberta Research Council.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture relative to research. Could the minister indicate whether there will be a change in priority relative to agricultural research in the province of Alberta, specifically at the research centre in Lethbridge?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as we announced some time ago, we committed additional funding for Farming for the Future for an additional five years. In addition to that, we introduced legislation to further co-ordinate the research activities between the government, the private sector, and the universities. We are going to give a higher priority to research development, especially

as it relates to specialty crops. We are going to continue with our strong commitment. As the hon. member is aware, we commit in excess of \$20 million per year as it relates alone to agricultural research, and we're hopeful, too, that when we do proceed with the legislation, Bill 7, that is before the House, we can do so on a very speedy basis.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications, a supplementary. Has the minister taken steps to ensure that this readjustment of priorities about which he has spoken will mean that funding will be increased commensurately for biotechnology, microelectronics, and other important research and development areas and does not mean an overall reduction in research and development funding by this government?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, I first of all remind him that the Research Council has, for direction, a board made up in large part of representatives of the private sector, and they are very much involved in the future directions of the Research Council. Now, in respect of the biotechnology areas and microelectronics that I had earlier indicated, they are very supportive of those directions, and it was really their initiative, in conjunction with the suggestions of the government, that that's the direction the Research Council should go. I am not able at this point in time to comment, obviously, upon more detail that will be coming forth this afternoon in the budget, but I can assure the hon. member that research in this province is being very well supported. I'll look forward to the debate that I'm sure he'd like to have with me later on in budget estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for St. Albert.

### **Labour Legislation Review**

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. The minister has undertaken a world tour at a cost of some one-half million dollars to review existing labour legislation and to propose reforms to Alberta's obviously inadequate labour legislation. There were a number of specific major concerns identified by the minister and his committee as the concerns of Albertans on labour relations issues that were either ignored by the minister or the minister has chosen not to respond to. My question to the minister is: would the minister advise this Assembly if this is the full review of labour legislation to assure Albertans that for their present and future the legislation will be responsive to the needs of all Albertans as promised in the throne speech of June 1986?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try and walk on eggs and avoid discussing the impending legislation that will be introduced into this Assembly. On the other hand, I would take issue with his statement about the current Alberta legislation. There may be some difficulties with it, but the impression that Alberta is not up to the levels of legislation in the rest of Canada is somewhat deceptive in that our records show over the years persistently a lower record of loss of time from strikes and lockouts than the rest of Canada. As to the legislation, the hon. member

will have to await its introduction.

MR. STRONG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister and his committee chose to ignore the issue of spin-off companies in his final report. My question to the minister is: is it the position of this government that employers can, by corporate reorganization, evade their responsibilities under collective agreements, thereby negating the freedom of employees to choose a union of their choice?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member take part in the debate on the legislation when it's introduced into the Assembly.

MR. STRONG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister can rest assured that I will take part in the debate.

The minister again has chosen to ignore the unfair application by employers in this province of a 25-hour lockout. My question to the minister is: is it the position of this government that employers may, by artificial means or creative application of the law, cancel duly bargained collective agreements and impose unilaterally wages, terms and conditions of employment, thereby ignoring their responsibilities to bargain in good faith with their employees?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is getting perilously close to being out of order in terms of its detail and the number of questions that are being raised within it. But, hon. minister . . .

MR. STRONG: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take your point of order at the end of question period. Minister.

MR. STRONG: Just on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: At the end of question period, hon. member.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, this government has made a commitment that we will have labour legislation in this province that is to the benefit of all Albertans, that is fair, that is equitable. That commitment will be kept.

MR. STRONG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has proposed a new certification process for the certification of unions to gain representation. My question to the minister is: is the minister aware that the method proposed in his final report is totally unworkable, confusing, and will also lead to inordinate delays at the Labour Relations Board, thereby frustrating the attempts of Albertans to choose . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, succinct supplementary has come to an end. Minister of Labour.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is somewhat confused between legislation and a report to government which was authored by nine members of the population of Alberta: three from organized labour, three from management, and three from the general public.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. minister. To the Assembly, come back to *Standing Orders*. And it's with regard to one that the Chair was forced to quote to the House yesterday

afternoon, and it comes under Standing Order 13(4):

When a member is speaking, no person shall . . .

(b) interrupt that member, except to raise a point of order.

The Chair is very much aware of interruptions in all quarters of the House and conversations taking place.

Hon. minister.

DR. REID: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will reiterate. This government has made a commitment that there will be legislation that will be fair and will be reasonable for the benefit of all Albertans. The report that the hon. member is referring to was a report to this government by a committee of which I happen to be the chairman. But the makeup of that committee is very important when considering the recommendations. There were three appointees from organized labour, two of whom have some connection with the construction industry, three from management, and three from the general public. That report will be thoroughly considered in the development of the legislation which will be in this Assembly for debate, and the hon. member will have lots of chance to debate it at that time.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Will the minister assure this House and all Albertans that when the legislation is finally introduced, he's not going to push it through, that he will leave it until fall so that we can have a full discussion of what's proposed and its consequences.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think that will depend upon when I'm able to present the legislation to the Assembly and have reasonable time for people to respond to the legislation. That timetable is beyond my control to some extent.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In the interests of providing employment opportunities for Albertans who want to work, would the minister consider introducing right-to-work legislation?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have lots of chance to introduce that discussion into the caucus discussions on the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The member has not been recognized, hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think that when you stand, you are recognized, whoever has the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, please.

### Oil and Gas Industry Incentives

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Premier. Over the last two days the Premier has incorrectly stated that drilling activity to date in '87 is up over that in early '86. In reality it's down by one-half. In fact, experts predict that it will be the worst year in recent memory, with only 28 percent of rigs working in 1987. Our concern is that the Premier is out of touch and his judgment is distorted by incorrect information. Would the Premier admit that experts, including the president of the Canadian Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, whom he quoted yesterday, predict that '87 will be the

worst year in recent memory with only 28 percent of rigs working?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I had some discussion with the hon. member from Calgary yesterday about statistics, and you can always use whatever statistics you want. As I explained yesterday, the drilling industry in Alberta has more rigs available now than they have had on a historical basis, and therefore the 28 percent does distort a normal period of activity. We've had many years in this province when 200 to 250 rigs drilling was a very acceptable, solid level of activity, and then in certain periods it would go into the 300s and even 400s. But we should be clear that when you're using just a percent, there are lots of opportunities to use it to whatever advantage you want.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the Premier would like to give the impression to the House that rigs are rabbits and they keep having little rigs all the time. The fact is that the rig count is the same in the last couple of years.

But let's go on. Is the Premier aware that 15,000 workers, one-half of those in the oil servicing sector, are unemployed and that more will lose their jobs if something isn't done?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that is something that we are very concerned about, but I would point out to the hon. member that it's because of this government's programs that the employment level and the rig level is where it is. It would have been much lower without the government's commitment to the energy industry, some \$2 billion of assistance to the conventional oil and gas industry.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, obviously not working.

Is the Premier aware that the conventional oil industry employs 90 percent of the people that work in the oil industry, not the frontiers and not the megaprojects or the tar sands?

MR. GETTY: Approximately, yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier. How long is the Premier going to let this condition continue? How bad does it have to get before he will do something?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier, the government has committed some \$2 billion towards the conventional oil industry.

MR. MITCHELL: Spend, spend, spend.

MR. GETTY: That has been an investment in the energy industry, and might I explain to hon. members who maybe don't really understand the energy industry that when you put incentives into the energy industry, it is not necessarily an expenditure on a longtime basis.

As a matter of fact, you get that money back. If those wells aren't drilled, the reserves aren't found. The simple discovery by Shell Oil of some 2 trillion cubic feet of gas could pay out all of the expenditures that go towards incentives. So look a little further than the end of their nose.

I might also, Mr. Speaker, point out that if you go on a monthly basis from February to March, which I was intending to do yesterday, you'll find that in February, 117 rigs were operat-

ing, but in March, 171, not counting those that are moving as well. So rather than saying 15 to 20 percent on a month-to-month basis, they're up by 40 percent over last month's.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Premier mentioned that his government had provided \$2 billion worth of aid to the industry last year with very dubious, mixed results. In fact, that drilling activity was compressed into a one-month period. What new program initiatives is the Premier prepared to take this year?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would know that as the Minister of Energy explained yesterday or the day before, the programs were put in effect, one in April and the other in October. The fact that the industry moved in such a massive way in December was certainly not the government's desire, and as a matter of fact we were looking for a more steady level of drilling. Nevertheless, the industry did choose to do it that way. We've talked to them, and we think they will continue to have a pretty steady growth in drilling in Alberta this year. I've just shown that there was some 40 percent increase from February into March in drilling rigs, and that is the industry responding to the government's programs.

I should also point out that a new program isn't necessary. We have a five-year program in place here, and the industry is adjusting to it.

### Toxic Waste Sites

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Last spring the minister indicated to this Assembly that his department would be conducting a toxic waste site inventory due to be completed March 31, 1987, which is only a week and a few days away. Albertans have been reminded as of this last two weeks of abuse in our environment in terms of the Lynnwood Heights controversy. Could the minister indicate whether that inventory is complete at this time and we will be presented in this Legislature with a complete list of sites such as the one just mentioned?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, to date we've received some 75 responses from across the province of Alberta, and of those 75 responses, 25 have identified basically landfills that had been abandoned or forgotten about in the past. What I've also done in addition to making the public appeal to the people of Alberta, I've also forwarded some 1,000 letters to industries throughout the province of Alberta, municipal governments, people who might be interested in this, and we are assembling this information. The response to this date is approximately 75. I intend on sending out another letter very shortly reminding those individuals who have not responded to us to in fact research their records again. I can provide the specific information on March 31, but I intend on carrying forward with the whole process and repeating once again to municipalities and industries to be a little more dutiful in responding to us.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. Would it be the intent of the minister to introduce more stringent regulations or penalties in terms of sites such as this that have been covered up in some way or ignored in general by either private citizenry or the corporate entities in the

province of Alberta, past and present?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's been our policy since, I think, early 1982 that when it came to a situation of decommissioning a plant site -- the situation that the hon. member is referring to in Calgary refers to an abandoned oil refinery site that was abandoned, left, in 1975. Our policy today is dramatically different than what existed in 1975. Today no plant, no firm, can walk away from a plant without ensuring that there is proper reclamation on the site. That policy is in place now. It is the policy of the government today and it has been since the early 1980s. The difficulty about the Calgary situation is it occurred in 1975, before we had this policy in place. I feel pretty confident that the situation that occurred in 1975 simply could not occur in 1987 in the province of Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary for clarification. What does the minister intend to do with those sites prior to 1975? Will it be the intent of the government to go back and clean them up? Or will the polluter that polluted during that time be brought back to court, as such, to make payments and to clean up the damage?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear in the letters that I sent out in the fall of 1986 and the letters that have been going out in the early part of 1987 that the polluter must pay. In the situation in Calgary with respect to two spots of land approximate to the river -- there's one area of land approximately one acre in size and another spot of land approximately 500 square feet in size -- reclamation and cleanup of the lead-contaminated areas would not be an onerous expense for the owner of the land today.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister also mentioned last spring that there was a phase 2 and phase 3 that would be implemented following the report of March 31. Could the minister indicate whether those are in place and will proceed and will be implemented early in 1987?

MR. KOWALSKI: That's absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. Phase 2 and phase 3, if necessary, will be followed through. Phase 2 essentially is a thorough investigation of the sites that have been investigated, and phase 3 would be the necessary follow-up to make sure that in fact the reclamation is taking place.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. If the polluter must pay, could the minister please inform the House how his policy with respect to the D & D storage site in Nisku, which was overtaken by the government and has required, therefore, the people of Alberta to pay the operating expenses until that site can be cleaned up and then to pay the cleanup costs of that site, is consistent with the fact that he allowed the owners of D & D off the hook?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, it's turning into a paragraph. Minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not leave anybody get off the hook; I was not the minister at the time. The fact of the matter was that the owner of the land had no dollars. There was nothing. You could sue anybody, but you cannot take blood out of a stone. If the firm has no assets -- we have ac-

cepted a responsibility for the cleanup of the environment in this province, to take it over. We're simply not going to leave something sit there forever and ever and ever while the debate raged on as to how can you get dollars from somebody that doesn't have any dollars. We accepted a responsibility to move and we did it.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of the Environment. When he instituted and set funding for the program to identify toxic waste sites, did he also attach to it funds so that those sites could be cleaned up quickly and then the legal details of which polluter should pay for it could be handled later? And if those funds were not attached, why not?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you accept the principle that the polluter must pay and then if you accept the approach that we have taken as a government to foster an action plan to first of all identify these sites -- we are currently in the process of getting these sites identified. It was very clear in the letters that went out to everyone that the person who owned the property is held responsible for the cleanup. I'm really very reticent at this point in time to basically asking my colleagues in the government caucus to ask that the public of Alberta, 2.35 million citizens of Alberta, must be taxed to pay for a pollution responsibility that would rest with an individual or a company. And at the moment I believe that I'm going to use my good offices to ensure that those who are responsible for pollution will be the ones who will be paying for pollution rather than my coming to ask my colleagues, the government caucus, or coming to the Legislative Assembly to say, "We should take these people off the hook and the public of Alberta should pay for pollution control."

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Member for Rocky Mountain House followed by the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

### **Hinton Pulp Mill Expansion**

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Could the Premier inform the Assembly of the details of the proposed expansion of the pulp mill at Hinton?

MR. TAYLOR: That's important?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it may not be important to the hon. Liberal leader, but it's very important to the people of Hinton and to the people of Alberta, who care about the project.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: At the end of question period, hon. member.

MR. GETTY: The thin skin never ceases to amaze me. Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps there could be fewer interruptions so we could get an answer to the House. Hon. Premier, please.

MR. GETTY: We are extremely pleased that Champion have

made their commitment of a major expansion to the pulp mill at Hinton. some \$285 million expansion. This proposal will now go to the government cabinet, which I believe will result in an approval that will allow us to . . . When you put this expansion along with the \$400 million and some commitment to a petrochemical plant, you have almost three-quarters of a billion dollars of capital investment announced within the last 10 days to two weeks which is in the area of diversification, which is a significant commitment to Alberta's future and a significant accomplishment from our efforts to diversify the province's economy.

MR. CAMPBELL: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. How many jobs will this provide in Alberta? [interjections]

MR. GETTY: I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of the Liberal and the ND parties hate to hear good news. I am uncertain of the number in the construction period, but some additional 300 jobs in the operation of the mill -- and my hon. colleague the minister of forestry may wish to add additional details for the member.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is very fortunate for Alberta for something like this to come forward. The permanent jobs are quoted at someplace in the realm of 370, and during construction it will be something like 1,140 man-years.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary. Member for Rocky Mountain House. [interjection]

MR. CAMPBELL: Don't rattle the bars, Nick; we'll feed you.

My final supplementary to the Minister of Forestry. Lands and Wildlife. How will this affect the lumber business or the industry in the Rocky Mountain House area as far as utilization is concerned?

MR. TAYLOR: You'll need researchers for that one.

MR. SPARROW: Very definitely when a mill comes on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair does not recognize the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon as being the minister of forestry. Minister of forestry.

MR. TAYLOR: You won't let me answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister of forestry. He will answer. [interjection] I failed to recognize you; perhaps you failed to listen. Minister?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, when a pulp mill comes on stream like this, it does help sawmills throughout the province because it increases the salability of those chips. As far as your specific Rocky Mountain House area, I'd like to inform the House there is an opportunity there for the industry to come forward. There is enough wood supply for a good-sized mill or an oriented strandboard plant or medium-density plant, and we're talking about all three in that area too.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Can the Premier indicate if the addition is entirely funded from the private sector, or is there any government involved?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I understand the proposal to the government has some degree of government participation, and we will be looking at that in a favourable light because we are committed to diversifying this province, and we know it's not easy. It's a fistfight in diversification these days throughout Canada. We are going to make sure that we get it happening here in Alberta, and we'll do what is necessary. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: No petitions to sell your property in the House. Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. To the Premier. Will this expansion to Champion Forest Products also involve an expansion of their forest spray program, which most people felt was under moratorium, and will the government provide any funding for the chemicals if that does happen?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's more properly handled by the Minister of the Environment or the minister of forestry.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, the forest land use agreement that we have with Champion will be enlarged to include more wood supply, and very definitely the research that's going on in forest spraying will continue in the province. We've had test plots throughout the province, and we're doing research in many areas. It has to be looked at as a tool for us to look at long-term regeneration of forests. We will continue to be very stringent in our control of it so that it's not done in areas that are going to affect wildlife and the resource.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Meadowlark caught the eye of the Chair.

MR. MITCHELL: Go ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: He's already designated me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair needs to hear that from him himself. Agreed?

MR. MITCHELL: I'll designate the leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure it must strike fear and terror into their hearts when they see two of us going at them.

My supplemental is to the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. Are the regulations for pollution or the amount of chemicals to be discharged into the air and into the water from the addition to the plant going to be the same as the regulations for the initial plant, or are we going to use the modern, more updated pollution regulations?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, we are going to be following a process of using very, very modern pollution control mechanisms, perhaps based on the most recent ones, the licence that was provided by me to Millar Western less than one month ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Member for Ed-

monton Highlands followed by the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

### Access to Abortion

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is for the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Since last fall equal access to therapeutic abortion in the province has declined dramatically. Fifty-six women this month alone have been referred to clinics in the United States, which amounts to effective discrimination against lower income women, given that they're paying for this travel and procedure out of their own pockets. Since I last talked to the minister privately about this issue some months ago, can he tell the Assembly what assessment he's made of the Alberta Medical Association's recommendations that the Royal Alexandra hospital be funded to incorporate its own clinic along the lines of the Calgary Foothills hospital?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the information that I have from both the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Alberta Medical Association is that no woman who has requested and been approved for an abortion in an accredited hospital in Alberta has in fact been turned away. But there apparently is a number of people who are seeking assistance through organizations such as Planned Parenthood as opposed to going directly to their family practitioner, and that's resulted in referrals to other parts of Canada and to the United States as well. We've been monitoring that situation, and we would hope that the situation does correct itself by people taking the proper route, and that is to work through their family doctor.

With respect to the Royal Alex abortion clinic proposal, I have indicated both to the Alberta Medical Association and to the hospital that their proposal, which envisions a different method of accommodating women seeking abortions, would in fact, it appears, save the hospital money by streamlining their process and not utilizing their regular surgical or medical beds. I therefore indicated to them that they are free to establish the clinic, but they must do so within the dollars that the hospital presently has. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they presently have that under consideration.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister, who has responded in the way that he did in our conversation some months ago. Is the minister of the view -- is it his department's policy, in fact -- that it wouldn't be more effective use of our dollars to provide through provincial funding, special funding, the particular clinic as opposed to imposing that individual expense on those Alberta women who currently are not able to access the procedure in Alberta?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, there should be no suggestion that women are being turned away from the Royal Alex hospital because they don't have the clinic that they've been seeking. My understanding from hospital officials and from the Alberta Medical Association is that no one who's been approved for a therapeutic abortion at that hospital has been in fact turned away. In fact, I have had not one single complaint in my office along those lines. So while it may be cost-efficient for the hospital to handle their cases in a different way through a special clinic, that won't -- in my opinion, at least, or from the information that's been provided to me -- result in any fewer or greater numbers of women seeking abortions outside our province.

MS BARRETT: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think the point here is that with the slowing down of physicians' actually wanting to perform the procedure, the result has been more referrals through the family planning clinics. But my question would be then: will the minister assure this Assembly, give his guarantee, that his department will under no circumstances deinsure therapeutic abortion from provision of the medicare plan in Alberta?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I can't guarantee anything. We've had a difficult time, as members know, over the course of the last several months in dealing with this issue, in that the doctors who were performing abortions previous to last October were in the habit of extra billing -- in some cases, some rather large amounts. When extra billing ended, some of them decided that they would withdraw their services. My understanding from the College of Physicians and Surgeons is that most of those who were proposing to withdraw their services have since decided to continue providing the service.

Then there was the court challenge of whether or not they could charge \$75 for a referral letter, and the courts decided that that would be a form of extra billing, which supported the position I have taken. So since that time the matter is one of the doctors' receiving the standard fee from medicare of \$84.50. I've discussed with the AMA the possibility of that changing, and they agree with me that in a year when we're in fact trying to decrease the cost of the medical care plan rather than increase it, it would be inappropriate to increase that fee.

That's where we sit right now, and I intend to have further discussions with the Alberta Medical Association and with the college as to whether or not there's anything further we can do to resolve this issue. Certainly, the prospect of people paying some of their own fees is one that's still open.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary?

MS BARRETT: Yes, final supplementary. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to carry on discussing it with the minister.

My final supplementary, though, is to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. Given that demographic and time series studies have indicated that the presence of more family planning clinics helps to reduce directly the number of unplanned pregnancies, will the minister indicate what measures he is taking to ensure that we will in Alberta see more family planning clinics and, in particular, a heightened profile of their educational components?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the budget that the Provincial Treasurer will bring down today will continue to provide support to the 27 health units throughout the province who carry on that responsibility very admirably. I know, for instance, in the city of Calgary the services at the clinics that are offered in that city are very good, and those services will continue to be provided by those health units.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Member for Edmonton Gold Bar. If there's time, followed by the Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

#### **Women in the Public Service**

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again I am

compelled to raise the issue of the numbers of women in senior positions in the public service. Yesterday, on hearing my comments that seven out of nine deputy ministerial positions have been filled by closed competition in the last year, the minister stated, and I quote, "They are advertised within government." My question is to the Minister of Labour. Will he then confirm that when a position is, in your words, "advertised within government," the advertisement appears in the *Bulletin*, a copy of which I'm holding? Is this what advertising in government is?

DR. REID: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. We sometimes approach other ministers. Since I became the minister responsible for the personnel administration office, which does not, incidentally, include the appointment of deputy ministers, there have been five deputy ministers appointed during that time. Two were advertised widely. The other three were filled by transfers of deputy ministers between departments.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. That's not really what every public servant in Alberta believes. They think this is where they find out. I've gone through these *Bulletins* back to mid-84, and only three deputy ministerial vacancies out of the 10 I know of have been advertised in the *Bulletin*. Will the minister then confirm my contention yesterday that the vast majority of these appointments over the last two years have been filled without being openly advertised?

DR. REID: I can't off the top of my head give the response that the member's looking for in relation to the time prior to my becoming the minister responsible for personnel administration. I can only confirm the figures I just gave her. Of the five that have been made since I became the minister of personnel administration, two were by open advertisement and three were bilateral transfers of deputy ministers within the government service.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, will the minister then explain to me how "equal access," the minister's own words, is to be guaranteed when the government is consciously filling virtually all deputy ministerial positions with direct appointments, transfers, rather than through competitions? A very strange personnel policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to finish this complete set of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Hon. minister.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that when I look at the figures of applicants for the senior positions within the provincial public service, I find that usually the number of applications from women is somewhere between 5 percent and 35 percent of the applicants. On the other hand, when I look at the same ranges, the number of successful applicants amongst those female applicants is somewhere between zero and 50 percent. There is within the senior ranges of the government public service -- as I said yesterday, already somewhere between 30 and 50 percent of the people occupying those positions currently are women, and that applies specifically to the three areas from

which senior management are drawn. The number has increased significantly within the last decade, very significantly. I anticipate that process, and I look forward to it.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, the question is, how are any potential applicants supposed to know? How are they supposed to know the position is open? The minister is either dissembling about staffing procedures or doesn't know what's going on in his own department with regard to appointments to the senior service. Can the minister tell us which one of those . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Take care, hon. member. The Chair will be forced to deal with the matter of calling to order because of one of the words that was used there, making references imputing false or unavowed motives to another member.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'll check *Hansard*, but I do believe I indicated already that the appointment of deputy ministers does not go through the personnel administration office.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister of Labour. While recognizing that there is a deficiency in the advertising of the assistant deputy minister and deputy minister level jobs and in the absence of an affirmative action program, would the minister at least commit himself to directly approaching, to the effect of at least 50 percent women, all of the people who are being approached to apply for those jobs?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the situation is that these particular posts that were transferred were transfers of deputy ministers -- in one case from Executive Council to Economic Development and Trade, in another from Energy to Executive Council, and the recent appointment of the deputy minister of Environment -- were all lateral transfers of existing deputy ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, a supplementary.

MRS. MIROSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Do you feel, Premier, that this government has given women equal opportunity when you chose your cabinet?

MR. GETTY: When I chose my cabinet, I was extremely pleased at the tremendous amount of talent available to me in making those choices. Because it is interesting that when I first came into the Legislature as a member of government, the former Premier appointed the person who is now Her Honour to be a minister of the Crown and it was the first full minister of the Crown as a woman in the history of this province. And subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, you can just observe -- as can all members -- that that has stepped up considerably and added a great deal to the cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. The Chair recognizes the minister of hospitals and medical services with respect to a purported point of privilege.

### Question of Privilege

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated I wanted to rise on a point of privilege with respect to certain remarks by the hon. Leader of the Opposition the previous day. The leader was not in his seat yesterday; I see he is here today, and I would like to pursue the matter.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday at the beginning of question period the Leader of the Opposition asked the following question of me, and I quote: "Why did the minister break off negotiations with Alberta's optometrists last Friday?" I indicated in reply that no meeting with me had taken place and that no one had broken off negotiations. That was then disputed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have since that time had an opportunity to further review the matter.

On Friday last two members of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care staff, Cec MacKenzie and Don Junk, met with two members of the Association of Optometrists, Mr. Gordon Hensel, president, and Glenn Campbell, executive director. The association asked if staff of the department had a mandate to negotiate a new fee schedule and were advised that they had no such mandate and that the matter of fees paid by the Alberta health care insurance plan were under consideration by my office. At no time -- at no time -- did staff members suggest that no negotiations could be held with either department staff or myself, and no suggestions of breaking off negotiations were made by anyone at the meeting.

Yesterday morning Gordon Hensel, president of the Association of Optometrists, expressed to me his concern that the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition about the Association of Optometrists and the discussions with department staff had cast an inappropriate and unfair reflection on the association. Mr. Hensel expressed the view that he did not think negotiations had broken off.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that on Wednesday the Leader of the Opposition either had completely inaccurate information or had some other motives which I am unable to understand. If the hon. leader had only involved my conduct in his misleading statements I would have simply set the record straight on Wednesday. He, however, involved people outside this Legislature who are not here to ask for a correction. My purpose in rising on a point of privilege today is to ensure that these unfortunate remarks by the Leader of the Opposition are corrected and that the hon. Leader of the Opposition extend his apologies to the president and members of the executive of the Association of Optometrists and to this Legislature.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the minister of hospitals has lost nearly all perspective in dealing with the medicare issue. The minister has lost sight of the central issue completely. He's packing a hit list for medicare cuts. His department officials let it be known that the optometrists are on the hit list.

I am told that the minister's executive assistant telephoned the Association of Optometrists yesterday and demanded a letter from them attacking me for my comments. The minister didn't get the letter he was seeking, I am surprised that a minister of the Crown would behave in such a shameless way.

The minister also contacted the association and promised consultation on the issue of cutting eye exams from medicare. He also promised to resume negotiations at some future point. These are new commitments from the minister.

I am not going to apologize for raising the issue and forcing the minister to address the issue. His interpretation of the facts

is that negotiations never began with the optometrists. They showed up to negotiate fees and were told that no negotiations were possible because of the government's hit list for medicare cuts. The minister says his privileges are violated, because his interpretation is that negotiations were cut off by the government before they even started. I said that the government decided to break off negotiations. Even though this is a matter of interpretation of the facts and not a question of privilege, I will let the minister have his interpretation of the events.

The optometrists of this province work hard to care for the people of this province. I congratulate them for their efforts, and I urge the minister to refrain from his effort to cut them from the health care insurance plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is a bit concerned that two things have happened with respect to the requests for withdrawal of information by the minister in his request. The first one was with regard to comments made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the minister directly. The second part, however, was an apology with respect to the Association of Optometrists.

In listening carefully to the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition, the second part has indeed been fulfilled with respect to the apology to the Association of Optometrists, in the opinion of the Chair.

The first part of the discussion which took place could well be dealt with as a point of order rather than a point of privilege because, as is clear in both our *Standing Orders* and *Beauchesne*, differences of opinion over the facts really fall under the heading of a point of order rather than a point of personal privilege.

The Chair will take under advisement, however, the first part of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition because some scrutiny needs to be exercised as to some additional comments that were then made. So in that respect the Chair again underlines the fact that the apology to the Association of Optometrists has indeed been given.

But with respect to the first part of the comments, the matter will come back to the House on Monday, and the Chair would respectfully invite both the minister and the Leader of the Opposition to join me for coffee Monday morning at 9.

In addition, however, the Chair is much concerned over the last 10 days as to the direction of the House. The business of using all too loosely the term "mislead" to create the impression that other members of this House are misleading and giving distortions, whether it be comments that are voiced second or thirdhand from outside of the House or with respect to within the Chamber itself -- and the Chair just gently but firmly admonishes the House, all members, to be much more careful about the way questions are phrased or preambles are phrased which may indeed lead to offence being taken by other members, because the Chair is quite certain that all members of this Assembly do indeed value the parliamentary process and are very concerned about what the image of this House indeed is in full reality.

I have the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under the provisions of Standing Order 40 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse please, hon. member. I believe we have a point of order from the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. It's very much along the lines you said, on parliamentary process. It was with respect to the question from the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House of the Premier about the announcement of an expansion of a pulp mill, and 358 of *Beauchesne* quite clearly says:

Such questions should:

- (a) be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance as to require an immediate answer.

What I would like to put across is that although we are all happy to hear of the fact that there will be more trees cut and his constituency will do better in that Hinton has expanded its pulp mill, I think it was more properly an announcement that should be made as a ministerial announcement and not be put into question period, with puffball questions from some of the backbenchers in order to get a headline back in the Rocky Mountain News. I think something like this, Mr. Speaker, is something that you could blow the whistle on in order to make sure that the questions are of urgency and of matter in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order the Chair recognizes the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark followed by the Premier.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address their point of order as well. There is a broader issue. I think it's important that we distinguish between the two purposes for question period that seem to have evolved. There is an idea on that side of the House that question period can become a convenient way of communicating with one's constituency. On the other hand, there is an overriding principle and priority principle, and that is that question period is integral to the accountability process in the parliamentary democracy system.

While government backbenchers have the right to speak in question period -- we acknowledge that; we understand the pressure they feel and the importance they place on communicating with the people of Alberta -- surely they also have an overriding responsibility to the process of accountability that is incumbent in an effective question period, and that process can be eroded by weak and obsequious questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, imputation of motive. Take care.

MR. MITCHELL: We in the opposition respect their right to speak in question period. That is undeniable. We simply ask that they exercise some discretion in the interests of preserving the integrity of question period, which is critical to the process of accountability, which is also critical to the process of parliamentary democracy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to get into this point of order because once the hon. leader of the Liberal Party started to present it, it became obvious it was kind of without basis. But when he says that the hon. members on our side and in our party in this Legislature are not raising matters of urgency or importance, I disagree completely. And if you were to rule out every question that was raised that did not have urgency or importance attached to it, I'm afraid the hon. leader of the Liberal Party would not be able to ask any, from his record so far in the House.

Dealing then with the comments from the Member for Ed-

monton Meadowlark. no member of this Legislature can be elected and then, by coming into the House, regardless of what party they represent, lose his rights. As a matter of fact, you gave some percentages of questions where they arose over the past period of time that you have been Speaker, and you mentioned 89 percent or 90 percent coming from the opposition. While that in some way gives comfort. I gather, to the opposition, it gives concern to me that members on our side are not able to exercise these rights, because every member in this Legislature is elected equal and they have equal rights in this Legislature to ask questions.

MS BARRETT: On the point of order. Mr. Speaker, while citation 357(2). *Beauchesne* indicates an historical analysis of not only questions for oral delivery but also for written delivery by way of the Order Paper -- indicates that if all of the rules which apply to question period were so strictly applied, there would be very little on the Order Paper, let alone in Oral Question Period.

And when it comes to the ability of the opposition members to ask questions, Mr. Speaker. I take issue with any assumption that this opposition in this Assembly, in Alberta, in this Legislature, is given greater opportunity than other Legislatures to ask questions in the oral form. I think we need to take a balanced view of this. The fact of the matter is that if we were dealing with a really strict interpretation of the rules and of the *Beauchesne* citations in particular, almost nothing would ever get asked. But at the same time, let's face it. The tradition of Oral Question Period in our parliamentary history is to give it overwhelmingly in favour of the opposition as it is the fulcrum point for the opposition members to keep the government accountable.

I think a balanced view on this issue is needed.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER: Recognition once on a point of order. Please bear that in mind, hon. members.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Speaking briefly to the point of order. I would think that the figures you gave the other day of 80-plus percent of the questions being asked by the opposition would indeed be what one could call a very over-balanced view of the ability of the opposition to ask in the question period.

Mr. Speaker. I feel, as the Premier has said, that I was elected to this House equal to anybody else in the House, and I had the ability and the chance to ask questions that affected my constituency. If I had something that affected my constituency to the tune of 350 full-time jobs, to me that would be important. It would be important to let the people of my constituency know that, as was asked today. And I'd like to know what the difference is between asking for a headline in the Rocky Mountain House *Mountaineer* and a headline in the Edmonton and Calgary *Sun*.

MR. TAYLOR: May I speak . . . [inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER: No, you may not. The Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. A very short point. The Premier

has on a number of occasions made the point in this House that rights usually presume responsibilities. I think that the original point of order was merely a request that it be noted to government members not in the cabinet that their questions should be of some import and accountability and that they judge their right with some discretion and take the responsibility to ask serious questions that could not be handled by a mere news release or newsletter to their constituents.

MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER: No, you may not. You may not. The Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications followed by the Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. YOUNG: Very briefly, it's quite out of order under the rules of *Beauchesne* and under the rules that we practise to be reflecting unduly upon the quality of the questions that are being asked. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature belongs to all members of the Assembly, and apart from the special recognition which is given to the leaders of the respective opposition parties, all other members should be equal in terms of the question period. I think that's simply a reiteration of rules which you have brought to our attention at the very commencement of this sitting. I leave the matter with that on our minds.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to answer the Member for Edmonton Glengarry and also the leader of the Liberal Party. The utilization is a very, very important factor to the constituency of Rocky Mountain House, and I'd just like to bring that home. And certainly I'll mention and forward *Hansard* in order that the people of my constituency can understand just what is going on in the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot reply. Hon. member, you have now been -- the Chair has had to admonish the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon now three times with respect to this particular point of order. The member makes the case when he stands to raise the point of order. This is not a debate; it's not a summation of a debate. It's simply that you've made your point and hopefully you've swayed the House and swayed the Chair.

The Chair would like to point out that indeed question period is for all members of this House. The practice that we have in this House has been brought together by development of consensus by the House leaders of all political parties, the House leaders indeed. Now whether or not the House leaders have been able to communicate that to the party leaders, I don't know. But I can only speak in terms of the fact that the House leaders together with myself developed the consensus whereby question period is administered, and that is the way the question period will continue to be administered. And from the point of view of the Chair, the government M.L.A. or an M.L.A. from any other political party has equal access to question period in this House and it will continue to be that way.

Now, whether or not the Chair must then impose a value judgment as to whether questions are urgent, as pointed out by the Member for Edmonton Highlands and by other members, then indeed a number of the questions really would fail because

they would not meet the test of urgency, and that perhaps would be from all quarters of the House.

As to this practice which has developed in the last seven days of interesting comments such as "puffballs," I would assume that all members of the House have equal opportunity to be able to say "puffballs" to questions from the people that are themselves using the same term.

As to the quality of question, surely to goodness the Chair is not expected to have to deal with the quality and the absolute merits of the question. As the Chair has listened to questions being put from all corners of the House, there have been indeed a number of very fine questions on very important issues as raised by all hon. members. And for one to engage in a value judgment upon the quality of the question is actually being less than gracious with respect to what the process is all about and invites a similar kind of response to oneself.

Now with regard once again to question period, last summer the questions from the New Democrats, the Liberals, and the Representative Party did indeed total 89.3 percent, and with respect to the time involved it was 89.5 percent of the time of the Assembly.

I would really invite all hon. members to read *Beauchesne* over the weekend and also to think about what we're really doing here and how this House appears to the people of this province.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: This will be a fresh point of order on an entirely different subject, the Chair trusts.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the distinction between the first point of order, which concerned the nature of questions that were being asked, whether they were adequate to the definition in *Beauchesne* of the type of questions that should be asked -- I'm setting that aside; you have dealt with that effectively. Thank you very much.

My point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Then why the comment on the first point of order? What is this new point of order?

MR. MITCHELL: Because I want to draw the distinction between that and my second point of order.

My second point of order concerns the number of questions, which is quite different from the point of order raised by the leader of my party. The number of questions -- the analysis, the statistics used here have to be carefully reconsidered. There is no dispute that 89 percent of the questions have gone to opposition parties. There is no dispute that 89 percent of the time for questioning has gone to opposition parties. However, we have to consider that the government gets far more time in question period because their ministers get to answer those questions at length. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MITCHELL: I don't believe that to be particularly funny.

The point is that question period is a forum for accountability. The ministers in the government get far more time to present their case, get far more time in that forum. If it's to be fair and to be consistent with parliamentary democracy, then 89 percent is a misleading figure because 89 percent of the ques-

tions may be going to us in the opposition, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for the challenge of the Chair. That's it.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under the terms of Standing Order 40 and request unanimous consent of the Assembly to deal with a motion immediately with respect to the pending meeting of the Ku Klux Klan in Alberta and its potential for bringing its international leaders here as well. I'll distribute this and wait for the decision or the call of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes that this particular request for unanimous consent under Standing Order 40 has been made and instructs the pages to please circulate that motion. The House will remain frozen until such time as all members have a copy of it. [Several moments elapsed]

Hon. Member for Highlands, speaking with respect to urgency of debate.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While it's not known the exact date of the proposed meeting for this international association which promotes intolerance and hatred, I think it's important that all members of the Assembly do what we did last year with respect to indicating our abhorrence of those individuals and associations which do promote intolerance and hatred of particular ethnic and cultural groups in our society, in an attempt to apply peer pressure from the highest authority in this province to help serve as a deterrent for such a meeting to take place and as a deterrent to associations and individuals who themselves may, as we speak or as we are here, be planning their own special plans for the promotion of intolerance and hatred.

I believe that is the essence of the urgency.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Deputy House Leader.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the question of urgency this morning, I first of all want to put it in the context in which we find ourselves today, with one hour and five minutes remaining, I believe, until the formal conclusion of the Speech from the Throne. In saying that, I know that there are a good number of members who would still like to advance their speeches on that address.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature -- I am sure there isn't a single member of us here who does not abhor the activities of the association in question and their despicable conduct and their attitudes. [applause]

Mr. Speaker, previous Legislatures have advanced the Alberta Bill of Rights and also the Individual's Rights Protection Act to express our desire that Albertans should express tolerance and understanding and respect. This motion purports urgency for an event that will occur sometime in the month of May. Under those conditions, and in declining support for the motion this

morning. I suggest that House leaders may want to consider the possibility of an agreement to bring this matter forward prior to that time if that is the wish. But this morning, not knowing how many speakers there may be involved in debate who may want to debate the matter. I believe we should go on with the Speech from the Throne.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I can agree with the intent of the motion that's brought forward. In terms of urgency, there's no urgency as far as I'm concerned in giving a quarter of a million dollars of publicity to the objects of this group, and I certainly intend not to allow the debate to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: A request for unanimous consent has been made. Those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: It fails.

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

Moved by Mr. Alger:

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 March 18: Ms Laing]

MS LAING: Thank you. I wish to respond to the Speech from the Throne.

In the months since September 1986 when we were here I've visited many of my constituents and met with people throughout the province to listen to their views and concerns. I've also attended teachers' conventions, trustees' associations meetings, and in addition, I have attended a couple of rallies, one protesting the late opening of the Mill Woods hospital and the second one protesting the slashing of funds to community schools.

There are two community schools in my constituency, which I believe are of the highest order of educational institutions and that we must honour them and support them. I attended the closing ceremonies at one of my community schools. They had been involved in the study of peace: how to live together in this world that is now becoming smaller and smaller as we are joined together through communication and of common fate. It involves studying new ways to solve problems; it was a celebration of the diversity of life and of cultures and a hope for a peaceful future. It was indeed an awesome sight and a profound experience to see 350 children release balloons carrying messages of peace to the world.

I have received many letters of concern in the past months about the state of the economy, of our educational and health

care systems, of social service delivery systems, about workmen's compensation, and the high unemployment rate in this province. In addition, I have received letters in regard to seat belt legislation and also concerns about the issue of world peace.

My concern is that the Speech from the Throne does not address many of the issues that have been raised with me by my constituents. There are indeed many high-sounding phrases that they do not in fact address the reality that we face this day.

First, however, before I address those issues, I would like to note past comments that have been made about the reality that I know. Some of those comments have drawn laughter. They have been in reaction to my comments about sexual abuse, wife assault, and incest. I'm never sure whether that laughter is coming because people are anxious or whether they feel guilty. But violence . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair didn't hear any laughter in this House.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke one day on the matter of rape, a member opposite laughed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair apologizes. I thought that the member was referring to today, I'm sorry.

MS LAING: Violence, whether it be physical, sexual, or emotional, is never funny. Other times members have talked -- this is in the past -- and joked around when I have spoken, as if in shutting out the information that I talk about, they can deny it. The belief is that what is not acknowledged and is not seen is not real, but it does exist, and until we acknowledge that reality and name it, it will not change. And change it must if the lives of the young people in this province, the unemployed, the abused women and children are to be changed. And that is why I speak about those issues here: because they must change.

I also note the concerns of the Member for Lethbridge West that he raised on Wednesday last regarding our commitment to the family. I believe that the Playboy revolution of the 1960s, with its emphasis on bachelor pads and mirrors in the ceiling, has been very destructive to family life in this province and, in fact, in the western world. I have seen that many women and their children have been thrust into poverty when the fathers of those children have left and have failed to pay support. So I agree with the Member for Lethbridge West. We must again refocus on the family.

One of the themes of the Speech from the Throne is to improve education and learning opportunities for women by increasing awareness of changing roles and removing obstacles which prevent women from a wide range of career alternatives. I hope that means there will be enactment of equal pay for work of equal value and affirmative action policies. Education alone -- and I assume here that the education is to be directed at employers -- will not change the wage gap which is indeed widening and has risen from 64.9 percent to 65 percent in the last year. And indeed, university degree women earn 68 percent of what men with university degrees earn. Women are, in fact, hired at a lower rate of pay, and there are not the promotions. And research indicates that the education of women in the work force is in fact higher than the education level of men. Women are not represented proportionately in senior positions in the civil service, in teaching and, indeed, in the civil service. Although 52 percent of the employees are women, only 12 percent

are in management positions.

Another related theme in the throne speech is new initiatives to encourage women to consider careers in nontraditional occupations. I applaud that, and I hope it includes removal of sexual stereotyping in texts that are used and in advertising. And I hope it includes an emphasis on women's role in history, in science, in literature, and in art. In all the literature that I studied in high school, stories and literature of women were not included. I hope that will change. I hope this will mean that school and employment counselors direct and encourage non-traditional career choices not only for women but for men, because I'm sure that when that happens, then the work that has been traditionally done by women will have higher valuation.

We in the past -- and continue to -- have not valued the work traditionally done by women; that is, meeting the needs of other human beings, their children included, and yet we see that our children are our most valuable resource. We need to honour the caring and education of our children, and it needs to be recognized monetarily. Similarly, office workers, who are traditionally women -- secretaries and assistants -- are the foundation on which executives build their careers, and they need to be rewarded for their contribution. If we have women as carpenters and engineers, that's good. But I hope there are jobs for them, because in fact the problem these days is a lack of jobs.

Men, if they are moved into nontraditional jobs -- that is, the jobs that women have traditionally done -- will probably not be any more satisfied with the low wages for those jobs than the women are. I would hope that the government would work to eradicate the notion of women as unsuited for certain types of jobs: lifting or mathematics. And indeed, at the University of Alberta women had a higher grade point average in every faculty, including the Faculty of Science.

Mr. Speaker, the government holds the family as the social strength of our community and, indeed, of our province. I totally agree. Therefore, we need to have some real initiatives in programs that will insure family life. We need more than rhetoric. We need to ensure that family life is strong and healthy and provides a nurturing and supportive environment for its members because it is in families that we learn how to live together with each other, how to solve problems, how to live in society. And if our families are to be what we want them to be, then there are some conditions that we have to meet.

There must be full employment so that adult members, parents, can provide for the needs of their children for food, clothing, shelter, and educational opportunities, as well as for their children's emotional needs. Unemployed parents are hard pressed to provide for any of these needs and, indeed, in times of high unemployment there is an increased rate of family breakdown and violence, including child abuse, wife battering, and incest, as well as the visits to the food banks and a denial of equal access to all educational opportunities for children whose parents are poor. And this would include access to books and field trips.

There is a dearth of resources for the victims of violence, and in this province one in six women that is in a married relationship is battered. Across Canada one in four female children and one in ten male children are sexually abused, in 50 percent of the cases by a family member. So we need resources for these women and children that suffer from abuse, and we need resources for offenders so that they can learn new ways to deal with conflict in their families and so that they can learn about new ways in dealing with the frustration and rage that they often feel about their inability to provide for their families.

If this government truly values family life, it will provide an environment in which families can not only survive but an environment in which families can flourish. And this would mean that one does not require the healthy mother of a healthy four-month-old infant who is on social assistance to look for a job. And it means that the single-parent mother of more than one child would have an adequate social assistance allowance so that she can at least have a telephone and that she does not need to take from the food budget to pay the rent money. In addition, due to unemployment family members are sometimes forced to move -- the hon. leader of the Liberal Party noted that the other day -- and this means there is dislocation from family and support and community systems.

A final point is the issue of our unemployed youth. The years from 20 to 30 are the years that we create families. Our young people -- and 17 percent is the rate of unemployment in young people at this time -- are denied this opportunity. This figure, this 17 percent, does not include or take into account the number of discouraged workers or those in dead-end minimum wage jobs and those on short-term PEP jobs at \$5.50 an hour. These jobs are no basis for establishing the strong families that are the foundation of this society.

I note the government's commitment to children's mental health issues and to the education of children. I would hope that there is a concurrent recognition of the other needs of children. These needs are to be cared for and nurtured in environments that nurture and stimulate children both intellectually and emotionally. Therefore, we must value and recognize the contribution of parents who stay at home to care for the children. And we must also commit ourselves to those children of parents who must or choose to work, to ensure that there is quality nonprofit day care that is on-site. This would ease the burden of the working parent logistically and allow for the maintenance of a strong parent/child bond. The lack of quality day care is the major obstacle to women's full participation in the work force. The government can demonstrate the commitment to women and children of this province by enacting and enforcing day care standards and providing sufficient subsidized day care places.

The government states also that it has a strong commitment to the education of children. In the face of the 3 percent cuts added to the inflation rate of 4 percent, plus the slashing of some programs, this commitment is not readily evident and in fact demonstrates to me a commitment to things other than education on behalf of this government. Our children are our future. I hear from all over Alberta, from parents and teachers, their concerns, their consternation, and their fear at the proposed reduction in education funding. Albertans have historically valued education beyond all things. My parents and their parents said that they believed education was the way to prepare oneself for a meaningful life of contribution to society, and parents today feel the same way, and my desk is covered with letters from parents saying that.

In looking at the cutbacks to education, I wish to argue most emphatically against the cuts to community schools. This seems indeed a penny-wise, pound-foolish cut in that these programs are cost-effective and involve long-term involvement of citizens in community life, prevention of problems such as vandalism and school dropping out. Surely we will pay in other ways with more dollars for this short-term saving. I am unconvinced that the minister's assurances about the need for special education funds being protected are enough to protect the average children, as special-need children take time away from the classroom teacher. I believe that in fact the average children and the

gifted children in this province may well suffer because of these cuts.

I am also disturbed about the closing and reduction to service of children who are in trouble with themselves and with society. Two such closures have occurred in my constituency. Again, we will pay in the long run as these young people have difficulties that escalate and they come to populate our jails and our mental institutions. Too often they are young people who have come from families in which there was unemployment and violence. In many cases they were victims themselves, and in other cases they witnessed the victimization of other people, and they have learned that violence is a means and a way to achieve one's ends and a way to deal with one's feelings of helplessness and frustration. I believe it is not because of Dr. Spock's teachings that we have violence in this society but it is because there has been violence put upon children.

In addition, I must object to the closing of schools and the busing of children out of their communities. The school is the centre of community life. It allows for children to be in their schools in their community. It means parents can participate in the child's education and know the child's friends. When children are bused outside of their community, parents are denied the right to be fully involved in their children's lives.

The government also makes a commitment to the safety of workers, Mr. Speaker. We need more than education. We need standards, and we need enforcement.

Some of what is mentioned in the throne speech I believe will further erode many Albertans' belief in themselves. I speak of the phrase, "social support programs [that] encourage individual initiative." What I see in Social Service policy and rhetoric suggests that people at the food banks are poor managers, that instead of recognizing the miserly social assistance allowances and the punitive regulations as the cause of what is happening in this province to these people, there is indeed a cruel attitude towards the employable people for whom there are no jobs. Let us not say that they are unskilled or inexperienced. What about 900 teaching interns, what about social workers, what about teachers, what about nurses and civil servants who are laid off? They do not lack expertise. They do not lack experience. They lack opportunities to work and to contribute to their families and to society.

Another issue I wish to raise is the motion on support for peace that was in fact passed in this Legislative Assembly last fall and the support for peace initiatives. I wonder where the government's commitment to peace is and what measures and steps are being taken to inform the federal government of our commitment to peace as that government makes plans to turn part of southern Alberta into a military zone.

Mr. Speaker, we need a Speech from the Throne that addresses the issues of all men, women, and children in this province, that addresses the issues of environmental protection, of world peace. We need a speech that is fair and offers support for initiative in all peoples. And certainly community schools are an example of that kind of initiative. We need support for the initiative of the unemployed by providing jobs and adequate living allowances that allow for maintenance of self-esteem and dignity. We need a commitment to single-parent mothers who choose to stay at home with children. We need to provide for them an adequate living allowance and, as I said earlier, to end the demand that single-parent mothers of a child over four months seek employment.

With those kinds of regulations I have to say: where is this government's commitment to the family and to the children?

We need a commitment to women through equal pay for work of equal value and affirmative action legislation. Nothing else will do. We need a commitment to the many ethnic groups of this province through education that celebrates the many cultures of our society and of the world, and out of that commitment, to education for peace that proposes new ways of solving problems between individuals, within families, and in communities, and between the nations of the world. We need a commitment to provide for the mental and physical health care of all Albertans.

Much has been made of the deficit, Mr. Speaker, but all of us in our lives incur a debt as we lay the foundation for our lives and for our children's lives. We may borrow money for our children's education or for our own education; we may borrow money on occasion for special health needs; we want our children to have the best future. We have borrowed money to build our homes. When a foundation is being laid, we do not suddenly say, "Oops, too expensive," and start using more sand than is wise. If we are borrowing for education, which is the foundation of our career, we do not suddenly stop and jeopardize our career choices by saying that we can't afford to borrow any more. We may quit spending on clothes and furniture and parties, but we borrow if we need to create the foundation of our lives.

People, especially our children, are the foundation, and we must not put them on hold. We must not put their future in jeopardy. We need to create a strong, resilient population. We do not do that by telling people they are lazy or poor managers. We assess the situation and then create opportunities for them. We encourage and applaud the efforts of the ordinary Albertans, and we must in fact be fair to all of them. And thus I urge this government to rethink its position, step outside of its rhetoric, and listen to all people of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Bow Valley.

MR. MUSGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's certainly a pleasure for me today to make some comments on the throne speech as it concerns the residents of Bow Valley constituency.

First, I'd like to congratulate the Lieutenant Governor on her delivery of the throne speech, which is basically the document that sets out the actions that will be taken by our government over the next year. I'd also like to congratulate the Member for Highwood and the Member for Red Deer North on their moving and seconding of the throne speech; a very eloquent pair of speakers, I must say.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't make some comments and compliment you on the improvements to the Legislature where we as elected people spend a lot of time, and it does make some improvement to our comfort.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents, the Bow Valley people, agree with fiscal restraint. They believe we should be controlling our provincial deficit so as to not leave a huge debt to future generations. They believe that their children and grandchildren deserve better than that. They are reminded of the huge deficit by the federal government that will take generations to recover. This deficit was brought around by the former Liberal government and also supported by the NDP.

I was surprised to hear from the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark recently, who suggested in *Hansard* on March 16 that the province of Alberta should have saved money during the good days so that there would be some when days were not so good. He forgets that the Alberta government did in fact save

approximately \$15 billion, which we call the heritage trust fund, which we do now have in bad days. The heritage trust fund far more than covers any deficit that's been incurred by the province to the present time, while his party, the federal Liberals, accumulated a deficit that will probably go into infinity as far as the federal government is concerned.

Now I recognize that a restraint budget is going to be a challenge to our municipal governments, hospital boards, and school boards. However, it is my belief that these people are worthy of that challenge. As a matter of fact, our hospital administrator recently said at a public meeting that the time has come when the government must say no to budget increases and in fact find ways of reducing budgets. I certainly appreciate his comments in that respect.

Agriculture and energy are the two basic industries in Bow Valley at the present time. Agriculture needs some help. The farmers appreciate the continuation of the farm fuel rebate program and also the farm fertilizer program. The reduction in the feed grain market adjustment program that was announced in January and will take place at the end of June is necessary for budget reasons. However, it is unfortunate that the program has to be reduced at this time. It was a successful program, and it has proven a major success to the cattle and feed industry in Alberta.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Because of this program there is in excess of 150,000 head of cattle being fed in Alberta that without the program would have been exported to eastern Canada, or perhaps some to the United States. To the grain farmer it means that there are 150 to 2,000 tonnes of coarse grains fed in Alberta that would have been left, adding to the glut of cereal grains that we at the present time have on hand. I believe that if we were to have the proper distribution of the Crow rate, we would not have to have the farm feed program. I believe that if we were to convince the federal government to pay the Alberta grain producers a portion of the \$60 million of the Crow benefit, rather than the railroads, we could dissolve the program. It would take the distortion out of the Canadian feed industry without the provinces having to respond with a provincial program, and if we were to have a pilot project in place in Alberta, we could probably save the provincial budget about \$60 million.

About 50 percent of the economy in Bow Valley constituency is supported by the gas and oil industry. When I visited oil company offices during the summer of 1986, I was told that if oil prices were to increase to \$16 a barrel U.S., rather than the devastating prices it was at that time, they would be able to recover their cost of production and have a small profit. Now, recognizing that there is a royalty holiday for five years on all wells drilled before October 31, 1987, and also recognizing that the price of oil at present is roughly \$18 a barrel -- I believe it was over \$19 today -- I'm surprised that there's no more action taken in exploration in the gas and oil industry. The answer I hear from the oil and gas producers is that the inactivity is created because they feel the price of gas and oil is still very unstable. Oil and gas companies in the Bow Valley constituency voice that they are very thankful for the Western Accord and they are also thankful for the dropping of the petroleum gas revenue tax.

Our reduction in the 1987-88 budget for schools was first recognized as a severe handicap, but I've met with some of the school boards and have pointed out that the 3 percent reduction

does not take place until September 1987, thus allowing them some time to plan a strategy for their budget in the following year. They are now recognizing this as not quite such a severe hardship.

Advanced education is very important to the residents of Bow Valley, and it is hoped that there can be a future building considered for a college in Brooks. We now operate the Brooks campus of the Medicine Hat College out of an old hospital building. Space is very crowded and offerings are restricted because of space. The laboratory on the campus is very, very inadequate. Recognizing the restraint program, we still look forward to the day when we can see a building erected on the land that was donated for that purpose.

I'm pleased with the concept the Alberta Opportunity Company has provided in the throne speech in new, innovative ideas on capital for special projects. This becomes important when we are speaking of diversification of our economy. I believe that we need a program to assist in manufacturing in Alberta. Manufacturing some of our natural resources could supply a lot more jobs, and it could also put a value-added price on our renewable resources and also depleting resources for export. I have to compliment Lakeside Packers in Brooks on their announced expansion of their packing house, which will create a lot more jobs for Brooks and more than double their capacity to slaughter cattle.

In a questionnaire that was circulated in my constituency recently, Mr. Speaker, the response was about 22 percent. Of those 22 percent, the vote was 57 percent against seat belt legislation, about 40 percent in favour, and 3 percent undecided. This would put Bow Valley in a democratic decision to not have seat belt legislation. However, the people of Alberta have voiced their opinions in percentages that actually are opposite to the percentage that mine voted in favour. Therefore, that makes it a democratic decision of the people of Alberta to have seat belt legislation. Being of a democratic nature, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to accept that decision.

I am pleased that the twinning of Highway 1 will be on schedule, as announced in the throne speech. It is hoped that by the end of 1987 construction season, Highway 1 will be twinned all the way from Brooks to Calgary, and also another portion of it will be twinned between Suffield and Medicine Hat, which has a very high accident rate, partly because a lot of the drivers from the army base at Suffield are from Britain and they're accustomed to driving on a different side of the road than our laws allow.

I'm looking forward to the official opening of the field station, Tyrrell Museum, at Dinosaur Provincial Park on May 15. Dinosaur Provincial Park attracts about 50,000 to 60,000 visitors a year, and it will be a revelation to find some fossils on display for the people that are visiting the park and particularly from the source that the fossils came from. There will also be a workshop where people will be able to observe the preparation of fossils to be exported to other places.

We're looking forward to future improvements in Dinosaur Park that will allow more overnight camping and a better road system. They're also considering a transit system that will allow people to visit points of interest in the park without having to use their own vehicles. I'm also looking forward to some improvements in Kinbrook Island Park in regard to the boat dock and the swimming area.

I'm encouraged that legislation will be introduced to enable the implementation of an insurance industry and compensation which will support policyholders when their insurance compa-

nies become solvent. I recently talked to a taxi driver whose insurance company had become insolvent, and he was not able to negotiate an affordable insurance with any other insurance company. Mr. Speaker, that basically put him out of business for the present time.

I'm happy to see that there's legislation proposed to provide a greater equity in rural property taxation system, Mr. Speaker. Having been a member of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties for many years, we tried to bring about a more equitable type of assessment for rural Alberta without having to define who is a farmer. Our experience was that to define a farmer was an impossible task. As I understand, this proposal will provide equitable assessment to smallholdings and farmers without having to draw lines on who and who isn't a farmer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Speech from the Throne portrays very well the position our government must take to offer services to Alberta that are affordable. In regard to restraint, I am reminded of a quote that I think describes what we have to do very amiably. The quote is: "tough times never last but tough people do." I think that we as Albertans are looking forward to better days.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to contribute to the speech in response to the Speech from the Throne. I only wish that I had more optimistic things to say about it, because at the very beginning this speech talks about how the government is going to be putting forward proposals to vigorously promote and continue the diversification of the Alberta economy. It seems to me that making a statement like that simply underscores the failure of the government's efforts for the last 10 years since the former Premier said that we had to diversify this economy. I want to say that there are thousands of people in this province, many of whom are in my constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods, who are waiting desperately, and we are still in a deep recession here with no concrete response.

Now, it goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that "1986 was a difficult year for many Alberta families," and indeed that was absolutely true, many of whom are constituents in my riding of Edmonton Mill Woods. The appalling thing, though, is the double standard that exists with this government. Last year when they talked about the deficit for our budget here, at the same time the ministers were getting a 5.6 percent salary raise. They forced through, they ran through in this Assembly a 10 percent raise for the MLAs. They kissed away half a million dollars sending Mr. Reid and his friends around the world. They've got nice patronage jobs for Mary LeMessurier, Milt Pahl, Horst Schmid, and a whole slew of others. I want to say that the people in my constituency do not appreciate that double standard.

It goes on to say in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, that the government will continue its priority commitment to job creation and training. Every day in the paper there are daily announcements of job losses in the private and public sectors. Training is absolutely important, but there is a follow-up that goes with that: there have to be jobs to be trained for. There is no point training people simply to continue to be on unemployment and welfare. I have hundreds of constituents in Mill Woods who have got all kinds of pieces of paper attesting to their training and still there are no jobs; that is what we need. What can we say to the people who are unemployed? The only response that we get from our minister of manpower is these band-aid jobs, PEP grants at \$5.50 an hour that have as their main purpose simply to keep people working long enough to requalify for unemployment insurance and nothing more.

We go on to talk in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, about this government's efforts to assist school boards to maintain the excellent quality of education. That has got to be the height of hypocrisy. Every day in the papers we're reading stories of people who are losing their jobs due to the cutbacks in this government's budget. There was a report just yesterday that the Edmonton Catholic School District will be reducing its staff, and that's only the latest of a whole string of examples. I can tell you that at just one school in my constituency they are going to be looking at laying off two teachers and one support staff person. What is their future? One of these band-aid jobs at \$5.50 an hour? Unemployment insurance? Welfare? We've got to have a more creative response than that. At the same time, our schools are also having to squeeze very lean budgets already for library materials, cultural programs, and others. And what's going to be happening? Is it simply going to be passed along to the parents?

Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents brought me a sheet. His daughter at the high school had to come up with a whole slew of user fees from textbooks rentals, ID cards, cocurricular fees, bus passes, and so on and so on. It's over \$100, Mr. Speaker, and he's got two children. That's \$200 just to get in the door, and it continues thereafter.

Another example of this government's total lack of commitment to the quality of education has got to be the example where they've cut 100 percent its funding to the regional film centres of this province. Mr. Speaker, that is an insult to the rural school districts of this province who have for a long time supported the regional film centres, all five of them, around this province with more support than the provincial government has. And now the government simply says we're going to cut their support entirely. Did the Minister of Education ever visit one of these regional film centres? Not on your life. Did she consult with the people before she made this announcement? Not at all. And then we have the labour review committee of Mr. Reid. He spent \$0.5 million. That money, Mr. Speaker, would have kept those five regional film centres in operation for another year entirely.

The community schools issue has been referred to as well, and I can only mention how disappointed the people of my constituency are that when they had a public meeting recently to discuss the future of community schools, the minister declined to come. She couldn't send a deputy minister; she couldn't even have any of the 12 people, Mr. Speaker, who are on the government caucus education committee. Not one of those could bother to take a few minutes out of their schedule to come and explain this government's policy on community schools.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we've got all these people who are unemployed, many in the construction industry, and we have new areas of the province, in the city of Edmonton -- for example, in my constituency, Daly Grove, the people there have bought their homes, they have built their homes on the basis that there would be a school in their neighbourhood. It's on the maps, it's been on the maps for six years now, and people are getting a little tired of waiting. And I put it to the government: doesn't it make more sense to be paying construction workers wages to build a facility like a school that will serve the needs of people in our communities rather than paying welfare and unemployment which we know is unproductive?

This throne speech goes on to talk about health and social services, and I have to say it's totally appalling that there is not a single reference in here to the Workers' Compensation Board. I have had more complaints about this institution of the provin-

cial government than all others put together. Mr. Speaker, in the *Globe and Mail* of last week, where the Conservative Party is in their rightful position as opposition, people there have called for a royal commission to investigate the workers' compensation there. A Conservative Member for Brantford, Philip Gillies, told a press conference it's time to tear down the entire structure and start all over again. I would submit the same thing applies in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech goes on, on page 7, to talk about native affairs, and I have to say it is absolutely appalling and a disgrace to the people of this province that this government does not mention one word regarding the land claim of the Lubicon Band. This government has consistently refused to negotiate with them in good faith and continues to disgrace this province by so doing.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have often referred to the fact of the deficit, and in fact that is a legitimate concern. But we've got all kinds of alternatives that have been presented here. We looked through every single government department and identified \$750 million that could be shaved from wasteful and nonproductive expenditure. All these offices internationally around the world that are havens for our friends like Mary LeMessurier, who can't seem to win by the voters -- she loves the private sector, but she still has to stay on the public trough. There are all kinds of other things like that that could be cut. And we identified, Mr. Speaker, another \$1.3 billion of extra revenue that the government could collect if they only had the guts to close all the tax loopholes that their friends in the government benefit from. I've tabled my tax return publicly so my constituents will know where I'm coming from, and I'd encourage the members on the opposite side to do the same. There are alternatives to cuts in people services; we do not have to do that. Education is an investment in this future, health care is an investment in the future of our people, and this government seems to be unable to realize that.

This throne speech, Mr. Speaker, is a disservice to the people of this province, and we are looking forward to the budget speech where we can have another look at all of the misallocations that this government is putting through. The people in my constituency are not impressed with this, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater-Andrew,

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is probably the first real time I got to speak in this House since the election, and I look forward to participating in the Speech from the Throne.

This time I would like to congratulate the Speaker on the fine job he's done in supervising the renovation of this House. It is much more comfortable now and it's a different feeling in here. I would also like to congratulate the Member for Highwood for the fine moving of the Speech from the Throne. I think he does justice to his constituents and brings a lot of fine, commonsense points to this House. I would also like to congratulate the Member for Red Deer North on seconding it, and with his fine comments I think this summer I'm going to tour all of Red Deer.

Mr. Speaker, what is impressive about the throne speech, so gracefully delivered by Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor, is its very comprehensive plan of action. I'm sure other hon. members would agree that we faced a very demanding and challenging agenda when we were elected to serve some 10 months

ago. These demands and challenges have not lessened in these months, but we can see in this throne speech a plan of action in elements of our provincial economy and for all the services this government provides to our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to start with the agricultural incentives. Last year's throne speech contained the welcome news of a long-term fixed interest financing program for our farmers and ranchers. In the Redwater-Andrew constituency alone, over \$26 million from this farm credit stability program has gone to 310 of our farm constituents. Mr. Speaker, this throne speech has even more good news for our vital agricultural industry. With continuation of the farm fuel distribution program and the fertilizer price protection program, this gives our farmers and ranchers the lowest input costs in the country for seeding this year's crop. Let me just underline that the lowest in Canada for input costs is in Alberta right now. As it has been said so often in this House, our government went to the experts, the farmers and ranchers, for their advice about the hail and crop insurance program and the Agricultural Development Corporation program. Mr. Speaker, these experts came back with a lot of good suggestions and good advice and good comments, and this government will make the changes that are needed.

One statement everyone in this House can agree to is that Alberta's farmers are the best in the world. Establishment of an agricultural research institute to co-ordinate and prioritize research will keep our farmers where they belong, at the top in the technology they use and at the peak of their production. In other words, if we need something done fast in this province, just ask our farmers; they're the most efficient people in all industry.

Research pays a multitude of benefits in the long term. Long-term benefits are always on the agenda when the government looks at agriculture. Long-term benefits are what we seek as an advisory committee and task force investigating better alternatives to the current Crow benefit method of payment. This government is always demonstrating its support and priority for agriculture, whether in providing a service or negotiating for better terms for our farmers.

Rural Alberta is also supported by a number of important utility programs. The throne speech reaffirms the rural gas program, the farm water program, and a new loan program for rural electrification associations.

Mr. Speaker, Redwater-Andrew understands the tourism potential of our province. We know that our province is full of special places of interest, as well as world-class attractions. We congratulate the government for recognizing the potential and encourage the minister to continue his very fine efforts and initiatives. Especially, my constituents know how much our province offers to visitors who want to go off the beaten track.

Mr. Speaker, let me invite you and all the hon. members to visit Redwater-Andrew. They could start with a historical tour, start near Smoky Lake by visiting the fur traders' Victoria post, Fort Victoria and Fort White Earth along the Victoria Settlement. Museums in Lamont, Andrew, Redwater, Smoky Lake, and Shandro display local and natural history. Take a drive to admire the special architect of the orthodox churches in many of the communities and then stop at one of the campgrounds or by a lake or the North Saskatchewan river for lunch or an overnight campout.

In the interests of Wildlife '87, stop by one of the 16 proposed or established natural areas in the constituency. Conservation, education, or recreation has significance in each of these areas, and as well, tourism potential. Riding and hiking trails around Anton Lake, blueberry picking at the site near Bellis --

maybe some of you have picked blueberries out there already -- diverse wildlife from moose and deer to duck and loon are abundant in the areas, also the jack pine woodlands, black spruce muskeg, and aspen parkland. Mr. Speaker, these areas remind us of the diversity of landscape in this province. In my constituency there is different landscape every few miles. That is why I'm proud that Wildlife '87 was mentioned in the throne speech. Our natural heritage is as important as our cultural heritage or any other heritage you'd like to list. Our province was the first to endorse the federal concept of Wildlife '87, and this year has served to highlight the efforts already made in preservation, conservation, and management of our wildlife resources.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

While you're driving along Highway 28 going east to Smoky Lake, you'll hit Canada's largest forest nursery, Pine Ridge Forest Nursery. As the hon. Associate Minister of Agriculture mentioned the other day, it is a great asset in this province and it does replenish many forests. Let me just give you a breakdown of what happens in there. Pine Ridge creates 40 full-time jobs, 50 seasonal April to October, and 100 casual; that's three weeks when the spruce and pine are being lifted out of the ground. In addition, it's a five-tier program. They've got the tree-seeding program which involves extracting seed from the cones, and they do between 21,000 and 27,000 bushels of cone a year. Then they've got the bare root seeding program which they seed in greenhouses and outdoor beds, and they go through 14 million of these seedlings a year.

They've also got an investigation and research program where new varieties of spruce and pine are tested.

Mr. Speaker, this project in the Redwater-Andrew constituency, and mainly in the the Smoky Lake area, is one example of our government's diversification and program of decentralizing. The employees there do bring a lot of dollars into the area, and that's what keeps our small businesses going.

Mr. Speaker, like the rest of Albertans, my constituency welcomes a labour market strategy, particularly as it will provide work experience, retraining opportunities, on-the-job training, and support for entrepreneurial activities. I also believe that a new labour code will mean a great deal for this province and its people.

As we look back over a turbulent economic year, we must acknowledge the vision that made diversification of our province's economy a priority. Without the diversification efforts that have been made in the past few years, our province and its citizens would have had a much rougher 1986 and would face a much tougher 1987. Instead, we look ahead to continued building on the foundation that is in place. The Alberta Opportunity Company will innovate with inventory financing for retailers and special consideration for entrepreneurs. Diversification means continuing to train Albertans in new technologies and science so they can compete internationally in providing their skills and products. Diversification means continuing to exploit our tourism potential, and diversification means providing small business with the climate to continue to be an engine of growth in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, communities across our province have continued to show their strength as they have adjusted to the difficulties we have faced in the last year. They have demonstrated a willingness to work co-operatively with the provincial government to face necessary financial restraint with the least effect on

services.

Mr. Speaker, I have personally met with every county, municipal district, town, and village council in my constituency. They, like this government, are committed to a strong Alberta achieved by working together, and by working together in this House and with all Albertans, I think we will get a strong economy again and get this province rolling and live abundantly again.

Mr. Speaker, I've only touched the surface of the content of this throne speech. I have left a great deal unsaid that I am sure Albertans have taken note of and applauded. I also remain confident in the vision this government has for our province. There is a line in an official 75th anniversary song that says -- "I won't sing it here today, because you'd probably all leave -- "Our fathers carved a life from just a dream." Our parents dreamed of a strong, vital, prosperous place for future generations, and it is one that will continue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Highwood. May the member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honour for me to have moved the acceptance of the Speech from the Throne. I've been delighted with the response from all the people who participated, all the folks who told us about their constituencies. I found it somewhat strange that none of their constituencies seemed to add up to mine, but them's the breaks, Mr. Speaker.

There are times when I wonder whether or not we're on the right track, but I'm positive that this particular Speech from the Throne has been of a magnificent structure toward our getting started for this session of parliament. I've appreciated the remarks from both sides of the House. I think they've been most formidable, and it has been my honour thus to have moved that motion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in that context, I would like now to take the privilege of closing the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion moved by the hon. Member for Highwood, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Ady	Fischer	Oldring
Alger	Fjordbotten	Orman
Bogle	Getty	Pengelly
Brassard	Gogo	Rostad
Campbell	Heron	Schumacher
Cassin	Horsman	Shaben

Cherry	Hyland	Shrake
Clegg	Isley	Sparrow
Crawford	Koper	Stevens
Cripps	Kowalski	Stewart
Day	Mirosh	Trynchy
Dinning	Moore, M.	Weiss
Downey	Moore, R.	West
Drobot	Musgreave	Young
Elliott	Musgrove	Zarusky
Elzinga	Nelson	

Against the motion:

Barrett	Martin	Roberts
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Sigurdson
Fox	Mitchell	Strong
Gibeault	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hawkesworth	Pashak	Wright
Hewes	Piquette	Younie
Laing		

ACTING ASSISTANT TABLE CLERK: Mr. Speaker, 47 for the motion; against the motion, 18.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Might the House agree to reverting to Tabling Returns and Reports?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Attorney General.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**  
(*reversion*)

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Order for a Return 139 of 1985 and Motion for a Return 141 of 1986. I would point out just by way of note that -- I should really say that I'm filing Return 139/85 because it is being done as a courtesy since it related to an order made before the commencement of this Legislature, but the information is still being provided, although it's quite stale dated.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. To make the opposition swell, I think there was 19 in that vote rather than 18.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for the correction. I'm sure it wasn't a comment on physical condition.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

2. 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 Assembly as are members of the Executive Council.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Might the House also agree to reverting to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Minister of Agriculture.

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

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to Members of this Legislative Assembly, a dear friend and a former Member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Edmonton Sherwood Park. He's in the members' gallery and I would ask him to rise: Mr. John Ashton.

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

**Bill 2**  
**Daylight Saving Time Amendment Act, 1987**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 2, Daylight Saving Time Amendment Act, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, this Act would bring into force this year, on the first Sunday in April, daylight saving time, and we are proceeding with this legislation in concert with most other provinces in Canada and with the United States of America. It is important that we maintain our lime position relative to those other jurisdictions for many reasons having to do with financial institutions, transportation organizations and facilities, and communications. I would urge hon. members to accept this particular Bill and endorse its contents.

I might say just in passing, having gone through a couple of plebiscites in earlier days on the subject of daylight saving time, it is quite clear that the subject has ceased to have that dramatic drawing power of attention in the province of Alberta that it once had.

[Motion carried; Bill 2 read a second time]

[At 12:47 p.m. the House adjourned until 3 p.m.]