

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, March 21, 1988 2:30 p.m.**
Date: 88/03/21

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, we give thanks as legislators for the rich diversity of our history.

We welcome the many challenges of the present.

We dedicate ourselves to both the present and the future as we join in the service of Alberta and Canada.

Amen.

head: PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by 230 residents of Alberta representing 20 voluntary agencies. These citizens

request that the Assembly urge the Government to establish a task force to call for and examine submissions regarding the effects of [the Volunteer Incorporations Act] on non-profit organizations in this province.

Petitions are still coming in, so we will likely be presenting the same position in the future.

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 52, I wish to table the annual report of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. Copies of this report will be delivered to each member.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 201
Freedom of Information and
Personal Privacy Act**

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 201 for first reading. Bill 201 is the Freedom of Information and Personal Privacy Act.

This Bill would provide any person, under certain conditions, with access to any record of the Alberta government. Also, one of the members of the Human Rights Commission is designated a privacy commissioner and charged with the expeditious handling of any complaints from persons who feel they are not fairly treated under the Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon had caught the eye of the Chair.

**Bill 226
Party Leadership Finances Act**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 229, Party Leadership Finances Act.

This Bill amends the present Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act -- perfects it, Mr. Speaker, to require that contributions to party leadership candidates be disclosed which set a limit on the amount of these contributions but would not make these contributions tax deductible, as now is the case for other types of contributions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has moved for first reading, Bill 226 -- not 229 -- Party Leadership Finances Act.

MR. TAYLOR: Mine says 229, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe we'll find . . . Orders of the Day [inaudible] 226.

MR. TAYLOR: My fault, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was the size of the contribution there.

[Leave granted; Bill 226 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

**Bill 202
School User Fees Elimination Act**

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, I'd like to beg leave to introduce Bill 202, the School User Fees Elimination Act.

Mr. Speaker, if this Bill is passed, it would amend the School Act to strike out all those provisions within the current Act which allow school boards to levy fees and charges for text books, supplies, certain sorts of tuition, field trips, and special courses. As a consequence any user fees in the schools would be done away with.

[Leave granted; Bill 202 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would like to interject for half a moment. Perhaps while 5BX is good for all of us, that we might move through votes and proceedings, we'll go up in numerical order because there's such a considerable number of Bills to be introduced for first reading.

The Chair would, then, recognize the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

**Bill 203
Quality Child Day Care Standards Act**

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I move for leave to introduce a Bill entitled Quality Child Day Care Standards Act.

Mr. Speaker, the title of the Bill is self-explanatory, but of particular note is the reference in it to educational standards for day care workers.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

Bill 204
Farm Land Vendor Financing Act

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 204, the Farm Land Vendor Financing Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will propose to expand the financing alternatives available to farmers by guaranteeing vendor-financed mortgages.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

Bill 205
Alberta Economic Council

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to beg leave for first reading of Bill 205, the Alberta Economic Council Act.

Mr. Speaker, if passed, this Bill would establish an Alberta Economic Council with some 30 members drawn from groups representing various sectors of the population. Its principal duty would be to advise and recommend to the government strategies and policies by which Alberta can achieve the highest possible levels of employment.

[Leave granted; Bill 205 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Red Deer-South.

Bill 206
Alberta Family Institute Act

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 206, the Alberta Family Institute Act.

The intent of this institution, Mr. Speaker, is to reinforce the family unit here in Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 206 read a first time]

Bill 207
Alberta Plus Corporation Act

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to request leave to introduce Bill 207, being the Alberta Plus Corporation Act.

Mr. Speaker, if this Bill is passed, it will provide a mechanism, the Alberta Plus Corporation, to ensure that major developments of provincial resources go ahead, with full and maximum benefit to the people of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 207 read a first time]

Bill 208
An Act to Amend the Municipal Taxation Act

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 208, An Act to Amend the Municipal Taxation Act.

Mr. Speaker, if this were passed, it would have municipalities do an annual assessment on property at current market value.

[Leave granted; Bill 208 read a first time]

Bill 209
Loan and Trust Corporation
Conflict of Interest Act

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 209, the Loan and Trust Corporation Conflict of Interest Act.

This Act would regulate conflict of interest and self-dealing in Alberta's financial industry.

[Leave granted; Bill 209 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Vegreville.

Bill 210
Mid-winter Holiday Act

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 210, the Mid-winter Holiday Act, for first reading.

Mr. Speaker, this Act would establish a new statutory holiday on the third Friday in February. Based on our recent Olympic experience showing us just how much fun we can have in February, and recognizing also that a well rested and healthy work force is a productive work force, I propose this Bill to help beat the blues and dissipate the doldrums of a long midwinter.

MR. SPEAKER: One would hope we could have fun every day.

[Leave granted; Bill 210 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Lethbridge-West.

Bill 211
Children's Access Rights Enforcement Act

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 211, the Children's Access Rights Enforcement Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps more tragic than to realize that children of broken marriages are having difficulties having access to both parents. The purpose of this Bill would be to provide, where the court has ordered, that access rights be given to the noncustodial parent, that steps would be taken to see that indeed those rights were enforced.

[Leave granted; Bill 211 read a first time]

Bill 212
An Act to Amend the Emblems of Alberta Act

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 212, An Act to Amend the Emblems of Alberta Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, if passed, would designate the Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep as the official mammal of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 212 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Vegreville.

Bill 213
Mid-winter Holiday Name Act

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, Bill 213, the Mid-winter Holiday Name Act.

This Bill sets out the procedures for the holding of a contest among Albertans to choose a name for the new holiday created by the Mid-winter Holiday Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 213 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

Bill 215
An Act to Amend the
Mortgage Brokers Regulation Act

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 215, being An Act to Amend the Mortgage Brokers Regulation Act.

The Bill would simply strike out the clause in section 2 of the Mortgage Brokers Regulation Act which exempts members of the Law Society of Alberta from those provisions of the Act regulating the vending of mortgages.

[Leave granted; Bill 215 read a first time]

Bill 216
An Act to Amend the Jury Act

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 216, An Act to Amend the Jury Act.

This Act would allow for consideration by a court to compensate jurors who may suffer considerable loss of income by fulfilling his or her obligation and desires to participate in our judicial system when required or requested to do so.

[Leave granted; Bill 216 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-North West.

Bill 217
An Act to Amend the Hospitals Act

DR. CASSIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 217, An Act to Amend the Hospitals Act, which proposes that a hospital district be established in any area with two or more hospitals.

[Leave granted; Bill 217 read a first time]

Bill 219
An Act to Amend the Land Titles Act

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 219, An Act to Amend the Land Titles Act.

The Bill would require every person owning land in Alberta to declare by July 1, 1989, whether or not they are a Canadian citizen or whether or not they live in Alberta or Canada or elsewhere. The registrar of land titles would file an annual report with the Assembly regarding foreign ownership of Alberta land.

[Leave granted; Bill 219 read a first time]

Bill 220
An Act to Amend the Insurance Act

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 220, An Act to Amend the Insurance Act.

This Bill will amend chapter I-5 of the *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980*. A new section will forbid the use of age and sex as determinants for insurance premiums and establish those factors which may be considered in a schedule of rates filed with the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board.

[Leave granted; Bill 220 read a first time]

Bill 223
Disabled Parking Act

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder, I request leave to introduce Bill 223, the Disabled Parking Act.

The Bill requires every operator of a parking lot to set aside a number of stalls for use by disabled individuals and makes it an offence for a person who is not disabled to park in them.

[Leave granted; Bill 223 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Bill 222
An Act to Amend the Labour Relations Act

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 222, An Act to Amend the Labour Relations Act.

This Bill would repeal the section of the Labour Relations Act which presently prohibits hospital employees from striking. The Bill also sets out rules whereby some of those employees governed by a collective agreement could be subject to an essential service designation as established in the collective agreement.

[Leave granted; Bill 222 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Bill 225
Retail Business Holidays Act

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Retail Business Holidays Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to require most commercial enterprises with a sales and display area of greater than 220 square metres to be closed on statutory holidays, including Sundays. The Bill provides for a series of exemptions, principally in the tourism and personal services trade. As well, the Bill provides for a business to remain open on a Sunday if it is closed the immediately preceding Saturday.

[Leave granted; Bill 225 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

Bill 4
Energy Resources Conservation
Amendment Act, 1988

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 4, the Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1988.

This Bill adjusts the timing of installment payments from the Treasurer to the ERCB, provides for records retention consistent with practices in other governmental agencies, and provides a mechanism for enforcement of local intervenors' costs.

[Leave granted; Bill 4 read a first time]

Bill 3
Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1988

MR. FISCHER: It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to introduce Bill 3, the Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1988.

This Bill includes minor changes to the Livestock and Live-stock Products Act as well as the Dairy Board Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 read a first time]

Bill 2
Homestead Lease Loan Repeal Act

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 2, Homestead Lease Loan Repeal Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bills 2, 3, and 4 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders for second reading.

[Motion carried]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. JOHNSTON: I would like to file with the Legislative Assembly the Public Accounts for the province of Alberta for the year ended March 31, 1987. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would file a copy of the annual report of the department of Alberta Treasury for the same fiscal year-end.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1987 annual report of the Legal Aid Society of Alberta.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 18(1) of the Auditor General Act, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Auditor General for the year 1986-87. At the same time, I would like to table the report of Chief Electoral Officer on the Chinook by-election held on Monday, November 23, 1987. Copies of both of these reports have been distributed to all members.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the annual report of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation for the year ended March 31, 1987.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to table the following reports: number one, pursuant to section 19(5) of the Legislative Assem-

bly Act, Members' Services orders 1 through 6, 1988; secondly, pursuant to Standing Order 110, the annual report of *Alberta Hansard*; and three, pursuant to the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, the annual report of the office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, some very special people situated in your gallery. These are six students who are winners of the essay and poster contest held during Municipal Involvement Week in 1987 and their parents, grandparents, and friends who accompany them.

They were asked to write essays or do posters on the topic of telling us why their council is important to them and have contributed much by fulfilling that responsibility. I'd ask them to stand as I read their names in the gallery: first, Kim Vandermeer and Mr., and Mrs. Vandermeer, her parents, and her brother Darren; Randy Coutts from Slave Lake; Colby Lieveise, his mother Mrs. Lieveise, from Beaverlodge; Melissa Thoreson, her mother, grandparents, and Mr. and Mrs. Enders of Wembley, Alberta; Betty Unrau and her father, Mr. Unrau, from La Crete, Alberta; and Gwen Elias from La Crete, Alberta, accompanied by her father, Mr. Elias. I would ask them now to all stand and receive the thanks of this Assembly for their contribution and a warm welcome here today.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature, 28 grade 10 students from the Assumption school in the town of Grande Centre. They're accompanied today by their social studies teacher Mr. Seb Stang, two parents Romeo LeFebvre and Guy David, both of the town of Cold Lake, and bus driver Ray Perepeletza. They're seated in the members' gallery, and I'd ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to make two introductions to you and the members this afternoon. First I'd like to introduce some 26 grade 6 students from Satoo school in the constituency of Edmonton-Mill Woods. They are seated in the members' gallery, accompanied by their teacher David Fairfield and parents Mrs. Jan Coan, Mrs. Cathy Hnatiuk, as well as Miss Angela Williams. I'd ask them to please stand and receive the very warm welcome of the members.

Mr. Speaker, seated in the public gallery there are 55 students, accompanied by their teachers, from Meyokumin elementary school, from the grade 6 class. They are accompanied by Mr. Eldon Wyman, Mrs. Wendy Troock, and Mr. Vlad Eshenko, the assistant principal of the school. I'd ask them to please stand and receive the warm welcome of the House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Social Programs

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the Premier. Last Thursday the Deputy Premier indicated that the so-called universality of programs is going to be targeted. On Friday we asked the Deputy Premier. He's a little more subdued, and we're not sure what he means now, so what we want to do is ask the Premier to take this opportunity to clear up the confusion and indicate whether the Deputy Premier was re-

fleeting government policy when he said, and I quote: "We will be getting away from the universal aspect that has been so long attached to social programs."

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I reviewed *Hansard* when this matter was discussed on Friday, and I thought the Deputy Premier answered very clearly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, you're probably the only one in Alberta who believes that, but that doesn't surprise me from this government. My question to this Premier, because this statement was made and many Albertans are concerned: will the Premier indicate which social programs have been targeted by this government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that also was discussed on Friday and, again, answered by the Deputy Premier.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, this is what we expect from this government. They make a statement outside, and then they will not come back in the House.

Now, we went back and saw this beautiful document from the Progressive Conservative Party. You know, the new-right republicanism. My question flowing from that, where they talk about priorities for government services and that programs should be established on the basis of responding to the greatest needs and should take into consideration the financial circumstances of the individuals affected: would the Premier confirm what they mean, that there will be spending cuts in social programs which will hurt average- and middle-income people? Is this not the new agenda of this government, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GETTY: That will not happen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Would he explain, then, what his government -- it has his name on it -- what they mean by that statement? In fact, will he also explain what we mean when the Deputy Premier says that we're moving away from universality? Explain what is meant to the people in this Assembly.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as the Deputy Premier said on Friday, the paper will be introduced in the House, and all members will have a chance to express their views on it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Surely the Premier must notice that with all the cut and fill and the changing of opinions that goes on over there and the attack often made on the universality of programs, the public's concerned. To say that they're going to table it is not a good enough answer. When will that Bill be tabled? When will it be tabled?

MR. GETTY: First of all, it's not a Bill, Mr. Speaker, it's a paper. That document will be tabled at the appropriate time.

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

Loan Guarantees

MR. MARTIN: Maybe we can get some more answers, Mr. Speaker, because this has already happened. The government, in a time of restraint, recently stunned Albertans by announcing

that they were prepared to advance \$12 million in cash to that great free enterpriser Peter Pocklington. At the same time, the government announced it will authorize further loan guarantees of another \$55 million. This is only the taxpayers taking the risk. My question to the Premier is: why did this so-called free enterprise government give this so-called free enterpriser this taxpayers' generosity?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter that's handled by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and I would ask him to respond. [Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, please. [interjections] Order please.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the importance to the provincial economy of improving our capability of value-adding and food processing is well known, particularly to our primary producers and also to most members of the Assembly. In providing support to companies in Alberta, including Gainers and others like Cargill, XL, Fletcher's, and others, it is a continuation of the government's recognition of the importance of being able to market our food products in a processed form throughout North America and the Pacific Rim. The loan guarantee and the loan which will be provided to Gainers over a period of three years is consistent with that policy.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, isn't this an interesting version of free enterprise in Alberta? The rich and the powerful get loan guarantees, and we have cutbacks in education and the rest of the things.

My question, then, to the minister of economic development -- I'd love to have that \$55 million, where the taxpayers take all the risk, and if any profits are made, then a person like Mr. Pocklington will get it -- what specific guarantees and detailed performance guarantees has the government demanded, that they will in fact create jobs? Is it just across the board, do what you want with it, or are there specific guarantees?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, we would welcome an application from the hon. member to process agricultural products, and we're prepared to consider him. [interjections] What was the second part of the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Hon. minister, we'll have it with the next. Supplementary question, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, yes; the agreement is a very rigid agreement that involves an undertaking by Gainers to build a new hog processing plant in southern Alberta and to expand and upgrade the beef processing plant in northern Alberta. Many producers have spoken both to the Minister of Agriculture, the associate minister, and other MLAs with respect to the importance of having that capacity to process our beef in northern Alberta as well as increased capacity to process pork in southern Alberta. These are the two main expansion areas that were included in the agreement with Gainers.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what they talked about, but would the minister not confirm that there are no performance guarantees? There is absolutely no obligation for Mr. Pocklington to do this. We handed him \$55 million dollars in

loan guarantees and said, "Do what you want."

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I've dealt with the question, and that isn't accurate. There is an undertaking to do both of those that I have described to members of the Assembly. Certain conditions, of course, have to be in place. One of them, which I've spoken of earlier, is that the available hog supply must be here. There's no doubt in our mind that with our Crow offset program and the consistently low prices we've experienced, there will be and has been an increase in hog production, and we would much sooner see those hogs processed in Alberta than moved live into the U.S. or British Columbia.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely unbelievable. "Fifty-five million dollars; away you go. Maybe if the hog market is there and you can make a profit, we'll get some of it back." My question to this minister is, because this is such a sweetheart deal: will he table this whole contract with Mr. Pocklington here in the Assembly so that we can take a look at it?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the choice of words of the hon. leader is unfortunate. It is not a sweetheart deal. It is a loan guarantee for which the taxpayers receive a fee, and the \$12 million loan, which will be drawn down over three years, is at 9.6 percent, which is .6 percent higher than the loans we're providing to farmers and to small businessmen. So I don't know where the hon. member is coming from with respect to its being a sweetheart deal. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Little Bow, if we can get through the back chat, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister of economic development, and it's with regards to the guidelines for this type of a loan or a loan guarantee program. Would the minister indicate what are the guidelines? And could the minister as well table the guidelines for such a program so that other entrepreneurs in the province may have access to the same type of opportunity?

MR. SHABEN: In responding to the second question of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I had indicated that we have on previous occasions provided support to companies that are prepared to value-add in Alberta. In southern Alberta, for example, XL Food received a loan guarantee plus an interest deficiency guarantee over five years. In the case of Cargill, also in southern Alberta, there is an agreement to provide capital support for the development of a new project there. In the case of Fletcher's we provided support to the farmers to pay off a portion of the loan on the purchase of the plant. Our programs respond to the specific requirements of a project. Each one is different, and we would respond in an appropriate way to those who plan to do things in Alberta and not just talk about it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to learn that there are no guidelines. But I'd like to go back to the Premier, because he answered the original question. In view of the sweetheart deal the Premier must have been over a barrel. Was it by any chance any promise or agreement for a loan or a guarantee he made when they settled the Gainers strike?

MR. GETTY: What rubbish, Mr. Speaker. Actually, I'll tell

you one guideline, and that is that this government is turning this economy around and diversifying the economy in this province, and the timid types like him, whether they like it or not. . . [interjections] You haven't seen anything yet.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Vermilion-Viking, finally.

DR. WEST: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Provincial Treasurer. In a normal lending practice there is always protection given to the moneys by the lender. In this case it would be the people of Alberta. Could you indicate what steps have been taken to protect their interests in a normal procedure such as a loan or a loan guarantee?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of record, as the minister of economic development has explained, that a full covenant has been taken against all assets under Gainers or Gainers Properties companies to ensure that (a) we have proper security and (b) that in fact our charge against the property is one of the first and, finally, that we have a floating charge against all of their assets that may be from time to time encumbered by our loan guarantee.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

Daishowa Pulp Mill

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Daishowa pulp mill that is in process in the Peace River country seems to have been rushed through, an almost unseemly rush. The environmental impact study was filed on December 15, and a scant six weeks later the plant has its approval. Then yesterday we heard the minister of career development, who has one of the departments that should have had input into whether the Daishowa plant had indeed desired all the hurdles, and the minister said that, yes, he had worked on the permission part. My question is to the minister of career development. Could he file in the House what report he gave the Department of the Environment remarking upon the Daishowa environmental impact study?

MR. ORMAN: If he'd like to put it on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to consider it.

MR. TAYLOR: I think I caught him with his lottery down, Mr. Speaker.

The second question, then, is to the Attorney General. Certainly the Attorney General, who is in charge of negotiating with the Lubicon in the area, must have had some input after the environmental impact study had been filed December 15. In that six-week period could the Attorney General inform the House what input he made on this project, and would he be able to file his report or his letters on that?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I took part in discussions relative to this matter. The negotiations, of course, now being carried on regrettably are not directly with the Lubicon Band because they refuse to negotiate with the province at this stage. We're hoping that will change. But the fact is that the negotiations have been carried on with the federal government and with two negotiators, one appointed by myself on behalf of the government in the late fall of last year and one by the federal government at just about the same time, prior to our appointment of the negotiator.

Certainly the question of whether or not the land associated with the Lubicon claim would in any way be impacted upon by the Daishowa project was reviewed by my colleague the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, and that was made known and thoroughly assessed in the process.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. The first two questions really are somewhat of a violation of *Beauchesne* 360(2), limitations:

A question may not . . .

- (2) seek information about matters which are in their nature secret, such as decisions or proceedings of Cabinet.

So just a careful warning.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order -- maybe we could take it up later -- this was not secret. This was a hearing at which the departments were invited to make their information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on.

MR. TAYLOR: But obviously all the gobbledygook from the Attorney General means that he wasn't consulted. At least if he was, he had such a great effect that they forgot all about it when they announced the project.

This question, then, is to the Minister of the Environment. Was the minister aware that in his own files, when the Daishowa environmental impact study was filed, there is a report by a Dr. Hawkes in 1976 that says quite clearly that the Japanese experience in the 1960s said the kraft pulp method of dealing with making pulp caused deaths and abnormal illnesses in people with lung diseases? Was he aware that that report was in the files?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think it's probably in order to clarify for the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon just a little more fact with respect to this matter. Several days ago he raised an original question with it, and perhaps we should just clarify some of the dates in question.

It was on October 19, 1987, that we requested that Daishowa prepare and submit an environmental impact assessment. That came about after a series of discussions that occurred in 1987. That EIA report was submitted on December 18, and supporting appendices then were provided to us on January 4, 1988. Alberta Environment then referred to various other agencies of the provincial government and, in fact, to the federal government the environmental impact assessment. That environmental impact assessment report is currently under review. We recently requested, in the first part of February, additional information from Daishowa with respect to this project, and I think it should be very clear that we are in an ongoing way receiving additional information from Daishowa. We've received no application for permits or licences under the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act, although we anticipate they will be coming.

But perhaps the most important aspect of all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that during 1987 when we discussed this matter with Daishowa, we insisted that we should have a new, environmentally sound instrument called oxygen delignification attached to

the Daishowa plant. That eliminates the production and the usage of chlorine that the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is talking about. The report he talks about, dated 1976, may very well have been current in 1976. But this is now March 1988, and I should point out that oxygen delignification has now become the methodology of usage at Daishowa. It's state of the art, the most sophisticated to be found in the world.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the report is from 1976, but there has been no proof at all to show that the modern method, supposedly, is any different from the old one. So how can this minister say there is no necessity for public hearings when Daishowa had no public hearings in the Lubicon area and he himself has a report in his files saying it could be, it's possible, that pulmonary diseases would affect the band that has already been stricken with TB in the last year?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, this is March 1988. The report that the member is talking about is dated 1976.

I took the advice last fall of the opposition in doing a little traveling, getting outside of Alberta, and one of those trips took me to Germany where I had a great opportunity to meet with federal environmental officials in Germany who had indirect consultations with the people of Sweden. As you'll recall, a year ago members of at least one of the opposition parties said: "Kowalski, get out of here. Go to Europe. Find out what's going on." Well, I did it, and I came back. I'm very, very confident in my mind that the new methodologies that are being used, state-of-the-art equipment being used in various parts of the world, will provide oxygen delignification equipment not only for us at Daishowa, but we've also been very successful in negotiating that for the new Champion expansion. There's no question in my mind that this is the best equipment currently available in the world, and that could be tested by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

Mr. Speaker, it's erroneous, I suppose, that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is once again saying, "Why were there no public meetings at the Daishowa site?" The Daishowa site is 16 kilometres or nearly 10 miles away from the town of Peace River. If the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is unhappy that a meeting was not held at the Daishowa site, which has nothing there -- there is not a room, not a hotel, not a motel, not a meeting hall . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order, order.

Additional supplementaries on this question, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think one issue has been seriously overlooked here, and that is that the government has obviously known for nearly 50 years that some of the lands might be considered natural lands by the Lubicon. Can the Attorney General please explain why it is that he didn't have somebody in his department -- once he got wind of the whole plant, the notion of it and plans for it -- pick up the phone and phone the band to talk to them about it?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the regrettable fact -- and I mentioned this earlier -- is that up until the initiative that was undertaken by our Premier relative to a direct contact with the chief, the band has been refusing to discuss with the government of Alberta the subject of negotiating their claim. [interjections] Well, the chatter that goes on across the way is indicative of the

attention that is being paid to this matter in a serious way by the opposition parties. That's regrettable, but nonetheless, I will . . . [interjections] Well, that's fine. If you don't want to listen, I'll sit down. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Nevertheless, throughout both Friday and today -- all hon. members might think in terms of looking at Standing Order 13(4). It would be kind of useful.

Agricultural Strategy

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. A group in Canada based out of Ottawa and possibly western Canada, called the Agricultural International Development Associates of Canada, wants to buy land in western Canada and supposedly assist our farming enterprises here in the west. I would like to ask the minister: is the minister aware of this company, and if so, will the company share in the equity financing proposals that are being contemplated by the minister as indicated on page 12 of *Hansard* Friday last?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the group. They came in to see me last summer, and I listened politely, as I do to all citizens who come to my office. You're lucky I have to give a government opinion because if I gave a personal one of the former Minister of Agriculture, it would not be allowed to be printed in *Hansard*.

We're certainly willing to look at all positive suggestions which would assist Alberta farmers in their financial situations, but in terms of the equity opportunities I mentioned on page 12 of *Hansard*, we're looking at Alberta opportunities.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether the funding for this organization is coming partly from government, and is there any intention of the government of Alberta to become involved with them in terms of direct loans or in terms of making ADC land which is now in the hands of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation available to them for purchase?

MRS. CRIPPS: Absolutely not.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether she is aware of the funding for this group? Is it Canadian funding, or is it international funding?

MRS. CRIPPS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether this company is establishing in Alberta? Have they given notice to the minister that they will establish here and want the co-operation of the government of Alberta?

MRS. CRIPPS: The company indicated they were going to establish in Canada and were looking at Alberta as a positive opportunity.

One of the reasons a number of companies are looking at equity financing, Mr. Speaker, is because of Black Friday. Private investment is now interested in agricultural land. Over the long term agricultural land has been a solid investment. It reduces inflationary risk, and there are a number of

businesspeople interested in agricultural investment in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary back to the Provincial Treasurer. Yesterday I guess I didn't ask the question clearly enough, and the Treasurer slipped out the back door on me. It was with respect to whether the Provincial Treasurer viewed the options the report suggested of financing and vendor financing, whether the Provincial Treasurer is contemplating changing the income tax rules in such a way that interest derived from money by investors in agricultural funding will get a better tax rate than interest derived from other types of loans.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the same answer as I gave on Friday: no.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, to the associate minister. In view of the several hundred quarter sections of land that the ADC now holds title to, can she give this House and Albertans the assurance that the government will not entertain efforts from groups as outlined by the Member for Little Bow and sell large portions of that land to single interests like a private land bank or corporate interests?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the ADC holds around 800 quarters of land, which is made up of about 300 parcels, i.e. farms. We would not anticipate selling that land to one or two individual operators. We expect that land to move back into the agricultural sector. It's moving on a regular basis. That's part of the instructions I had from caucus in terms of dealing with the Options and Opportunities report.

Pollution of Rivers

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. In view of the recent attention that's been brought to the topic of dioxins in rivers in North America, I was wondering if the minister would give us an indication of the status of dioxin pollution in the rivers in Alberta.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, we're talking about tracing something that's very, very difficult to trace. I cannot conclusively say at the moment that there are dioxins in the waterways of our province, nor can I conclusively say that there are not dioxins in the waterways of our province. What we've been doing and what we initiated last year in 1987 with all the ministers of the environment in the country of Canada -- and members will recall that I tabled a document in the Legislature called Dioxins and Furans from a Canadian Perspective -- is attempting to find an international protocol that would basically allow us to identify a proportionate amount of dioxins in any particular volume. We're looking for a very, very minute trace, usually one part per quadrillion, and one part per quadrillion would be a one and 15 zeros after it. To give yourself an equivalency, Mr. Speaker, it would be roughly trying to find a dollar bill someplace in the area of Canada.

There is not a conclusive, internationally sound or recognized protocol that we can use to measure. Notwithstanding that, there are some instruments that are available, and we can get some tentative results from that. We're in the process of getting such information, but even when we do, there is some debate whether or not we'll really know what it means.

DR. ELLIOTT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would this imply then that we don't have a way of checking what's happening at the docks and, say, downstream on a river from existing pulp mills such as the one we have in Grande Prairie?

MR. KOWALSKI: No, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't. Last fall we took 24 water samples, and we have the water samples located in Alberta Environment's department just a block or two away. Before too long I'll be sending some of these samples to Wright State University in Ohio where there is a basis in terms of defining some type of criteria to identify what a dioxin is or what the level of it is. Recently the government of Saskatchewan took some fish samples, and the Minister of the Environment in Saskatchewan recently issued a statement that basically said that in the results of their analysis of fish collected from the North Saskatchewan River near Prince Albert there is not a health hazard with respect to dioxins. In addition to that, we're actively pursuing a definition or a standard or an international protocol, so that when we do have the samples evaluated everybody will agree that the identification means something.

DR. ELLIOTT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the department have any procedures then, when they're negotiating with present pulp mills or the future pulp mills that have been announced with respect to what precautions might be taken?

MR. KOWALSKI: Earlier in question period, Mr. Speaker, I alluded to the fact and the existence of oxygen delignification equipment that's now in place with respect to the proposal for Daishowa. I also pointed out that in terms of the discussion with Champion at Hinton, Champion in terms of its expansion program will introduce and put in as part of its plant, oxygen delignification equipment. You will recall that various members of the opposition were suggesting that we might deal with that last year. Those are basically the two plants that in essence would deal with that in the province. There's one other, and that's Procter & Gamble at Grande Prairie. Procter & Gamble currently does not have oxygen delignification equipment, but we would advise them that when they come back to us for a licence upgrading, one of the items we will be putting on the table is the need for oxygen delignification equipment at Procter & Gamble.

The estimate right now is that that equipment might be as high as \$45 million for one plant, Procter & Gamble, and the other two plants and major firms are currently under way. Millar Western and Alberta Newsprint in Whitecourt will not use this, because they're using chemi-thermal mechanical pulping processes that don't use chlorine and there are no dioxins formed as a result of it.

DR. ELLIOTT: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister's department have a strategy with other jurisdictions with respect to pollution problems with our rivers flowing through our province or into another?

MR. KOWALSKI: The only major river that flows into our province is the Peace River. All other rivers basically originate in the Rocky Mountains and flow out of our province. There is no interprovincial agreement in terms of water apportionment or water management on the Peace River. There never has been one, but in the last year we've begun negotiations with a pretty positive government now in British Columbia that is prepared to sit down with us and talk to us about an apportionment agree-

ment. Hopefully, if all goes well, we'll be able to solve such an instrument within two years from now. Mr. Speaker, all other major rivers that flow through Alberta and flow out of Alberta are governed by apportionment agreements with the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. Considering that the federal Environment department got results back in six days on samples they took in B.C., could the minister guarantee that he will have some results back from the samples he took last fall and that he will do an EIA that includes a risk assessment of dioxin danger before he permits the go-ahead of the Daishowa plant?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt at all about the ability to get back a result from testing for dioxins. The difficulty is that the scientific community still has not agreed on what the protocol is or what the definition means. So on the one hand you can get a result back, but if two different scientists disagree with it. . . . Is it one part per quadrillion, which is one part out of one with 15 zeros behind it? Somebody else says, "Well no, that's dangerous, but you could have 20 parts per quadrillion." I can't even understand what a million is, never mind a quadrillion. I think it's extremely important that all of us have a definition that the scientific community will agree to. Is it important if it's 20 parts per quadrillion, or is it important if it's 30 parts per quadrillion? Because the last thing in the world we want to have is nonsensical debate with two people arguing about what it really means. We want to make sure we can protect our environment, but in order to do that we have to have knowledge with respect to the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for St. Albert, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Labour Legislation

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today -- the initial one at least -- go to the Premier. In view of the fact that the construction industry has had an absence of collective agreements for almost four and a half years now and that this absence of collective agreements was created by a lack of decent labour legislation, specifically when it came to this government allowing for 25-hour lockouts, could the Premier tell us whether or not he supports what his Minister of Labour brought to this Assembly last year by way of Bill 53? Do the Premier and this government support the Minister of Labour's initiative in Bill 53 to re-establish collective agreements in the construction industry?

MR. GETTY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the whole House passed the piece of legislation and obviously had our support.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Premier for his answer. It's been a lot better than what we've seen in this Legislature in the past.

This is a supplementary to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour introduced Bill 53, could that Minister of Labour tell us why he has delayed the process of Bill 53 bargaining?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think the parties have delayed the

progress.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, that simply isn't the case, and I'd like to ask a supplementary to the Minister of Labour. Why, when Bill 53 contains a disputes resolution tribunal, did you as a Minister of Labour in the province of Alberta move away from the process and appoint a disputes inquiry board rather than a disputes resolution tribunal under Bill 53?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member was present in the Alberta Room in Government House the middle of last September when I addressed this issue with the two federations. At that time I made perfectly clear to both federations what I had said previously: that the provisions in Bill 53, the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act, where it mentions the formation of the arbitration board, whatever you want to call it -- those provisions were not in any way intended to impose upon a major industry an agreement. Those provisions were included in the statute so that in the event of a small item in the general part of the agreement or perhaps one of the smaller tables dealing with the subsidiary parts of an agreement, in the event that that was stopping all the progress when the rest had been agreed to, there was a way of settling the dispute and attaining a total agreement, the master agreement as it's called. That was made amply clear to both parties last September. I have repeated that on many occasions, and I am repeating it again today so the hon. member will finally understand what was said to him some six months ago.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Labour. This minister has turned around and asked repeatedly from both bargaining federations why bargaining was stalemated. The minister got the answers. I have to ask the minister: in his latest recommendation when he directed the bargaining to recommence between the federations, why did he not put some specific guidelines in his recommendation to the parties to see some end point to the negotiation procedure under Bill 53?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting in the same room and the same building I told both federations that I was very disappointed with the progress that had been made. After all, it is the responsibility of those parties to negotiate a collective agreement. In some six months very little of any use has been achieved. One has to remember that this legislation was developed in full consultation with both parties and with the construction owners. In other words, they have failed to utilize legislation that was produced with their close involvement to achieve collective agreements.

I believe part of the problem is the makeup of the federations, and for that reason the primary responsibility of the disputes inquiry board will be to develop recommendations to me on changes that should be made to those federations so they will work better and they will achieve a collective agreement. If they don't achieve all of it, if there are small items left over, then it is conceivable that arbitration will be used, but it will not be used to impose a total agreement upon the industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Assistance for Small Business

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to

the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. The throne speech emphasized the government's commitment to providing small business with viable approaches to funding through AOC. How is this commitment consistent with AOC's paltry \$1.3 million in venture capital support for small business last year?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the number referred to by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark is for the start-up year for AOC. In the current year -- that is, the year ending March 31, 1988 -- I fully expect that Alberta Opportunity Company will make available to Alberta companies between \$10 million and \$15 million of venture capital. So they have responded very well to the request of the government to move from a provider of debt financing to one of providing creative financing.

MR. MITCHELL: It's still not a very significant amount in light of the hundreds of millions of dollars that are going to large businesses.

Why is AOC putting so little emphasis on support for manufacturing enterprise, only \$3.2 million in the last reported year?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, Alberta Opportunity Company does not control the applicants who approach them for financing. The corporation responds to the applications. In the past couple of years the activity level of AOC has been very high, and the percentage of loans provided to companies based on the application numbers has been a good percentage.

I don't get involved, nor do any elected members, in the work of the Alberta Opportunity Company. It functions under a board of directors of private citizens, businessmen and women from around the province who give direction to the administration. I think those private citizens have done a very good job in directing the activities of the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. MITCHELL: Why is AOC putting so little emphasis on support for new small businesses, only \$4 million in the last reported year?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the tremendous importance of small business to our economy and of the number of jobs that are created by small business. In fact, during 1987 there were 17,000 new business incorporations in Alberta. The majority of them find their financing through banks and trust companies and through a variety of vehicles, and not all choose to use government agencies. The activity level of small business is very good in Alberta, and it continues to be the primary creator of jobs and continues to be the target area for the Department of Economic Development and Trade, the Department of Technology, Research and Telecommunications, and the Department of Tourism in terms of our support to economic activity.

MR. MITCHELL: Granted that it is such an important part of our economic development, could the minister please explain how he finds acceptable that only 388 small business projects were supported by the Alberta Opportunity Company last year?

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, recently in speaking to and with a lot of small businessmen, the comments I've received on the small business term assistance program have been very positive. We provided initially three-quarters of a billion dollars to small businesses at 9 percent, and the take-up, as the hon. member would remember, was so great that we had to increase the amount to more than a billion dollars. The businesses that are talking to us say that the benefits of having 9 percent fixed rate financing over 10 years have been tremendous in their capacity to add employees and to expand their business. So there are vehicles other than Alberta Opportunity Company responding to the needs of Alberta small business.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In light of the fact that we're speaking of venture capital, can the minister indicate if the Alberta small business equity corporation program is going to continue and if it is going to be enhanced?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the SBEC program has created over 350 pools of equity financing, and to date those small investor pools have not completed their investments. We're monitoring it very closely, and should a new program appear to be beneficial or a modified program require development, we're watching it very closely. We're also looking at other ways of improving access to seed capital, and that activity is going on in co-operation with a number of departments in government.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier the minister was asked about \$67 million in loans and loan guarantees to one company, that being Gainers. I wonder if the minister could estimate for the Legislature how many small businesses could have been helped and how many jobs created in Alberta by small business if they had had access to that \$67 million.

MR. SHABEN: Hypothetical.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a point of order right at the start of this spring session, which you may choose to rule on. I refer to *Beauchesne* 359(2), in which we're told that a supplementary question should have no preamble. I believe that's in the clearest of language for even those of us without Harvard degrees to understand. I also appreciate the fact that you have allowed us in previous times, through your graciousness, to have a little bit of liberty on this and squeeze out a phrase or two before a supplementary. You've properly allowed that, I think, because you recognize for some members this allows a bit of steam to be let off -- steam being a form of gas -- and if we were not able to do that, some members might properly hurt themselves. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe today the Blues will show that the Leader of the Opposition, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and also the temporary leader from Westlock-Sturgeon took extreme liberties in their supplementaries, even to the place of quoting from other sources at length, at extreme length, deviating somewhat from their scriptwriters'

questions and quoting from other sources, which took a considerable amount of time from this House.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this up not in any way to question your good judgment but rather to reinforce our appreciation of the fact that you allow us some small liberty and to encourage you and assure you that you will not offend any reasonable member of this House in coming down on us when we go to such extremes as we've seen today.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona, on the point of order.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To that point of order, it's regrettable that the Member for Red Deer-North just didn't go back one word, and it's only a monosyllabic word. It's regrettable that he didn't go back that one word to read "should need no preamble." The member said that the section says "need no preamble." If he had gone back just a very short space, he would realize there is some latitude for a preamble.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: That was my point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order as raised by the Member for Red Deer-North is indeed one that I know many members within the House have thought about from time to time, that it's a reminder that needs to be given to the House as a whole. Indeed, there's been some considerable latitude given to *Beauchesne* 359(2), and the length of question inevitably invites the length of answer. So that's another matter of concern for all members of the House as well.

I'm certain the House might be interested that on Friday the House was able to deal with 35 questions -- not 35 subjects; 35 questions -- and today we've been able to deal with 38. Nevertheless, for today we have at least four other members who wish to get into question period. Indeed, if we had briefer supplementaries and perhaps briefer answers on occasion, we might be able to get through more of the questions members want to raise in terms of the House, because question period is not strictly the sole prerogative of the leaders of the political parties that are in the House.

So again I take note of the issue as raised and would read into the record again 359(2):

The question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble.

Certainly we don't need to have members saying "Thank you" to ministers for their answer, but let's assume that "thank yous" are in order and just keep carrying on and let's get the questions out.

Thank you.

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

Moved by Mrs. Mirosh:

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: Mr. Martin]

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise and speak on the Speech from the Throne, and I will probably not be as complimentary as the two previous speakers. What I would like to say first of all is to welcome back, at first official chance, you as the Speaker of the Assembly and our first admonishment. I consider the source, so I know you had to react to it, but we consider the source and we're always brief on this side.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to say about the original two speeches and the Speech from the Throne is that there is a classic example, I expect, of seeing things through rose-coloured glasses. In other words, it seems to me that this government is blinded and sees things as it would like to see them. In other words, you look at the Speech from the Throne. I was looking for some bold new direction we'd see from this government, because we're told now that we have a bold new leader and, boy, he's really going to go out and change the direction. Well, I understand that speeches from the throne are deliberately vague. We all understand that, that when we look at the budget, it fills in the details. But I've never seen a Speech from the Throne that didn't talk about anything new. These were all announcements we'd heard before. They were all sort of platitudes about how things are so great in Alberta, that this government has been absolutely perfect. There's not a single problem left in the province. If we just read the Speech from the Throne, everything is going along so well that perhaps we don't even need the Legislature to debate any of the issues.

I have never seen a Speech from the Throne that didn't give any direction at all about what the government was attempting to do or was going to do in the future, Mr. Speaker. I have to say to this government that you can put on your rose-coloured glasses; you may ignore and try to ignore the reality of what's happening. Not everybody is fortunate enough to get \$67 million, as Mr. Pocklington, from the government. There are a lot of other citizens, Mr. Speaker, that don't find things going along so well in this province. If I may say so, if I may talk just briefly about what's happening in my constituency and perhaps what's happening generally in the inner city in not only Edmonton and Calgary but some of the other cities as well, this is the truth. This is not putting on rose-coloured glasses, Mr. Speaker. This is the reality of what's happening in my particular riding.

I've often talked about how proud I am to represent over the years the riding of Edmonton-Norwood. I've said that it's an interesting part, as far as I'm concerned. I'm sure every member feels that his particular riding is the most interesting part of Alberta, but they're wrong. The most interesting part of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, is Edmonton-Norwood. I've talked about this in a number of ways because of the ethnicity of the area: the small shops and the small restaurants of different ethnic foods. Also, it's very much like a small town in the middle of a city. Those of us who grew up in small towns understand what it's like to know a lot of people in the area. I can assure you that in the riding of Edmonton-Norwood, because of the strong community groups and the strong social action groups, there is that feeling of being a small town. Saying that, Mr. Speaker, I do believe and honestly believe it's the best part of the province to live.

But I want to tell you that in my riding -- and I think I'm speaking for other members -- there is some real suffering, and a lot of it is caused by this government's policies or, if I may put it another way, lack of government policies. Around the inner city -- the Social Planning Council has done a study -- in areas in my riding, we have roughly 30 percent of the people unemployed. Thirty percent in my riding. You tell them to read the Speech from the Throne. You tell them how well things are in the province and how well things are for people and they'll tell you what to do with your Speech from the Throne, I can guarantee you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reality, with that 30 percent unemployed, is that we've had the fastest growing industry in the province in both Calgary and Edmonton and some other towns as well as cities. The fastest growing industry is still the food banks. This has to do very directly, of course, with the high unemployment. We haven't created the jobs this government said they would. But it also has to do with the cutbacks in terms of social services. Now, in fairness, I will acknowledge that one aspect of it, I understand -- we'll see it Thursday -- is that there will be an increase in the food budget. Well, we've been talking about this year after year, Mr. Speaker, especially with the recent cuts, that they were unnecessary and unfair. It's not just the food allowance; it has to do with the living allowance. It has to do with it being below the minimum people can live on in a decent way. For anybody to think that welfare people aren't going to the food banks, that's just not the reality. They're not listening, Mr. Speaker. And that's the reality of what's happening in my riding. I go into the schools. If people that are sitting here are not aware that there is hunger in the schools and poverty in the schools, then again they're not listening. They're not listening to the principals and the teachers in the inner cities. It's not only the inner cities; there's a whole new group of poor, too, moving out into the suburbs.

The reality is that when I talk to the administrators and the teachers in my riding, there are kids -- and many of them -- coming to those schools hungry. I just find it appalling, Mr. Speaker, that in a rich society like this, one that can give \$67 million in loan guarantees to Peter Pocklington, we cannot even have hot lunches in the inner cities for people who are unemployed and single parents. I find that frankly appalling. And I say that's the reality.

What did we do besides cutting back social allowance, Mr. Speaker? In the last one, one of the groups that is coping the best -- and we have many good schools in my area, and principals and people I'm proud of working in there, and there are some very exciting things happening. What we do, though, is cut the community schools that are somehow trying to deal with those needs. They don't have the resources to do it, but some of them are doing it; they're out collecting money or whatever. What do we do when they're doing a good job? "Oh, we can't afford that." We cut the community schools last year by 50 percent. I'm told there will be a slight increase in this budget because we're getting close to an election year. But a lot of the damage is done, Mr. Speaker.

For those of us who don't believe that the inner-city schools . . . If I may say so, I believe -- and the Minister of Social Services is here -- that it's basically the best preventive social service that we have, in the schools. If I may put it this way: it's the last significant-other institution that many of these younger people will ever deal with. Some of them come from very tough backgrounds, and for cases where there are a number of single parents, if they don't get the help they need at the

school situation, they're going to look for it in other ways. Mr. Speaker, it's like the old advertisement that you see on television, having to do with a car: you can pay me now or you can pay me later. And that's the reality.

We can put money into preventive social services, specifically in inner-city education and hot lunches and these sorts of things. We can get the best teachers in there, the caring teachers, and I can assure you that some exciting things happen. I can use one example of a school in my area. When I first went in there after I was elected, it was all that was wrong about inner-city education. It really was quite a miserable place to have to visit. But because we now have a principal that cares and has brought in teachers that care, there are some exciting things going on with those students. They now care about their community; they care about their school. That principal is so proud when he takes you around. In four years that's a different school, and I can see different attitudes occurring there, Mr. Speaker.

But the reality is that it takes money. Like I said, the old advertisement: you can pay me now or you can pay me later. If we don't put money into inner-city education at that level, Mr. Speaker, I guarantee you'll still end up paying it. As has been happening, our welfare rates will go up. We can build more jails. We can provide all the other money that will inevitably come from social breakdown. So it seems to me that even those people that are only worried about money and economics -- over the long haul I can guarantee it is a good bang for the buck to put money in this way.

But the reality is that government hasn't done it. The reality is that when you see cutbacks across the board in education, you see it in some rural areas and you see the results of it the quickest in the inner city. Again, that's the reality. What happens with people *in* the inner city, if I may say so, is that the teachers will burn out very quickly, and they get out of it very quickly. That's what happens in the inner city. I say to this government: that's not in your Speech from the Throne, but that is an absolute reality in terms of my area and, I expect -- I know -- in other areas in the province.

The other interesting thing in my riding, Mr. Speaker, is one of the things back in -- I believe it was 1977. The city was going to try to close down the Sprucewood library. Where do you cut things? All in the inner-city. Maybe they're not going to howl as loud as they do in the suburbs. But the reality was that in this case they did. They fought hard, and they were told, "Well, your circulation is down." Well, obviously people in the inner city need encouragement to use libraries. They've got the circulation doubled now. But now the city is saying that because of the cutbacks in government funding in libraries -- and I'm going to watch this on Thursday very closely -- you may lose your library anyhow, and the Sprucewood library.

Now the parents have banded together again, and they tried to deal with the minister of culture. I tried to get an appointment; he was too busy. So I had parents come in and try to see him; still too busy. I noticed he was okay to be on the television after, though, but he couldn't meet with people. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that they understand. He says, "Well, it's not my decision; it's only the city's decision." It doesn't take a genius to figure out that if there's a cutback in the funding for libraries at the provincial level, it's going to make it very difficult for the cities. And that's the type of response we got from one of these government ministers. I'm appalled by it, and I can assure you that the people in my community are appalled by it. Because all they wanted to do was sit down and explain what was happening

in their library, and they couldn't even get access to the minister to do that. Mr. Speaker, that's the reality that some people are talking about. That's the reality, not what's written in here.

But let me look, if I may, more generally at what's happening in the province. If I may say so, this government is absolutely floundering. Now, I know that they think, "Gee, we make this announcement, that announcement, this loan guarantee for this corporation, that loan guarantee for that corporation," and if the Premier calls Bernard Ominayak, "Why, we're showing new direction." He should have been phoned 10 years ago, but it's nice he got around to it. But then the other two ministers write letters distorting the facts, so all the good that was done is basically gone anyhow, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

But the reality is that we're told now that there's a new Premier going to take charge, a take-charge guy like Ronald Reagan, and we're going to come out with new directions. And this is what we got: this Speech from the Throne. I want to say that the reaction to this particular Speech from the Throne, even from Conservatives -- even from Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, and I understand there are still a couple of them left -- is that they're very, very disappointed. Because all Albertans, I believe, regardless of political stripe, were really looking for a change in direction from the Getty government. What did they get? They got this: a regurgitation of things that have failed in the past. But we're told that we're sure lucky to live in Alberta, we're sure lucky to have a Conservative government and all the things that are going on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. MARTIN: You may agree, because that's why you're not listening. You're not listening to the people of Alberta. They were looking for some fairness and some understanding of their situation from this government, some encouragement from this government, and all they got, as I said, is a regurgitation of things that failed in the past.

But we have, and I'll come back to that, a naive faith in the Mulroney trade deal: it's going to change everything. We're all going to be walking around in gold because we'll have so many jobs that all our wages will go up because of the Mulroney trade deal. Mr. Speaker, people will make up their own minds about the Mulroney trade deal, but people were looking for some specifics and initiative from this government. Maybe I'm being too hard; maybe they're saving all the goodies for the budget. We'll be looking forward to that on Thursday night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're all aware in public life that governments have to make decisions, have to say no from time to time. But I think the question we all have to ask in public life is: what do Albertans want from government? If I may say so, I think it can be categorized in three general areas. I'd like to just briefly go through those, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

What do Albertans want from government? I say that first of all they want honesty. Now, honesty is not just in the personal sense, although obviously that's important. I think all of us, regardless of our political stripe, would recognize that. But what they want is governments and political parties to say honestly what they would do, before an election, and actually do it during an election. Because there is a growing cynicism, Mr. Speaker, that politicians and political parties will say whatever they want to get elected, and then they forget about it. In other

words, I say that they want people to say what they mean and mean what they say.

I want you to go back to the last provincial election, Mr. Speaker. We were told when the government went to the polls that again -- we've heard this many times -- recovery was just around the corner. We were told: "Just elect us. We're a stable business government, and all these things will happen." But do you remember the government and the leader of the Conservative Party saying, "Elect me and we're going to cut education"? No, I didn't hear it. Do you remember them saying, "Elect me and we're going to move towards a two-tiered health care system and try to bring in Bill 14 and remove a lot of services from medicare"? Do you remember them saying that in the election? I certainly don't, Mr. Speaker. Do you remember them saying, "Elect me and in the next budget year we're going to find new ways to tax average people over a billion dollars"? No, I don't recall them saying that. Do you recall them saying, as we now hear, although they're being very vague, "Elect us and we're going to move away from universality in social programs"? I don't recall those election goodies being done. We were told basically that things were okay: "Just elect us, the Conservative government, and we'll continue to go along." Well, that's what I mean about honesty. If you have a right-wing agenda, say it before an election, Mr. Speaker, not after an election. That's what the people of Alberta want.

Mr. Speaker, the second thing that I believe average Albertans want is fairness, some fairness from government. Not that they expect everything, but they do want some fairness for average people. They want a fair taxation system. They can look, especially when they got taxed over a billion dollars in different ways, and find out that certain people don't pay taxes in the province. They can also find that a corporate sector here in Alberta has the best row to hoe of any in Canada. So they resent it. They don't mind paying their fair share of taxes, Mr. Speaker, but average people resent it when they know that the richest and most powerful in society don't pay their fair share. So they're looking for fairness there, and if the government hasn't heard that, they haven't been listening.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that more and more Albertans also want fairness for women. They want to move as quickly as they can towards equality for women. They want to look at a decent and reasonable day care system. They want to look at things like pay equity and not turn their heads back. There's a growing 51 percent of the population who will not put up with unfairness any longer, and this government had better recognize that if they want to be around. They also want fairness for seniors, Mr. Speaker. They want an attack, as I've been talking about, on poverty. Not that it can all be done overnight, but they want fairness in the inner cities, as I was talking about.

And eventually, if this government's listening at all, they want fairness and opportunity for all the business sector and for all people. They don't see this idea of handing out loan guarantees to major corporations like Gainers: Gainers with such a good Alberta record, you know, for the farmers and the working people in this province. Now, that's some sort of free enterprise. The government sets up the loan guarantees; you go out and do what you want, and if you happen to go belly-up, well, the government's going to call. If there happens to be a profit, then the so-called entrepreneur takes it. Now, that's a new twist. I'm sure Adam Smith would find that very interesting, Mr. Speaker. And that's a reality; people are sick and tired of handouts to the government's friends, and then it's free enterprise for everybody else. I've heard about this Gainers thing --

if this government's not listening -- from some major business people and also some small business people, and they find it unfair.

But above all -- and they're all interrelated -- the greatest priority, the highest priority, of a government should be that its top concern should be the welfare of average people. As I've said before, the rich and the powerful will always look after themselves no matter what government they're in; they do, all over the world. But to me the mark of a decent, caring, humane government is one that puts their top priority to deal with average people, not one that the first thing they do after an election is bring in unnecessary and hurtful cuts in people programs like education, social services, occupational health. That's not a government. As we pointed out, there's all sorts of waste in this government, all sorts of waste that they could pull aside. But that would affect, again, the government and their friends, and they're not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I am appalled -- in terms of standing up for average people: the lowest minimum wage in the country. I could understand it a bit if this were Newfoundland, where they don't have any money. The lowest minimum wage in the country; that's the message that we send out. Mr. Speaker, I don't need to tell you. I shouldn't from this end, because we've fought hard and clean for us to be again -- fairness in those labour laws. Anybody who saw Bill 44 -- we predicted what would happen. When the former Member for Spirit River-Fairview and I stood and fought that law, we predicted precisely what would happen down the way. Unfortunately, we were right.

You can say that dealing with working people, it's fair we'll just bring in laws that take away their rights. And that's what this government has tried to do, Mr. Speaker. It tried to do it with Bill 41. It's done it with Bill 44. It brought in Bill 110. It didn't need 110, because those things were already occurring. But I'm also saying -- and we now have a number of examples just recently: the nurses and Zeidler's -- that working people are no longer going to put up with unfairness. This government ignores it at its own peril, and I would hope that this new labour Act -- although I'm not going to hold my breath, knowing the right-wing influence from this government -- that they would be fair when they bring it in. But I have to say that I doubt it very much, Mr. Speaker. If I'm wrong -- and it deals with a serious possibility -- I'll be the first one up to say it. But I don't think I'll have to get up very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, people want to look at the whole workers' compensation system, the unfairness there of injured workers, where they can't even get an appeal, where it's backed up, where we have, supposedly, a private consultant looking into it. We know what to do. When the minister interfered and said that you had to save money on the backs of injured workers, that's what the problem is. This minister interfered, and now he's running around trying to find a way out.

People in the rural areas and especially some younger farmers want some help from farm foreclosures and dealing with debt. They want some way to deal with deficiency payments from both federal and provincial governments so they can compete fairly with the Europeans and the Americans. They want these sorts of things and are looking for leadership from government, Mr. Speaker, but they're not getting it.

Certainly the classic example of not standing up for average people had to do with the way we've regulated -- or didn't regulate, if I can put it that way -- our financial institutions in this province, the most recent example, of course, being Principal. Here we had a government that was quite prepared to wheel and

deal and help out the most powerful in the society -- "Gee, if we don't move here . . . We don't want to upset them" -- knowing full well back in 1984, and perhaps even earlier, Mr. Speaker, that there were problems there. What did they do to protect average people, many of them senior citizens who had put their life savings in there? Nothing, until it was too late. They pulled the pin on them. That again is not the mark of a government that should be very proud in writing a Speech from the Throne telling everybody how lucky they are to live in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is that it's not that Albertans want magical answers and to know that everybody has all the answers. What they do want -- and they're not getting it from this government -- is a hardworking, fair, honest government that puts as their top priority average people. That's what they want, and that's what they're going to tell this government in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, last fall we talked a fair amount about the Mulroney trade deal. It just amazes me how naive these people are: Ronald Reagan loves us and therefore he wants to do everything for us. We shouldn't even check things: "Brian said it's okay. Let's just accept the Mulroney trade deal. It's going to be great for us." When we tried to raise questions about certain aspects of it, we were told, "Ah, you're naysayers, wimps." Even if you want to get the facts, you don't get the facts: "Just trust us. Trust Brian and Ronald." Well, this government must be the last group in the world that trusts those two.

Now, Mr. Speaker, rather than rhetoric, it's not a matter of free trade. It's a matter of this particular agreement. All of us here, I think, are for free trade, and the more we can break down protectionist banners around the world, the better off we'd all be. But we have to deal with an agreement that was signed. That's what we're looking at. As we've pointed out before, there is no binding disputes mechanism. We have a binational panel that can only rule on whether the United States or Canada were breaking their own laws. Now, that means the FERC decision, softwood lumber, all the nontariff things the Americans were doing to us before, can continue under this agreement.

The service sector -- it's the only free trade agreement in history where we've put the service sector in. And when they were yammering about how many jobs would be created -- the Economic Council of Canada -- we called them up short. This last time it was based on a growth in the service sector, and they thought that it was going to be protected, because no other free trade agreement ever included the service sector. We'll lose thousands of jobs there, especially a lot of women's jobs, Mr. Speaker. They don't talk about that, though, the fact that they put the service sector and opened it up to the Americans to own. They don't talk about it. They say, "Oh well, we still own our resources." Well, what does ownership mean if you can't set the price? What does it mean? Clearly you can't set different prices under this agreement. So what does ownership mean?

Now, I've gone through all those points before, but I think it important to bring them up again. One thing that did happen just after the session concluded, Mr. Speaker: we saw the final document. I mean, that's bad enough. I believe the document came out on Friday, December 11, and we had to sign it by January 2. Some way to run a country, Mr. Speaker. But one of the things in there that made it very clear about provincial control of resources is that the final draft of the Mulroney trade deal did confirm that Alberta has suffered a significant loss of power over its constitutional jurisdiction. Alberta's long fight to manage its own affairs and maximize Alberta's benefit from the development of natural resources may be over. And I point out

the reason. If we look at article 103: Extent of Obligations, Mr. Speaker, it says in there, and I quote:

The Parties to this Agreement shall ensure that all necessary measures are taken in order to give effect to its provisions, including their observance, except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, by state, provincial and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that what they've said now is that the Mulroney government is guaranteeing provincial compliance with this agreement. That has to do with our natural resources I've just been talking about and other areas of provincial jurisdiction. Now, how they had the right to do this, I don't know. But I expect this government meekly will say: "Oh, that's okay. We give up our provincial control of resources. It's nice we have a free trade deal, because we'll all be rich." But, Mr. Speaker, that's a very serious matter. I wonder if this government had a secret deal that they would comply with this or if they just weren't aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, this province fought hard to take control of its resources with the farmers' government -- Mr. Lougheed used to talk about it a lot -- so that we could control our resources from eastern Canada. But it seems like we're quite prepared to give them to the Americans, and we're even prepared to accept it, even with provincial compliance.

Mr. Speaker, I don't need to tell you that if you want to move ahead with diversification, how are you going to do it if you can't target certain industries with lower natural gas? You can't even give our own consumers a break, because we've guaranteed this compliance with the Mulroney trade deal. Why doesn't the government talk about that Mr. Speaker? Why don't they talk about it? We asked them. They said, "No, no, you're wrong." But they never tell us how we're wrong. Then in the final deal we saw the reality of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, Albertans are going to look back at this Mulroney trade deal -- and there's a good chance the Conservative government won't get back federally; a very good chance. But if they happen to, Albertans are going to rue the day. They're going to look back at the time and all the fights we had, that we were quite prepared to give up provincial control of our own resources to the Americans, even after the fights we had. And we'll have some more to say about that, Mr. Speaker, you can bet in question period. [interjections] Some of the backbenchers are getting a little restless, you know, because they never get to do anything. I often think we should have show and tell or exercises every once in a while so it would give the backbenchers something to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by saying it's our job as the Official Opposition . . . [some applause] See, again some exercise. If they keep pounding, I usually react to that. I go on longer, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it another half-hour.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, another half-hour. I can read our alternate Speech from the Throne for them.

Mr. Speaker, our job is to criticize. Now, there's so much to criticize that there's hardly anything positive to say. I could say about this government that some of them dress well from time to time. There, I've been positive. But the reality is that this Speech from the Throne is an absolute failure. It gives no direction at all to where this government is going. We're told there are hidden agendas, though. I think they've read Ayn Rand again, or perhaps Ronald Reagan, and now we have a hidden agenda: we're going to move away from universality. The

Deputy Premier says that -- not in the House; he says it outside. Then he says to be patient, after he scared everybody.

But the point I make is that we believe there's a different way to go. Certainly we will criticize this government. That's our job. And nobody loves criticizing them more than me, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you.

AN HON. MEMBER: They make it so easy too.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, they make it so easy, as my colleague says. It's like leading with your chin all the time.

But, Mr. Speaker, the other thing we will attempt to do is lay out a very different agenda for the province of Alberta. As you know, we've put in -- and I expect the other opposition parties -- a number of motions we want debated. There will be a number of private members' Bills. If this government was listening, it would recognize that it's coming from average people in the province. To show them how to do it, we wrote and put down an alternate throne speech, Mr. Speaker, that I announced a couple of days before the House started. I was hoping, because from time to time they have stolen our policies, that they might have stolen our alternate throne speech and presented it. Then I could have been extremely positive toward the government, that they were listening. But the reality is they didn't. They came in with their Speech from the Throne that, as I said, disappointed everybody.

The point I want to make, in conclusion, is that while it's our job to criticize, we will continue to try to lay out different alternatives, a different agenda, a different vision for the people of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, in case some of the backbenchers don't have anything to do -- and that's likely -- I would like to lay out and file for the library three copies of our alternate throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to rise this afternoon to make some remarks on the throne speech. I will at various times make reference to some comments made by the Leader of the Official Opposition. The hon. Leader of the Opposition used the word "reality" many times, and I'm not sure that he really knows what the word means. There are those who think they live in the world of reality. Psychiatrists and others have expressions to use for the mental health of those people who think they're living in a world of reality, and it's sad in many ways.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

However, Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the so-called real world. We have heard nothing but negatives from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He certainly could have found some positive things to say. I as a Calgarian am very proud of the Olympics in Calgary; I think most Albertans are. Yet the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not say anything positive about Calgary or the Olympics, and I think that's extremely sad as well.

There are many positive things going on in this province, Mr. Speaker, and this afternoon I would like to give a brief economic overview of what is happening and how this province is coming around. Particularly I want to make my remarks with respect to the petroleum industry. However, I will be talking about other sectors of the economy as well.

Mr. Speaker, the economic outlook for Alberta for 1988 is

encouraging, and I think most people recognize that. We'll have a better year than we had in 1987, and 1987 was better than what we had expected. We had higher levels of activity in the oil and gas sector than we expected, as prices averaged higher than we had expected. Agriculture. Cattle prices have improved. Certainly there are problems in other areas, but the expectations are for improvement in the grain area as well. We had an overall 2 percent real growth in this province. Exports from Alberta increased by 4.5 percent.

Employment. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was whining about the high unemployment. Mr. Speaker, we were at an all-time high as far as employment is concerned in this province in 1987: 1.152 million Albertans working, more than ever in the history of this province. That's a positive, Mr. Speaker. Seventeen thousand new companies formed last year; that's another positive for Alberta.

We are expecting, as I say, improvement in 1988 over 1987, continued strengthening in our economy, primarily because of growth in investment, including significant projects. Some of these projects have been announced and others we expect to come, in the areas of forestry and energy primarily. How much growth can we look forward to in 1988? The forecasts are bullish. The Conference Board of Canada is predicting 3.4 percent real growth in Alberta for 1988.

Yes, there are some uncertainties out there, and one of those uncertainties is the world energy-pricing situation. We expected softer prices in the early part of 1988, and now we are experiencing them. But we look for prices to strengthen in the second half of this year. One significant factor, of course, is the OPEC production quotas. Meeting with Mr. Lukman, the chairman of OPEC, who was here February 8 and 9, he indicated that he was positive with respect to his expectations about controlling production in order to stabilize prices, particularly for the rest of this year. So there is that uncertainty. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, our fiscal regime in this province, with lower royalties and lower finding costs, make Alberta very attractive for investment in oil and gas. In fact, it's the best place in North America to invest in oil and gas.

One of the programs we have is the Alberta royalty tax credit program, primarily aimed at the smaller companies and of great benefit to them. Even with the current oil prices, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Canadian Petroleum Association, Mr. Bill Gatenby, is forecasting a 10 to 15 percent increase in drilling activity. The recent *Oilweek* survey of industry indicates even higher increases: industry increasing expenditures by 35 percent in 1988, according to *Oilweek*. Solomon Brothers are more cautious; they're talking about a 20 percent increase. In short, the outlook is optimistic and encouraging for the economic growth of this province in 1988.

We've come through some rough times: a double whammy of the agriculture industry and the energy industry being hit by events that were beyond our control. Oil and gas revenues fell in 1986 from \$5 billion in the preceding year to \$1.7 billion in 1986. The outlook again looks much better. We forecasted a \$1.9 billion deficit, with oil prices averaging around \$17 U.S. a barrel. Instead, that deficit looks like it will be significantly less, with prices averaging around \$19 U.S. a barrel for 1987. Land sales: \$700 million instead of a forecast \$200 million.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, 1987 was a year of recovery, and the government has a plan in place with respect to balancing the budget by 1990. We've relied significantly on the heritage trust fund, which was put in place many years ago. It was an important stabilizing factor to our province, to our revenues. In

1986-1987 the heritage fund contributed \$1.4 billion to our coffers. This supported the health and education and social service programs that this province offers. The heritage fund income is comparable to proceeds that could be expected if we had a 7 percent provincial sales tax, Mr. Speaker. I emphasize: a 7 percent provincial sales tax would be equivalent to the revenues coming into our General Revenue Fund from the heritage trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks about spending, spending more money on this and spending more money on that. Three words describe their approach to dealing with fiscal problems, and that's spend, spend, spend. The people in British Columbia, the people in Manitoba know the fiscal policies of the NDP government. Mr. Speaker, we are being responsible with the resources of the people of this province and have a plan for a balanced budget come 1999. [interjections] I'll revise that, Mr. Speaker: nine years earlier. Before they get all excited, that's 1990; even better than what I said.

And talking about spending, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition ignores the fact that we spend more money than any other province in this country on a per capita basis for our social programs. I could go through the different areas, whether it be education and/or health care or in other areas, but in looking at the entire picture, I think it's even more interesting. We rank first of all in general expenditures, 36 percent above the average provincial expenditures in this country. We rank first in almost every category of expenditure except debt servicing, and of course we don't want to be first in that category. But that's where we would be, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP were in charge of our coffers. We have provided above-average services in the past. It was difficult to exercise restraint in the last two years but we did, and I think we've done it in a manner that has had minimal effect on Albertans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the short-term economic difficulties we've had, I am very optimistic about the longer term. We have tremendous potential in resource development in this province, whether it be oil, gas, forestry, coal, and of course agriculture will continue to be a base industry of this province in the future. Most importantly, it's the attitude of Albertans. It's their work ethic, their entrepreneurial spirit, which I think is unmatched anywhere in this country. Not only are Albertans excellent in terms of volunteering their time and efforts into ventures such as the Olympics or Commonwealth Games, but they have a work ethic, an entrepreneurial spirit that is unmatched anywhere in this country, and that will go a long way in the future to making this a better province.

In the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, we talked about our priority on diversification of our economy. Besides upgrading our products here in Alberta -- I can give you many examples of the areas where we want to upgrade our products in this province, and we are: Petrochemicals and the fertilizer industry: we've made great strides in those two areas, and those areas are about to take off again. I anticipate that over the next two or three years we will see a billion to two billion dollars of expenditures in this province and new ventures in the petrochemical and fertilizer industry areas.

We have seen significant new developments in the forestry area -- and we could list them -- the recent one of course being the Daishowa project in Peace River, some \$500 million capital expenditure there. Then just recently, the Alberta Newsprint plant, the first of its kind in this province in the Whitecourt area. We have the magnesium plant near High River. The throne speech referred to many of these projects. I think it's very sig-

nificant, Mr. Speaker, that in the last two years we have had in announcements approximately \$1.5 billion in new developments in the forestry area alone. I haven't done a check on what the previous 10 years' investments were in the forestry area, but I would guesstimate that they were of the magnitude of some \$200 million. Our Premier came in to this province as our leader emphasizing diversification of our economy, and forestry was going to be one of those areas. We have had in the time that he's been here \$1.5 billion worth of announcements.

Tourism. Well, Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up to the successful Olympics, where we had a focus on Alberta internationally, exciting prospects for the future in the tourism area. In a press release today outlining the initiatives in the area of lottery funds, where they would be placed, again tourism emphasis comes up strong on the list.

Telecommunications and high technology. The hon. minister tells us there are approximately 40,000 Albertans that are employed in the high-technology area, 1,200 companies that are involved in high technology. Mr. Speaker, tremendous progress has been made in that area in the last several years. And the fact that Alberta today has the highest number of people employed than ever before, I think, says well for our diversification efforts up to this point.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few minutes going back to the oil and gas sector, first of all on the conventional side. We've seen the significant picking up of activity over the past year in the drilling area, the conventional oil and gas field. This came about as a result of the expectation of firmer prices, our fiscal restructuring, and of course the industry themselves in terms of the cost-cutting steps they took to make their companies more efficient. Recent reports that we've received indicate that in 1987 profits from some companies are as high or higher than they were in 1985 before the price collapse, and we expect increased activity in 1988. Just a couple of numbers, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that our expectations are based on solid evidence. Well licences are up 232 percent for the first two months of this year over the first two months of last year. The winter rig count climbed to a high of 358 active rigs. Forecasts 15 to 20 percent or higher have been made in expenditures, and some are indicating expenditures as high as a 35 percent increase.

But notwithstanding the activity in the conventional field, Mr. Speaker, we are expecting depleting oil reserves in such major fields as Pembina. They are declining, but there still will be considerable production as we proceed through the enhanced oil recovery process. So we will have on the conventional side vigorous exploration and development, I think, for the smaller pools in the years to come. That exploration is supported by our royalty holidays, by our royalty rates that we lowered a year ago, and by such programs as the Alberta royalty tax credit program. We're producing today 1.4 million barrels of oil per day -- 1.4 million. About a third of that is exported into the United States. Overall, as a nation we remain as a net exporter of oil.

Developing the Wainwright military range: I've indicated publicly our plans there for sales of parcels to be put up in the time period between probably the end of April or the end of June, with activity beginning there over the course of the summer. So on the conventional side, significant activity. And the throne speech makes reference to some significant finds in this province in the north and in the south in both oil and gas.

On the gas side the outlook is extremely bright. Gas exports increased by one-third in 1987 over 1986 to the highest level in

the 1980s. We can expect a further increase, perhaps a 10 per cent increase, in 1988. Again, about one-third of our production on the gas side goes to the United States, about a third of it is used here in Alberta, and the other third goes to Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec. Mr. Speaker, the industry knows and we know that U.S. supplies are running short. There is a definite need in the future for Canadian gas. We currently provide about 5 per cent of the United States' total needs, and that number should rise in the future. We have tremendous reserves of gas in Alberta and much more to be found, I believe, in the next 15 to 20 years.

Natural gas prices. The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn was shouting across the floor something about prices. Yes, we have had a tough time as far as prices are concerned in natural gas, but again the outlook is improving and does look bright. This winter U.S. spot prices increased dramatically above \$2 U.S., although they have slumped somewhat since. But the consensus is that prices will remain higher in 1988 than they were in 1987. Domestically, consumers of gas have enjoyed reduced gas costs, and we've had, through the deregulation of natural gas, the ability of producers and consumers to enter into direct contracts, into direct sales. Approximately 600 gas removal permits have been issued since direct sales have started.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on further on the deregulation process, but I'll leave that for another time and turn to the heavy oil and oil sands areas. There is real potential for development in our oil sands and heavy oil areas. Our reserves in the oil sands are greater than the entire reserves of oil in the Middle East. Mr. Speaker, not too many people are aware of that: the tremendous reserves we have in this province in the oil sands and heavy oil areas. We need that production to maintain our current total production of oil in the years to come, and we need that production not only for security of supply in this country but for economic stimulus and jobs in this province.

Speaking of investment -- and members may be surprised when they hear this, but it's a fact; it's reality. That is, there have been over \$1 billion of new investments in the oil sands and heavy oil areas that have been announced since the world prices crashed early in 1986. That list, Mr. Speaker, is lengthy. I'll make reference briefly to some of them: Esso at Cold Lake, BP and Petro-Canada at Wolf Lake, Shell in Peace River, Sunco at Fort McMurray, and of course Syncrude with their capital addition project and the spending they have going on on that project for this year as well.

Upgrading, however, is a key to the future development of our heavy oils in this province, Mr. Speaker. We have to upgrade our resources to the maximum extent possible. It's been important in the petrochemical industry, so we feel it's important as well to upgrade our heavy oil and our bitumen rather than to ship it down the pipeline to be processed and upgraded at the other end.

We've been working long and hard at the biprovincial Upgrader in Lloydminster. Just this weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was in Lloydminster at a meeting held in that fair city, sponsored by the local politicians and chamber of commerce people, as well as with the assistance of our good member from Lloydminster, to present to us the picture at Lloydminster with regard to the current economic situation and the importance of an Upgrader in that community in the future. In meeting with Husky and with the federal government and my counterpart from Saskatchewan, we agreed to explore a new approach to getting an Upgrader in Lloydminster. The authorship of this new

approach is all of us who were involved. The details of our approach are being analyzed currently. We hope to have officials report back to us by the end of the week as to those details of their analysis, and governments will meet again as soon as possible, probably before April 7 but definitely we will be meeting in the time period around April 7 to April 10, to make a decision with respect to whether or not we see a possibility of the Upgrader going. So I'm hopeful that we'll be able to make progress in that particular area. Lloydminster does need the economic stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, our number one priority in our Department of Energy this year is to bring on stream major projects, and we are having negotiations on several of those projects right now. I've made brief reference to one, but the one that is the most exciting is the so-called OSLO project, the other six leases project, where there would be some 72,000 barrels of production per day when the project comes on stream in the 1994-1995 time period, costing some \$4 billion. That \$4 billion means jobs. I'll tell you how many jobs it means. It means, in terms of construction, some 9,300 direct and indirect jobs. Once the project is built, there will be over 6,000 direct and indirect jobs, almost 3,000 direct jobs on-site in the Fort McMurray area, and that translates in my arithmetic to an increase in population of some 12,000 to 15,000 people for the city of Fort McMurray. Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, this is another project that we are negotiating at the present time, and there are others in the oil sands and the heavy oil areas. I hope to be making an announcement with respect to another project in the upcoming several weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make my final comments with respect to free trade. The hon. Leader of the Opposition made some comments about the free trade agreement, and we know how negative they are on the free trade agreement. [some applause] See, they're even applauding their own negativity. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about honesty, that Albertans want honesty. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree; Albertans want honesty. They want honesty from the Leader of the Opposition as well, a man who should be telling Albertans an accurate picture rather than indicating dishonest accusations towards this particular government.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands right here a document called A Time to Choose Canada. It's the New Democrat's trade option. I think it's important to point out in this document that on January 15, 1988, when the Member of Parliament for Essex-Windsor, Mr. Steve Langdon, released this NDP alternative to free trade -- it is interventionist. The proposal calls for, number one, lower domestic prices for energy resources, and I quote from page 47: Canada's industries "benefit from low Canadian prices to gain a competitive advantage in international markets."

This document should be called a revitalized NEP program; that's what it should be called. That's their answer to free trade: more central government control. And the Leader of the Opposition, talking about honesty, tries to scare Albertans and the public that we are losing our ownership rights in this province. What hogwash. Our ownership rights are intact, Mr. Speaker. And he complains that we cannot set our prices. We're moving in a direction where we didn't want to set our prices. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Sufficient is sufficient.

Hon. minister.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we don't want to set our prices in

this province; we want the marketplace to determine what the prices are. So the honest answer to the free trade agreement is that Albertans regain full control over the rights to their natural resources we fought so long and hard for. So let's hear the truth from the hon. Leader of the Opposition on that.

Mr. Speaker, the trade agreement will benefit all Albertans, whether it be in agriculture, the forest products area, or in energy. How will they benefit? Very simply because tariff barriers will be taken off; tariff and nontariff barriers will be removed over a period of time. The status quo, as the hon. Premier has mentioned many times, is not good enough, because we won't end up having the status quo with the increasing protectionism in the United States. So for the producers in this province of these products that were referred to in these areas, reducing tariffs and barriers will help our producers and ensure our producers access to greater markets. For the consumers it's very simple: greater choice of goods and benefit from reduced costs. On the energy side, no import taxes. Contracts will be the answer to assured markets. No two-price system, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in ending my remarks, I remember some comments made by the leader of the Toronto national NDP about cultural sovereignty, the loss of our cultural sovereignty. Mr. Speaker, we will not be losing our cultural sovereignty. I'd like to quote a few items that relate to our sovereignty in this country, and I'll ask members whether they think we're going to lose these things. First of all, there's the CBC, UIC, the Canada Pension Plan, Wayne Gretzky, the Calgary Flames, unions, the Musical Ride, Anne Murray, k.d. lang, Eaton's, the Calgary Stampede, postal strikes, metric, French immersion, 6/49, Ben Johnson, Newfoundland jokes, and many others. I ask you: will we be losing our cultural sovereignty with the free trade agreement, which simply is a matter of bargaining in products from one side to the other?

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I've run out of time, I think the future looks very, very bright in this province, not negative as portrayed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition today.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] I can see the unmitigated joy with which I've been greeted over there. After these years, Mr. Speaker, sometimes you think that the government backbenchers and the front bench have given up on ever learning anything, but the fact that they have greeted me with such joy means that they're looking forward once again to learning a few facts about Alberta. I think that when one examines the Speech from the Throne, the question of leadership comes up. [interjections] I'm leaving them an opening.

There has been a very strong effort to try to put across to the people of Alberta that this government knows where they're going. Somehow or another they've cast out reports; there's been great money spent. That activity and the announcing of a new megaproject, a new guarantee, somehow or another gives the impression it's leadership. But what they have done is fallen back as all right-wing thinkers do. They always feel, very much like a steer in a herd of bulls, that somebody out there has more weight than they have. It has to be the big megaproject, the guys that run the big corporations. Somehow or another, if a large corporation comes in, twiddles its horns around and does a little belling, throws dirt over its back, it can always get its way with that form of government. Whether it's a pulp mill,

whether it's a tar sands plant, whether it's a meat packing plant, there seems to be no thought that it should be analyzed as to whether it is doing good for the province.

One of the advantages of -- I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you're famous for knowing quite a little about history. One of the things that history teaches us is that there were always governments of the day in many areas of the world that were so enthused when the spotlight of the international buccaneers turned in their direction to say that what they had was valuable, whether it was guano or oil or land, that they hastened with pen in hand to sign away the rights of their children, grandchildren, and often great-grandchildren. Hence, it's no accident today that when we look at the tar sands plants, there are only half a dozen companies represented. They own nearly all the area, because at one time, when those tar sand permits were given out for almost 99 years by the old Social Credit government and before that the United Farmers, they were so pleased that somebody would come in and even look at the tar sands that they gave away to anyone that would sign in at that time. Of course, as time would tell, the large corporations ended up owning most of the assets.

This is why I'm troubled when I hear the Minister of Energy enthusing about the tar sands plants while our conventional oil industry is going down the drain, Mr. Speaker. Why could not the Minister of Energy and this government think of some positive solution which I found in many areas of the world where an area is already owned by many large corporations? The government of the day asks -- and of course if the asking doesn't get too far, sometimes they rule -- that these projects have a certain percent of Canadian or local content. Why isn't OSLO, for instance, which is cornered now by, I think, five or six companies, required to bring in 25 or 30 percent equity from the conventional industry in Alberta? Why isn't the Daishowa group or the one out here west of the Champion area, Millar, that they're talking about, required to bring in some of the small loggers? No, it's always the same. The tar sand area -- I know the minister is pointing at the throne speech; I'm glad he's read it. But if this government were to work around and move to allow some of the smaller operators to get in on the heavy oil or tar sands projects or the Upgrader, I would be very, very amazed indeed.

This is a government that's preoccupied two ways, Mr. Speaker. One, with the megaproject. It's really a lazy person's way, if you're a lazy politician, of trying to recover the area. Somehow or another the big international investor comes in and he is going to take all your peanuts and develop them. Or he's going to take your oil, or it's going to be your aspen, or it's going to be your aluminum. Yet history tells us it's always the same: if you go to a major project, a major developer, you're going to have growing pains down the road and an economy that's badly dislocated. The sooner you settle down and realize that the real asset you have in this province is between the ears of most of your citizens rather than what the Lord supposedly left under the ground but didn't choose to reveal until you were elected, the better off you will be as a government. And this is what we get over and over again: how lucky Daishowa looked at us, that Esso is willing to take our \$40 million; how lucky that Cargill is willing to take our \$20 million. How lucky can we be? We give them the loans, we give the guarantees, and we think we're lucky. Under that type of an economy -- and I notice the minister of small business isn't here -- I could put a banana plantation into Fort Vermilion and make money. But somehow or another they think they're lucky with all these

things.

You wouldn't even mind if these old right-wingers followed their own philosophy of the law of the marketplace: "All right, fellows, if you can't build a plant and make money selling oil, we're not going to loan you money. If you can't put a beef plant together and butcher beef and sell it and make money, we're not going to loan money." But no, somehow or another if it's a farm co-op or an organization like Fletcher's or something like that that comes in for money: oh no, you can't trust those farmers, loan them some money. Guarantees to Mr. Pocklington for a pork plant, but you know what happens to a farmer if he comes in to this government and asks for a loan guarantee to get money to expand his pork production so he can supply that plant. The cabinet minister would hold his sides, rolling on the floor laughing for half an hour: "Imagine that, an Albertan coming in here asking for a loan guarantee the same way as Esso and all those big boys. They must think we're crazy." After all, Albertans are supposed to get by without loan guarantees. As a matter of fact, they're often asked to get by without loans.

So the whole idea that somehow or another the processor that comes wandering in here dangling their bonnet and plume, wandering the world looking for suckers -- and I'm sure our flag has gone up to the top there; I am sure that . . . When somebody mentioned that one of the cabinet ministers did not have time to see a delegation from the Leader of the Opposition's constituency, I can see why. I bet you that agenda is made up of everybody dropping in from all over the world to put projects together. We just had a recent one out here in the pulp area. They said, "Well, I'm sorry; we can't even tell you who's involved this time." Not only are we giving out money to the multinationals, but we now have organizations and projects under way where the government feels they cannot let the public know who's involved, Mr. Speaker. I can't imagine what the reputation of those investors must be like when they were proud to announce that Mr. Pocklington had received over \$60 million. Can you imagine what the reputation of the new investor must be like if they're trying to keep it secret?

No, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that has given up trying to give any leadership. This is a government that has not realized and not looked through what makes an economy go today. If you look at what makes an economy go today, I think one of the first things that enters your mind is that you have to look at what are the prosperous economies in this world. Prosperous economies are in Korea, Japan, Switzerland, Holland. One of the characteristics about these areas is that there's very, very little natural resource. Economies, as a matter of fact, in this world that are most often the worst off are those where there is a surfeit, or surplus, of natural resources. Maybe it's the way the good Lord has made us. When we don't have the natural resources to peddle away, when we don't have our grandchildren's assets to sell, we sit down and start thinking things through, and one of the earmarks of those societies that sit down without assets is that they put as much money as possible into education. They realize that society in the world today belongs to the people that can give us service, the groups that can give us service, to people that can think.

And what do we do in this province? We cut back when money comes to education. Instead, we can always find money to bonus a large corporation putting through some project that's going to sell our assets. I talked to one of the front-benchers just a few minutes ago; he may remember the argument. He was so pleased that they were getting rid of all that aspen. He

said that nobody needed it. Well, one of the problems with my gray hair is that I can remember many assets in this world that nobody needed that became very, very valuable 10, 15 years down the road. What I'm worrying about now is the way they're carving out to all the foreign companies, and some of the others not so foreign, that are willing to come in here these huge tracts of so-called mining aspen and feeling that, by gosh, they've done something. It may well be that those contracts 10 years from now we could let out to other people at five, 10, and 15 times the value. I would just suggest that this government might exercise a bit of caution before they continue their holus-bolus auctioning off for nothing much more than jobs and an Oklahoma guarantee that they will not pollute as long as they're making a profit, that they may well wish that many of these assets had been saved to be used down the road.

Now, going a further step, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the throne speech, one of the things that puzzled me about it was the complete lack of mention of some of the areas in the case of women's rights. These are things that really don't cost that much money; it's more an attitude. It's more an indication of where your priorities are at. Yet the government had many of these things that they could do in their throne speech. I'm afraid that probably my speech today will be lifted out holus-bolus and put in their election platform next year. But at that risk, I will still tell them that there are some things they can do without spending money, some things you can do without asking Esso to do it for you, some things you can do and accomplish without asking Cargill to do it for you, the small things like money for shelters for battered women and families.

If a society is built on its families, on its homes, and on its women who now raise -- everybody's fond of mentioning 52 percent of the population being women, but the point is that the people that run families, raise families, are now getting up somewhere in the 60 to 70 percent category. So certainly money for shelters for battered women and families is one of the most logical things, and it's so small. The Minister of Career Development and Employment loses it on his way to counting his lottery funds in a week. So the amount of money we're talking about is very, very small indeed.

The question of maintenance enforcement. This is still an antiquated society, Mr. Speaker, that expects the woman, who's usually the one left with the children, and the gentleman, if you can use the term rather loosely, that she may have been married to, hasn't been able to get along with -- they break up, and this government still says to her, "Well, you go out and collect the money." Well, how in the dickens can a woman, who wasn't able to get money out of him when he was living in the same house and working, expect to be able to get money out of him after he's left? Yet this government would maintain that: no, enforcement has to be done legally; it has to be done through the whole process.

Now, I agree that there was a certain parting of the curtain, Mr. Speaker, and they were dragged kicking and squealing last year into the 20th century and said they would help these deserted mothers, these women, single parents that were bringing up families, to try to pursue the people for some enforcement. But the success rate has been abysmal; it's been lousy. It runs at less than 60 percent, which is light years ahead of where they were. They were running about 30 percent of the collection of back payments. But it's still far short of Manitoba, that runs up over 80 percent. I personally think, Mr. Speaker, that legislation could be put in that society takes on collecting the money from the errant spouse and not ask the spouse that's left behind to try

to do the collecting. Society could pay what the courts have decided, then turn around and chase the errant spouse. I wonder how far the errant spouse would get, telling the people that collect for the bureau of internal revenue and our taxes to go to hell.

No, Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas I question. Child care standards: somehow or other the idea of free enterprise -- for some reason we have to make sure we protect Esso from competition, have to make sure BP gets a good deal on heavy oil, or that some of the pulp people have to go ahead, but when it comes to child care standards, free enterprise is supposed to take care of it. Somehow or another this government seems to think that six-, seven-, and eight-year-old children are able to evaluate the type of day care they get, to the extent that they say: "No, Mom, we'd better move someplace else next week. I'm not sure I liked that day care last week. We got a little free enterprise going, Mother. I hear they're offering free beer over on the other side of St. Albert," or something. But, no, none of that, Mr. Speaker. The least this government could do is put together some form of standards and codes in one of the most critical areas we have when it comes to developing our family and our home life and developing what is the real resource of this province. It's not aspen; it's not tar sands. It's people, children.

Minimum wage: that's another thing that's rather interesting. It's rather intriguing, you know, that rather than taking our philosophy from Switzerland or western Europe and the developing economies, we seem to take our philosophy from the Middle East, from Khomeini or the different types of organizations that run through the Middle East to north Africa that are just as rich in assets as we are. But there, too, it's private hunting licences for the large corporations. There, too, this government takes its model in putting as little money as possible into education, day care, and home standards. After all, women are supposed to stay at home. There, too, they take their standards when it comes to minimum wage. It isn't by accident that those countries in the world that have some of the lowest standards of living and in particular have the most disrespect for human rights and have the least respect of all for the family have some of the lowest minimum wages. Yet we in Canada now wear the proud mantle -- and this government could take a bow; I'd ask you all to stand up for a minute and take a bow. You have the lowest minimum wage in Canada. You must feel very, very proud about that, very proud. Particularly, you as a government also have the highest number of dollars guaranteed to corporations, per capita or total, of any government in Canada.

Disposable income: you average out Esso's income with the guy that has nothing down in lower Red Deer, who, unless he turns up at your church to get a handout, sits there and has to beg. That's the type of averaging we do. Sure, that's a great way to do it. The good old Christian ethic, you know; I mean, rice Christians. This is the whole concept we have here, Mr. Speaker -- get in line or you're not going to get paid; get in line or you're not going to get fed. Average the income: sure, take Esso's income and invest it, mark it down there, and you get a high income. But what we want is a society that is more even, where the people in the middle are the people that can be [inaudible] with dignity. The minimum wage that we have, down at less than the \$4 level, is something we should hang our head in shame, Mr. Speaker.

No, if you look through this, it is a government here of the overprivileged, by the overprivileged, for the overprivileged, Mr. Speaker, with apologies to Mr. Lincoln. This is a govern-

ment that thinks that unless you have a lot of money in the bank, you don't need a guarantee. Talk about a banker's mentality. People used to always say that bankers are an awful bunch to go deal with, because when you went to a banker they would not loan you money unless you already had the money that you needed in the bank. That's the only reason they'd lend it to you. They've got good followers today, in this part of the 20th century. There is such a thing as a banker's child. We see them in the 60-some opposition over there. They will only loan money and guarantee money to those corporations that already have a great deal.

As you look through what's gone on, we hear the talk about free trade. Well, this government has been very skillful in saying, Mr. Speaker, that free trade is the issue. It isn't. The free trade portion of the agreement that Mr. Mulroney so in-advicably signed: it's okay; *comme ci, comme ça*, as they say. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask for your permission for that. The fact is that it's not any big deal on the trade portion. We're going to move from -- what? -- 80 percent now without any tariffs and duties to 90 percent. Now, that's not suddenly going to make the deserts bloom and everybody drive a Jaguar or whatever it is the modern downtown Conservative yuppie drives today. It's not going to make that big a difference. But what will make a difference are two little pacts that were snuck in at the same time.

They announced it at first as a continental energy policy. Then I notice lately that they're kind of embarrassed about that. It's not a continental energy policy any more; it's a guarantee to buy our oil and gas. Big deal. The Yankees are running out of oil and gas. There's a whole ruddy ocean between them and where oil and gas is. They have to import 40 percent of their needs, and we come back and announce triumphantly: "Do you know what? The Yankees are going to buy our oil and gas." Big deal. What the heck were they going to do if they didn't buy our oil and gas? When there's a colossal shortage south of the 49th parallel, we come back and say that they're finally going to guarantee getting our oil and gas. Well, I have news for the people over there. There's no question about it; the Yankees would have gone up here playing *Yankee-Doodle*. They might have even learned how to sing *Alouette*, Mr. Speaker, in order to get our oil and gas. We didn't have to give anything away to get at it.

There's another part to the agreement, and this, I think, should bother farmers more than anyone else. There's a third part to that agreement, a very sneaky little deal, where indeed the investors in the U.S., except for the oil and gas companies -- and after all, who cares about oil and gas? They're mostly owned by Americans now anyhow. Investors coming up from the U.S. and their bankers and their brokers are going to be able to move in here without any rules. In other words, they're going to be able to operate the same as Canadians.

They'll come in with their large amounts of money, and we are already seeing one of the effects. If you're a farmer, you have to be concerned, because when the financial groups of the U.S. are able to move in here without any restrictions, as it now appears they think they are going to do -- mind you, we gave away a lot of that by taking a lot of the regulations and teeth out of FIRA -- that means they can manipulate our dollar. It isn't by accident that when free trade was first announced, our dollar was around 72 cents. Now it is up over 80 cents. What does that do to a farmer that's trying to penetrate the American market with beef or trying to penetrate the American market with other products, pork or otherwise? He has had his competitive

advantage already decreased by about 12 or 15 percent, and free trade hasn't even gone through yet. Once that goes through, Mr. Speaker, there's no question the large banks and financial institutions of the U.S. will indeed control our dollar, and if they control our dollar, they control how much we can penetrate their market.

Now, admittedly there is a six-month withdrawal feature. You can get out of this thing on six-months' notice. Also, you can countervail each other, so there's so much for the so-called guaranteed access. The Americans can get us at any time by saying that we have an improper type of subsidy or whatever it is, and I'm sure they're going to do that. I know the Premier said, "Well, we own our oil and gas; we can do what we want with our oil and gas revenue." I know there's just no way, when we take the legal arguments of the people in the U.S., that they accept the idea that we can move our oil and gas around at our own prices to our own people. We cannot do that.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that is totally lacking in imagination, lacking in leadership, and in fact even worse than just rolling and lolling as the water and currents move them, they've sold their souls as Daniel Webster did when he was wrestling with the devil. They've sold their souls to the large corporations that are willing to come in with our loan guarantees on the rather airy-fairy idea that, "We'll take your resources, Mr. and Mrs. Alberta, in return for creating a number

of jobs." And that's the whole thing; it's jobs, jobs, jobs at the price of selling our children's and grandchildren's assets. No, Mr. Speaker, it is a government that doesn't deserve its vote of confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods perhaps might consider adjourning debate.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, given the hour, I would like to adjourn debate for this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. All those in favour of the motion, please signify.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, by way of information so that hon. members may plan, the Legislature will not be sitting this evening or tomorrow evening.

[At 5:26 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]