

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

[Leave granted; Bill 207 read a first time]

Title: **Thursday, June 7, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 22****The Legislative Assembly
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 22, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would redefine and reduce certain statutory restrictions that exist at the present time in respect of service by Members of the Legislative Assembly on some public bodies where other citizens are also serving and giving of their time. The Bill would significantly improve public input by certain boards and agencies of government by providing a practical means for elected representatives to be more involved in the deliberations of these bodies.

[Leave granted; Bill 22 read a first time]

Bill 23**The Glenbow-Alberta Institute
Amendment Act, 1979**

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 23, The Glenbow-Alberta Institute Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of this amendment is to permit the institute to remunerate board members for their service.

[Leave granted; Bill 23 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 23 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

Bill 207**An Act to Amend The School Act
(No. 3)**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 207, An Act to Amend The School Act (No. 3).

The basic purpose of this Bill is to require rather than permit the provision of special education as needed. I'd also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill provides for a two-year preparatory period to enable the government to put the necessary financial and programming supports firmly in place.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the president of the Executive Council, it's my pleasure to table the annual report of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission for the period April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978, as required by The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Act.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to file the annual report of the Securities Commission for the period April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978. Copies of the report will be made available to all hon. members.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 18 grade 10 students from Fort Assiniboine, Alberta, accompanied by their leader Parm Basahti. I might point out to members of the Legislature that this community is the second oldest in Alberta, being in existence for well over 200 years. I would ask the students and their leader from Fort Assiniboine to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 34 grade 9 students from the Boyle school in the Athabasca constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Peter Avasthi, who is now well into his second decade of bringing social studies classes to the Alberta Legislature on an annual basis. Also with them are parents Mrs. MacFarlane and Mrs. Berube, and their bus driver Mr. Harmata. They're in the members gallery. I'd ask them to stand and be welcomed to the House.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, it's not very often I have visitors up here from my constituency, so I will take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this House, John Van Dam, the mayor of Redcliff, the biggest town in my constituency. Would you please give him the according welcome.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the House 10 grade 10 students from Harry Ainlay high school in the constituency of Edmonton Whitemud, accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Knudsen. Would they please stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 80 members of a grade 5 class from Brigadier Gault school in Griesbach Barracks in Edmonton, which is located in the Edmonton Calder constituency. They're accompanied by their teachers Mr. Don Murchie, Mrs. Babiuk, Miss Williamson, and Mrs. Kirkpatrick. These young people are all members of Canadian armed forces families. They're seated in the public

gallery. I'd like to ask that they stand and be recognized by the members of this House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Rural and Native Housing

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It really is a follow-up to where we left off questioning yesterday. Can the minister confirm a report that six houses built by the Alberta Housing Corporation in — and I use the term "in" — Canyon Creek have been vacant since their completion date last June, despite an urgent need for housing in the area?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, out of almost 1,300 houses this government has provided for rural and native families, from time to time there are bound to be a few that are vacant. They may be vacant for a number of reasons. Repairs may be required. Or often, for example at Atikameg, there are some vacancies where people had indicated they wished to have rural and native houses, and then their employment picture changed and they moved on.

Because of the mobility of society there are always, at any given point in time, certain numbers of vacancies. In any community the hon. member names, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure there will be the occasional vacancy from time to time. Of course, local housing committees allocate the units to tenants. When tenants apply, they decide the priority lists for those houses. It's a normal ongoing situation.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's comment that it's a normal ongoing situation, will the minister confirm to the Assembly that the reason for the unoccupied houses in Canyon Creek is that against the advice of local people they were built on the creek bed, and subsequently were declared uninhabitable by the health inspector?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the minister may wish to answer the question. The first one was of doubtful suitability for the question period. It would appear that the hon. member is not asking for information, but giving information in a sort of debating form and then asking the minister to agree with him.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, rather than leave something hang out there that should be answered, because I think a wrong inference is intended ... I'll retract that — a wrong inference thrown out there. Perhaps not intended; I wouldn't say that.

MR. SPEAKER: Fairness would require that the hon. minister be given ample opportunity to answer, if he wishes to take it.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the water table is very, very high all along the shores of Lesser Slave Lake. Whether it be Canyon Creek, Faust, Jousard, or whatever area, this is a geological fact.

We're trying to accommodate native people where they want to live, and the majority of families do not

want to move very far from where they were originally sited. Therefore the corporation, with great difficulty, often has to build houses in areas where the water table is very high. Now this incurs technological difficulties. But the corporation tries its very best to build very adequate housing for people in areas in which they want to live.

MR. R. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the minister. Have officials of the Alberta Housing Corporation brought to the minister's attention the unique problems at Canyon Creek and that the Alberta Housing Corporation did go ahead and build the houses in that location after they had received advice from the people in Canyon Creek that the houses should not be built there? Has the Housing Corporation brought that information forward to the minister?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware of the problems of building houses in an area of high water table. If the Leader of the Opposition would care to drive along the shores of Lesser Slave Lake and observe the housing situation, I think it would become evident to him that the water table is very high there. This, of course, creates technological difficulties in building housing. Sure, I'm aware of the difficulties in building housing there, but again, the corporation intends to provide houses for people where they require the houses.

I don't know why the hon. Leader of the Opposition is so sensitive about the rural and native housing issue. This government has provided close to 1,300 houses in the last few years.

DR. BUCK: Tom, you've been listening to your lawyer friends.

MR. CHAMBERS: No, perhaps it's because he was a member of a government that for 36 years ignored the needs of our native people.

DR. BUCK: Red herring, Chambers.

MR. CHAMBERS: This government has provided close to 1,300 housing units for our native people, and I'm proud of that fact.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. If the minister is so proud of the fact that this government has provided the housing, if the Leader of the Opposition charts a plane, will the minister accompany me to Jousard, Canyon Creek, and Atikameg and look at the houses the minister's so proud of?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly these travel arrangements could be made elsewhere. [laughter]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. It may be humorous to some people, Mr. Speaker, but it's not very humorous to the people out there who are in this situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. R. CLARK: I'll repeat the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: In fairness to the Assembly, I think it should be said that whatever humor there may be in the situation as far as the House is concerned, it does not relate to the plight of the native people.

MR. R. CLARK: Well, it certainly does to those who are trying to live in those houses, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister prepared to come with me, at the expense of the office of the Leader of the Opposition, to visit the communities of Atikameg, Canyon Creek, and Jousard to look at the houses? We've raised these questions with the minister since last December. We can look at them, and the minister could report to the Assembly before we do his estimates.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I have been in those communities on several occasions, and I'm well aware of the housing in those communities. I repeat, the vast majority of the rural and native recipients of housing in this province are very, very delighted with that housing. I've talked to many, many of them. I get all kinds of responses, and they are very happy.

There are one or two problem areas. You know, when you deliver the kind of volume which we've intended to and have done, you're going to have the odd problem in paperwork. When he threw his temper tantrum yesterday, the hon. leader was talking about paperwork. But obviously when you build 1,300 housing units, you're going to have some paper problems and a few other minor problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A year and a half, Tom?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the record of this government in rural and native housing is tremendous, the best of any government in this country. I'm very proud of the record of delivering nearly 1,300 housing units to our rural and native citizens.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'll pose the supplementary question to the minister once again. Why will the minister ... Mr. Speaker, noting the expression on your face, I'll rephrase the supplementary question. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, has the minister personally visited Canyon Creek and seen those houses which were built where the folks in Canyon Creek indicated to the minister's staff they should not be built?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say that I've visited all the 1,300 housing units of one kind or another that we've built. But I've visited a lot of them, including, I think, all the communities along Lesser Slave Lake.

My office is always open. We get many very good suggestions. But in fact the vast majority of all suggestions and comments we get are extremely favorable. When we do have a problem indicated to us, of course we rectify it as soon as possible.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last supplementary question to the minister on this issue. In light of the comments made by the Member for Lesser Slave Lake that one of the reasons the Alberta Housing Corporation was having difficulty with the rural and native housing program was that it was a Crown

corporation and not a line department, is the minister giving serious consideration to making the Alberta Housing Corporation a line department, so hopefully there could be some accountability with that agency, and we can get these problems dealt with?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Speaker.

Alsands Proposal

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and ask if today, at long last, he's able to tell members of the Assembly the nature of the hearings that will be taking place in the Fort McMurray area with regard to the Alsands project.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted the Leader of the Opposition has asked that question. I advised the House yesterday that I hoped to be able to have information they'd asked for. Unfortunately, I was in meetings all morning until almost before coming in the House and do not have it available.

But I should say, I think, that part of the confusion — and I wouldn't suggest it's in the mind of the opposition leader — arose out of the nature of the questions. I think the first question asked whether following receipt of the Energy Resources Conservation Board report there would be hearings similar to those held in the Cold Lake area. The reason that's confusing, Mr. Speaker, is that the hearings in the Cold Lake area were held by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and of course they're held before the report is made. Similar hearings will be held, and it was always intended that they be held, in connection with the Alsands project in the Fort McMurray area.

I'll be able to review the other specific answers to the other specific questions this afternoon and have them for tomorrow morning.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the minister aware of any townsites studies which have been completed and received, which recommended a specific townsites in the area north of Fort MacKay to handle anticipated population expansion because of the proposed Alsands project?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, a fair degree of work has been done by the Department of Municipal Affairs, by the northeast commissioner's office, and by consultants who have worked for the northeast commissioner's office, with respect to an entire regional plan, first of all for Fort McMurray and region and secondly with regard to identifying possible alternative townsites in that area. As for there being a specific, single report that's completed with respect to all the answers required to make a decision in developing a possible alternative townsites, I don't believe we've progressed that far to this date.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had an opportunity to review the study by Stanley Associates presented to the office of the northeast Alberta commissioner in late 1978, which recommended a specific townsites near, I believe, McLeland Lake, north of Fort MacKay?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I believe I do have copies of that report in my office. I would add, however, that that particular report is only a small part of the entire work that must go into making a decision as to where to locate employees for any potential plant in the Athabasca oil sands.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister. Has the government scrapped the recommendation of a town built north of Fort MacKay, assuming the Alsands plant is going ahead? In other words, if the plant goes ahead, has the government made a decision not to build a town north of Fort MacKay?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I answered that twice yesterday and said that no decision has yet been made with respect to where new employees might be located for a new oil sands plant. No decision has been made, so the government has certainly not scrapped any proposals that have been brought to its attention.

Glenrose Hospital — Children's Services

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In view of the statements in the Speech from the Throne about the Year of the Child, could the minister explain to the Legislative Assembly why the Glenrose hospital in Edmonton is terminating the provision of speech and hearing diagnostic and treatment services to school children in the city of Edmonton, I believe affecting about 750 children?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take notice of that and report, because that would be a decision taken by the hospital board.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Education. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether the Department of Education has held any discussions with the Edmonton Public School Board, the Edmonton Separate School Board, or both, concerning the provision of these services which have been terminated by the Glenrose due, I'm told, to fiscal restraints?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have held discussions. My colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and I have met with representatives of the Edmonton Public School Board, not with representatives of the Edmonton Separate School Board. In consequence of that meeting with the school board, certain activities have been set in process in the two departments, designed first of all to examine the circumstances leading up to that decision, and secondly, we hope, to provide a remedial opportunity.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Education. Is the government prepared to assure the Legislature that until such time as both school boards in the city of Edmonton have a program in place, the Glenrose will in fact continue to provide these diagnostic and treatment services?

MR. KING: I'm sorry I can't give that assurance to the hon. member at this time, because the Glenrose School Hospital is not within the jurisdiction of the Depart-

ment of Education. But I can certainly assure the hon. member opposite that I will discuss that matter again with my colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, as well as with my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. BOGLE: I'd like to supplement that answer, Mr. Speaker. Part of the concern is whether the service should be provided by the Glenrose hospital or by the local health unit. I think a major concern is to ensure that the service is provided. To that end I have requested that officials from the Department of Social Services and Community Health meet with officials from the Glenrose hospital, to ensure that the program is carried on in the short term. It's my understanding that the program has not been terminated, rather that the executive director of the hospital has indicated it will terminate. In the meantime we want to ensure that there is not a shortfall, that the service is provided, so that we have ample time to work out suitable alternatives if that is necessary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either of the hon. ministers. What provision is going to be made both for the Edmonton separate and the Edmonton public school boards as far as their budgeting is concerned, in view of the fact that the director has indicated that as of September 1 these services are going to be suspended due to fiscal cutbacks in the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, and that in fact this is going to create a financial problem for both boards? Has any consideration been given at this time to providing the necessary funds to maintain this service at the school board level?

MR. KING: The disadvantage, Mr. Speaker, of our sitting at opposite ends of the bench.

To repeat my earlier comments, my colleague and I last week met with the Edmonton Public School Board, and we were made particularly aware of the implications for that school board of that tentative decision. We gave an assurance to the Edmonton Public School Board that the two departments would consider what they reported to us at that time and would propose alternatives for the short term, which will not necessarily be funding alternatives. They may be the direct provision of resources rather than funding alternatives.

We are aware of the problem. We do not want to see those students suffer, and I think I can give assurance that they are not going to suffer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Education. The minister advises the Assembly that there will not be any suffering in terms of services, but then says there may not be any financial implications. Mr. Speaker, I don't pose this in an argumentative sense, but will the government assure the Legislature at this time that there will in fact be a level of service, including the staffing required, to provide the diagnostic and treatment services presently provided by the Glenrose?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I thought that was the question I answered just one moment ago.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, to supplement the response given by my colleague. I've tried to indicate that I've requested a meeting be arranged to ensure that there is

no shortfall. We're really talking about priorities of various authorities: on one hand the Glenrose hospital, which looks at its budget to determine where best its funds might be used; on the other hand we have health units and local city boards of health. We want to ensure, Mr. Speaker — and I think it's irrelevant whether we're talking about funding that goes directly to a health unit from this department, or from another department of government to another facility — that the end result is that the young people in this province receive the kind of care they have become accustomed to and deserve. That is the kind of assurance my colleague and I have tried to give to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either of the hon. gentlemen. The question is whether there will be a guarantee of funding so that the staff components remain the same.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking me to tie my officials' hands in their discussions, the answer is no. I've said we're going to make every effort to ensure that there is not a shortfall and that the services are provided as they have been in the past.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the line of questioning I think I should supplement the answer. I said earlier in this House that all hospitals have until December 1 to put their appeals to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care with respect to the proposed budgets that will be presented to the House following our provincial budget. I will have to go back and check on the details of the specific program the hon. member is talking about, but surely he should understand that that appeal is open for that program or for others, and would be initiated by the local hospital board.

International Year of the Child

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's with regard to the financial support for programs in this Year of the Child. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether additional funding will be provided for projects in celebration of the International Year of the Child. I understand the present funds have run out. Is the minister considering extending funding?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Member for Little Bow is referring to the two parts of the program initiated by my predecessor. On one hand, \$100,000 was set aside for the Alberta committee for the International Year of the Child. That committee then solicited ideas from across the province and selected recipients. I believe they placed a maximum on their proposals of \$2,000 per applicant. The second part of the program was the interdepartmental committee made up of several departments of this government, and that total dollar amount equalled \$50,000.

I think the specific question was: will additional funds be made available to the first component of the program, the part administered by citizens from across the province? The answer is yes. A request was received through Dr. Audrey Griffiths, I believe three weeks

ago, to complement the funding that had taken place. With some of my colleagues I reviewed the very excellent work that has been done by that committee. After a personal meeting with Dr. Griffiths we agreed that an additional \$25,000 would be in order to assist the committee to extend its program.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Under those circumstances, will all applications that have been submitted to Dr. Griffiths and committee be approved or accepted?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker. As I understand from the discussion I had with Dr. Griffiths, the recommendations they received from various communities were quite large in some cases. Some programs clearly fit within the guidelines the committee had established; some did not. It was Dr. Griffiths' feeling that enough very deserving projects had been submitted that the additional \$25,000 could very amply meet the need and provide the additional funds to those projects from one end of the province to the other.

Eastern Slopes Zoning

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. Would he inform the House whether the government has reached a decision with regard to an application by Shell Canada Resources to rezone lands in the Jutland Mountain area of the Castle River valley from prime protection to another zoning level which would permit the drilling of an exploration well?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this has been a difficult decision. I know it's of particular interest to the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest because this Jutland area is within his constituency.

I think it should be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that during the 1960s Shell Oil Company obtained permission to do exploratory work in the Jutland area. They carried out this exploration and seismic work until 1977, and at that time made application to drill a test well. However, between the time they completed their exploration and made application to drill their test well, the Eastern Slopes policy had been adopted by the government.

In this policy we zoned the Eastern Slopes into eight zones, with number one being the prime protection area, specifically in regard to watershed, wildlife habitat, and environmental sensitivity. Unfortunately the site where Shell wanted to drill its well fell within the prime protection zone. It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the site they selected had been logged over, and there was an access road into this site. All these things were given due consideration.

However, after carefully considering all aspects, it was our decision that the application for Shell to drill a well be rejected. This means that because of our Eastern Slopes policy, Mr. Speaker, Shell Oil Company will be eligible for compensation for expenses incurred during its exploration program. Our policy will mean that Shell Oil Company is eligible for between \$4 million and \$5 million.

Longshoremen's Strike

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

Premier. It's further to a question I raised yesterday in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan has made a request to the federal government to intervene in the longshoremen's strike on the coast. I'd like to ask, the Premier if any direct or public action has been taken by his office requesting the federal government to act immediately to intervene in that longshoremen's strike.

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, today there was communication between my office and the office of the Premier of British Columbia in which we agreed that the Premier of British Columbia, as the chairman of the most recent western premiers' conference, would attempt to get a communication of concern on behalf of the four western premiers directed to the federal government. At this stage I'm not able to advise members of the Assembly whether all western premiers concurred in that, but we did. It's hoped that this will be an expression, a communique, by all four western premiers.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. I may have missed it, but did the Premier indicate that as of this week some directive would be going from the western premiers to the federal government to take action to intervene in this strike?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that "directive" is the appropriate term, but a communication is intended to flow from the western premiers to the federal government expressing concern with regard to the strike in the ports. At the moment my understanding is that it will be sent in the name of all western premiers, but in any event it will be sent in my name and in the name of the Premier of British Columbia.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier clarify when that recommendation or communique will be sent to the federal government? Will it be this week? What is the timing of that communique? Or has it been sent already?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if all is well it should be within hours. If not, I'm sure it would be no later than tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a matter of clarification by the Premier. Will that communique give a direct recommendation, or will it just express concern? What is the intent at the present time? And I'd like to know from the Premier very clearly at this time: what is the attitude of the government of Alberta? The Premier of Saskatchewan has indicated his attitude; what will the Premier of Alberta indicate as our position in that communique?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think our position has been expressed both in the Legislature and outside. We are deeply concerned about the matter. It is a labor dispute. It is certainly appropriate to allow the new federal Minister of Labour, who I understand is journeying to the scene, to attempt to resolve the matter as he has committed himself to doing.* We will observe what he does. As to proposing or directing to him the specific way in which he deals with the matter, in my

judgment that is not in the best interests of any of the parties involved. We will watch what he does. If, as the federal Minister of Labour responsible for that matter, he is unsuccessful in his efforts to mediate the dispute, of course we will urge other appropriate action, which may include the recalling of Parliament if that is necessary.

That's our view. We're deeply concerned about the matter, but on the other hand it would be unwise and ill-conceived for us to direct people as to the way in which they would go in a labor dispute of this nature, until they've resolved mediation approaches at the highest level.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. As a preamble, I feel that is very inadequate at the present time when we look at some of the figures and the effect on the economy of Alberta. On other issues — the Premier has indicated that on energy matters we know where we stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not aware of any notice of motion having been given for this debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: at this point in time, in such a serious situation, why are the actions of the Alberta government different on this subject than on other subjects where the point of view is made very clear? For example, we fought an election on the matter of energy — that Alberta would not back down and would tell the federal government what to do. Why is it different on this issue?

MR. LOUGHEED: If the hon. member is through his speech, I'd be glad to respond.

I am somewhat disturbed that the hon. Member for Little Bow would suggest that the automatic action in a labor dispute such as this is merely to recall a parliament without an effort being made by the federal Minister of Labour to properly mediate and resolve the dispute. If we get into a situation in this country, either in the province or on the federal scene, that the answer is always to bring back a legislature and move in that function, in my judgment we'll find ourselves in a mess in labor relations. And if that's what the hon. member is suggesting, he is very wrong.

I think it is incumbent upon a provincial government that has some wisdom in these matters to support the view that a Minister of Labour should be given an adequate opportunity to resolve that matter, serious as it is. If he is unable to resolve the matter, the communication either by the western premiers or by the government of Alberta will clearly be one to recall Parliament and to resolve the matter. But every reasonable effort should be made to the Minister of Labour to be able to do that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. I wasn't aware of the federal minister's journeying to Vancouver. But if the minister isn't going to the coast, will the Premier in his communique make that as a recommendation? This what I'm saying: is there a clear recommendation to the minister to go to the coast and initiate mediation as of today?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my information is clearly that the federal Minister of Labour is either

*See page 258, left column, paragraph 2

there or in transit and is commencing mediation proceedings, as he properly should be, having been sworn in just a few days ago. I think that's an appropriate approach for him to take. If he's unsuccessful, though, I have mentioned the alternative course of action. It's not just one communique involved here. There may be others. We are watching the situation through the Deputy Minister and Minister of Economic Development on an hour-by-hour basis because of what is at stake. But I repeat, the approach implicit in the hon. member's question is, in my judgment, not in the best interests of anybody involved in this country.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier indicate, when the watch is being taken, what will seem like a reasonable time before a second communique goes to the federal government indicating a second recommendation from the government of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: We've gone rather far afield in this line of questioning. What is a reasonable time is clearly a debatable matter. It's not a question of fact.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The Premier raised it. I didn't raise it.

MR. SPEAKER: That may be so. But it's still a debatable point.

Weather Modification

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The previous Minister of Agriculture had indicated that the results of the five-year weather modification plan would be made available in early or mid-1979. Has the minister had the opportunity to make an analysis of the five-year program and, if not, when will the results be available?

MR. SCHMIDT: Not yet, Mr. Speaker. It would be difficult to set a time as to when they would be available, but certainly as soon as we've had the opportunity to review them and arrive at a decision.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister's department considering expanding the program after this one five-year program, after the analyses are made and the results made available?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the review and analysis will certainly dictate the direction we're going. So I would say no, not at this time.

Housing — Cold Lake Area

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works, to give the minister an opportunity again to tell us the great things he's doing in housing. I'd like to know if the minister can inform the Assembly if the Alberta Housing Corporation has undertaken any formal evaluation studies of the effectiveness of its housing programs in the Cold Lake area?

MR. CHAMBERS: I'm not aware of anything specific, Mr. Speaker. However, I'd be quite happy to check that point and report to the hon. member.

Fusion Research

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct my question to the Minister of Economic Development. Could the minister comment on the development of an international consortium preparing to pick a site for fusion research? It's my impression that Alberta is one site of about four being considered. It would be interesting if the minister could advise us in what state that process is and what the government of Alberta is considering to entice that project to the province.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think all governments, particularly in North America, are looking with a great deal of interest at the question of fusion research as one of the hopes for the future in the energy field. As such, new technologies that might be developed over the coming years become a very important matter.

I would have to do some detailed checking to give the hon. member the direct specifics of that matter, but I will do so. I do know some work has been done through both the University of Alberta and the Research Council. But I'll have to check and find out the exact nature of that and where the situation is, and report to the hon. member.

Articulated Buses

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Transportation. About three years ago, the government of Alberta purchased a number of articulated buses to be used experimentally in our cities. I think they are still being used. I wonder if the hon. minister could tell us the result of the experiment, whether they intend to pursue it by way of purchase.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't been made aware of the status of the use of those buses. I haven't noticed them recently. Last night I did see a report on the use of the buses in eastern Canada. But I'll take the question as notice.

Food Supply

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs if he or the government of Alberta have had an opportunity to discuss with Macdonalds Consolidated and Horne & Pitfield the problems with respect to the impending shortage of fresh fruit and produce, created by the U.S. truckers' strike.

MR. KOZIAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government at this time reviewing any contingency plans with respect to the impact of the truckers' strike in the United States on Alberta consumers?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, we aren't directly reviewing the impact in that respect. Of course we haven't been specifically fixed with information that

that is definitely going ahead. Rumors of strikes abound in many cases, and I don't think it would be proper to run around and chase those rumors on every occasion, unless something serious came about.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. One could argue that, in view of the concern of some of the wholesalers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Premier whether the government would give consideration to discussing with both the Southern Pacific and Santa Fe railroads the possible availability of refrigerator cars, which would make it possible to continue the supply of fruit and produce to Alberta wholesalers if this strike is not settled in the next several days.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd refer the question to the Minister of Economic Development.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we are keeping track of the situation relative to the conveyance of fresh produce, particularly from the United States. My office has been in touch with some of the more prominent truck lines operating from California, in fact right through to Mexico. We've been assured to date by the principal in that particular case that in fact he has enough fuel and hasn't had any problems with running his trucks. If there's a change, one of the alternatives of course is to work through the rail system and/or the water system to get the produce here.

Gas Production

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct my second question today to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Could the minister indicate to the House whether his department has considered prorationing gas as is done for oil, given that there's a surplus of gas on the market, without a market, and some small producers do not have access to that market?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that very important matter would be one of a number of possible solutions to the current oversupply of natural gas in the province.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister indicate whether that policy suggestion is under active consideration, and how serious the problem is for small producers? I understand there's a court case on this matter.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate receiving some information from a variety of sources during the coming months on the extent of the problem, the amount of difficulty it has, particularly for small producers, and on the possible alternative courses of action we might take. But I would anticipate it would be some little while before we would be able to deal with that on a policy level.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

102. Mr. R. Clark moved that an order of the Assembly do

issue for a return showing copies of all correspondence and related documents regarding the agreement between Gordon Miniely, former Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and Dr. Talip Talibi, purportedly absolving Dr. Talibi of any indebtedness to the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission.

[Motion carried]

103. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a list of the names of the individuals appointed by the Minister of Labour to act as chairpersons of boards of arbitration, the number of times each individual has been appointed, and the name and address of the law firm, if any, with which the individual is associated; such list to cover the period commencing March 15, 1975, to June 1, 1979.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

205. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta urge the government of Alberta to take all necessary action to provide appropriate, publicly funded education to all the children of this province, regardless of handicapping conditions, to assist them in attaining their full potential.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to move Motion No. 205, standing in my name on the Order Paper, as an affirmation of the official opposition's belief that all children in our society have a right to education. As detailed in that motion, we believe that the education any child receives should be publicly funded — unless of course his parents wish otherwise — and tailored particularly to meet his special needs, talents, and interests.

This concept of the basic right to education is not only one of the cornerstones of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child, it is also a cornerstone of democracy itself. Unless we assist a child in attaining his full potential, he can never become a genuine and complete participant in our society, whether in Alberta, Canada, or North America as a whole. I find it remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that although lip service was paid only recently to that UN declaration in this very Assembly, the right of every child to education still does not exist in the province of Alberta.

As it is currently written, Section 136 of The School Act states that a school board must accept into its schools all resident pupils, or direct certain pupils to other jurisdictions. However, Section 138 says that a board may provide special education if it so chooses. Finally, Section 134 allows a board to excuse temporarily any student who does not fit readily into a regular classroom or regular school activities. Significantly, the term "temporarily" has never been clearly defined in the Act.

It has been said that school laws express the feelings of the lawmakers of a state, province, or local jurisdiction. The position of the Department of Education for the province of Alberta can therefore be translated as follows: we want every child in the province of Alberta in school; however, what happens to him after he goes

through that door is not really of concern to us. In any case, any school board with a conscience is bothered by the inherent hypocrisy of such a position that will provide an escape clause by which certain undesirable students can simply be allowed to disappear from the system.

Mr. Speaker, the obvious effect of current legislation and of that underlying attitude is twofold. First, no child in this province is guaranteed appropriate education or, indeed, an education at all. In fact, no child is guaranteed anything more than the space of the classroom. Secondly, some children, and perhaps those with the greatest amount of need — we talked about the potential of young people leaving school and becoming juvenile delinquents, and in this resolution we can refer to the physically and mentally handicapped — are not vouchsafed even this kind of schooling.

Mr. Speaker, the glaring inadequacy of The School Act has been pointed out many times by parents, educators, legal experts, and the handicapped themselves. The response of the previous Minister of Education was one of being rather stubborn, rather insensitive to the problem, and refusing to rewrite the legislation. We look at the present minister: with his current pronouncements with regard to schooling versus education, it appears that he is a rival to his predecessor in the ability to shirk that very same responsibility. Mr. Speaker, we should view that with alarm.

On the other hand, if we look at and itemize them, a wealth of special education programs can certainly be identified in the province of Alberta. For example, the daily needs of the severely and multiple physically handicapped at the Glenrose hospital can be met, in addition to their own clientele. We discussed that today in the House, and we questioned how long that type of thing is actually going to happen. The Alberta children's hospital in Calgary offers diagnostic and referral services to residents of southern Alberta. The large school systems of Edmonton and Calgary, along with the hospitals I've talked about, have been able to offer a variety of programs for the handicapped in our large urban centres.

We can also look at other noteworthy initiatives taken across the province of Alberta. For example, the MD of Taber operates classes for the trainable mentally retarded, for disabled junior high school students, and for the dependent handicapped. In a smaller and less significant role, the Cochrane school in Alberta has provided special programming for five years for a boy suffering from muscular dystrophy. The county of Lamont, where a lot of this concern originated, was suddenly faced with the unprecedented presence in its classroom of a girl who suffered from cerebral palsy. That school board and that county are struggling to meet her needs physically, emotionally, and certainly educationally with a minimal amount of assistance from the Department of Education. They are attempting to do the job on their own. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that wherever school boards across this province are attempting to provide some type of program, they are doing it without any real, meaningful, or substantial assistance, particularly financial, from the provincial government at the present time.

I think, Mr. Speaker — and I'm sure the minister will argue this if he is able to comment on the resolution today — that some effort is being made by the province in this regard. For example, we look at provincial initiatives that have been taken by the Minister of

Education, announcing the funding of 120 new special education teaching positions throughout the province. Secondly, the government announced an ongoing program to partially finance out-of-province education for learning disabled children. Recently, through the throne speech, the new minister announced improvements at the School for the Deaf. Fourthly, there was the commencement of planning for a new facility for multiple handicapped, deaf, and blind children.

However when I examine those programs on a large basis, there are obviously certain drawbacks we can identify, and I'm sure they are of concern to many of us. What is wrong? First, Mr. Speaker, they're incomplete. According to the director of special education services for the province of Alberta, there are simply not enough special education teachers available in the province to fill these new positions that were announced at an earlier date. According to parents of learning disabled children, who must be educated outside the province because such education is unavailable in Alberta, the maximum funding the department provides is less than half the total cost, and even this assistance is very poorly publicized and often difficult to arrive at. From one of my own experiences in the last year, I found that multiple telephone calls had to be made before we were able to arrive at some type of support for a handicapped child who needed the facility in another province.

Parents of students at the School for the Deaf certainly welcomed the announcement that there would be improvements there, but they regret very much that they had to lobby a full eight years for a number of changes. And parents of the multiple handicapped, deaf, and blind children must be concerned at the lack of speed in the planning and construction of the new provincial facility for their children. A number of them have already received notice that the province of Ontario cannot continue to accommodate those children much longer. They are in a very difficult position.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and more significant as a matter of concern, the government of Alberta has consistently refused to articulate a policy of support for the rights of the handicapped, including — and perhaps most important — the right to education. Thus with no unifying, philosophical framework from which to operate, the Department of Education responds spasmodically to put out whichever flame arises, without any type of overall program.

What we have to do in cases like that is give credit to the various groups across the province that are able to raise the concern and, in isolated instances, receive the attention and financial support of the Department of Education or the government of Alberta. But until the universal right to education is acknowledged by this government, Mr. Speaker, handicapped Albertans will continue to be educationally and socially disenfranchised. They will be reduced to a situation where they are begging for favors from the government, begging for favors from the insensitive bureaucrats, until they receive what they need; but not a positive thrust from the government, or initiatives to meet the needs, so there isn't this tug of war between the handicapped and the government of Alberta.

On the other side, Mr. Speaker, should the government prove willing to endorse the principles behind the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child, rather than simply mouthing the words, the

goal of providing appropriate education for all Albertans could be realized more readily than some here today might wish to acknowledge. That would be a great accomplishment, not only for the new Minister of Education but for us as members of this Legislative Assembly.

Today in the Assembly I introduced Bill 207, An Act to Amend The School Act (No. 3). Basically, as I already explained in the introduction, that Bill makes it mandatory rather than optional for school boards to provide special education as required, or to arrange for its provision through some other agency. It also defines the maximum allowable temporary absence from the school as a period of not more than two weeks, during which time appropriate programming must be located for the child in question. Finally, the Bill provides a two-year period for local and provincial preparation. Later on in this debate, my colleague from Clover Bar will also detail what we feel are some necessary steps not only in the implementation of that legislation, but the objective of taking our responsibility in Alberta in providing for the right of education for all children.

I think we should consider something else in the debate on this resolution. We are here this afternoon not really to debate the mechanics of a private member's Bill or the resolution as such, but something much more important: that we support the concept and the principle that all Albertans have a right to education, and that this government has the grave responsibility to assist every Albertan through providing appropriate education so that young people, and particularly our handicapped young people, can reach their full potential and be active and participating Albertans. That's what I think we should debate this afternoon in a very positive sense.

The government may be able to stand in its place and defend the type of programming that is going on, Mr. Speaker, but it's not a time to be defensive. It's a time for us to move forward, offer some good suggestions, attempt in all manners to co-ordinate the programs of government, meet the needs of the handicapped, and provide a trust between the citizens of Alberta and this government that we really believe in the right of education. Today we can start to fulfil that objective, and I call on members to support not only this resolution but any method or technique by which we can fulfil that objective.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. ADAIR: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 31 members of the grade 9 class from Glenmary in beautiful Peace River. I would ask that they, along with Mrs. Lovsin, stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**
(*continued*)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the resolution . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I saw the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar rise first.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that has been proposed by the hon. Member for Little Bow touches on the idea of the right to education for all or, in another way, the notion of special education which, I might add, is a very complex and controversial issue. If one examines the resolution as proposed, it bears certain positive merits and would receive endorsement, I'm sure, from parents who have the misfortune of being burdened with a handicapped child. However, I'm confident that a full understanding of the problem cannot be fully appreciated unless one has been exposed directly to such a predicament.

However I have difficulty with the resolution, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the broad, encompassing nature of "regardless of handicapping" covers a large spectrum of conditions. Also, the mechanism for providing an appropriate education is certainly open to debate, after the hon. member indicated that after getting the child into the classroom door, what happens is of no concern.

When you look at handicapping conditions, does the resolution refer to a youngster where a discrepancy exists between the child's potentialities and his or her achievements? Does it refer to children whose learning problems are primarily due to visual, hearing, motor handicaps, or does it refer to mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or environmental hardship? Does it refer to minimal brain or perceptual handicap? Does it refer to disorder in one or more of the psychological processes involved in understanding or using written or spoken languages?

Mr. Speaker, the whole phenomena of learning disabilities or handicapped conditions are a matter of definition, and few are very enduring or have a broad consensus. The definition problems are not merely semantic; they are fundamental to the whole field. Each definition has different implications for assessment — as in the Lamont case — classification, approach, research, social perception, training, social services, legislation and, finally, financial resources.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta Education has some broad definitions to enable school jurisdictions to establish special education classes. First, you have the educable mentally handicapped grouping. This is where they provide programs in regular school systems, through integrated or segregated settings, and in most of these there are resource specialists. Then you have the trainable mentally handicapped programs. Most of these are in private schools, such as Winnifred Stewart school. However, the trend in the '70s has been for some of these schools to be undertaken under the umbrella of a school system or school board. Some have not decided to do such, for a variety of reasons. Then, of course, you have the dependent handicapped, such as at Michener Centre, where they require medical care or are multihandicapped.

I also note from Department of Education reports that there has been a dramatic increase in the number

of special ed. programs throughout the province. If we take the years '67 to '77, the number of children in our regular school systems in special programs has risen from 2,800 to some 20,000. In private schools or institutions, we have in the neighborhood of 769, to 727 in the year 1977.

During the '70s there has been an increasing emphasis to make provision within the regular school system for the trainable mentally handicapped, or the dependent handicapped. An increasing number of rural areas have initiated local programs to deal with this problem, whereas in the past those children were sent to institutions or special schools. But whether the school systems are in a position to provide for all, regardless of handicap and without regard for location or population, is questionable.

The concept of the child as ineducable is frequently called the zero-rejection concept. It holds that no child should be excluded from the school. Putting it another way, all children, regardless of their level of functioning, are accepted into the schools and provided with a program for their special needs. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this concept is highly idealistic, because it does not take into consideration the realities of life. And it carries serious implications. It implies an immense broadening of the definition, the mandate of education, and it goes far beyond the scope of what we normally characterize as the mandate. This is particularly true of the child who is severely mentally handicapped. Dealing with this kind of handicap requires a major effort, and it takes a great deal of time to be devoted to such a child, often with frustrating results and very little noticeable improvement in the child's ability to function.

The mere fact that special education has grown in this province, albeit in the larger centres, indicates a degree of responsiveness and concern on the part of teachers, school boards, and the government. Recent developments and announcements indicate the government is prepared to allocate dollars for the development of curriculum for the handicapped, a move which will certainly be welcomed.

Secondly, there is a recognized higher cost with special education, and this is reflected in the increased grants. Thirdly, the learning disability fund has been expanded for the purpose of diagnosing difficulties and the prescription of corrective programs.

May I remind the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that other programs are to be reviewed by this Assembly: improved services at the Alberta School for the Deaf, the expansion of the EOF to the junior high level, the new program unit for dependent handicapped and multihandicapped, and preparatory planning for a facility for the multihandicapped and blind children. These are definite, positive steps in response to the general concerns implied in the resolution.

None the less, some very important issues are still outstanding. One of the most controversial issues surrounding special education is the integration into the regular school system. Integration, which is a current trend, has been brought about by the view that every child is special, that no child is exceptional, and that separating the handicapped from the mainstream of the educational system does not cure the problem.

Idealistically, again, it sounds good, but will it work? Most schools are not structurally or educationally equipped to accept increasing numbers with special needs. Most staff are already faced with a stress situa-

tion in dealing with a supposedly normal child, because of factors such as high parental expectations, lack of parental support, lack of motivation, alienation, suitability of programs, physical, social, or emotional hang-ups, poor home environment, or whatever. So to integrate into a regular school setting youngsters bordering on the severely handicapped and to expect positive results is indeed a formidable expectation.

Keep in mind that the cornerstone of a successful educational program is still the teacher. When the disposition of many is already concern about the regular programs, don't expect a burst of enthusiasm about the responsibility and burden of dealing with the very severely handicapped. The school cannot be all things to all people, and the custodial role already has jeopardized its mandate in terms of meeting its objectives.

So, Mr. Speaker, some very pertinent questions remain. What is education? Do all children have a right to an education within the school setting? Where does the mandate of a publicly supported school system end? What is integration? What are the disadvantages and advantages? What support services are required to make it work? Are teachers prepared for dealing with the severe handicaps in terms of training? What are the shared responsibilities of the home, other professions, other agencies? Should all special services required by the handicapped be labelled educational, or should there be an interfacing with other departments?

And what implications does this have for funding? Is mandatory legislation necessary? Consider the implications. I recall a report by Arctic Mackenzie Consultants which reaffirmed that permissive legislation, local initiative, and incentive funding provide effective services, and that mandatory legislation is not necessary.

Forcing the issue of a right to education is one thing; getting the child beyond the classroom door to acquire an appropriate, relevant education is another matter. As we extend our education services to include the more severe kinds of handicaps, I'm sure people are encountering major problems. The handicapped child requires a great deal of help in coping with the normal routines of daily living. Thus authorities usually find themselves providing child care as well as education. The amount of money required to supply constant care and intensive training for one child is considerable. The person who trains or educates the severely handicapped child requires special skills, and often these skills and attitudes are quite different from what you will find with a regular teacher.

In many of our larger centres, school jurisdictions in the last decade have, with government support, dramatically developed many programs that are deemed excellent. Accepting the responsibility to educate the handicapped appropriately is not simply a matter of legislation or funding, rather one of developing an effective program which requires a unified approach, and an interfacing of teachers, parents, other professions, community services, and various government departments.

Mr. Speaker, because of population, specialized staff, and community resources, there will always be some inequity in trying to duplicate the same excellent programs of the larger centres in the rural areas. To provide equal components for all throughout the province is like expecting to undergo open heart surgery at your local hospital.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have a great deal of

empathy for the parents and families of severely handicapped children who require special needs, and I heartily endorse the spirit and intent of the resolution. But implementation of the resolution is much more difficult and will probably not satisfy everyone. The proposition that Alberta is a land of abundance and therefore could resolve this problem overnight with 100 per cent satisfaction, with 100 per cent funding, and on each citizen's doorstep, requires careful consideration from this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, unless the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill wishes to ask a question.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the Assembly to introduce special guests, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member the requested leave?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the Assembly Joe and Aleida Hazelzet, who are from Calgary. Would they stand and receive the recognition of the Assembly, please.

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**
(*continued*)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the resolution this afternoon, I certainly intend to support it. I suppose the place to begin a discussion of this matter is to examine the question of whether education is a right or a privilege.

Mr. Speaker, none of us in this Assembly would argue that significant progress hasn't been made in the last few years in terms of improving educational opportunities for both the physically and mentally handicapped in this province, those suffering from multiple handicaps, those mildly handicapped. But while we've made considerable progress, it seems to me, especially in this Year of the Child, that we have to review the UN Declaration of the Rights of the Child, which says: the right to free education and the right to special care of handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's really much doubt that there is a pretty clear intent in the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child that there should be a right to education, and that that right should be extended beyond the normal school system in the sense of people who can fit into that system, but there must be special programs within that system for the physically and mentally handicapped.

When he introduced the resolution today, the hon. Member for Little Bow went over the history, both the Lamont school case — I don't think there's any need in reviewing that again — also the whole question of the provisions within the Act, but the ambiguity over the

exercise of temporary excuses which seem to have been interpreted, at least in some jurisdictions, as a way to avoid providing education for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, in saying that, I don't criticize the local jurisdictions because, despite the fact that additional funds have been made available, these additional funds are certainly not adequate even to begin to make it possible for school divisions to provide the kinds of educational facilities in the first place, as well as instructors in the second place. I'm told that we're looking at 104 new positions in special ed. in 1979, but we are going to have difficulty filling those positions because not enough people are being trained by our university to fit into special education.

When the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar talks about an integrated approach, I couldn't agree with him more. We do need an integrated approach if we're going to cope properly with the question of providing education to the physically handicapped as a right. You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we're going to have that integrated approach until we force both the school jurisdictions and the provincial government to recognize that education is a right. As long as we limp along as we have — admittedly improving as we proceed, providing more opportunities than we did five years ago and more than 10 years ago — the fact of the matter is that we're still going to get into a situation where the Department of Advanced Education is saying, well, should we really be stressing the whole question of special ed. at our education faculties? On the other hand we get people in the Department of Education saying, look, we can't really expand special ed. any faster than we are, because we don't have the qualified people to teach special ed., even if we made more positions available.

Mr. Speaker, I really think we're not going to overcome that question of integrating and coordinating until such time as there is a very clear statement of intention and policy based on the assumption that the right to an education is in fact a right — not a privilege, not something that parents have to go chasing around from one department to another or with a telephone book, scouting possible grants from hither and thither, all too often having to rely on private charity of one kind or another. No, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize that there should be a basic right to an education regardless of how handicapped that individual may be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few minutes with this question of Glenrose in Edmonton. It's my understanding that a letter went out on May 22 indicating that diagnostic and treatment services for children with speech and hearing problems are going to be terminated September 1, 1979. The reason contained in that letter — among others, the major reason is fiscal restraints.

Mr. Speaker, we had the interesting situation in the question period this afternoon where the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, under whose jurisdiction Glenrose would come, apparently was unaware of this letter. We then had the Minister of Education tell us that he'd sat down and discussed it with the public school board — not the separate school board, but the public school board. We had the Minister of Social Services and Community Health advise us that the services were going to be provided in another form.

But the crucial question was raised: are we going to make sure the funds to supply those services are availa-

ble? If Glenrose is cutting them off, somebody's going to have to pick them up. That somebody is going to have to be the health unit, the separate school board, the public school board, or a combination of the three. Unless the minister is prepared to guarantee some sort of budgetary provision, the inevitable result is that we're going to have to provide the services for up to 750 children without the staff the Glenrose is phasing out on September 1. To say, as the minister did today: look, no problem, we're going to try to work this out, there's not going to be any change in services — unless there is some kind of fiscal commitment to pick up where the Glenrose is leaving off, there can't be any other result than a cutback in services.

Mr. Speaker, I say very sincerely that I would like to see the Minister of Education rise before this debate concludes and assure the House that the Glenrose is going to carry on the same level of service to children in the Edmonton area that it has, until such time as there is a guarantee of funding, either to the health unit or to the boards in question — and probably to the boards in question would be the most likely result.

Mr. Speaker, we can't really talk about rights of the handicapped if there is at least some danger that existing programs are going to be qualified. I don't see how you could argue anything other than the fact that they're going to be qualified, if we have Glenrose phasing out on September 1 and we have no commitment at this time to ensure that there is funding to maintain the staff and the service at either the school board or health unit level.

Mr. Speaker, I note as well that in March this year the plan the former Minister of Social Services and Community Health, Miss Hunley, had talked about at some length, the Cormack plan to build community resource centres, is not going to proceed. As a result, the school board is going to have to take up to 70 multihandicapped children with approximately five months' notice. In fairness to the government, while we have made some progress, I raise this because the fact of the matter is that we have a long way to go, and there's at least some evidence to indicate that we're being pushed back.

To talk about some of the rural divisions, Mr. Speaker, opportunity rooms, I had a situation in one of the divisions — I won't name it because it wouldn't be fair to that division; the problems that exist in rural education exist throughout the province. Because we don't make enough money available for opportunity room funding, this particular opportunity room teacher decided on April 1 or thereabouts to stop teaching. Rather than replace that teacher, the school board in its wisdom decided not to replace him at all and, in fact, there would be a gap of three months in the opportunity room in this particular school.

Mr. Speaker, that sort of thing is not happening because superintendents of schools are mean ogres who want to deprive children of the advantages of the opportunity room. It is happening because of our failure to provide the money where it's needed, at the local level, to sustain an adequate education system not only for the handicapped but for all children in this province.

I'd just like to conclude my remarks by hearkening back to a rather thoughtful statement that Senator Kennedy made in the United States when the Senate committee was reviewing his proposal for a national

medical care scheme. He made the point, and I think it's a very valid one, that we can judge the morality and even the civilization of a people on the basis of how we treat the weak; not how we treat the strong, who can look after themselves, but how we treat the weak.

DR. BUCK: What about the opposition?

MR. NOTLEY: Somebody said, what about the opposition. Well, maybe we could qualify in that category, too. Whether or not the government would qualify for the handicapped is hard to say.

Before the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would argue that with the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child saying that education should be a right, with the financial capacity of the province being very clear, we should be saying now to those parents who have handicapped children that we're going to provide education as a matter of right. No one is suggesting it can be done the day after tomorrow. The hon. member suggested a two-year gearing-up period so we could have co-ordination. It obviously has ramifications for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower; we're going to have to train more special ed. teachers. We're going to have to work out arrangements with school boards. We're going to have to make physical arrangements in schools. One of the problems with Lamont county was the capital structure changes that have to be made when you provide education for a handicapped child. All those things have enormous implications. No question about that. And they're going to be costly; no question about that either.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't think any of us can argue that education should be a right for some children and not for all. That's really the point that has to be driven home. While this government can take some credit for progress made to date, as I talked to parents of children who are physically or mentally handicapped, there is no doubt that we have a long way to go.

[Dr. Buck, Mr. Isley, and Mr. Knaak rose]

MR. SPEAKER: We appear to have had a three-way photo finish. Could I first of all recognize the hon. Member for Bonnyville.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate on Motion 205, because I feel that education for the handicapped child is a very important subject that deserves much of our attention.

However, although I support education and educational opportunities for the handicapped, I am bothered by Motion 205 for two reasons. One is the vague wording of this motion, and I refer to the statement "to provide appropriate, publicly funded education". I wonder who is the decision-maker, when it comes to deciding how appropriate an education is. Would this decision be made by the parent, the school board, the superintendent, the teacher, the provincial government, or who else?

The other thing that concerns me with respect to the interpretation I take from Motion 205 is that I consider it redundant. It seems to be directing the government to move in a direction in which it has been moving. If you talk to many people who are closely associated

with educating the handicapped, they will probably tell you that we have taken giant steps in the last eight years. This may indicate a lack of awareness of existing programming on the part of the hon. Member for Little Bow.

If we look at where we are today and review Section 133 of The School Act, it tells us which children, and the age levels, school boards are responsible for educating. Section 136 directs the board to accept pupils in schools of its jurisdiction or direct them to schools of another jurisdiction. Section 138(b), which the hon. Member for Little Bow partially quoted, says:

Notwithstanding anything in this Part a board may provide special education by operating special schools or classrooms or by making a grant and sending pupils to an organization or agency approved by the Minister which provides special education . . .

So I suggest the machinery is there.

If we look at the programs in addition to normal funding of education, we have the funding of special education positions. In recent years the number of categories of special education teachers funded has increased to 16. If anyone's interested in the 16 categories of handicapped, or students you can trade positions for, or students with learning disabilities, they'd be wise to check with the director of special services, Dr. Jack Church.

In addition to those types of programs, in 1972 this government added the learning disability fund: in approximately 1973 the educational opportunity fund, which is currently being extended into the junior high schools. Probably the most dramatic improvement for delivering education to the handicapped is the program unit grant, the new program for dependent and multihandicapped pupils. Again I suggest that anyone interested in the amount of money being pumped into this program check with the documents distributed by the director of special services. A further move by this government in the direction of responding to the needs of the handicapped was the announcement made in December to start planning a facility for the multihandicapped, deaf, and blind children of Alberta. It's my understanding that if we achieve that objective, it would make it the first in Canada.

We must remember that in 1969 the school system accepted little or no responsibility for the trainable mentally handicapped. Institutions in this province faced long lists of students waiting to enter. There were minimal programs for the student rated as trainable mentally handicapped, and the dependent or multihandicapped. Things have changed dramatically since that time.

Another concern I have in this area is that we don't get our programs too far ahead of our ability to implement them. I think we must realize that when we start talking about the handicapped individual, we're in a highly emotional social area. Probably in the last 20 or 25 years in this country, we've moved from hiding these people, to institutionalizing them, to now going into the process of integrating them. Again I refer to the program unit grant for the dependent and multihandicapped, which allows parents and local jurisdictions to develop programs either separate from or integrated with other students. From the input I receive from parents in my constituency who have children in these categories, I think

there are very distinctly different schools of thought on the question of integration. The arguments put forward by the supporters of integration seem to me also to suggest that we have to have a somewhat separate training or educational institution as well, to which we can take the normal students to get them used to the handicapped, in preparation for bringing the handicapped into the classroom.

I very much appreciate the flexibility allowed to local jurisdictions in the funding of the program. If it suits their needs, they can offer the program in a separate entity or in the school setting. We must realize, though, that with the number of different handicapped students we can be dealing with, not every school jurisdiction in this province can deliver a program. This brings us to the question of accessibility to programs. I think the point was well made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar that you can't have open-heart surgery everywhere in the province. We must be realistic when we look at specialized programs.

Another area we have to look at in trying to keep our implementation process up with our program process is the development of teachers, and the importance of accurate and recurring assessment. I think with humans doing it, with the tools we have, there's always a possibility of misclassification. So we have to be very careful in that area.

The other thing I would touch on briefly is the back-up service provided to the handicapped from the Department of Social Services and Community Health when students have to leave their home communities to take advantage of programs.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would state that I'm opposing the motion based on its vagueness and redundancy. I stress that we direct our efforts to the streamlining and implementation of present encompassing programs, and to concerning ourselves with what happens to the handicapped after they pass the age at which education normally stops, 16 to 18 years. I think that opens an area for a future debate on how we deal with integrating the handicapped into this society after they've been through the programs that our educational systems have.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Dr. Buck and Mr. Knaak rose]

MR. SPEAKER: We appear to have another tie, and it would seem that in circumstances of this kind, the custom in most parliaments is to attempt to maintain some kind of alternation between speakers for and against a resolution. On that principle, I would recognize the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too take pleasure in speaking to this opposition-designated motion this afternoon.

I'm sure certain members across the floor would have us believe that the right to education is commendable but not really attainable. We in the official opposition believe that the goal can indeed be attained, and we're here this afternoon to explain how. We hope the now government will do some instituting now, in case that now government has forgotten what that word means.

As my colleague the hon. Member for Little Bow pointed out, a change in school legislation is not in itself sufficient to remedy the exclusion of the handi-

capped from the educational system in Alberta. I happen to know, both as a patient and as a concerned parent, the young lady whom the court case is over — the case that brought us to where we are now. So I do have an interest as a parent and as a member of the Legislature and knowing the situation as it exists.

Members of both sides have said the situation will not be rectified instantly; there are many problems and ramifications. But as I said, just the change in school legislation is not sufficient to remedy the current situation. Certain supporting steps must be taken both immediately and on an ongoing basis by the Department of Education and other government departments. We saw this afternoon that sometimes we have a little trouble communicating between departments. I'm sure that as the cabinet grows to 54 — because we have to give everybody a pension — it'll be even more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, those steps of trying to have the Department of Education and other government departments working are ongoing things, but we have to look at the planning required. Under the heading of preparation finance, and under planning the initial activity that must be carried out, is the conducting of a province-wide census of the handicapped. Who are they? Where are they? What are their unique educational needs?

To date, the Department of Education has no idea how many children have simply been allowed to slip away from our school system into the background via the school's undefined temporary absence clause. Nor is there any official knowledge of how many children simply languish at home, never having been registered with school authorities because their parents know only too well that no special help exists for these youngsters. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the department has shown very little inclination to really find out where these youngsters are.

Once these basic data are known, facility and program planning can begin in earnest. That's not to imply that all children requiring special education should be accommodated in segregated institutions or, to take the opposite extreme, to suggest that every child, regardless of severity of handicap, should be placed in a regular public school classroom. Rather, Mr. Speaker, in planning facilities and programs for the education of handicapped children, our guideline should be a phrase taken from the American special education experience: the least restricted environment. In other words, every child should be placed where he can thrive. While not all handicapped children belong in public schools, many more than there are could undoubtedly be accommodated.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, while some handicapped children may never — and I say never — leave total care institutions, there can and should be educational components to their daily lives also. I hardly need point out, Mr. Speaker, that a whole range of alternative settings exists between these two extremes.

As a corollary to the goal of the least restricted environment, Mr. Speaker, I further submit that a child in need of special education should be placed as close as possible to his home and family. Certainly programs cannot be implemented nor facilities constructed in every Alberta community for dealing with the rarest of disabilities. As the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar said, we can't have open-heart surgery in every operatory in Alberta. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't try. Some programs may operate best on the

county level, and some facilities may be justified only on a regional basis.

Of course these are questions that can be answered only following the completion of the census I mentioned, Mr. Speaker. Moreover, they are questions that will require repeated consideration. I suggest to the hon. members that the Glenrose hospital school and the Alberta children's hospital, both of which already provide diagnostic and referral assistance to communities throughout the province, could, with suitably broadened mandates, provide knowledgeable advice in this regard.

Turning to the question of professional preparation, I would first remind members that not enough special education teachers exist to meet the current trend. Obviously, therefore, once we extend the right to education to all Alberta children, this number will have to increase. But beyond the issue of expansion, which seems to be a preoccupation of this government — we talked about the slight expansion of the cabinet; look at all those fine pension plans that got doubled — we must reconsider the nature of special education teacher preparation programs in this province. Currently special education teachers are trained to practise only at the elementary level. No programs in teaching the handicapped, not even in isolated courses, exist for teachers practising at the junior high school and secondary school levels. Even more amazing, for certification in Alberta, teachers are not required to take even a basic survey course in special education.

Mr. Speaker, these and other glaring inadequacies must of course be remedied through consultation involving the minister, through the Department of Education, his colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, on his right, representatives of our provincial universities, and spokesmen for the teaching profession. I suggest, however, that the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower could take some initiative by increasing funds to the faculties of education to enable increased research in special education and improved teacher training programs, and by establishing a bursary program to enable practising teachers to return to university to study special education. I'm sure the minister, with his new enthusiasm as a new minister, will certainly move or, at least, look in this direction.

MR. HORSMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask the hon. member whether the paper he is reading from is his own thoughts or the thoughts of someone else he's bringing to this Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Would the hon. minister like to sit down?

MR. R. CLARK: And do something.

DR. BUCK: And do something. That's right. The minister's had a couple of months to get something going in his department, but he's more interested in playing lawyer. The minister should know by now, Mr. Speaker, that he should be the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and get off his duff and do something. So to the hon. minister: I can put notes down any way I'd like to Mr. Speaker, he's wasting my time, and I'm almost running out of time.

MR. HORSMAN: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refer the hon. member, through the Chair, to the ordinary rules of this Assembly about reading speeches. If they are the thoughts of someone else, it is necessary for a member to identify the thoughts as being those of someone else.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, they're certainly not the ideas of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower or the Department of Education. That's quite obvious.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that I'm being hassled, I'd like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I was just going to observe that although the Chair had some fairly strong suspicion about the speech being read, that suspicion had not yet deteriorated into a conviction.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that the time has almost expired, I would like permission to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Assembly would agree to call it half past 4, we might proceed to the next order of business.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS**
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill 203
The Conflict of Interest Act

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to lead off the discussion on Bill 203, The Conflict of Interest Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I just say in passing that I know there has been some concern in the Assembly as to whether 202 and 203 should both maintain their place on the Order Paper and both be open for debate. It would seem that there are substantial differences between the two bills, although they may cover the same general subject matter. To sort out those differences, and to see which aspects of which Bill might be debatable, might be an exercise in frustration and waste the time of the Assembly. I would therefore suggest that both Bills might be debated in the ordinary way.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome your ruling. Thank you for that ruling.

In rising to lead off the debate this afternoon on Bill

203, the conflict of interest legislation, might I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in many regards I view the debate on this Bill, and the principles involved here, as a continuation of the debate which started in this House on May 25, when we asked of the Premier the very first questions in this session, with regard to certain airplane flights, and have continued with a number of questions in that area since.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill outlaws what I consider to be unacceptable conflicts of interest among present and former MLAs, ministers, deputy ministers, executive staff, members, and heads of Crown corporations and government agencies.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of behavior must be prohibited, and the Bill moves in that direction. I think it's self-evident that conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest need to be outlawed; that is, they place individuals in situations where as a result of either their responsibilities or information they've acquired when they're in public office there is the possibility or the opportunity to promote a private interest in conflict with the public interest. I further believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's self-evident that such conflicts of interest are improper.

Finally, I believe it's self-evident that if we act that such conflicts of interest are improper and where we see these conflicts of interest have in fact occurred, it's essential that we legislate, in the form of Bill 203, to stop those kinds of conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe the merits of the Bill are self-evident, I want to spend a portion of the time available to me this afternoon dealing with this central principle, but also commenting and dealing with some of the points raised in this Assembly during this session. I want to start with the comments by the Premier over the past several months, and by several of his colleagues most recently, regarding the central principle of this Bill, which I see as codifying the conduct of Members of the Legislative Assembly, former members, members of the Executive Council, and heads of Crown corporations.

The arguments against such a statutory coding of ethics are essentially three. The points made are that we don't need it, that we already have it, and it's unworkable. Now these arguments aren't reasonable, and they contradict each other. The argument that we don't need such a Bill was made by the Premier when he rationalized that electoral accountability was the ultimate guarantee of ethics among elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind members of the Assembly when they're considering the principle of the Bill that on May 25, when we asked the Premier in this Assembly about his acceptance of free air line tickets and, more generally, about ministerial acceptance of gifts, he replied: "that ... matter I presented to the people of Alberta ..."

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the Premier's memory is a bit shaky. In fact that matter was not presented to the people of Alberta by the Premier or this government, but was initially presented to the people of Alberta by the media of this province. The Premier himself never disclosed those gifts. If it hadn't been for the investigation of the media, the people of this province might never have learned of those free trips.

The point is: the argument of accountability to the public presumes that the public will be fully informed of the actions of public officials. But without at least a policy of disclosure of gifts — and, Mr. Speaker, this

government has no such policy — the public cannot always judge the rightness of government action, because the public will not be aware of all the actions.

Mr. Speaker, it's fair to say, and I'm sure my colleagues in the Assembly will agree with these comments, that the government won a tremendous victory on March 14. I would say also, and I hope they would agree with me, that basically it was a clean campaign. But, with 75 seats in the Assembly, I expect most government members would also agree with me that the greatest danger this government faces is a trend toward complacency and arrogance itself.

I suggest that the Premier's remarks in the Assembly on May 25 reflect that. In discussing this principle of setting out a code of ethics in legislation, which is what we're talking about this afternoon, the Premier indicated he was prepared to rest his answer with the decision people made on March [14]. What did that decision really mean, Mr. Speaker? We heard those comments on the first day in the House and later in the session. On June 4, Monday of this week, we heard a rather different interpretation of that mandate by the Premier. He talked about the six points the Conservatives raised during that campaign, not one of those six points being central to the question of ethics. A different interpretation, an interpretation I believe was far closer to the real intent of the provincial election.

So this afternoon, when hon. members are considering the basic principle of this Bill, which in its simplest form is: are we going to set down in legislation those things which are regarded as conflicts of interest by MLAs, former MLAs, cabinet ministers, heads of Crown corporations, so not only members of the Assembly, heads of Crown corporations, and executive staff people know where they stand — and, more important, the public know where they stand — or are we going to hide behind the idea that we can't accept the principle of setting out that code of conduct or conflict of interest?

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind hon. members of the comments made in the Assembly by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn in an earlier debate, when he said:

... questions of ethics are highly subjective in nature, and ethical standards are inevitably determined by the prevailing [norms] and values of a society at a particular [time and point].

That's indeed a very interesting comment.

The ethical principles underlying Bill 203 is that public officials should not be in a position of actual or potential conflict of interest, because such a position incurs the possibility that the public interest may be sacrificed for the private interest. According at least to my ethical standards, a conflict-of-interest situation is a bad situation. Now it may be that other members have different points of view. My guess is, though, that on a subjective judgment most people would agree with the point of view, the principle, of this Bill. When one looks at the recent proliferation of this kind of legislation in other provinces in Canada, in our federal government, and in North America, I think the principle of having legislation setting out conflict of interest would be supported by most people.

The hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn stated that "ethical standards are inevitably determined by the prevailing [norms] and values of society" Yes they are, Mr. Speaker. So are laws, and so is Bill 203.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw members' special atten-

tion to the portion of this Bill that deals with individuals who leave cabinet or a senior position in the public service with Crown corporations. I raise this matter in light of comments made, once again, by the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, when he made the point that we want to attempt to encourage people to participate in government. I submit to members of the Assembly that the principle involved in this Bill, approved by the Assembly, would be an encouragement to people.

The point can be, and has been made by some people, that prospective MLAs may be deterred by unreasonable restriction against returning to their normal occupation upon leaving government. That's a valid concern. But the restrictions in this Bill are that a former public official would be prevented for a period of five years from taking employment to influence the public agency which he has served. Let me rephrase that for members: a former cabinet minister or official of a Crown agency would be prevented for a period of five years from taking such employment that he or she would be directly involved in trying to influence the agency which they served.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there are hon. members in the Assembly who in their own mind are trying to grapple with the principle of this Bill and are saying: is there a real need to set out conflict-of-interest legislation? Referring to an earlier discussion in the Assembly, I'm reminded of the comments by the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. The hon. minister said:

This is the fundamental principle at stake

The principle, the issue that has to do directly with the inference in this Bill before us, that members of the Assembly, ministers of the Executive Council, their executive staff members, and corporation and agency heads, act against the public interest or in conflict with the public interest

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important when discussing the principle of this Bill, that we put on the record some examples members should keep in mind when they're deciding whether or not to support this principle. One example in the memory of many members of this Assembly would be the former Attorney General, when he was requested by one of his cabinet colleagues to have the RCMP investigate an individual in the Slake Lake area, against whom the RCMP were contemplating no criminal charges. A second example of why we need this kind of legislation is the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture who used his official position to arrange for the sale of his own agricultural products. Go back and check the judicial inquiry that was held. A third example, in our judgment, is when executives of two Crown corporations solicit funds for the Conservative Party. We don't think that's proper. This legislation would prevent that. A fourth example is when the Premier accepts free flights from an air line company with which the government has to negotiate. We don't think that's acceptable, and this legislation would prevent that.

The former Attorney General in the province introduced legislation which potentially could have been of very direct benefit to him. There were great cries in the Legislature when we raised that, but the government dropped the legislation the next day. We think it should be set out in legislation that that's simply not acceptable. The former Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care attempted to use his position to discharge the indebtedness to government of a particular physician.

We don't think that use of public office is acceptable, and this legislation would prevent that. Or the campaign people of the present Minister of Housing raising campaign funds from outside his riding from people the minister does business with.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would outlaw, make it outside the area where not only MLAs, cabinet ministers, and executive staff, but other people, would not be able to be involved in those kinds of activities.

If anyone questions whether there is a presumption in my Bill that public officials get themselves into conflicts of interest, then let's be clear about it: they do, Mr. Speaker. We're all human. We can all make mistakes, and we all do. Let's not get bogged down in praising or condemning the records of present or former governments, be they provincial or federal. Let's simply make it very clear that in this legislation there are not extreme penalties for innocent mistakes; neither should any government or opposition member be fearful of sanctions in the Bill. It seems to me that we must be setting some sort of example for the public, not inventing differences between ourselves and what we expect from ordinary people.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my comments on this Bill, there are those who will say — in fact, have already said — that it would do no good to set out conflict-of-interest guidelines in legislation, because if someone was really going to benefit themselves, they would do that irrespective of the legislation. In fact, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood made that point earlier during a debate in the House. I simply say that what we must attempt to do in this Assembly, and what this legislation does, is set out clearly and, I think, fairly straightforwardly what is expected of MLAs, cabinet ministers, their executive help, and heads of Crown corporations. I believe that Alberta's public officials, including members of this Assembly, would generally comply with this Bill if it were passed, just as I believe members of this Assembly and the public of Alberta generally obey the laws of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to concentrate my remarks upon responding to some of the continuing pattern of argument by the Premier and several arguments raised by members last week on this whole conflict of interest question. To some, this may seem to have been rather a strange way to proceed. However, although mine is the first speech on Bill 203, I don't pretend this is the first reference in this House to this whole question of principle. This debate, in a sense, is a continuation of the debate we've had in this House since the first day this Assembly opened for question period. It was heard last week in the debate by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and members across the way in their rejoinders to his comments. It's also been heard across this province, this country, and this continent over a number of years. I see no reason to resume the debate from square one. Those of us who favor conflict-of-interest legislation have presented our arguments. Those have been responded to, and now I respond to the arguments on the other side. In doing so, I hope to have provided some continuity and some progress to the ongoing debate.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 203, The Conflict of Interest Act, is aimed to define and prohibit conflict of interest among public officials. It defines such conflict in some detail, but of course my mind is open to appropriate amendments on details. I would certainly look forward to

amendments that members would want to put forward in committee. But on the principle of this Bill my mind is settled. I believe we need this kind of legislation in Alberta, and I believe we need this kind of legislation now.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this particular Bill, and also on the one that was put forward previously by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, with several real concerns in my mind. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has eloquently put his case and has repeated many of the arguments put previously.

What we are really looking at here is a philosophical direction which I find very difficult to accept. We are looking at doing away with the philosophy of previous centuries and are really being asked to accept a philosophy of the rule of morals, ethics, and codes of conduct by legislation rather than by accepted practice. The Leader of the Opposition made a point about the changes in ethics and morals that occur with the passage of time. But those changes are relatively slight. After all, for the last 2,000 or 3,000 years we have been living with the Christian-Judaic code, which is essentially: do unto others as you would be done by. I think we are being asked to change that code of ethics and that basis for behavior to one where we legislate things in this particular environment, rather as if we were legislating speed limits or making it part of the Acts of the province that you shouldn't steal things out of a drugstore. I really don't feel that sort of thing is necessary.

There are, after all, two philosophies of law enforcement. We have one which says people are essentially reasonable, normal human beings, who admittedly on occasion break the speed limit — I haven't yet had my licence suspended, but it may be coming fairly soon — that basically we are not criminals, that we believe in the rule of law, and that the police are there only to try to put us on the rails if we slide off occasionally. The other philosophy of the rule of law is that people are essentially criminals who are kept straight by having a police force.

Since the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade is not here, I will try to use my pidgin German. There is a German saying: *Was nicht verboten ist, ist erlaubt*, which liberally translated is: What's not forbidden is allowed. We know the results that came from that type of philosophy.

The Leader of the Opposition has given some examples of the occurrences which he feels justify the introduction of the legislation he's presenting at this time. But we must realize that those examples have already been dealt with quite satisfactorily by the present system — at least to my satisfaction, and obviously to the satisfaction of most of the people of Alberta.

I can give an example of what happens with legislated conflict of interest. It doesn't apply at this level of government; it applies at a lower level, if that's the right word. I like to say there are three equal levels. But at the municipal level, in Hinton, three members of the town council voted on a matter which, on superficial examination by anybody, would not have involved the slightest conflict of interest. It was about the routing of a road past a shopping centre, and the fact that this would involve the moving of pulp trucks. It would involve the pulp mill in strengthening the roadbed. These three people happened to work for the pulp mill. They didn't own shares in St. Regis; there

was no direct financial benefit for them. But the judge, presumably in his wisdom, decided that these three people had to go off the town council.

That's the kind of thing we're going to look at if we have ethics and morals, conflict of interest by legislation and by definition. First of all, the legislation is going to become top-heavy, trying to fill all the holes that develop in the dike over the passage of time.

If you look at the process of parliamentary democracy, all of us, on both sides of the House, have been through nomination meetings and the election process. I think we have to trust that the people of Alberta, who decide who they want in this House, are going to find out most of the weak brothers or sisters in the electoral process. I would hope so and, from what I've seen of the members of this House, I think they did very well.

Mr. Speaker, it's a basic tenet of parliamentary democracy that policies are set by elected people. This particular government obviously believes in this. In fact, they got into what some people would have described as political hot water by dealing with the environment conservation agency, the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, and the Hospital Services Commission. These bodies were not elected, but in fact were setting policies. When the government changed it so those bodies did not set policy, it may at first glance have appeared a dicey situation politically; apparently it wasn't. But these things were done because the government believes in parliamentary responsibility. Apparently the electorate decided it was good government and good politics as well.

But what comes from that is that ministers and the members of the Legislature are responsible for their actions and policies to those people who elected them. The ultimate judge of our behavior in this House, and that of the ministers, is going to be the electors of the province. The voters are the ultimate judge. I don't feel the responsibility for that judicial process should be transferred to the court system, however wise the judiciary may be.

I've spoken quite a bit about philosophy so far. Another philosophy comes into this, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned it. We have essentially two types of politician in this country: those who make politics a profession unto itself, and those who take time out from other careers to spend in politics. We may well need the professional politician. I happen to believe we definitely need the amateur politician. I feel they retain their relationship with their constituents, with the members of the general public. They have a closer feel than the professional politician in Ottawa can possibly have, spending at least 10 months of the year, as he or she does, 2,000 or 3,000 miles from their constituency, in the case of the Alberta representatives.

For those I will describe as amateur politicians — although some of them become very professional at it — first of all we have to make it relatively simple to get into elected positions. I think clauses 10, 11, and 12 in The Legislative Assembly Act particularly apply to the ordinary members of the Legislature. The restrictions there are quite adequate for even the present-day morals and mores of society. This government has introduced disclosure for members of the Executive Council, so the general public knows they are not dealing with matters in which they have a direct pecuniary interest during their tenure of office in

whatever ministry it may be.

Therefore, people coming into this Legislature have knowledge and experience based on their other careers. They bring that knowledge and experience here, and they use it not for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the people of Alberta. When we leave this Legislature, presumably most of us either have or will acquire additional experience and knowledge useful to the people of Alberta. We are being asked to accept a code of ethics or conduct that, for five years after we leave this Chamber, will essentially prevent us from using that knowledge and experience for the benefit of the people of Alberta, not for our own benefit.

We are being asked to accept that for five years — after all, it would be during those five years that presumably that knowledge and experience would be most useful — we will have essentially no further active part in trying to determine the path of this province. We're being asked to take no part in persuading this Legislature, its members, its committees, or any bodies authorized by this Legislature. I think the people who are going to lose by that are not going to be the individual members who have left this Assembly, but the people of Alberta. They're the ones who are going to lose.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with what I was saying about the philosophies of the law enforcement process, one of the three things the Leader of the Opposition mentioned was that some people say it is unworkable to have a written code of behavior. I happen to believe that's true, but not for the reasons he would give. What happens if you introduce laws which are very specific? People will find equally specific ways around those laws. In the highly unlikely event that anybody with the determination to use the Assembly for his own personal benefit would be bothered to go through the nomination and electoral process, purely and primarily for his own benefit, I don't think we can introduce laws in this Assembly that would stop him. I really believe you cannot prevent people from breaking a law by policing. That's not my philosophy of law enforcement, and three previous generations were all policemen before this one became a doctor.

What we're seeing here, Mr. Speaker, is a situation that's worthy of *Alice in Wonderland*. We are really being asked to introduce legislation which, first of all, is going to restrict the people who come into this Legislature. We're going to restrict the experience and knowledge brought into this Legislature. Then, when people leave it, we're going to restrict them from applying any further knowledge and experience they may have acquired. As I said already, this can be to the detriment of nobody except the people of Alberta, who we primarily are here to look after. We're here to look after their interests and nobody else's.

I've been in this Legislature only a short time. I've been a politician, in the accepted meaning of the word, only for slightly longer than that. From what I have experienced of all the members on both sides of this House, I don't feel that anybody in this House has the slightest intention of trying to corrupt what are essentially the basics of the parliamentary democratic system. None of us is here for that end, and I, for one, am prepared to trust that.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in the time I've been here I have not only been convinced I can trust my fellow members, I have also been convinced that this particular type of

legislation is completely unnecessary.

Thank you.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to participate in this very important debate. I would like to congratulate the members who have participated previously. I have looked back on the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, the Member for Edmonton Norwood and, today, the remarks of the Member for Edson, and the contributions to this very important discussion with regard to a code of conduct in terms of moral and ethical standards by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

In rising today I should like to remark that the hon. Member for Old-Didsbury, in placing this piece of legislation before us today — that it is a very well-intentioned piece of legislation. However, I find some aspects difficult. First, I should like to deal in a philosophical bent with the legislation and later deal with some of the specific principles in the Bill.

The question of a codified, legislated approach to matters of ethical conduct and moral standards of elected people is one we should not take very lightly. In these days of post-Watergate public cynicism toward public officials, it is very easy to succumb to an expedient, legislated approach to the moral and ethical conduct of elected officials. This approach may soothe public opinion by being able to point to a statute or law which is all-encompassing in its restrictions or requirements for disclosure, its rules or qualifications on what is proper or improper conduct, what constitutes a conflict of interest, or what is not a conflict of interest.

But such a law or statute will not prevent any person who, with intent, wishes to act outside or in conflict with that law. It will not prevent any individual from acting in manner which will prevent the individual from being in a conflict of interest. I think it is important that we recognize that fact. We can legislate, Mr. Speaker, but that is not going to prevent any elected person who has the will to circumvent that law from doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that serving as an elected person is a privilege, perhaps one of the highest callings a person may respond to: serving his fellow man for the good and general benefit of the public at large. I believe a very important qualification which the public expects of persons running for office is for the individual to have exhibited the highest moral and ethical standards in his daily life style or his dealing with others.

As stated by the hon. Member for Edson, on the path to election to public office the individual is judged twice by his peers: first, in the party nomination and, secondly, in the general election which follows. And the scrutiny by the public of him and his actions is very important. Mr. Speaker, I place a great deal of faith in the wisdom the electorate exercises in selecting the people they choose to represent them, whether in municipal, provincial, or federal elections.

In assuming public office a person accepts a trust between himself and the people he represents. That stewardship or trust is under constant scrutiny by society. Any action by that individual to transcend or break that trust will result in complete public scrutiny of the person's action. And I submit that public reaction will

resolve that person's breach of accepted moral and ethical behavior. In light of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition this afternoon with regard to the actions of the former Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, that matter was dealt with very quickly by this government. It didn't require legislation. It was acted upon.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we as elected people must allow our conscience to act as our guide. I think the full knowledge that any conduct — I must emphasize, any conduct — which does not seem fully acceptable will be challenged by the public at any time, will go a long way to guide members in their conduct and in their understanding of the trust the public has placed in them.

I should like to quote from the inquiry by Justice Morrow into the affairs in the city of Edmonton, if I may, Mr. Speaker. He stated:

A person in public life must tread cautiously in the areas where even a hint of conflict of interest might exist. There are always people who will attempt to read the worst into anything an elected person does.

He goes on to say:

I want my conduct in public office to be completely above suspicion.

I think we all follow that principle, and are all very cognizant of the fact that our actions are always under public scrutiny.

Another aspect of a legislated standard of conduct is whether all possible acts of conflict of interest can indeed be covered. I think it's very difficult to broadly legislate, to put into narrow, legalistic lines, every possible conflict-of-interest situation a member may enter into. And standing here in this Assembly, I'm not naive enough to believe there isn't the possibility that any member in this House may at some time be in a situation which may be a conflict of interest. But that situation must be one in which that individual member responds himself in terms of his own conscience.

I think it would be difficult, in terms of this very legalistic approach, to come up with an Act which did not resolve all questions of ambiguity which may arise in that legislation. We would then be leaving any conflict-of-interest legislation or Act of moral code and conduct to be interpreted. I believe there'd be some very great difficulties in terms of the interpretation that would be placed on the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with one of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, in reference to what this government has taken as its mandate in terms of the recent election campaign, particularly in terms of the conduct of this government with regard to moral and ethical standards, the Premier went to the electorate and announced that in the campaign he wished the people of Alberta to take six items into consideration, the first of which was "the overall performance record of the Progressive Conservative Government". I would submit that the "overall performance record" of this government would include the aspect of moral and ethical conduct of this government.

Mr. Speaker, a number of other aspects of this legislation before us today create some difficulties for me: first, specifically, the effect of repealing — which this legislation suggests — sections 10, 11, and 12 of The Legislative Assembly Act, which clearly outline the relationship of Members of the Legislative Assembly

with regard to their conduct relating to the government of Alberta. This proposed Bill would remove those sections.

There are some specific clauses in those sections of The Legislative Assembly Act which, I believe, should be carefully scrutinized before they are repealed. These provisions have been tested over time as being requirements of Members of the Legislative Assembly with regard to their relationships with the government. I recognize that there may be a need to review aspects of The Legislative Assembly Act because of some of the provisions which may be outdated.

In particular I would like to refer to *Hansard*, and some items which were brought to our attention in 1975 by Dr. John Walker, the former Member for Macleod. Mr. Speaker, if I may quote from page 275, May 29, 1975, the former Member for Macleod stated:

In looking through The Legislative Assembly Act I came across some real gems. They weren't all connected with conflict of interest. There is a beautiful one, though, directed at our skirt-wearing members in the Legislature. It says:

Under this Act, women are upon an absolute equality with men, have the same rights and privileges as men, and are subject to the same penalties and disabilities as men.

He goes on to say:

I wonder if this gives them the right to go into the government members' washroom.

There's another dilly here, Section 41:

During a session of the Legislature, or the 20 days preceding and the 20 days following the session, no member of the Legislative Assembly is liable, except for a breach of this Act, to arrest, detention, or molestation, for any cause that is of a civil nature and within the Legislative authority of the Province.

It sure would be interesting to get the history behind that one.

Those are the comments of the former Member for Macleod. I think it may be useful for us to undertake a review of The Legislative Assembly Act with regard to looking at some of its provisions.

The point I am trying to make clearly today is that before we remove Sections 10, 11, and 12 of The Legislative Assembly Act, there should be careful consideration of the implications of that action. I think there may be room for either a committee of the Legislative Assembly itself or the Institute of Law Research and Reform to review The Legislative Assembly Act, particularly Sections 10, 11, and 12. I don't think we should remove them from the law of this province until some very careful scrutiny has been done.

Mr. Speaker, another provision of this Bill which concerns me is with regard to the broad disclosure provisions suggested in the Bill. As I interpret the provisions behind Section 9, it would require disclosure of a member's involvement with

... ownership of real and personal property of any nature or kind, and all business and financial involvement of any nature ...

And then there are some exclusions.

But this particular section does not restrict that disclosure to property or business interests only inside the province of Alberta. It's open-ended. It can include property outside Alberta. I question whether it is relevant to the nature of a potential conflict of interest of

an elected member of this Assembly whether he has an interest in land in Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, the United Kingdom, or the state of Montana, or whether he owns a business which is only carrying on business, say, in the province of Ontario.

But from reading the legislation proposed to us, I find that it's all-encompassing. I would suggest that such provisions should only be limited to interests in land or in business that is active or being carried on within the province of Alberta. The thrust of Section 9 in terms of disclosure is just too broad.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of difficulty with Section 8, that the hon. member proposes. I like to call this the five-year sterility clause, because I think that's what it is. In fact I have a great deal of difficulty with a sterility clause of any duration whatsoever.

MR. YOUNG: You can explain later.

MR. BRADLEY: In context of the fact that the hon. member has proposed to us that for a period of five years — and he suggested his clause would relate only to the matter of employment with a former agency. I've looked at Section 8, and in my mind it pertains to influence by a member, or "attempt to influence for compensation" But I'd particularly take out the word "influence". No former member

... shall influence ... the public agency by which he was employed or which he served, or any of its members, officers or employees in their official duties within a period of 5 years

That suggests to me that the person, in terms of what an influence is or would be construed as — it could be construed as a representation, meeting with them, discussing any matter of public affairs with those people. I really find that disturbing, Mr. Speaker.

In order to ensure that people from all walks of life, particularly people of high calibre and ability, enter public life and contribute their knowledge and experience to informed decision-making, I submit that the five-year period of removal from activity with regard to former responsibilities suggested by this Bill, would severely limit competent, knowledgeable, and successful people from running for elected office.

We have been fortunate in this country and province that we have had a tradition of attracting capable individuals from the private sector to contribute to public life by running for and being elected to public office. I know a number of them have made personal and financial sacrifices to serve this province and this nation. They have felt a sense of obligation and duty to contribute to the well-being of society. But if society makes the sacrifice too great, society may do itself an injustice, because it may not continue to have the benefit of the wisdom, knowledge, and experience of some very capable and talented individuals. By default, a number of people may feel that a five-year sterility clause is too great a sacrifice to ask.

Mr. Speaker, that may lead us to a point that only a small elite of career politicians, professionals, will be left to govern us. I submit that good government requires the benefit of the knowledge, practical experience, and talent of people of all walks of life, and that restrictions such as Section 8 may discourage a number of capable individuals from seeking public office.

I concur with the hon. Member for Edson with regard to those former members of the Assembly who

may continue to serve the people of this province because of the experience they have gained in this Legislative Assembly, in accepting positions where they can continue to share with the people of Alberta the knowledge and experience they have gained. I really concur with the remarks by the Member for Edson in that regard.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in this area of ethical and moral conduct, I believe the government has an exemplary record; first, with regard to the disclosure guidelines which the hon. Premier presented to this Assembly in 1973. I think there are provisions there with regard to the actions of members of Executive Council which are sufficient in terms of their requirements. In 1978, the code of ethics for public servants was introduced. I think that handles adequately the area with regard to deputy ministers and other members of the public service, Crown corporations. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have The Legislative Assembly Act, which covers the conduct of members in their relationship with government.

Finally, I believe we should not overlook the supremacy of the people of Alberta with regard to judging matters of ethics and conduct of their elected representatives. He or she who breaks that trust, beware. I respect the good intentions of the hon. member in bringing this Bill forward. But for the reasons I have enumerated, I am unable to support it at this time.

MR. D. ANDERSON: With respect to this Bill, I think it's time and appropriate at this place in the debate that I briefly go through the comments made, both in the debates of last week and this week with respect to the Bill and see if there's been a common thread, a central idea, a central theme, that has come out of these speeches. We started last week on this issue of ethics and conflict with the speech from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview who, at the beginning of his speech, quoted the philosopher Rousseau, who said, "Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other." And that theme of a need for morality, a code of ethics, a standard of conduct was through his speech. Though he dealt with the specifics of the particular Bill we debated last week, that was the general theme that I believe was presented to this Legislative Assembly. His speech was followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, who again articulated a number of concerns with respect to the particular Bill and dealt with a number of issues dealing with conduct and ethics. But if I may quote the debate of May 31 from *Hansard*, page 123, the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn said:

Let me say at the very first that I in fact share the view of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, of the critical importance of high standards of ethics and conduct on the part of members of this ... assembly.

His speech was followed by the Member for Banff-Cochrane, who again dealt with a number of his specific concerns, but also indicated clearly throughout his speech a desire for ethics, for standards, for principles on the part of the people of this Assembly.

The debate ended that day with a speech from the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, which the Leader of the Opposition didn't significantly deal with in his remarks. I can see why, because the hon. member indicated very clearly that in 1971, when this govern-

ment was elected, it reviewed for the first time in 35 years, standards and ethics and the code of conduct it wanted its people to deal with and, in 1973, presented a code of ethics for the ministers of this government. It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the years prior to 1971, when the proposer of this particular Bill was a member of Executive Council, we have no record of a call for a Bill such as has been presented today.

MR. R. CLARK: The opposition was asleep then.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, on that particular day the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, of course, also indicated that she stood for ethics and codes of conduct and believed that they existed.

Today we started off with the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, the Leader of the Opposition, who said that the central principle of this whole issue was codifying conflict of interest, that we had a need for ethics. The other thing he said — and I'm wondering if at some point in the future we can get clarification — was that we have 75 seats on this side of the House. I was wondering which desk he wanted moved over here in the coming few weeks. But that aside, the hon. member clearly identified a number of areas of concern and said he believed in ethics, standards, and morality. That theme was followed by the Member for Edson, who identified concerns with respect to creating more legislation, and problems regarding trying to identify principles and moral standards in writing, but he stood very firmly for ethics, standards, and morality.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest very articulately indicated that there has been and now exists The Legislative Assembly Act, which in fact very clearly identifies a code of ethics and standards for this Legislature. I find it disturbing that with this piece of legislation, presented as a new and separate Bill, we are called upon either to vote for or against a code of conduct, or conflict-of-interest legislation, when in fact the vote on this Bill will not reflect that particular feeling. What is evident is that every member of this Legislature who has spoken so far in this debate has indicated he believes in ethics, standards, and a code of morality. I must say that personally I very much believe in that standard as well and, in fact, that some of them have to be in writing. And indeed they are, in The Legislative Assembly Act.

I'm going to move to adjourn debate in a minute, Mr. Speaker. I don't have time to go through the details, but I do believe that a good percentage — I'd say a good half at least — of the ideas presented in this particular Bill already exist. Those that don't are elaborations which aren't significant, and I can't understand why the hon. member has not dealt with them through an amendment of The Legislative Assembly Act. Certainly I wouldn't want to suggest that the member only wanted the publicity value, or to suggest we didn't have ethical or moral standards. It must be because in the last 16 or 17 years in this Assembly he hasn't had time to read that particular section of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me details of how one Act compares to the other and the specific sections that would apply. Unfortunately, with reference to the clock today, I don't have time to present that and would like to hold those remarks for another day. I therefore beg leave to adjourn this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:27 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

