

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: Monday, March 19, 1990, 2:30 p.m.

Date: 90/03/19

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **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: **Notices of Motions**

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise under Standing Order 30 to provide the Legislature with notice of a motion to adjourn debate owing to the urgent need for a debate on the environmental and health concerns arising from fly ash emissions from the Millar Western plant in Whitecourt. I will stand to debate the urgency of that motion after question period.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Grande Prairie, followed by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Northern Alberta Development Council wishes to file with the Assembly the Adult Literacy in Northern Alberta position paper.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I file with the Assembly pictures illustrating the deplorable effect of fly ash emissions from the Millar Western pulp mill in Whitecourt.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as promised on Friday during question period, I wish to file with the House copies of the provincial government's position on the goods and services tax, Protecting Alberta's Future, which was circulated by the government to all members on November 9, 1989. I would certainly encourage the Leader of the Opposition to have his caucus read it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, sir, to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly an individual who has offered outstanding service to the people of the province of Alberta. He is sitting in your gallery; he's the former Minister of Economic Development and trade, a former MLA from Calgary, and I would ask that he rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly, and that is Mr. Hugh Planche.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce to you and through you to members of the Legislature Raoul Le Bouthellier from New Brunswick. He is accompanied today in the gallery by Michael Lanteigne. I would ask that the Members of the Legislative Assembly welcome these two people.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of this Legislature 42 students from J. Percy Page high school, an example of cultural diversity as it works. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Kieran and Mrs. Kendal. They are seated in the public gallery; I would ask that they now rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. McINNIS: Now, Mr. Speaker, each day at this time the Legislative Assembly is joined by thousands of CKUA listeners all over the province. This week is pledge week at CKUA, and the phone number is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjection] Order.

The Chair recognizes Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Legislative Assembly 39 students from the Calling Lake school. They are accompanied by their teachers Sheila Jacobs and Sybil Simmons, counselor assistant Shannon Jacobs, teacher assistant Rose Houle, and bus driver Cora MacFarlane. They are seated, I believe, in both the members' and public galleries. I would ask them at this time to rise and receive the normal warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Smoky River.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's certainly my pleasure to introduce 21 wonderful children representing the Peace River country from the town of Girouxville. They are accompanied by their teacher Richard Fournier, and Doris Benoit. At this time I'd like to ask the students from Girouxville school to rise and receive the acceptance of this Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to members of the Assembly a special guest who's here on business today. He's Richard Moses. I believe he's in the public gallery. Many people will know him as the host of two programs widely listened to in Alberta. One is called *From the Classics*; the other is called *A Classic Example*. I'd ask Mr. Moses to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place would like to do an introduction without passing out phone numbers, please do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: We just did it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: Oral Question Period

AGT Privatization Proposal

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. Last year the government repeatedly turned down Official Opposition requests for the report prepared by Dominion Securities on the possible privatization of Alberta Government Telephones. Since then we've seen some curious references to the telecommunications industry: in the throne speech; we've had the minister of multiculturalism speaking to Conservatives, saying that he expects the sale of at least half of AGT before the end of the year; a political patronage appointment, Dr. Webber, now the new chairman of AGT, saying it's time to privatize the industry. The point I want to make here to this minister: Albertans have a right to know what is going on with AGT. My question to the minister. Will the minister now finally table the report done on AGT by Dominion Securities?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I believe the matter is on the Order Paper and will be addressed in due course.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, due course may be too late; that's our worry. My question, then, is to the Premier. Because of the mismanagement of this government – they've run up deficit after deficit after deficit – they're probably looking for a quick fix here by selling AGT. My question is specifically to the Premier then. Can he tell us: is the privatization of AGT part of the government's plan to reduce the deficit?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader, I believe, is trying to anticipate budget matters. We are going to have the budget this week, and I'm sure he should feel comfortable about waiting until the Provincial Treasurer delivers it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the point. We don't feel comfortable. We didn't even get the report to look at what they're suggesting. I want to ask this Premier because a lot of people are concerned about this, especially rural Albertans, who'll see their services cut and prices go up. Can I get assurance from the Premier today, then, that there will be no move towards the privatization of AGT in the 1990 budget? Can I get that assurance?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the hon. member shouldn't try and anticipate the budget.

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

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that tells us a lot. It's the way this government operates.

Goods and Services Tax

MR. MARTIN: We'll see if we can get some answers from the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that he handed out his glossy documents. I had read them, and I assure him I used them and even looked at some of the figures in my debate that he should have been at with Mr. Andre.

But I want to say also that my colleague from Calgary-Mountain View is in Ottawa today at the House of Commons standing committee, fighting against the GST on the part of all Albertans. Over the weekend we had hundreds of New Democrats going out door to door fighting the GST. Now, the Treasurer tells us that he has one of the best positions possible in opposing the GST. I want to ask the question: other than handing out glossy pamphlets and patting himself on the back in the Legislature, what concrete action is this Treasurer taking to fight the GST? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, let me say that I should pick up some of the themes from the question period last Friday. I appreciate that the Member for Edmonton-Norwood has in fact understood that public opinion is in favour of the government of Alberta's position, and that should be as a matter of record on the table. It is very important because, you see, the debate on the GST goes back some time, and at one point the federal government was determined to divide and conquer the provinces. During that period the Minister of Finance and I suppose to some extent the Prime Minister of Canada wanted to bring all provinces on side. They could see the particular problem with Alberta. Alberta was the one stumbling block to having a consensus on behalf of the provinces to bringing a rolled-in value-added tax.

What is important is that the Premier at the Premiers' Conference managed to convince his colleagues, the Premiers of the time, that to join in with that wrong-headed policy would in fact take away the rights of the provinces. The Premier convinced the Premiers, and the Premiers directed the finance ministers to go back and review what happened. You may remember that Mr. Wilson then said unilaterally that the provinces would not be part of a combined program. Now, that was Alberta's position initially, and that is a significant point, Mr. Speaker, because of course after that point the provinces drew strongly together in their opposition.

Now, I appreciate the frustration, and I appreciate the help that the Leader of the Opposition has brought to this issue. It is important that we combine forces because I think both parties agree that this would be negative on the economic impact for Alberta and would have major if not disastrous impact on the small business sector in our province. On that point we have an accord, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the member's support. But let it not be said that the members should have any view at all that Alberta has not been forefront. Our Premier has taken the leadership on this issue, and right across Canada it is well known that the Alberta position is the position of opposition and is the one that has forced this debate.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, contrary. During the federal election I recall this member out knocking on doors for a Conservative MP, and it's clear what they were going to do at that time. This is a political battle and a serious one for the province; we both agree with that. As a result of that, my question to the Treasurer. Is this government now prepared to say to every Conservative Member of Parliament in Alberta: "Enough is enough. If you support this GST in the House, we are going to be out working against you in the next election." Are you prepared to say that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any doubt

that the local Alberta MPs are suffering the pressure of the position of the Alberta government, and as I've said before, all members of the Conservative Party have carried that message to their local MPs, and you have seen the kind of reactions taking place. I know that the MPs are suffering conflict in their own mind trying to decide whether or not the three-line whip that's been put on over their voting in Parliament as opposed to the wishes of their constituents – it's very clear in their mind, and they're suffering that consequence.

But further, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this Friday afternoon, March 23, we will be meeting with the Alberta MPs. The Premier will be putting forth a series of issues, and I can tell you that one of the first issues we will deal with will be Meech Lake and the GST, probably in that order. In the case of GST we'll make it very clear where the Alberta government stands. We'll outline for them how the impact will be in our province, and we'll express to them our concern about this GST. That issue I'm sure will take a lot of time. All members of our caucus will have a chance to express their views, and the MPs will see fully what it is we intend to do.

Mr. Speaker, that's the outline. You've seen the paper, which I tabled in the House today. You've seen the results of the polls across Canada, across Alberta, strongly opposed to it. As I've repeated again, the leadership on this issue is Alberta's leadership.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that was a very nice speech but avoided the answer to the question.

I'd like to ask the Premier the question then. As the Premier of the province and as the leader of the government, is he now prepared in the Legislature to say today that if any Conservative Member of Parliament supports the GST and votes for it, his government will be out working against them in the next election? That's the political heat that we need on these guys.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the hon. member is serious with that kind of question. He knows that in any election there are all kinds of issues, reasons to vote for some people and not vote for others, and surely the hon. member would know that those are individual decisions Albertans will make.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, leader of the Liberals.

Tolerance and Understanding

MR. DECORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To our shame, over the last two weeks in particular, Albertans have heard more and more from other Canadians complaining about the racial intolerance that many Albertans are involved in. Contributing to that difficulty and that problem has been the silence of the Alberta government and particularly the Premier. Virtually all that the Premier has said on this issue is that he's happy that the federal government has finally made a decision on the Mountie turban issue. My first question is to the Premier. Will the Premier commit to making a statement deploring this perception of racial intolerance in Alberta, saying that there is no racial intolerance in Alberta, and in fact stating that this is contrary to the values we have as Albertans on minority rights?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we fight racial intolerance in Alberta anywhere we see it.

MR. DECORE: I wish you'd say it, sir.

My next question is to the minister of multiculturalism, who is particularly adept at appearing before television cameras and speaking out – and I applaud him for that – for the arts. Would the minister of multiculturalism agree to commit to the same sort of initiative to speak on behalf of minorities in Alberta and particularly to explain to Albertans and Canadians this issue of the Sikh Mountie turban matter?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am more than glad to stand up today and explain to the leader of the Liberal Party that I am, in fact, the minister responsible for multiculturalism and not necessarily for minority rights. I think multiculturalism is understood by Albertans to be a policy for everybody, for all Albertans. If you are interested in the promotion of equality for all Albertans, then you just have to look at the things that the Alberta government's been doing over the last number of years. There's a task force on the foreign professional qualifications that is being conducted right now, aimed at encouraging fair treatment of all Albertans. We have an Institute of Multicultural Resource Development that is aimed at providing equal opportunity for all Albertans in the workplace. We have an Individual's Rights Protection Act that is aimed at assuring equality for all Albertans in the workplace, and there's a federal Charter of Rights aimed at just that as well. That has been the commitment of this government, to ensure that that happens. Now, granted, there are areas of the province where individuals have some difficulty with some of the issues that are present today, but we are continuing to work and will continue to work in the future for the equality of all Albertans.

MR. DECORE: My final question is to the minister responsible for human rights. I wonder what action, what initiatives the minister intends to take to overcome this problem of racial intolerance that seems to be growing and growing and growing in our province.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that there have been some unfortunate incidents in Alberta; I might add, what I would view as a small number of people making outrageous and intolerable statements in this area. I would say that one thing we can all do is wear the pin that I have on today, which is the Diversity and Unity pin that the B'nai Brith has put out. I would encourage everyone else to wear that pin as well. I have some in my office and would encourage anyone to get in touch with me.

Also one thing the Human Rights Commission has done is that they have issued what we call the Nakoda declaration or Declaration of Dignity. They have made a very clear statement in it that we simply will not tolerate materials such as "derogatory pins, calendars and other offensive materials" and that "we believe that we are [a] better and stronger [province] when we treat each other with respect and dignity." Mr. Speaker, I have copies of this with me and would be pleased to share them with all of the House and indeed will file one with you today and circulate it.

Those are examples of things we have done. What will we do in the future? I think we must all, every one of us as individuals, speak up when we encounter any example.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Clover Bar, followed by Edmonton-Beverly, and the Chair notes that a tabling has been given to the Table by the Minister of Labour.

Dow Chemical Plant Fire

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the minister responsible for Public Safety Services. On Thursday last week we in Clover Bar experienced a fire at the Dow plant in Fort Saskatchewan. Although the fire was quickly contained and extinguished, newspaper reports indicated and inferred that there was toxic smoke and the possibility of evacuation. To the minister. Was there any danger at any time during this incident to the residents of Fort Saskatchewan or the surrounding rural area?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the fire at Dow Chemical that occurred I guess midafternoon on Thursday last, at least I am advised anyway, had no negative impacts on any of the citizens who lived in the Fort Saskatchewan or surrounding area. The fire broke out midafternoon. Within a matter of minutes the fire response team at Dow Chemical responded, as did the Disaster Services people with the city of Fort Saskatchewan, and both parties indicated there was no request or need for the province of Alberta Public Safety Services to respond further.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Clover Bar.

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Will the minister indicate what controls and/or safeguards are proposed in connection with the major industrial expansion that is contemplated at Dow and other plants within Fort Saskatchewan?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, several years ago – 1987, 1988 – industry was brought together along with municipalities, the Alberta fire association, the Alberta ambulance association, by Alberta Public Safety Services and formed into a co-ordinating committee called the Major Industrial Accidents Coordinating Committee. In all industrial areas of the province of Alberta all of these groups are working together to ensure that there is a mechanism, number one, to identify the impact of a disaster once it would occur, and as importantly to put in place an immediate response to such disaster. That co-ordinating committee has now been expanded beyond the borders of Alberta, utilizing the leadership that was obtained here in this province, and such work is also now being done in other provinces throughout the country of Canada based on the model of the major accidents co-ordinating committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Beverly.

Landlord/Tenant Relations

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this Assembly last June the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said he was looking forward to the report of the task force that's reviewing the Landlord and Tenant Act. Last week again the minister said he was still looking forward to receiving this report. I wonder: could the minister give this House an idea when he's going to be tabling that report, and could he assure this House and all Albertans that the report will be here sooner than six months from now?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I expect the report to be here sooner than six months from now, and I look forward to discussing it with all members.

MR. EWASIUK: Inasmuch as I understand the minister's office has reviewed this particular report, can the minister assure tenants that he's going to ensure that in that particular report there will be minimum requirements to take care of substandard housing in this province?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not yet have the report of the committee. I do expect them to report on a wide variety of issues. Once I receive that report, again, I will review all of those dimensions. I can't ensure what will be in the report. It is, in fact, a report of five individuals: tenants and landlords from across the province as well as an independent chairperson. I would look forward to that independent advice I receive in addition to those discussions which we'll have here.

Mr. Speaker, I might indicate to hon. members that the circumstance in the rental area is one we consider a priority and to be of importance in terms of discussion. That's why we've given the priority to this report that we have in putting it in place before Alberta had a difficulty in the area, though I appreciate the member raising the question and look forward to dealing with it further in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by Calgary-Buffalo.

SAIT Funding

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's now public that SAIT has been running deficits for the past three years, and the situation is so critical that the Minister of Advanced Education has had to ask his deputy minister to oversee financial operations. Another factor which has contributed to the deficits is a money-losing venture between SAIT, a Calgary businessman, and a private operator in Indonesia. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. Given that the chair of SAIT's board of governors has said that revenue-producing projects generated less money for SAIT than expected, will the minister now admit that this entrepreneurial approach to technical education has endangered the quality of education for SAIT students and exacerbated difficulties in bargaining between SAIT's faculty and staff associations?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I can't respond in any definitive way to the question posed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn. I was aware of financial conditions at SAIT, and I called an emergency meeting last month, the 26th as I recall, to discuss that very matter.

As to addressing matters which the hon. member raises now, I've a meeting later today with the chairman of that board, and perhaps after that time I can respond to the hon. member.

MR. PASHAK: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Advanced Education could comment on this: that the government of Alberta has poured at least \$10 million of public money into a Batam project, \$5 million from SAIT's budget and \$4.4 million worth of a loan guarantee for more equipment. Now, I'm not opposed in any way to international development, but this project serves few students and is not economically viable. So my question to the minister is: why has the minister allowed

SAIT to become the major funder of the Batam project when it in no way serves the needs of Alberta students?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be aware that the strength of the postsecondary system in Alberta is self-governance of these institutions. The Southern Alberta Institute of Technology is self-governed. It makes its own decisions. It's an autonomous board. It reports to the Auditor General, of which one would anticipate that report would be tabled in the House sometime soon. So I don't accept for one moment the hon. member's comments that the government of Alberta has poured \$10 million into, et cetera, et cetera. I simply would point out to the hon. member that that is the decision of a self-governing board, which reports to this House through me in *its* annual report.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

Tolerance and Understanding (continued)

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. First question to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Recent incidents of racism in Alberta have reminded us of the need for educational initiatives to promote acceptance and understanding. Mr. Ghitter's 1983 Committee on Tolerance and Understanding recommended that the Department of Education mandate programs on intercultural education and on tolerance and understanding in all of our schools. Notwithstanding our request since 1986, the government has absolutely refused to implement this policy so that our young people will have the information to understand each other. I'm wondering whether the Minister of Education will tell this House why his department has not implemented Mr. Ghitter's recommendation to date, and will he get busy and see that it is implemented without delay?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not done his homework. The province of Alberta at the recommendation of Mr. Ghitter put in place a very extensive tolerance and understanding approach to the design of our curriculum such that every piece of material must go through a tolerance and understanding filter that's reviewed by a number of citizens so that it in no way sends off the wrong messages to our children in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a list of courses which we have, especially in social studies and language arts, where we make the very focus of what Mr. Ghitter recommended and what the hon. member is raising with us. It is the focus of those courses. In grade 1 students study other Canadian families; in grade 2 students study other people in Canada as well as people throughout the world; grade 3, special communities; grade 4, a comparative study with Quebec; grade 5, Canada's link with other countries. It goes on through grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, such that in social studies alone our children are exposed to the breadth and diversity not just of Alberta, not just of Canada, but the entire world.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, those who follow this issue, Mr. Speaker, realize that there is no concerted program in this regard, and it's left to individual school boards. Look at what the Calgary school is doing, if you want an example.

Now, to the Premier. I'm wondering why the Premier doesn't recognize that of all groups in the province it's his own cabinet

and Tory MLAs that are most in need of education in this matter. Why doesn't he follow Mr. Ghitter's other recommendation, to set up a committee of this Legislature on tolerance and understanding, so that his party can get some education as to what's needed on these issues?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has dealt with this matter.

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

Colleges' Degree-granting Status

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question *today is* to the Minister of Advanced Education. The minister is well aware of the ongoing request from constituents all over central Alberta regarding the degree-granting status of Red Deer College. Recent reductions in federal transfer payments we know are going to be affecting education funding in the province. Has the minister yet assessed whether this projected lessening of funding is going to have a negative impact on Red Deer College's request in the line of degree-granting status? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, there have been several colleges indicate an interest in having the ability to grant degrees in the postsecondary system, not the least of which is Red Deer College, the Alberta College of Art. I have asked all the stakeholders in the postsecondary system what impact that may have on them and others and what their thoughts would be as to colleges granting degrees. I've asked them to respond to me by April 1, and I would expect, after having received their comments, to consider the whole request of colleges in the system for degree-granting status.

MR. DAY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may, again to the minister. In the past the minister has alluded to 1991 as being the earliest date at which he could give a possible resolution to Red Deer College's request. Can we have a commitment from the minister today that any change in transfer funds is not in any way going to delay the decision that all Red Deer and central Alberta constituents are waiting for?

MR. GOGO: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously access along with quality are the two priorities that I as minister have set, and this government has set education as its first priority along with health. I can't comment as to what effect a reduction in transfer payments under the established programs financing would have. The Provincial Treasurer is probably the only one who is prepared to comment on any shortfall in transfer payments. My commitment to the people of Alberta, particularly those students, is that if they have the desire and the ability to pursue postsecondary education, I will do everything I can as a representative of the Alberta government to see that that opportunity is available.

Just in summary with regard to the degree-granting question, I have said publicly that I would hope to make a decision by 1991 as to whether any additional degree-granting institutions will be created in Alberta. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to see that commitment through.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

Pulp Mill Technology Research

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be aware from his days as the Chair of Nortek corporation of an Alberta-based company called Tigney Technology. This company has technology to develop a pulping process for aspen poplar which involves no chemicals and zero effluent. Today they announced an agreement with the Soviet research institute and two Soviet banks to develop the technology in the Soviet Union. I wonder if the Premier can stand and give any good reason why the provincial government isn't involved in funding this research here in Alberta rather than having it developed halfway around the globe.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't a member of the government at the time, but I do recall from knowing Mr. DeLong, who is one of the principals in the Tigney Technology matter, that he requested and received Alberta government research funds and carried out research at the Alberta Research Council facility in northeast Edmonton.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, that was a very unhappy project. Bleached kraft technology belongs to the last century. Alberta may be the only jurisdiction left in the world that subsidizes tearing down trees and capital investment in bleached kraft pulping technology. I want the Premier to reconsider his position and consider bringing a moratorium on pulp developments until we look into new technologies like this which can produce pulp without the effluent.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how the hon. members opposite, from the opposition parties, are so in a rush to shut down Alberta. When you see the attempts to deprive, as I said, parts of this province that have been unable to get the kind of economic development that is so needed to build communities and allow their families to stay at home, yet you have members here trying to stop those developments when we have carried out and have the strictest environmental impact assessments . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GETTY: . . . when we have the strictest standards and rules and continue to have members try and stop these developments and stop the opportunities for Albertans, it's a shame.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Crow Benefit Payment Method

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Last week the minister in an answer to my question said that although the government is in favour of a method of payment of the Crow rate directly to the farmer, they had not made the decision on the dilution payment. Now, organizations like the Wheat Pool and Unifarm have said that they do not feel payment to the farmer is logical or correct unless they are paid the dilution payment. Now, to the minister. How can he reconcile or rationalize the fact that this government will not get off its pot and make its mind up on the dilution payment yet ask the farmers to accept direct payment of the Crow?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will again try to enlighten the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. It seems to me that I recall the hon. member also being down at the agrifood conference in Ottawa December 11 and 12, but obviously his ability to pay attention there was no better than his ability in the Legislative Assembly. As I indicated the other day, the first and preferred position of the Alberta government has always been to pay the Crow benefit to the producer throughout western Canada. In order to work toward that goal, we came out with the Crow benefit offset program, which has worked extremely well, much to the chagrin of the opposition in this Legislature.

We went one step further in a co-operative study with the province of British Columbia and the Alberta Wheat Pool to develop a pilot where the two western provinces could if necessary show the rest of Canada that we could put that money in the hands of the producers without interfering with the market conditions in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. That's the so-called Alberta/British Columbia/Wheat Pool pilot. But that doesn't change the fact that our first position is to solve the problem once and for all across western Canada. I would resubmit to the hon. member that we have a task force addressing that now at the national level that was announced following the agrifood conference. If that task force comes out with the right recommendations and across Canada we have the political will to implement them, we don't have to worry about implementing a pilot project. So it's premature to worry about making any decisions on the pilot project.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a wonderful answer to a question I didn't ask. Nevertheless, let's try it again. The farmers have told you. The majority of the farmers in Alberta belonging to the largest organizations have said that they do not want the Crow paid to the farmers unless they receive a dilution payment, which varies between \$90 million and \$120 million a year. Will you answer the question? Are you prepared to commit this government to pay that dilution payment?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon obviously hasn't heard the same message from the farmers at the farm groups that I have. The dilution payment, as he describes it, becomes an issue only if we're dealing with the pilot. The dilution can be addressed in a variety of other ways if we're dealing with the overall payout of the Crow rate benefit.

Highway 56

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Utilities and concerns the proposed north-south route called Highway 56. Now, in answer to a question recently in the House the minister said that they would probably bypass the Blackfoot Reserve with the north-south route. The concern I hear from my constituents: is this going to defeat the reason for having Highway 56? My question would be: how many kilometres would be added to that route by bypassing the Blackfoot Reserve?

MR. ADAIR: Number one, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I can't identify the mileage or the kilometres primarily because the process of identifying either the alternative right-of-way or a number of alternatives around the reserve, should we choose to go that way . . .

MR. MUSGROVE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I keep hearing from my constituents about where the road is going to go. Now, the minister has just stated that there are a lot of alternatives, but I'm wondering if he has alerted the landowners in that area, or has the department made any financial suggestions to them as to what the land would be worth?

MR. ADAIR: Not at this point, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important that first we identify the number of alternatives that would be utilized if we choose to go around the reserve. That's still not out of the question at this point. If we do get to that particular point, I can assure the hon. member that we'll be in touch with the landowners, the municipalities, and any others that would be touched.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

Farm Cash Flow

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last Thursday you could almost feel the breeze from the collective sigh of relief breathed by farmers around the province who were assured by the Minister of Agriculture that *in spite of* his own department's predictions of a 54 percent decline in net farm income – and it's your document, Mr. Minister; you should read it from time to time – making the projection for 1990 in real terms "lower than any time since the 1930s," they were assured that everything is A-okay in the countryside, everything's coming up roses, and the producers are very enthused and looking forward to spring. Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap; it's action that counts. I'd like the minister to tell us here and now what plans he has to take direct action on the cash flow problems being faced by producers in this province before spring planting.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is talking two different issues. Number one, he's talking about how bad the projected future cash flow is out there, and number two, he's suddenly talking about a cash flow situation prior to spring seeding. I have been subject to no lobbying about a cash flow situation in general across this province that is seriously going to hamper spring seeding. I think we've had three areas in the province that suffered some unusual circumstances last year which interfered dramatically in their cash flow. We have responded with existing programs to address some of the hurt in all three of those areas. So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that our farmers are in a reasonably good position for going into the spring seeding season.

If the doom and gloom forecasts that the hon. Member for Vegreville likes to perpetuate materialize, there may be some cash flow problems in an upcoming year. But I think anyone who has assessed the industry will know that the beef sector is strong; the pork sector's outlook is positive; the commodity crops are not bad. The real problem area is the producer of cereal grains, and that is caused by some world trade wars that are a little bit beyond our control.

MR. FOX: The minister should really have a talk with those doom and gloom bureaucrats in his department, Mr. Speaker. Farmers have legitimate concerns, and he's got to do more than just encourage them to sing choruses of *Don't Worry, Be Happy*.

I'd like to ask him a specific question relating to his neighbour Grant Devine, the Premier who's bankrupted Saskatchewan. He's been lobbying the federal government to help save his

bacon in the upcoming provincial election there, encouraging them to provide some assistance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: What's the question on the supplementary?

MR. FOX: . . . for producers in that province. I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has any plans to join with Mr. Devine at the upcoming meeting of ministers of agriculture to lobby the federal government for some assistance for farmers this year.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member were to review *Hansard* of last week when I responded to that question, he would find the areas that I indicated the federal government may have some responsibility to move with respect to the agricultural industry. He would also find where I acknowledge the rather unique and different circumstances that Saskatchewan is facing for two very basic reasons: number one, the ongoing drought that they've experienced on a broader sense than we have and, number two, the failure over the years to diversify their agricultural industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

Lysol Consumption

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few weeks ago a report commissioned by AADAC, the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, was made public, the research of which indicated that up to 500 inner-city residents are known to be consuming Lysol as a liquor substitute. It's a cheap alternative, but it's also dangerous. In other words, some people die. Now, I know that in the inner city there are also stores that stock cases of Lysol. They keep it behind the counter in order to conform to the Public Health Act, but they have cases, and they're selling it I think knowingly to people who are going to abuse it. So I'd like to ask the Solicitor General if he has any plans or will agree now to amend the Liquor Control Act to make it, first of all, enforceable, which it currently is just barely and, secondly, to make the fines so stiff that they will constitute a deterrent to shopkeepers from selling Lysol as a liquor substitute.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you for the question. We in government are painfully aware of the abuse and what is occurring to the health of the citizens in the inner city in this area. Unfortunately, it is not confined to the inner city, Mr. Speaker, and we are in conjunction with the Department of Health looking into this. We feel there may be some degree of legitimacy in the Alberta Liquor Control Board possibly looking and dealing only with those matters that are in fact liquor related. It may be a better idea if the Public Health Act faced all other substances that while they do have alcohol in them are not in fact liquor. I would ask a supplementary by the Minister of Health on this.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: I don't think there's much I can add, Mr. Speaker, other than to say that certainly the Solicitor General and the Department of Health are looking very carefully at the issue. I met about 10 days ago with several involved in the concern that's been expressed through the Boyle McCauley Health Centre. Certainly I personally got a better understanding of the issue in the inner city, and between the Solicitor General's

department and the Health department legislation we will hopefully come up with the appropriate solution.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a supplementary?

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the ministers. I look forward to an enforceability clause that really will work.

My supplementary question will be to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who probably is also aware that more than 1,600 cans were picked up in a sweep of Lysol identification just a few months ago in the inner city. My question to the minister is this. Is he prepared to I guess put government weight behind a request that has a lot of popular support at the constituency level: lobbying Sterling Products, the manufacturer of Lysol, to reduce the alcohol content of Lysol, which is currently at 67 percent, or get them to at least find a substitute, as have other manufacturers?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with my colleagues the Minister of Health and the Solicitor General that this is an important issue. We'd be happy to assist in any way that our department can; however, the establishment of standards and content is federal jurisdiction. I'm pleased to assist in any way we possibly can.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud.

Public Service Code of Ethics

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the document A Code of Conduct & Ethics for the Public Service of Alberta it states,

Political Activity

5.1 Subject to sections 5.2 and 5.3 there is no restriction upon participation in [public] activity by employees save that they must not participate directly in the solicitation of contributions within the meaning of The Election Finances . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions and also for the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife to give supplementary information in response to a question from Edmonton-Jasper Place?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has come to my attention that in the last 12 months, or since the last provincial election which is a year ago this coming Wednesday, three individual provincial employees all working under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services have been terminated because of their political involvement in Liberal campaigns, two in the riding of Edmonton-Whitemud and the other in Smoky Lake. I find this situation deplorable and unacceptable. My question: will the minister tell this Assembly if he made the final decision in the firing of Dennis Holowaychuk, a Liberal candidate in the last election?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I read about the "firing" – dismissal – of one Dennis Holowaychuk in a local paper that was published in northeastern Alberta.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the minister give me assurances that other employees in his department will not meet the fate of Don McMann, who was in the division of public affairs, who has publicly stated on several occasions that he was terminated specifically for his assistance in the campaign in the Edmonton-Whitemud riding?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, an individual Albertan, man or woman, who chooses to make a public statement or a public utterance certainly has that right to do it. I will be governed by my conduct. I'll be governed by the rules of integrity and the code of ethics that we have in the province of Alberta in dealing with any matter. What an individual chooses to say or do in public is their own choice.

All citizens of our province should be assured that the government of Alberta greatly admires the contributions made by all members of our public service in undertaking their responsibilities in their work. From time to time there are individuals who do not fulfill or meet the high standard that is required of a man and woman functioning in our society and working for the government of Alberta on behalf of all of the citizens of Alberta. When those circumstances do occur, senior management and individual departments take appropriate steps to improve the quality and the performance of the public service.

Procter & Gamble Pulp Mill Emissions

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, on March 15 the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place asked me a question about a complaint under the federal Fisheries Act in relation to Procter & Gamble Cellulose Ltd. In response I outlined that the RCMP and the Fish and Wildlife division co-operated in that investigation. I further stated that there was insufficient evidence to proceed with any charges. I also stated that nothing further was done. While that was all correct, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add some supplementary information to the question. The RCMP turned the complaint over to the Grande Prairie office of the Fish and Wildlife division on April 6, 1989, and in order to determine whether charges were appropriate in river fish toxicity, tests were required. Because of the extraordinarily wet spring and summer conditions it was impossible to conduct the required test. The work is planned for the spring and summer of this year, as the conditions are appropriate, and the work will include bioassay to determine fish mortality and fish tainting, if any, as related to the effluent of the Procter & Gamble mill.

MR. McINNIS: Supplementary. It's tempting to be concerned about one department approving this initiative and another one investigating charges. But I take it the minister has confirmed that there is no special funding available for this investigation. I wonder if he can assure the House that it will be possible to determine whether harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction of the fish habitat took place with the research he's outlined today? Is it going to be sufficient without the funds?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to wait to make that judgment until I see what the research is. I'd have to say, too, that I can appreciate the hon. member's confusion with respect to who's responsible, because there is the federal government, and the provincial Department of the Environment is also responsible in these areas and is also doing some testing with respect to the effluent. The staff in the region requested

additional funds to do the research. We're in tight budget times, and my answer was no, they'd have to find it internally. I've been assured that there are the dollars that would allow the tests to be done, and we will make sure that research is done. Whether or not it's adequate – if it's not, we'll have to do further testing, but I'm hoping it will be adequate.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Standing Order 30 request, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

head: **Request for Emergency Debate**

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to argue for the urgency of adjourning regular debate today and instead asking the House to undertake a debate into health and environmental concerns arising from fly ash from the tepee burner at the Millar Western pulp mill in Whitecourt. I would argue that there are a number of reasons why this debate is urgent, why it is necessary to undertake this debate today.

First of all, the full report from Enviro-Test labs has not been released publicly. What we have learned is that soil in the area is toxic, at the very least to young children. What we haven't learned is what *is* the nature of chemicals involved. There are suggestions, of course, that in this kind of burning dioxins and furans would be emitted as well as traces of certain kinds of metals such as lead and mercury. We have also not seen fully revealed the Enviro-Test lab recommendation that in fact a full and comprehensive risk assessment of soil toxicity in the Whitecourt area be undertaken. Clearly, we are not working with full information. The residents of Whitecourt are not working with full information. Therefore, they cannot assess their risk, and the government cannot assess the risk on their behalf and take mitigative measures as might be required.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the tepee burner continues to operate. While they have said that the burner will be moved – that announcement was made on March 2 – as recently as last Friday evening burning was still being undertaken in that tepee burner, which is in very, very close proximity to Whitecourt, in the valley where many of the Whitecourt residents exist. There's a certain concern that much of the burning is done at night with the possibility that this is being done in fact to mask the broad implications of the burning, the magnitude of the problem that could be confronting workers and residents of Whitecourt.

Thirdly, while they're moving the tepee burner, we still don't know enough about the nature of the site to which the tepee burner will be moved, the health risks that will be encountered by workers who will still work at that site and, of course, the environmental risks involved to those areas in proximity to the new site.

A third concern, Mr. Speaker, and a third issue arguing for urgency relates to the apparent delays in action on the part of this government. I note that a letter was sent on November 7 by the Minister of the Environment to a resident in Whitecourt . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The standing order says "briefly." Perhaps you'll sum up your comments.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to summarize this third point very quickly. This letter indicates that the minister knew on November 7, at least, that there were health concerns. It wasn't until March 2 that any

action was taken. This clearly has implications for how this government is undertaking to assess environmental concerns in other areas of this province and how they are acting on those concerns. Urgency relates to the fact that there are health concerns, Mr. Speaker, that those concerns have been revealed but the full implication of those concerns has not been revealed because we do not have complete information. We must get that information today. This government must act on it as soon as *is* physically possible. The urgency relates to the health of children and all residents of the Whitecourt area, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: No, hon. member. Standing Order 30 says: "The member may briefly state the arguments in favour of the request for leave."

The Chair has listened to the comments and the plea for urgency. The Chair believes that, indeed, there has been sufficient time during the throne speech debate so far for hon. members to make comment with regard to this important issue. As a matter of fact, last Friday afternoon the member who brings forward the request for the debate, the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, spoke for the length of time allotted to that member and at that time did raise a number of environmental concerns. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark also gave notice on Friday last, and it has now been published in Votes and Proceedings, of Written Question 193, with seven subsections, relating to this particular issue, and that will be dealt with in due course as the House works its way through the Order Paper. There is ample opportunity through throne speech debate which would take place later this afternoon. The Chair understands the House will be sitting tomorrow night, in all likelihood, to deal further with throne speech debate, and therefore that would give additional opportunity for members to discuss this issue as well as others.

So it is, in this regard, that under Standing Order 30(2), while the matter is an important issue, in the opinion of the Chair it fails the test of urgency. Therefore, the request for leave is not in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has received notification of a point of order from Edmonton-Centre with respect to the Minister of Health.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under the provisions of *Beauchesne* 495(2) and (7), with respect to public documents and letters, I just draw your attention to a comment by the Minister of Health last week when she referred to . . . She'd written to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and told him that the province of Alberta would do everything it can with respect to immunization levels and impelled them to take note of the level of immunization on that reserve. I'm just wondering, under the provisions of this standing order, whether the minister, not to injure the public but, in fact, to improve the health of the public, might table or file that letter in the Assembly.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would take direction from the Chair, because I would certainly want to check with the person to whom I wrote the letter before tabling it in this House. I'd like to have a chance to check the Blues before making that commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The hon. members will both check the Blues. The House will receive notification after there's been consultation between the two members and the Chair. Thank you.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Consideration of Her Honour
the Lieutenant Governor's Speech**

Moved by Ms Calahasen:

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 16: Mr. Fischer]

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. It's my pleasure to respond to the throne speech of the Second Session of the 22nd Legislature. I had hoped to have delivered my speech on Friday, as I had a special fan that had promised that she was very interested in what I had to say and that she would listen.

I would like to remind the members that after a man is too old to set a bad example, he starts giving out a lot of good advice. I would encourage you to listen carefully.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I would first of all like to congratulate Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor for the most gracious way that she delivered the throne speech. Also, I'd like to commend the hon. members for Lesser Slave Lake and Banff-Cochrane for their great presentation in moving and seconding the throne speech.

I am also very pleased and proud of the role that our government is actively playing in planning Alberta's future and the direction that we are taking and the stewardship that we are giving of this great province.

When I say "great province," maybe we should take a little look at what we as citizens of Alberta really have. When I listened to the Leader of the Opposition speak a few days ago now, I'm sure that he wasn't even speaking of this province. Many of us are not aware or do not appreciate the fact that we do enjoy a standard of living that compares with the best in the world. Many years of careful planning and investing in education, in health care, in social service care, and in our seniors' programs have developed a system that is envied all over the world. We have done this now with some of the lowest taxes anywhere, leaving us the highest disposable income of almost any nation. Certainly I see a lot of that, living along the Saskatchewan border, where people are always wishing to come into Alberta. In fact, they do migrate into Alberta when they retire to take advantage of the special programs that we have here. Our education system, as well, draws people here from other provinces, and there are some major, major financial benefits for those people to come here. I think we have to look at those kinds of things.

But most important of all, even with these kinds of benefits that I've just mentioned, we still have our much treasured

freedom and our economic opportunity. We have to think about the value of being able to choose our own occupation or the value of being able to choose our life-style, our education, where and how we're going to raise our families. We don't want the government telling us how to do those kinds of things. That choice is a very, very valuable asset that we have in this country, and I think we should be appreciating it more. Social and economic freedom are in the hearts and on the lips of people from Latin America to Lithuania, from China to Czechoslovakia. When we consider the events of the past year in countries like Romania, Poland, and the Soviet Union, we can thank God for our country. We have a nation that has managed to maintain the principles that people of other countries are now prepared to die for.

The credit for the prosperity and freedom that we now enjoy must go to the many previous governments of the past 123 years for their great stewardship and planning. I might add that it has been a strong Conservative government for the past 18 years that has provided that guidance and management. I also believe that it is because an NDP government has not had a chance in the history of this province to destroy our freedoms and our opportunities with their continual persistence towards socialism. The proper mix of government initiatives and planning can have a dramatic impact on the lives of Albertans, affecting both immediate and future generations. A strong and diversified economy, along with a balanced budget, is probably the single most important legacy that we can pass on to our children and our grandchildren. That is exactly why this government is committed to a balanced budget in 1992. All Albertans know that this not been an easy goal to work towards. The last few years of declining revenues and unstable world markets have presented problems, but as we move into . . .

MR. McEACHERN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order by the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: The member really should make sure that his information is accurate. He talked about a balanced budget, and for the last four years we've stacked up a \$10 billion deficit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I remind the hon. member that if he wishes to raise a point of order in the future, he must have a citation from *Beauchesne* handy.

Hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: As I lost my place a little bit here, Mr. Speaker, I want to begin here. I might add that it has been a Conservative government in the past 18 years that has provided this guidance and management, and I still believe that it's because an NDP government has not had a chance to destroy the freedoms and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, as we move into the 1990s, never has Alberta had such strength in so many new budding industries. I think of advanced technology, where over a thousand new businesses have already started. The forestry industry is another area where huge investment dollars are still coming in, and they're creating thousands and thousands of new jobs as well as huge economic spin-off for our province. The petrochemical industry and the manufacturing industries and the tourism industry are also responsible for creating a lot of jobs. With the help of good long-term planning, the economy here in Alberta is on the

rebound. The harvest from the seeds of diversification is just beginning to be taken in.

There has been a major turnaround from the recession in the early and mid-80s, and we have to give an awful lot of that credit to our Premier, Don Getty, and this government for their tremendous foresight and fiscal management.

MR. TAYLOR: Hallelujah. Praise the Lord.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FISCHER: I must remind the members that we have a standard of living that compares with anyone in the whole world. This was also accomplished despite the very harmful effects of the federal government's high interest rate, and our throne speech verifies that our government will continue to oppose this very harmful interest rate.

Our small business has remained the backbone of our economy, and the government has supported that sector through research, market development, and interest shielding. The small business term assistance program of one billion dollars that was put forward in 1987 looks very, very attractive in the days of a 16 percent interest rate. Saving 7 percent on a billion dollars is big money in any province.

Those of us in the Wainwright constituency are very, very thankful for the healthy environment that this government has provided for the agriculture community. Farming has been a difficult business in the past few years. Drought and far from ideal world markets have taken their toll. But I would ask the members of this House: where would we be without this government's help in a number of different initiatives? The farm credit stability program, which is the other part of the 9 percent money financing: \$2.1 billion has been utilized through this program. In the Wainwright constituency there was \$70 million used by the farmers. This represents a saving of approximately \$5 million in one constituency. I can't emphasize enough the value of that program to our farmers.

Another program is the farm fuel distribution allowance. I also watch farmers on the other side of the border who would love to buy their fuel for 15 cents a litre instead of 30 to 35 cents like they're having to do in Saskatchewan. This program has cost our government some money over the years, but it's been very, very valuable to our industry.

The farm fertilizer protection program has paid out approximately \$87 million in rebates in the past few years, almost \$19 million last year. Our water supplies assistance program and our red meat stabilization program have allowed the farmers in these areas to plan and prosper in the relatively stable market conditions. This year the new crop insurance program will greatly improve the protection of the farmers' production. I'm very impressed with our new indexing program. I think it's a huge improvement over what we've had in the past.

But there's still a lot of work left to do relating to the pricing of the commodity through our GATT negotiations and through a lot of our trading rules. We still have a lot of work that needs to be done – market development is another area that we need to work hard with – but we have made a lot of advances in some of these areas. Research in the processing of our agriculture products, our training and education programs, and the reduction of our trade barriers: there's been a lot of work done on that by our government, and I think that *it* should be recognized. There have been many changes over the last decade, and our government has done a good job for our Alberta farmers in

providing an opportunity to farm and for our children and grandchildren to farm and an opportunity to be competitive in the world marketplace. The challenge for agriculture producers over the next decade will be to continue to diversify and to streamline and to expand in order to maintain and enhance our competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Wainwright constituency liked the throne speech. It shows the commitment of this government to making Alberta a more rewarding and enriching place to live. The changes for improvement are outlined, and based on past performance, I can't think of a government anywhere in the world that I would sooner have manage these changes and manage this province.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Speech from the Throne, as delivered by Her Honour the Honourable Lieutenant Governor last Thursday, continues in what we know to be the very noble and necessary parliamentary tradition of trying to capture, in lofty language and imagery, the messy world of government and legislators who, like ourselves, are representing the many often competing interests of our constituents in a very changing world. It's not often in my experience – I don't know about other members – that people even try much anymore these days to look at the whole and not just at some of the parts: to really take time to dream some dreams, to articulate a vision, and to be there for some alternative sense of what the possibilities of the future might hold. There is, in fact, in the west these days, I believe, a kind of a lack of heroic public leaders who can both inspire others and empower others to work for the common good. So I think it is a noble and a necessary parliamentary tradition that we continue to have these things, whether they be sermons from mountains or valedictorian addresses or pep talks from the coach or, as in this case, a Speech from the Throne.

Perhaps I am reading too much into it, but I am indeed intrigued, as other members have discussed, by this throne speech's use of the concept of stewardship. From my understanding of stewardship, it is indeed a lofty and noble concept that deserves much reflection. As members can imagine, it is a concept that resonated deeply within my own sense of vocation, because as a Christian social democrat I firmly and strongly believe that I am not here on Earth to become a great owner of much wealth and property, but rather I am here to be a steward of creation. To me stewardship, properly understood, means often leaving aside self-aggrandizement, leaving aside more and more ownership and control, leaving aside, often, the sense of power. Instead, stewardship means having as a first commitment a fair and just distribution of the Earth's resources that are here intended for the benefit and the shared use of everyone on the Earth, indeed to be returned to the Earth itself for renewal and replenishment for future generations.

Now, I am perplexed how some people who call themselves capitalists – many, I think, who sit across the way in the Conservative Party – can also call themselves stewards or how individualists – those who worship individualism like many over in the Liberal Party – can call themselves stewards. There are, I think, some inherent contradictions in these concepts, and in truth there are some of us democratic socialists who I believe have also forgotten some of the imperatives of what stewardship

is about. We need to look at that as well, because we must not forget, members of this Assembly, that we are only here for a time; that, as the prayer book says, we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. As stewards of resources we are here to be for the resources of all of the people of Alberta, and we must work fervently not just for distributive justice today but for a healthy future in body, mind, and spirit for our children's children, our future generations.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I do sometimes get worried about my own five-year-old twin daughters and the other little girls growing up in Edmonton-Centre and in this province of Alberta. I hope it's not just because I'm being an overprotective father, but it seems also that as an MLA sitting in this Assembly and listening to Her Honour speak of stewardship, it troubles me to then go out and read reports such as the one recently released by Stats Canada which says that most women in the workplace in 1990 are still concentrated in only a few occupations that are generally low paying and have little room for advancement. Over the last 15 years this same Stats Canada report indicates that the average earnings of women have crawled up to be just 66 cents of what every man earns in this province. Fifteen years ago it was 60 percent; now it's crawled up to 66, and that's just not acceptable.

I think also of Cathy Greeve, the woman who was murdered in the downtown of the city, or, of course, the women who were massacred in Montreal last December. I think of the student over at the University of Alberta who shouted out, "Shoot the bitch." Then I read about statistics where one in four women in this province is assaulted, and I can't help but be troubled and worry about a healthy future for our little girls. I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just the feminists that need to be talking about these issues; it is also us men. As men we, too, need to break through the silence which often accompanies these issues, and as men we, too, need to talk in some concrete ways about pay equity, about reproductive rights, and about abusive men and what to do about these issues. For stewardship demands that, as men, we have to learn how to let go of some power; that, as men, we need to know how to better share power and be vulnerable. And stewardship, in our day and age, means learning some new things about maleness and what it is to be men with women in our society of fairness and of equity.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I also have to wonder, if children in our province are looking forward to a healthy future, if they're going to get there not so much by the processes of social democracy, which we advocate, and of stewardship, but rather they are facing a future that has the imperatives of social Darwinism: yes, they'll be there, but they have to first beat all the competition. The little girls and little boys of today have to aggressively learn how to beat the competition and work through the survival-of-the-fittest jungle that's out there and somehow come out on top. For how to be successful among all of the economies and technologies of the future is a very troublesome question for us, not to mention our children.

With the world swirling with the influences of corporate technology and trade and multinational corporations, just think: in another 15 to 20 years we might not have to worry so much about provinces or nation-states or things like the Meech Lake accord, for economics will have overcome politics. As we know, we're already moving very rapidly towards three mega economic trading blocs in the world, trading blocs which have within them an exchange of goods and services and capital which will flow irregardless of what politics and politicians and elected people might want to say or think about. We have the Pacific Rim and

China as a developing trading bloc that we know is so powerful, and the influence of Japan. Or we have the trading bloc of North America and South America. Is it any wonder that we saw our own Prime Minister down in Mexico talking to officials in that government about trade throughout North America following upon the free trade agreement of Canada and the U.S.? Or we have the third trading bloc of eastern and western Europe coming together in some incredibly powerful economic ways so that by 1992 they will, with the European Common Market, form a third trading bloc on this globe which will be far more influential and powerful than any particular nation-state or province.

By the time these trading blocs are up and running, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the talk of being stewards of creation will be quite replaced by the wizardry of those who are captains of the corporate sector, those who have mastered information technology, where only the fittest, the richest, the most technologically advanced little girls and boys are going to be the ones who are going to survive in that world.

Who cares about who the elected Senator from Alberta will be in a world where the question is: who will be the chief executive officer for 'Petroleum International Incorporated'? Forget about social work in the inner city or those who want to deal with the effects of people who are unemployed or people who didn't seem to quite make it in this new corporate world. Forget about the 14 million children in the world who die each year because of preventable disease and hunger. Forget about all that. The question is: how can I make little Jessica a senior manager in the operations of the corporate concentration of wealth and power in the new world? If she doesn't make it or if she fails to make the grade and to meet the competition, well, then let's just hope that the suicide rate doesn't get as high here as it is in Tokyo or New York City or that the use of cocaine and other drugs doesn't continue to stress us because of an increasing number of young people who are feeling that they just can't make it in this world of corporate concentration and competition.

We must, Mr. Speaker, work to ensure that stewardship forces an economy that is community based, that is locally owned and developed, a local economy that is controlled by people here and now.

We must be better stewards of the future and ensure that the principle at work is that technology and development serves humankind and not that humankind becomes servants and slaves to technology and oligarchic development, for stewardship demands that we hold fast to our own birthright that is here in the province of Alberta. We need to work co-operatively for the common good. As the phrase says, we need to think globally and act locally. We must work on alternatives, as we in the New Democrat caucus have fervently tried to do, and resist the pressure of the latter part of the 20th century, the pressure of these megatrends that seem only to serve the powerful and the corporate interests. As we know, it is the stewardship of the environment, of the good Mother Earth itself, the Earth upon which we all live and move and have our being. Such ecological stewardship is perhaps the most demanding of all.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech may lay claim for us in Alberta to be the cleanest province in creation, but I do argue that in this case cleanliness is not next to godliness, because I'm afraid that we in the province of Alberta are also becoming the most godless. At least we are over at the Alberta Research Council. For with the research of research colleagues over there, they have taken the ultimate step, I believe, of taking

genetic material into their own hands and into their own laboratories and have helped to unleash an ethical nightmare, which is the splicing of the genome and genetic engineering. The public, Mr. Speaker, is unprepared for what this will unravel for us in terms of biotechnology, bioengineering, health care, and a future for future generations. For genetic engineering, I believe, is so unprepared for people to be able to deal with, either ethically or technologically, that it is again an example of technology moving far ahead of where we are as a people, and is something over which we have no stewardship. We are only facing unmitigated challenges.

At the Research Council, Mr. Speaker, they have also, according to a recent report, taken time and Earth into their own hands and, incredulously, are now recommending how we in the province of Alberta may well be able to have to deal with continued climatic changes that we will experience with global warming. Our friends at the Alberta Research Council have said that by the year 2010 we will have a climate that will be similar to that of the city of Denver, Colorado. We need to work now, they argue, for implications that this climatic change will have in terms of our dams and our river systems, in terms of our agriculture and our growth industries from the soils: in fact, the whole pattern of life and death sustained by our ecology in the province of Alberta as we currently understand it.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, this is not stewardship. This is a 21st century environmental apocalypse that they are describing, driven by continued emissions of CO₂, by unrecyclable wastes, and by a failure of us to be stewards of the environment. A healthy future for our children means enough is enough of this kind of madness. We don't just want to sit back and predict the future or try to accommodate the natural world to deal with the rampant needs of an unnatural consumerism. Rather, we need to change and direct the future. I know it was Kennedy who rang early in my ears when he said: some people look at the world the way it is and say, why; I want to look at the world the way it could be and say, why not." Because the why not is a why not of a fairer, more shared sense of the resources of our province for all the people, and not to be continually driven by greed and by exploitation and by unfairness.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my analysis, my reflection on these matters which are important to me and the people that I've spoken to in Edmonton-Centre, is a bit too general and needs to be further critiqued in debate by members here and by members in my own New Democratic caucus. Unfortunately, I believe there are far too many government members who have a kind of unthinking allegiance to the stewardship of what it is to preserve the status quo and just say that anybody who might have some other things to say is just full of doom and gloom. Well, Mr. Speaker, we fundamentally disagree. We fundamentally have a different message that we want to speak loudly of to the people of Alberta, to say that we all need to be stewards of creation and to combine that with a passion for justice. That is what gives us life and gives us hope.

As a father of three young children and as a member of the Legislature for Edmonton-Centre, and as a New Democrat here and a social democrat in the global community, I say: God, please save us from escaping back into some romantic past or being fearful of an uncertain future, for the present is great with the future. We can, we will, and we must be stewards of creation with a passion for justice that respects the dignity and worth of every human being and even a reverence for the Earth itself. If we strive to do these things and to be this kind of

people, then I do believe that as the throne speech says, God truly will bless us and bless Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've been prompted to enter the debate briefly, having heard a sermon from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, and to do so in a serious way, because what he said is quite clearly true: there is a fundamental difference between the socialist philosophy and the Conservative Party philosophy as it represents the role that governments should play in our society.

The role of stewards is carefully expressed by our government in the Speech from the Throne. I'm going to engage just for a few moments in what is meant by "stewardship." Now, without getting into a theological argument as to whether Anglican stewardship is better than Presbyterian stewardship, let me assure the hon. member of this Assembly that he is not alone amongst us in being a Christian truly dedicated to serving the best needs of society. Quite frankly, one of the things I find most objectionable about the socialists is the attitude demonstrated this afternoon by the Member for Edmonton-Centre: that he and they alone amongst the socialists are the only ones who really care. They cloak themselves in the garment of self-righteousness in such a way that I find, if not obnoxious, at least upsetting.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre that there are those of us on the government side who are careful about the way they conduct their stewardship on behalf of the citizens of this province and their constituents. Very, very carefully this government has put together a throne speech in which that term is repeated over and over again, and repeated in such a way that we make it clear that the role of a steward is not to assume the direction and the control of the lives of individual citizens of the society in which we live. And that is where the fundamental difference comes. Leaving aside the rhetoric that we've heard from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre today, that sanctimony of the NDP really is just too much to take. Cloaked in sanctimony, they come before this Assembly day after day and say: "Only we care. We are the only ones who care."

But you know, all they need to do is look around, Mr. Speaker, at what is happening in the world. Look at what happened yesterday in East Germany. Thank God, they have thrown off the shackles of communism, and thank God, they have failed to put on them the shackles of socialism. Because there's not very much difference, in my mind, between the two: state control; direction by the government; we'll tell you how to run your lives; we know what's best for you. That's the socialist message, and we just heard it in spades from the Member for Edmonton-Centre: we know what's good for you, and you'll do it our way or not at all. He said there was a fundamental difference. Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental difference, and all I want to do is take his remarks and mine from *Hansard*, send them to my constituents, and say, "What do you want, folks?" And do you know what? I'm confident that they will accept, as they have in this province since it became a province, a private enterprise government that cares and a government that is not prepared to put on the shackles of socialism.

I urge the hon. members as well to look at what happened in Nicaragua. Now, what happened there? Despite all the predictions to the contrary, when given the free vote, the people of Nicaragua – I'm sure to the immense surprise and disappoint-

ment of the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods – elected a private enterprise government. They, too, cast off the shackles of socialism.

What's happening in eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union? Lenin's image is coming down. How the heart of the members of the socialist party across the way must bleed to see their heroes falling to dust all over the world. Then they come into this Assembly, and they say, "But we are the ones who care." It touches me. If it were only true. I'll tell you what they care for. They care for controlling the lives of individuals.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted that the hon. member said what he did, because it stirred me out of my lethargy, got the blood going. I daresay that this opportunity will present itself again, because one thing that the socialist members of this Legislature never seem to learn is that the people of Alberta don't want them any more than the people of Germany wanted socialism or the people in the rest of the world want socialism. They don't want the NDP as the government of this province. They didn't want them a year ago tomorrow. They didn't want them in 1986, or before that, or before that, or before that. Mr. Speaker, they will never want socialism and state control in this province of Alberta.

So the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre closed his remarks with a reference to the diety. I close my remarks the same way but in a different context, in saying that, thank God, the people of Alberta want to have a government that is truly a steward but not a controller, really a steward but not a director, really a steward but not a government which will tell us how to live our lives according to their socialist philosophy, which is being rejected throughout this world. Thank God for that.

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

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to rise today and speak in the Legislature in response to the throne speech. I think this was a most timely opportunity, following two hon. colleagues from the two other parties with which we deal in this House. It was much like watching a battle between a tyrannosaurus rex and a triceratops, two dinosaurs which fought each other to the death. Fortunately, there is a third alternative, and I am here to speak to that issue today.

The Member for Edmonton-Centre referred to having to read between the lines. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that was a very appropriate thing to do. Because there's so little on the lines, we need to read between them to find anything of any substance in this throne speech.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

I want to start with the first issue that was referred to in here: "Fiscal Responsibility." I didn't know whether to laugh or cry when I read that. I highlighted a sentence in here: "Recognizing the perils of deficit spending . . ." My God; talk about operating in slow motion. We've had deficit spending in this province for the last five years. The projection was first for 1991 to have a balanced budget. Now in the throne speech we have: "My government has presented a plan for a balanced budget by 1992." Mr. Speaker, I'll be interested to see when they finally do balance the budget, because I haven't seen any real resolve in that direction yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mañana.

MR. BRUSEKER: Mañana is a good term.

We have a strong reference, Mr. Speaker, to the goods and services tax at the bottom of page 1, and I think the goods and services tax is perhaps one area on which all parties in this House can agree. The goods and services tax, I think, presents a physical assault – and I don't think that's too strong a word, Mr. Speaker – on the province of Alberta. I think all Albertans, within this Legislature and without, need to do everything we can to get against that. Perhaps fiscal assault might be a good term as well. We need to oppose this in every way, shape, or form. My concern, however, is that with the last few question periods we have not heard a real concrete plan, a real direction as to what it is this government intends to do. After all, we're dealing with a Progressive Conservative government both here in the province and also federally, and yet there doesn't seem to be much agreement between those two political parties, which one would think might actually occur. So I'm concerned about that because we need to have a strong response; we need to have a strong opposition to the goods and services tax. I think it will hurt our industries, it will hurt our diversification of our economy, and that is something we need desperately in this province.

The next section in the throne speech talks about diversification of the economy, Mr. Speaker, and to be fair to the government, that has been occurring. Now, I'm not sure whether the government of the day can take the credit for it or whether it would have happened on its own, but in fact there is some diversification that has occurred and is occurring. I applaud that. I'm pleased to see it, and I hope it continues in the future. However, my concern with respect to this is that in the past this government has put forward position papers telling how they were going to diversify the economy and what it was they were going to do, and those position papers have now expired. What is the direction? Where are we going? What is the plan? I don't see that happening from this government. I don't see it in the throne speech, I don't hear it when I listen to question period every day, and I don't see it in the legislation being tabled in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. So it is a concern for me; it is a concern for my constituents. We must have economic diversification, but we need to have a plan. If it happens on an ad hoc basis, we might find ourselves in severe difficulty in the future. So my question to the government – and it's an open question – is: is there genuine leadership in the initiatives that are coming down, or is it simply something that's happening entirely on its own?

There is some mention of entrepreneurship and a salute to entrepreneurship in the province. Mr. Speaker, that certainly is a sentiment with which I agree. We need to promote entrepreneurship in this province, but we need to promote it in a physical way. Not too long ago I raised a concern which has not yet been addressed by this government. In the province we had a Centre for New Venture Development, it was called, at the University of Calgary. We had the entrepreneurship centres at the University of Lethbridge, at SAIT, and at NAIT. And in all four of those institutions – those entrepreneurship centres to develop new businesses and new initiatives – the funding has been cut. In fact, we see at the University of Calgary now that the Centre for New Venture Development has been absorbed by the Faculty of Management in part – and I emphasize the "in part": not in total. The program has not continued, yet we have the government proudly standing and saying what a wonderful

job we're doing here in developing the economy and in developing entrepreneurship. Yet, in fact, they allow programs like this, which are relatively inexpensive and could return manyfold tax dollars, job dollars, diversification dollars to this province – Mr. Speaker, I suggest that's a shortsighted vision. We talk about vision a little further on, but the vision I see is pretty shortsighted when we cut out something like this that has a tremendous multiplier effect. I'm disturbed when I see that happening in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there's a reference in here as well where the government of the day talks about "the ability to make timely decisions." I guess we need only to look at the record of the government in its ability to make timely decisions. A couple of decisions spring to mind: the Principal Group, the purchase of Gainers, the demise of GSR, the Canadian Commercial Bank, Northland Bank, Gibraltar Mortgage, Dial Mortgage, Tower Mortgage. There's been a whole litany which timely decisions of this government have allowed to fail. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that's not stewardship; I suggest that's not leadership. I suggest that's failing on the job. I am very concerned about the direction this government is taking with respect to diversifying our economy: "Providing Opportunity," as the title says that we find on page 2 of this Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, the environment is an issue of concern for all Albertans. We've had many, many questions in the Legislature regarding that particular issue. We've had many people write, phone, and come to see us. I'm sure all members have a concern about that, and yet the question I'd have to ask is: is this government leading, or is it following?

The courts dictated in Saskatchewan that the Alameda and Rafferty dams project should be closed down. We had a court decision in Alberta suggesting that the Oldman dam is now without a licence and probably should be closed down also. We had the Al-Pac decision wherein we had a half-baked plan to get started on a new pulp mill when, in fact, the technology is not even there, and yet there is a reference in the throne speech on page 3: "by incorporating the latest environmental technologies in all our industrial sectors." Well, Mr. Speaker, in our pulp mills it's clear that we do not have the latest environmental technologies. There are new technologies available elsewhere in the world. Why is this government not requiring the industries in this province to utilize those new technologies? That's not leadership; that is not stewardship. That is inaction that is not appropriate for Calgary-North West residents, my constituents. It's not appropriate for the constituents in the cities of Edmonton, Calgary, or anywhere in this province. Mr. Speaker, we need to have more direction; we need to have leadership; we need to have stewardship.

It's not until page 3 in this throne speech that we get to talking about the people. Well, if the people are so low in priority, why are we here? We are here to represent our people. We are here because the people sent us here from whichever of our 83 constituencies. The people in that area are the number one overriding factor and yet they don't even get a mention until page 3. Mr. Speaker, we've already seen the inability of this government to manage fiscal matters, and yet they put it as their first priority. The economy, which is sort of a spin-off, gets second priority. The environment is third. On the bottom of page 3 we finally get to the people. Mr. Speaker, it may be an old platitude, but the people that we have in this province are the most important resource we have, bar none. I would challenge anyone to disagree with that statement, because it is the people in this province that make this province go and make

this province work.

We see in this section on the people talk about our health care, having a healthy, productive life-style and so on. It's not until the last paragraph of the section on people – page 4 – we get one paragraph: "These educational needs are the top priority of my government . . ." What claptrap. We're waiting until page 4 to outline what the number one priority of this government is. Mr. Speaker, my constituents don't buy that. They don't agree with it.

Last Wednesday I was at a meeting of 450 to 500 parents in my constituency, and they are mad, Mr. Speaker. They are concerned that education is not the number one priority of this government. In the community of Hawkwood there are 700 children that are bused every single day to schools in other areas of northwest Calgary. In fact, some of the elementary students are traveling distances of 14 kilometres, which by a country distance is not very far, but it takes about an hour to get there. [interjections] Now, unfortunately, the rural members don't realize that there are traffic lights in the city and there are speed limits – which we tend to adhere to – which don't necessarily apply to all of the rural members, or they don't necessarily adhere to. But school buses tend to travel a little slower, Mr. Speaker, and they need to travel along and pick up other kids along the way. So we're talking about an hour trip to get from the community where they live to the school, and an hour back again. Mr. Speaker, schools should be built within the area to accommodate these children.

I bring as a point for example that this government has been notorious – and I think that's the correct word – for building hospitals in all the rural constituencies. In fact, I believe there is a hospital slated for the town of Eckville, and they already have a hospital there, Mr. Speaker. It may be an old one. The total population of the town of Eckville I believe is 650 people. Larger than the entire town of Eckville is bused out of my constituency every day. The cost of that hospital could build a school in that community for those 700 kids. Now, how many people in the town of Eckville are going to use that hospital? Are you going to see all 650 people going into that hospital every day for 200 days of the year, which is a school year in this province as mandated by legislation? I suspect not.

So, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the question I have for this government is: where are the priorities? Get it together, guys. You're spending money in an inappropriate manner. You talk about education being the number one priority, and yet they don't put their money where their mouth is. They don't put their money where it's needed. We need action to support this. It's very nice to have words such as "these education needs are the top priority of my government," when in fact they don't put their action behind it. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawkwood in my constituency do not agree that this is a number one priority because they don't see it happening.

Finally, with respect to questions that we've raised, many times we ask questions in the Legislature, and through this entire litany, if we can call it that, we hear about stewardship, we hear about leadership, and yet we don't see leadership from this government. We see half answers; we see vague answers; we see incomplete answers. When we ask questions in question period, this government reminds me of the boy who goes to confession and says: "Father, I'm worried. I told my dad I took a rope." The priest says: "Well, that's not too bad. I mean, you told your father about it." He says, "Yeah, but I forgot to tell you about the horse on the end of it." That's the kind of answers we get from this government. We get half a story or part of a story.

What we need and what the people of Alberta will need is a complete answer. There are many things that we still don't know, for example, about Gainers. We don't know what's happening with GSR. We're still waiting to find out exactly what's happening in terms of the payout to Principal Group investors. We see answers on one day that satisfy the needs of government, yet the next day they don't satisfy that same need.

Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech we see a reference to the Senate election that we held in this province, the first time it's ever happened in Canada. We heard much backslapping and chest-thumping about what leadership the province was providing in this new initiative, which is a federal initiative. We talk about the Treasurer standing up and saying how he opposed the GST, another federal initiative. We hear in the throne speech about being committed to the evolution of the Constitution, another federal initiative. Yet when we asked on two different days for the government to take a position and tell us what their position is regarding the decision on the Sikh turban issue, they said, "Well, it's a federal issue; we're not interested." Talk about speaking out of both sides of their mouths. Mr. Speaker, we need leadership, and we need direct answers and straight answers.

On the final page of this very short throne speech, we see a list of vague ideas and concepts. I guess the final point I would make is summed up very tidily by the end here. It reminds me of when I was writing term papers for different professors at university. The last point says: "introduce other legislation, programs, and fiscal measures for consideration and deliberation in this House." I think probably they should have just eliminated that and typed in "et cetera". "Et cetera" reminds me of a comment I heard, and it was a lesson I learned very well from a professor early in my university career. Whenever you write "et cetera," it simply says you've got something in mind but you really don't know what it is, so we're just going to throw it in and hope it looks impressive. Well, I suggest it doesn't look impressive. It doesn't look impressive to me. It doesn't look impressive to my constituents in Calgary-North West, and they're not happy with this kind of throne speech, which doesn't give us a lot of direction and doesn't answer a lot of questions and, I would suggest, in fact raises more questions than it answers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when we get to the budget and in future deliberations, we can see things that are more directive, we can see a firm plan of action. There is not a firm plan of action in this. I guess piggybacking on the closing comments of my two predecessors who spoke on this, I hope to God we do see some direction soon.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Bow Valley.

MR. MUSGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to bring a response to the throne speech. I would certainly like to congratulate the author of the throne speech. I think he did a terrific job, in as few words as necessary, setting out a positive plan for the future of Alberta in the next decade.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the throne speech and, of course, the Lieutenant Governor for her eloquent delivery of the speech.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about several things the opposition has been saying, particularly the former speaker. He would like to abolish all hospitals in rural Alberta in favour of more schools in the cities. Now, first off, we announced several years

ago a rural hospital in a small town in my constituency. It hasn't taken place yet, and until the budget is brought down, I'm not sure what's about to happen with that this year. It's in a town that's situated on Highway 1 about 90 miles east of Calgary. If some of the opposition people happened to be driving on Highway 1 and were involved in a car accident that required immediate medical attention, I'm sure they would be the first ones to criticize the Alberta government for not having any facilities there to look after them.

Now, he also said that some of these students had to ride 14 kilometres on a school bus. My God. I've got students that ride 140 kilometres on a school bus to go to school.

AN HON. MEMBER: We've got kids that walk that far.

MR. MUSGROVE: That's right. I can't believe this is a serious problem, that you have to ride 14 kilometres to get to school. Now, to abolish our rural hospitals in favour of more schools in Calgary just shows us how much the opposition is thinking about the total population of Alberta in respect to where they live.

Also, I'm concerned about their criticism of the management of our natural resources — almost entirely people from Edmonton. They gleefully initiate any controversy they can over the natural resources in the north and the south. They live in Edmonton. Now, certainly the Oldman dam, for instance, is the lifeblood for southern Alberta as far as water management is concerned and very, very important to those people. In Edmonton we have two dams on the North Saskatchewan River to manage the water as it comes down that river and control it as far as floods and any benefits to the city of Edmonton are concerned. I believe it was in 1985 that we had a flood in Edmonton, albeit we had these dams for water management, and there were certainly some financial hardships created for the people in the city of Edmonton. The Alberta government stepped in and said: "Yes, we'll help you out. We can certainly see there are some problems here." We had a tornado in Edmonton, and we stepped in, rightfully so, and spent millions of dollars to assist the people in Edmonton because of the devastation of that tornado. But as soon as we try to do something in southern or northern Alberta, Mr. Speaker, these people gleefully try to initiate something to shut it off.

Now, talking about the forestry industry, certainly we're all concerned about the environment, but the technology is there to look after the problems with the outflow into the rivers. But we hear words like "devastation of our forests" and how we're going to cut all the trees down and northern Alberta will be just like southern Alberta; it'll be just prairie. Now, I don't suppose they've ever toured the north.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never been there.

MR. MUSGROVE: Yeah. We had a tour of the north last year, and I was quite satisfied with the reforestation that was happening. But one of the things they don't think about, Mr. Speaker, is that if we were to do everything their way, we would let nature look after managing all our natural resources. Okay? So if we have a forest fire, we wouldn't put it out, because that's nature's way of rotating our forests' growth. But we do put out the forest fires. I think everyone agrees that we should, because if we're talking about hydrocarbons in the air, why that is the biggest contributor of hydrocarbons there is. So we put the forest fires out.

If the opposition had their way, we wouldn't harvest any of the forests. So a hundred years from now, we'd have a 100-year-old forest that would be dying. The only way to alleviate that problem at that time would be that it would have to be burned, because an old forest doesn't regenerate. So we would have a hundred years from now an old forest. We also would have a problem with wildlife habitat, because what a lot of people don't understand is that an old forest is not good wildlife habitat. You have to have a rotation of forests so wildlife have a place where there is some growth for wildlife to live in. Once you get into an old forest, why there's no grass, and of course even the limbs on the trees get too high for browsing. So it's not a place for wildlife to live.

I spent a couple of weeks with a friend of mine out in Willmore a couple of years ago. It obviously had been great moose country, but we didn't see one moose in the two weeks I was out there. He said that previous to that you could take a hunter out there and you'd get a moose riding down to the second camp the first day. He said: "You know why? Because this old, dense forest is not wildlife habitat anymore. The predators get in there and take their young lots of times before they ever get out." So that's why if we're going to manage one part of our natural resources . . . What I'm saying is that if we put out a forest fire as soon as it starts, then we have to continue to manage the rest of our natural resources. Well, I hope I've made my point on that, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to say a few words about my constituency. One of the things I've had some questions about lately is the town of Brooks. The town of Brooks is the centre of my constituency. It has almost half the population of the whole constituency. What some people don't know is that it's the largest town in Alberta. As a matter of fact, it's been almost eligible for city status for some eight or nine years, but because it was basically at one time about 50 percent dependent on the agriculture industry and about 50 percent dependent on the energy industry, when the energy industry went flat, why of course the population of Brooks dropped. It was up to about 9,700 people. In 1982 it dropped to just over 9,000 and is back up close to 9,500 now. The past several mayors in Brooks have been hoping to get past the 10,000 population as a requirement to get a charter as a city. I believe probably in the next two years or so they will accomplish that.

One of the good things that happened recently was the announcement of our college, of which I am very appreciative. Brooks now operates a campus of Medicine Hat College in an old hospital building. They've got about 250 full-time students and some part-time students. Of course, that's all they've got the capacity for. I think the new college will be a great benefit to the town and certainly will bring the population up to some point.

One of the other things that is diversification in that area at this time is the expansion of Lakeside. Lakeside, when their expansion is finished, expect to employ about 200 more people. Of course, that's probably what it takes to put the population requirements into city status. Some people ask why they would like to become a city. I guess there are pros and cons to that, but the town council tells me you get some involvement in the urban park grants. You also get some assistance in public transportation. One of the things I recognize they are saying is that if you're looking for economic development and you are a town, it's always considered a small town even though it's the biggest town in Alberta. So to encourage economic development having a city charter does have a benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to see the twinning of Highway 1 almost coming to a conclusion in my constituency. Of course, that will have the highway twinned all the way from east of Medicine Hat to Calgary. There are only two contracts left, and it's my understanding there'll be one advertised this summer. It'll be great to have a twinned highway without that interruption of single lane for a short distance. Highway 56 and Highway 36 are also – Highway 36 still has some oiled road north of my constituency, which people feel should finally be paved. They did one stretch last summer. Hopefully they will carry on with that this year.

Mr. Speaker, there's some mention in the throne speech about assistance to seniors. I want to mention that I was appointed chairman of the seniors' advisory council for Alberta last June. I have found that very challenging and interesting.

Just a few things about seniors. There is some concern about the growing percentage of the population in Alberta becoming senior citizens. But contrary to some public belief that a lot of these people are in institutions and are costing a lot of money, about 90 percent of retired people over 65 in Alberta live in their own homes, and of those over 85, over half still live in their own homes. This certainly is caused by our contributions to home care and our continual increased funding to home care. When we get the single point of entry in place, this will be of more benefit, because we'll be able to see that the seniors get the proper help. In other words, if they should be institutionalized, that will be recommended. If through home care or some other benefits we offer they can stay in their own homes, that will also be recommended, even though it has some implications attached to it.

I keep hearing young people say that as the percentage of senior citizens approaches 20 percent, there's going to be financial hardship created for the people that are paying the bill at that time. First off, I would have to say that this is something that has to be addressed by our seniors' council, and we'll be looking at that and making recommendations. But I have read some literature on it. As our population gets older now, they are healthier and better educated. I think one of the things we have to address, though, is compulsory retirement at age 65. In the future we might want to give some encouragement for people to work beyond age 65. These people that are retiring now are better educated than they were in the past. They are healthier. Because they have contributed to the Canada Pension Plan, they are generally not requiring help through the guaranteed income supplement. As a matter of fact, now there's only about 44 percent of the population drawing any portion of the guaranteed income supplement, and that's dropping by about 2 percent every year. So it's felt that in the future the population will have more money to spend.

As chairman of the seniors' council, we have a toll-free line for keeping in touch with all seniors at the grass-roots level, and the operation of the line enables us to provide information to seniors and to receive information from seniors. The number will be well advertised on decals to put on telephones in the very near future.

Now, this is the way the council is able to continue to make responsible decisions and effective recommendations to our government regarding the policies for seniors. I find this a very exciting and challenging part of my responsibilities.

I thank you for your attention, Mr. Speaker, and have a good afternoon.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Stony

Plain.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to respond to Her Honour's throne speech, but before I get into it, I'd like to make a few comments on some of the words of the previous three speakers.

I was most enthralled by the Deputy Premier's dissertation on Europe and other places. I would only hope he would pay half as much attention to what Alberta needs and maybe we'd get something done. He talked about the difference between management and control, and that led me to think about what the differences might be. I suppose when you go into the control aspect too heavily, you invite the intervention of the Supreme Court, and this government has had the privilege of being overruled twice in the last week: once on education matters, which really didn't even have to go to court; it was a matter of implementing provincial legislation and the Bill of Rights. The other was on the Oldman River dam. I find it interesting that every year that goes by we have a different reason for having started it, but it appears to me that it was just a matter of getting carried away with control as opposed to good management. We have the same kind of approach happening in our forest industries, where the government does not know the difference between good management and control, and we're now getting groups intervening in the Alberta scene – and rightly so, I might add – to hopefully get us back on track.

I was distressed to hear of the so-called competition, I suppose, between rural areas and urban areas, because as a New Democrat in Alberta, I think we have an obligation to all Albertans, both rural and urban. I find it rather distressing to start comparing whether we need a hospital more than a school, because certainly we should be looking at providing services for all people in this province.

The throne speech alluded to the economy to some degree. I must say that this government has a rare approach to managing the economy. We look at loan guarantees; we look at grants and who they're going to. Cargill needs a loan guarantee or a grant. Daishowa needs that. They could buy Alberta out for heaven's sake. Instead of being given away to them, they could buy us. We give royalty holidays to the oil sector for no good reason at all. We turn around and pick up the bankruptcy losses of outfits like Gainers after giving them moneys they don't deserve in the first place. We watch General Systems Research go down the drain. We don't have a forest management program; we have a forest giveaway program. Then we turn around and look at whatever operation that might be in the hands of the government that might be making money and we plan to sell it off or give it away. For the sake of me, I can't see selling or giving away Alberta to supposedly pay off the deficit. If we sell our house to pay off a mortgage, then we don't have a house to manage, and this government's well on its way to selling off and giving Alberta away.

They talk about balancing the budget. They've been balancing the budget for a long time. They never quite seem to make it. Something happens here; something happens there. It's never the government's fault. This year – I suppose we can blame the feds once again because their transfer payments aren't going to come through, but that was predicted quite some time ago – the goods and services tax is there for tagging on too. We'll blame it, but we won't do anything about it. I don't see an awful lot of planning for the future in there. I was glad to read that the government is committing to reducing its intervention in the Alberta economy. Given their past record, I'd say it's about

time they got out of it.

There's reference to Alberta's newer sectors. Tourism: it seems to me tourism started in Alberta officially at about the time Banff National Park was put on stream, and that was about the time Alberta became a province. But I guess we've finally awakened to see it's there. Forestry: there has been lumber activity in Alberta for a good many years. The petrochemical industry has been around for at least 40. But I suppose this government has just figured out that they exist, and we now call them the newer sectors. They should have been and could have been very, very viable many years ago. We once had a very viable red meat industry. In Edmonton specifically there were four viable major packing houses. That number has shrunk to one bankrupt operation the government had to pick up in order to make sure the people of Alberta didn't get the true facts on what was involved in its bookkeeping. High technology: I hope the government's approach to managing high-tech industries is far better than they have shown with respect to General Systems Research. I really sincerely hope they've got a well-thought-out approach to managing the high-tech industry, in which Alberta could and should become the leader in Canada and North America.

I found references to democracy and the Senate in the throne speech, and I found that to be quite interesting indeed. The Premier of this province, without any consultation, after the Meech Lake visits, after agreeing to submit a list of candidates for a senatorial appointment, had a stroke of brilliance and Alberta was going to suddenly elect a selection. I like the words: "elect a selection." Six hundred thousand people put an X, not all in the same place. Some good many of them didn't know what they were voting for, because we threw it in along with the municipal elections. I wonder if that number would have been 600,000 or 60,000 had the election stood on its own.

MR. SIGURDSON: More like six.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Or six. I don't know. But for whatever reason, they were there without any kind of comprehensive plan for Senate reform. Without any kind of plan for anything, we pushed through legislation to have a little election game, and now we make that a central issue because the Prime Minister of this country is wondering what to do with this selection. We've conveniently forgotten that the Premier, as I understand it, did submit the full list after he was pressured to, and basically everybody who was nominated to run is now on the list of selections. So why did we have the election? I suppose we could get some joy in having the only elected selected, whatever it is, in the Senate, if in fact that individual ever gets there. However, that's just typical of the way this particular government chooses to operate, and I don't expect to see any improvement other than their removal from office as the years go by.

In agriculture the real problems were not addressed. I'm looking forward to seeing what kind of legislation the crop insurance will, in fact, bring in. It may be an improvement. There was mention of Alberta farmers buying fuel for 15 cents a litre. I'd like to find the farmer who's getting it that cheaply. There was mention of the subsidization of fertilizer also. If you talk to farmers, they would tell you they don't care to have their fertilizer subsidized, because in effect that's not transferring money to the farmer; it only appears it's going to the farmer. That money is going to the suppliers and the manufacturers of that overpriced item in the first instance. That's not a help for the farmer at all. That's a giveaway to the corporations that

provide the fuel and the fertilizers. There should and could be some other method of looking after that particular problem.

I was quite thrilled when I heard education was going to be priority number one. The economy was priority number one, and education is barely mentioned in the speech at all. One area I would like to have seen mentioned is the business of taxation on the local taxpayer. That isn't even addressed. The burden of taxation is going more and more onto the local taxpayer, and it appears this government is not yet prepared to address this issue. There is the matter of not having sufficient or adequate school spaces for our children in this province. I would stress that it doesn't matter whether you're referring to the problem in Olds, where there's an antiquated school that should have been replaced years ago and is not going to get replaced apparently. There is an outcry in Calgary, where they're having a problem; there's an outcry in Edmonton, where they're having a problem with adequate and proper spaces, and indeed in all of Alberta. Rural Alberta is facing the same problem as the cities, and that problem is inadequate facilities for education. The curriculum is another area that has been messed around with. Some aspects are good; some aspects are bad. There doesn't seem to be a concerted plan, just grandiose posturing of where we should be going. I'm not saying that we should be spending more money on education necessarily. All I'm suggesting is that it should be managed a lot better, and the load of supporting education should be shared more equally.

There were specific areas that were identified in the Ghitler report of 1984. The one area that comes to mind is the business of native education. There was a good start made with the native education project, but it appears to have been placed on hold. There aren't any new initiatives in the field of native education. As a matter of fact, it hasn't even been resolved as to who would be responsible or who should in fact be responsible for administering and providing a decent education for the natives of Alberta.

Another area in education that has raised concerns throughout this province is the community schools: a very, very excellent program; as a matter of fact, one of the few programs you can find that can have total family involvement. What do we do with them? We put a cap on the number of community schools that can be built. That was done in 1984. Then in 1986 or '87 the funding was cut in half. In 1989 it was put back to its 1987 level. Meanwhile, the people operating this are in an area of anxiety wondering what's next, and now we hear references to how the community schools are somehow or other going to be blended into supporting high-needs schools. I would suggest that the government doesn't have education as a priority. It doesn't have a plan for education but is always reacting to crises that occur in education.

The latest one that's coming up in education, and hopefully it will be reacted to in a positive sense, is the field of tuition fees in postsecondary institutions. I feel very strongly that every student in Alberta who qualifies academically should be able to get through a postsecondary institution, and the financial resources should be there for the tapping. There are a variety of ways that can be done which would not cost the government but would in fact be an investment in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, going through the throne speech in bits and pieces, here and there, I am hard pressed to find any substance in it. As a matter of fact, at one time I referred to it as a whole lot of nothing. I'd change that to just nothing.

MR. DAY: You should have read ours and not Ray's.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: If I had written your throne speech or if you had used the hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood's throne speech, you'd have some substance.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please address the Chair in his remarks, and could we have order in all parts of the House.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'll rephrase that. Mr. Speaker, if the government side had used the hon. member's throne speech, they would have had a good throne speech.

I can't leave the throne speech without alluding to the "transportation system throughout the province, and providing education and training programs that better equip Albertans . . ." and so on. I like the transportation system. As a matter of fact, I'd say we've got a fairly decent transportation system. I would hope that the quality of road construction improves as much over the next 10 years as it has deteriorated in the past 10 years and we'll have a transportation system that may last. I'd also like to see the provincial minister of transportation get involved with some of the urban areas so that the provincial moneys being spent on transportation are tied in to make a viable network to access the cities and in fact go through them so that the provincial dollars that are given to the cities are invested as wisely as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to now move on to the constituency of Stony Plain. As you know, the Stony Plain constituency is moving ahead as a result of hard work and dedication. We've got good people out there. The constituency is made up of varied kinds of demographic distribution. We have a large suburban area. This suburban area, I am pleased to say, has been organizing into very active communities. They are actually forming community leagues where we had them in the good old days. This can be shown by the resurgence of the building of community halls and the like in the area.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

One of the things many hon. members may or may not be aware of, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that a good portion of the electrical energy that's generated for the use of Albertans is generated right in the Stony Plain constituency. As a matter of fact, the latest power plant, the Genesee plant, is just across the river from us.

The city of Spruce Grove lies within our boundaries, and it's also growing in a well-planned manner. Unfortunately, Spruce Grove is still lacking some facilities. We don't have a provincial building. We don't have a court location in the city, a badly needed facility.

AN HON. MEMBER: Change MLAs.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Mr. Speaker, I find that interesting. The Stony Plain constituents have their first opposition MLA in 40 years. I would hope that this MLA can give them better representation so it doesn't take another 40 years to accomplish what didn't happen in the last ones.

I find it actually rather depressing to have to announce to the House that we don't have a provincial building there. It should have been located years ago. We're also looking to upgrade the facilities for seniors. The community has been around for a while, the average age is getting up, and we're now looking for homes for the seniors and so on.

As hon. members are likely aware, Spruce Grove is the home to last year's junior women's curling champions, and the Kokusai Kaiyou Japanese school, the only one in Canada, is located in Spruce Grove. So we have been doing our homework on the international scale as well as on the local scale. The Japan/Canada friendship golf tournament will be held again in the constituency, likely being played at the Indian Lakes golf course.

We have a fairly large town in the constituency. It's called Stony Plain. It also is quite a progressive area; it's well planned, well laid out. It has within its borders some rather unique and historical sites: the Multicultural Centre, which the hon. Member for Redwater-Andrew had the privilege of visiting, and the Oppertshauser House. We have the Andrew Wolf winery, a very excellent winery, located within the town limits of Stony Plain. Stony Plain is also the home of the offices of the county of Parkland, which encompasses the whole area, and I'm very pleased with the good relationship between these major urban areas. They're currently working on a regional hospital, which may not be a first but at least they're looking at working together for the betterment of the community overall.

One of the largest villages in Alberta is the village of Wabamun. It's another excellent location. All the streets are paved, which would be quite remarkable, I would say, for most villages. Wabamun is also the home of the very first power plant in the area, the old Calgary Power Wabamun plant, which is getting fairly old in its days.

Mr. Speaker, on that note I'd like to conclude and thank the House very much for the indulgence.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise today and address the throne speech given by Her Honour Helen Hunley, the Lieutenant Governor. As I listened to and watched the throne speech, I developed a very humble feeling. She does such an elegant job, and we certainly will miss her when she retires.

I want to mention to you as well that it is with a great deal of pride that I now serve as the MLA for the Rocky Mountain House constituency. I have to tell you that Her Honour grew up in the Rocky constituency. When she was a young person, she did all types of farm work, drove horses, and a little later in life served her country in the armed forces. Upon returning, she became involved in politics, became the mayor of Rocky Mountain House, then later, of course, MLA, cabinet minister, and now the Lieutenant Governor.

I want to also congratulate the Member for Lesser Slave Lake, who did such a fine job of moving the throne speech. I thought she described her constituency in a very detailed and interesting way, and that little touch in her native tongue just added the bit of sincerity that made it a really fine presentation.

I also congratulate the seconder of the throne speech, the Member for Banff-Cochrane. He did an excellent job of trying to convince us that his was the nicest, most beautiful constituency in the province, and if I didn't know better, he maybe would have succeeded. I was really pleased that I was able to be here and hear the whole thing at any rate.

Before I address the throne speech per se, Mr. Speaker, I would make a suggestion that maybe we should get a video of the throne speech, complete with all explanations, and present it to the members opposite, because from what I've heard today,

they've obviously missed the context of the throne speech.

It truly was a fine throne speech, Mr. Speaker. It looks at what the government has done and its fine stewardship of this province. It also talks about how in the future we are going to be good stewards of this fine province. Probably in the field of management maybe a little bit of history would be worth while so we really understand the implications of this fine stewardship. When we go back into the early '80s, we see that our budget was rising at about 17 percent a year, and this was all at the time when the province was moving along to be the number one province in Canada. At the same time, of course we had Trudeau siphoning off money like it was going out of style, taking some \$60 million out of us through the national energy program, and in return of course we got about \$4.5 million: not really the fairest situation. Of course in 1986 all of a sudden we lost about 30 percent of our revenue just in one quick fell swoop. Nothing the province had done created that, but it's simply the case of the world oil prices going down to rock bottom and causing this huge drop in our revenue.

This government at that point put in place a very comprehensive and thorough diversification plan, and today we can see the fruits of that plan starting to come forward. I think a number of facts point this out very thoroughly, and there are a few of them I would like to mention. Last winter we had more people working in the province of Alberta than we've ever had in its history. In the third quarter of 1989 we had the highest consumer spending per capita of any province in Canada. Our unemployment has dropped by close to some 4 percent since the high back in '86. As a matter of fact, we are reaching a point that is very close to full employment. Because of the way the unemployment system is set up, you're never going to get below about 5 and a half percent. So we're really making great strides there. Housing starts in the province are reaching record levels. All of this is happening at a time when the level of service to our people in the province from the government is still number one in many areas and certainly well above average in the country. Investor confidence in the province has been increasing. We can see that by the number of plants that are being proposed and the dollars that are flowing into the province.

I could go on and cite many other instances where the economy is showing that this plan of diversification is really working. I guess if you went back to 1986 and someone had ever said that given oil flat, agriculture with some soft spots, we would have this type of economy in 1990, people would have thought we were really out to lunch, because it's just one of those things that didn't look to be possible. Along with that, of course, the province through the last four years has only allowed spending on services to increase by about 1.3 percent per annum. That, coupled with the diversification, Mr. Speaker, is the way the province is going to balance its budget by 1992.

So that, I think, really demonstrates the management of the fiscal policies of this government, the true stewardship of this government. Of course, within all this management of the economy we are going to have some problems and disagreements with priorities. Once we have a program in place and the need shifts and grows much faster than in another area, of course it's difficult to move over there right away and fill that need, but I'm sure that 10 years from now people will look back and say that this government did a fine job of stewarding the economy of the province.

The speech talks about providing opportunities. I applaud this type of stewardship, where we are helping people help themselves. I don't think most Albertans want to be on the dole. I

think they certainly want to have the opportunity to work, to invest, and to do things on their own. Now, of course, the role of government in this, I believe, *is* to help the entrepreneurs develop. They need to get technology transferred to them. They need to understand markets, and they have to have government assistance in locating those markets.

I think that when we look at agriculture, we can see this government has provided tremendous leadership. Alberta recognized the tremendous advantages in the free trade agreement and proceeded to assist in seeing that was passed. This is going to open up a market unparalleled to anything we have ever dreamed of in the past. Under this government and leadership we currently are working very hard to see if there isn't a method of paying the Crow benefit directly to the producer, as opposed to allowing it to go through the railroads. That, Mr. Speaker, offers great potential for diversification in the agricultural industry.

Of course, we're always sponsoring trade missions and assisting people in developing markets for all types of commodities through the trade missions to the various countries. I'm aware of one that's really affected my constituency, where some purebred breeders were on a trade mission just about a year ago and have all developed a fair market for bulls and breeding stock. We are putting a lot of money, time, and effort into research. That *is* one of the things that *is* going to pay off handsomely in the future. It takes time, but it'll come. We can see it more directly on the farm of course, with increased production per acre, but also as we move into processing and marketing, there are some very exciting things happening that will provide great opportunity for employment, great opportunity for investment and, as you back it right down onto the farm, provide that great opportunity for marketing.

Of course, the education of the farmer is a very important aspect as well of what this government is doing: numerous seminars, TV and radio information, a lot of papers. Another very good method that I don't think you'll find anywhere *is* the on-farm demonstration, a method of transferring all the modern technology right out onto the farm where it does good. Another program that is very unique as well is the green certificate farm training program, where young people have the opportunity to go on a farm and learn, hands on, the operation of machinery, looking after livestock, cropping, all those things, right on up to the ability to manage a farm.

Another area where this government is assisting agriculture a great deal, besides the ones that have been mentioned earlier today with the direct programs to the farm, is the lending portion of this government's actions, where we're putting money out through ADC to assist beginning farmers. Another unique program: shielding that interest down to 6 percent, allowing them to get established and do what they want to do. Of course,

our interest shielding program, where we brought interest down to 9 percent, is certainly of great assistance. As a matter of fact, there's in excess of \$2 billion being shielded that way.

Another area where this government has shown tremendous stewardship is in dealing with small business. We all recognize that small business is the generator of our economy in this province and, for that matter, in the country. Through Economic Development and Trade there are many initiatives being implemented. A few that come to mind, of course, are the setting up of operating and business plans, the teaching of how to market product and how to manage a business: all of these things very, very important to permit Albertans to help themselves.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I could go on to just about any area one wanted to talk about, and we would find in that that government's involvement is helping people help themselves. This, in my opinion, is true stewardship. Now, there's no doubt that Alberta's number one resource is its people, and I was pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne how we talked about the government's involvement in people matters. I think it's becoming increasingly important that we emphasize a good life-style, a healthy life-style. We have to also look at the workplace, make sure it *is* a healthy place to work, a healthy environment. We have to be sure that where we can prevent disease, we do it. As we move more directly into assisting the home, ways to alleviate stress both in the workplace and at home, we see so many cases where stress at home has caused a great deal of conflict, and this eventually leads to government having to assist in caring for these people.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I would move adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved adjournment of the debate. Those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's not proposed that the Assembly sit this evening. However, I should advise members of the Assembly that it would be the intention of the government to sit tomorrow evening for a continuation of the throne speech debate, which would hopefully permit us on Wednesday afternoon to deal with some second readings on the Order Paper.

[At 5:27 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

