

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, November 1, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the Legislative Assembly a petition from a number of St. Albert residents. This petition requests Members of the Legislative Assembly to oppose, in whole or in part, the annexation of St. Albert by the city of Edmonton. This petition has approximately 7,000 names, which were collected during a two-night blitz.

head: **READING AND
RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order No. 73, I request that the Clerk read the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: In regard to the hon. member's request, I should say that I saw this petition scant moments ago. There is an operative part, which is the petition itself. Of course that is very much in order for reading. There is a considerable preamble, which is really debate. Lest one page of debate might on a future occasion be followed with five, we should perhaps follow proper procedure, and therefore ask the Clerk if he would kindly read the petition itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CLERK: To the Premier, cabinet, and Members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly, and chairman of the Local Authorities Board.

Whereas the city of Edmonton has applied to annex the entire city of St. Albert, therefore we the undersigned residents of St. Albert hereby petition the government of Alberta and the members of the Local Authorities Board to deny the annexation of the city of St. Albert, in whole or in part, by the city of Edmonton.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Legislative Assembly copies of my address to the Vancouver Board of Trade, Monday, October 29, 1979.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to you 10 students from the Chester Ronning school of Camrose in my constituency. With them today are their teacher, Mr. Bob Larsen, and Mrs. Stover.

These students are from an advanced class. They've toured the Legislature Building and have certainly grilled their MLA as to the merits and dismerits of government. Mr. Speaker, they are seated to your left, in the members gallery, and I would ask that they now rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, 16 residents of St. Albert who were key participants in organizing and carrying out the petition that was presented this afternoon. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and be recognized.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 26 grade 5 students from Chris Akkerman elementary school in the constituency of Calgary McCall. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Janet Graham and Mrs. Linda Flannigan, and parent supervisors Mrs. Iris Lescure and Mr. and Mrs. Norman Renniak. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Department of Municipal Affairs

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, during the spring session of this Legislature, Royal Assent was given to The Municipal Debt Reduction Act. The passage of that Act provided a legislative basis for one of the most successful programs that has ever been provided to municipalities by any government.

The program distributed a share of the general revenue fund surplus to the municipalities in Alberta. The basic objective was the reduction of the debenture debt repayment obligations of Alberta municipalities and the provision of unconditional grant funds to assist in financing future needs. Each of Alberta's municipalities and eight Metis colonies was allocated an amount of \$500 per permanent resident. In addition, approximately \$37 million was provided for application to water and sewer debts shielded by Alberta Environment.

A stipulation on the distribution of the funds was that eligible municipal obligations holding an interest rate of 8 per cent or greater were terminated if they related to expenditures for general municipal purposes. Debentures at less than 8 per cent or those being repaid through local improvement levies, utility user fees, or by hospitals and school boards were not required to be repaid.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the program was fully implemented on August 1, 1979. Of the total \$1,031,325,765, sixty per cent or some \$648 million was applied to debenture debt. Forty per cent or approximately \$383 million was distributed as unconditional grants. After the debenture cancellation, every single municipality received an unconditional grant.

The net result of this program, Mr. Speaker, is that for most municipalities, debenture debts have been either totally eliminated or reduced substantially; and for all municipalities, surplus funds are available for investment or expenditure in accordance with the wishes of the municipal council.

It is important for all Albertans to realize that the financial benefit of this program to the taxpayer will continue for the full term of the cancelled debentures, as tax revenue will not be required for servicing of debts.

A summary of payments made in accordance with the program to each individual municipality is being provided to each member of this Assembly. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to file copies for the Legislature Library.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Constitutional Change

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I'd like the Premier to advise the Assembly what role he foresees the government of Alberta playing with regard to the white paper released in Quebec today, entitled The New Quebec-Canada Agreement.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd refer that question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, while it might be somewhat early for us, first of all, to articulate or outline a position of the province of Alberta with its participation in the coming referendum debate, I think it would be equally too early for us to comment on Mr. Levesque's new deal for Quebec, which I understand was tabled moments ago in the Quebec legislative assembly. Until I've had a personal opportunity to review it in English, I think it would be better for us to leave our comments, not in the order of speculation, but attempt to get some understanding of what the Quebec position really is. I would request that we leave the question of that matter until some later date.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Premier or the minister, in light of remarks made by the Premier on October 10, when he indicated:

Depending on the question, particularly if it's an economic question such as sovereignty association, we — the people, the government, and the Legislature of Alberta — may have an important role in the question.

In light of the point of view at that time, is it the intention of the Alberta government to participate in some way with regard to the white paper, and not allow the discussion to be between the government of Canada and the province of Quebec — that Alberta will have a planned strategy in dealing with the paper?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Member for Little Bow, I don't really know that my previous answer can be changed or modified in light of what he just added. I believe, in the date that he referenced, the Premier did point out well that in fact we would be examining and determining a strategy depending on what the white paper said. But at this point I'm attempting to make it as clear as possible that we are not certain what the white paper states.

I would only add that I'm not too sure if I understand the member properly when he says that the debate shall be only between the federal government and

Quebec. I think those have to be part of the role or part of the actors in the debate. Whether Alberta will participate will be dependent upon our understanding of the Quebec position as outlined in the white paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the minister or the hon. Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether at this stage any portion of the first ministers' agenda is set aside to consider the referendum white paper in Quebec?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, while the agenda for the first ministers' conference on the economy scheduled for early December is now being formed, I do not believe the specific point is considered.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. At present, are there any plans or potential plans to meet with ministers of the Quebec government, or the Premier of Quebec, to discuss the white paper directly?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, at this point I can't say there are any plans to do that. On the matter of ongoing relationships on various ministerial levels in the interprovincial field, there are continuing opportunities to ask and seek information and to discuss certain aspects of the role of Quebec in various program services. But that's been up to this point; beyond this point, I'm not too sure how the Quebec delegation will participate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly, subsequent to the questions on October 15, I believe, what priority the government of Alberta places on achieving major constitutional agreement prior to the referendum?

I raise this in view of the priority placed on constitutional change a year ago. Is it the view of the government of Alberta that there should be a major constitutional conference and that the country should try to find a way of amending the constitution before the referendum, or wait until the results of the referendum are in?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, just to give my interpretation of the period of 1976 onwards, I think much of the debate on the constitution was initiated by the then Prime Minister of Canada. As a result, Alberta played a very major and effective role in that discussion. However, it was not necessarily the priority of Alberta to pursue that. But as I indicated, we were ably represented at the table during those discussions.

In my estimation of the sense of priority at this point. I think a lot of it rests with the role of the federal government in taking the lead. As I indicated yesterday, we have indicated a willingness to participate in debate of certain constitutional issues. We have been able at least to reduce the items to a short list which might find some consensus among the parties, the provinces, and the federal government.

But I doubt very much that much constitutional progress will be made before the referendum, generally because I doubt that Quebec wants to play a major role. In fact, Mr. Speaker, some of the ministers have

indicated that they may not participate at a constitutional debate while the referendum is being called, because they will focus their attention in another direction.

Dependent Adults

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my second question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's to follow up the questions I asked yesterday with regard to The Dependent Adults Act.

I wonder if the minister could indicate whether, in the administration of that Act, it has been applied in any instances to physically handicapped but mentally alert persons?

MR. BOGLE: Because of the detail and the very importance of the question, Mr. Speaker, to ensure my answer to the hon. member is full and completely accurate, I'll take that as notice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in light of that answer, would the minister, when he's in consideration, consider case number 49 under that particular Act?

Mr. Speaker, my second question to the minister: is he presently considering an amendment to The Dependent Adults Act which would give legal guardians the right to confine their dependants for an unlimited period of time, because of behavior problems or other matters?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, without getting into the kinds of amendments which might be brought forward, I recall responding to the hon. member's question yesterday, indicating certain amendments are being considered. If I understood accurately the import of the hon. member's question today, he was asking whether we were considering an unlimited period of time for confinement. I can answer to that in the negative; we are not.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the process of assessing the guardianship order, a physician's statement is required. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the safeguards established under the Act at present, and the diagnosis that takes place with regard to the dependent adult, are adequate and sufficient to satisfy the minister and his staff?

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem that whether the minister is satisfied or dissatisfied about anything whatever is clearly a matter of opinion.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if he's had an opportunity to assess the physician's diagnosis of the dependent adult, and that possibly there should be more than one physician examining the person to arrive at a decision that this person should be declared incapacitated?

MR. BOGLE: I think a key factor to recall, Mr. Speaker, is that these cases are taken before a judge. If, in the opinion of the judge, there is need for further evidence, certainly that may be required.

What The Dependent Adults Act has done is establish a framework within which the process operates.

But the way in which the judgments are made is certainly a legal matter. As I said, we've tried very hard to ensure that in the process of the legislation there is ample room for flexibility by the judicial system.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. It's been brought to my attention that the majority of the proposed dependants are not provided with legal representation and often are not given notice of guardianship hearings. Following this, their estate, their funds or bank accounts — the court costs are charged directly to that particular dependent adult. I wonder if the minister is considering any type of amendments or change in the Act that would allow the dependent adult to always be represented by counsel and provided with some type of advocate service that may be paid by the court?

MR. BOGLE: Again, Mr. Speaker, we're into an area of some flexibility on the part of the judge as to whether a person deemed to be a dependent adult needs to appear in the courtroom. The matter of costs incurred is one which I'm certainly reviewing at present with my colleagues. That's a result of concerns expressed to a number of MLAs in this Assembly — as well as directly to me — by citizens in the province who have a concern about that financial obligation. We want to ensure that no hardship is placed upon any party. If and when amendments are brought forward in the legislation, that's a matter to which we will certainly be giving very serious consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could he indicate when this review will be completed and he will be able to report to the House with regard to the cases that have come under the jurisdiction of The Dependent Adults Act?

MR. BOGLE: As hon. members are aware, Mr. Speaker, it's a relatively new piece of legislation. To date there have been no amendments to it.

I think it's important that we keep two things in mind. One is that an adequate period of time is allowed to pass to allow the Act to shift down, if you will, and determine what amendments might be required to make the Act work better, in terms of the needs of dependent adults in Alberta. That is currently under assessment. I'm not prepared at this time to give a precise time when that review may be complete. I will certainly assure my colleagues in the Assembly that it's an item under active review at present. Once we have a list of ideas and concerns which can be put together in a package, that will go through the various processes and be before this Assembly in the form of amendments to the Act.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. If my memory serves me, I believe it's two years since the Legislature passed the legislation.

If I recall the minister's answer a moment ago, it indicated a package of proposals. Would the government be prepared to look at the part of the Act dealing with the question of the right to legal counsel where cases go before judges?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that that is not a problem at present. I understand that the question from my colleague across the way was with

regard to any burden that may be placed upon a family with regard to court costs, not the right to legal counsel.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question really relates to that very issue of whether the government is prepared, because of the sensitivity of the issue, to amend the Act to guarantee legal counsel which would not be borne by the individual.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly one of a number of areas we're looking at. I'm pleased with the input I've had from our members of the Assembly. If the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has some concerns that he thinks need to be addressed, I'd welcome that from him in the form of written correspondence or what have you.

If he's asking whether we will be bringing in an amendment to the legislation this particular sitting, the answer is no, Mr. Speaker, we will not. But I'm certainly working on that and a number of other factors.

Mr. Speaker, if there are specific cases where there is currently hardship, I would like to know about those on a direct basis from the hon. member.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Under the Act, the guardian is granted the right to consent to health care in the best interests of the dependent adult.

Can the minister indicate what safeguards are in effect, in procedures to prevent pregnancy, to prevent the possibility of unnecessary sterilization of the dependent adults, now that the sterilization Act of 1972 has been removed?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice. Again, it's of some detail, and a very important matter. I want to ensure that the response I give is full and completely accurate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Could the minister indicate who is doing the review for the minister, and whether the minister is directly involved in this very important subject?

I think there is some urgency to the situation. I'd appreciate the minister advising what specific types of things are going on.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as is the case with most legislation, we look to a number of sources for input, in terms of reviewing legislation. One person I'm obviously interested in hearing from is Joel Christie, the Public Guardian in the province. We want input from the many, many Albertans across this land who have a direct and a very personal interest. In previous answers I've mentioned MLAs, and to my colleague from Spirit River-Fairview I've said I'd welcome input from him. I haven't had it to date. If he has something positive he wishes to add, I welcome it.

DR. BUCK: You're dragging a red herring, Bob.

Weeds in Lakes and Rivers

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment. It concerns Lake Wabamun, a major recreational lake west of Edmon-

ton, used by the residents of Edmonton. Does the minister have any information on which he could make a determination of the cause of the weed growth at Lake Wabamun?

MR. COOKSON: The Member for Edmonton White-mud asks an excellent question, Mr. Speaker. I wish I had that good an answer for him with regard to Lake Wabamun.

Perhaps I could say this about the lake. It's one of a number of landlocked lakes in the province that are continuing to deteriorate because of the problem of no inflow/outflow. They're deteriorating for a number of reasons. It has to do with people, with the drop in the water tables, the general growth, and some industrial problems.

We've attempted to analyse and determine the basic nutrients which may be creating the sort of situation occurring in Lake Wabamun. I don't know whether we've pinned it down, but I think it's primarily a problem of nutrients: nitrogen and phosphates.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if studies have been done to see if there has been an increase in water temperature in the lake because of the industrial activity in the area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think those studies have been done over the years. As the Member for Clover Bar knows, Calgary Power, which has two major plants at Lake Wabamun, has spent considerable sums attempting to ensure that the temperature in the total lake does not go below what would be acceptable. Of course the temperature in the area where waste water is emitted, particularly in the case of the Wabamun power plant, is higher than the overall temperature of the lake. Major expenditures have been made in the case of Sundance to avoid this. But as to the specific question, I would say that the temperature in general may be slightly higher than it normally would be, but it still freezes over.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have any of the studies the minister's department has prepared indicated a possible solution to the excessive weed growth?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, a number of things have been done in the case of Lake Wabamun. I enjoy the opportunity of expressing to the Assembly that Calgary Power has been tremendously co-operative in assisting in work with regard to the weed growth. Over the years since about 1971 or '72, they have continually used equipment to remove weed growth over an area of about 300 acres. On some occasions I think they've removed as high as 5,200 tonnes per year of this material. The most recent indication is that the amount they have to remove from the area of the Wabamun plant is as low as 300 tonnes.

So I think they are doing an excellent job of attempting to keep the weed growth under control. In addition, they themselves have a major \$2 million study which I think will terminate this winter. That study is to determine whether the temperature may have some bearing on weed growth. So work is being done. As well as Calgary Power, the Department of Environment is spending a fair amount of money attempting

to analyse the type of growth and whether there is something we can do to restrict it.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister has any information regarding the study commenced by the Department of Environment on the really severe weed growth in Lake Isle, which makes Wabamun look like a very nice resort area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we're so bogged down with weeds we haven't got to Lake Isle yet. Lake Isle is a more serious problem. I guess we have to deal with one thing at a time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment. It seems he's the master of studies. Can the minister indicate if he or the department has a study going on throughout the province to see the effect of nutrients, nitrogens and phosphates, ending up in our lakes? Is a study being done right across the province to find out if this is encouraging weed growth in our lakes?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think I've spoken before about the studies going on with regard to the South Saskatchewan River basin, most importantly with regard to the problem of the Bow River. I'm personally reviewing the situation with regard to phosphate and its effect on weed growth. I hope we'll be able to make some positive recommendations in the reasonable future with regard to the impact of phosphate.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the House whether the interim report on the study of the South Saskatchewan River basin has been completed and provided to his office? If so, would he be prepared to table a copy of that interim report in the House?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the interim report is not in yet. I see no problem with making it a public document.

While I'm speaking about the problem, I might add we're getting good co-operation from the city of Calgary, thanks to the continual nudging of the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, which helps me. Calgary is also looking into procedures to reduce the phosphate input to the Bow River.

Olympics Bid

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you and the members of the Assembly are aware that last Sunday the Canadian Olympic Association made what I would call the logical choice of deciding that Calgary would put in the bid for the 1988 Olympics.

My question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks, who was with the delegation from Calgary along with, I believe, the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and the Member for Calgary North West. Could the minister indicate the government's involvement in making the presentation and, even more so, what the government's involvement will be in planning for the Olympics and the final bid?

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased as well, like all Albertans I think, that Calgary was indeed chosen to be the city to host the 1988 games. Our commitment was to travel to Montreal along with the Calgary group and help them in winning the bid. We were successful, with some good nudging of my two colleagues to the directors there from the Canadian Olympic development association.

I'd like to file with the Legislature at this time two letters of commitment by this government for the 1988 games. I'm sure that as we approach the date of 1981, when we have to have the bid acceptable in Germany, there'll be a number of discussions. I hope also that CODA, the Calgary Olympic Development Association, will work with every department so that indeed the bid we present will be acceptable.

Reynolds Museum

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister responsible for Culture and ask if she's in a position to outline to the Assembly this afternoon where things stand as far as the negotiations are concerned between the department of Culture and Mr. Stan Reynolds concerning his pioneer museum in the city of Wetaskiwin.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to answer the question in a manner that our last bit of correspondence with Mr. Reynolds's solicitor was on March 2, 1979. We have had no further correspondence with him since that date.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the Legislature that Mr. Reynolds has offered to give the antiques, both the cars and the farm machinery, to the province of Alberta?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I think the negotiations between the two solicitors are under way at this time. Until we receive the negotiations back here, I'm not in a position to speak to it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, negotiations aren't going very fast if March 4 was the last word the minister heard.

DR. BUCK: She's buying pictures, she hasn't got time.

MR. NOTLEY: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to ask the minister whether any effort has been made by the department to evaluate the museum, and whether any consideration has been made by the government of Alberta to establish a western farm museum similar to either North Battleford's or the one in Saskatoon.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, until the negotiations are terminated, I don't think I care to speak to the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the intention of the department to speed up the negotiations, in view of March 4, which was before the minister assumed her present duties?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, we are still awaiting a reply from Mr. Reynolds's solicitor. Until we have that, we cannot have any further negotiations.

Game Farm

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. In light of the fact that the minister, the MLA involved, and the people looking at setting up the proposed game farm in the Bon Accord area have met, can the minister indicate what progress has been made or is under way to see if some assistance can be made to ensure that a portion of the game farm does remain in this area?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this concept with the two resident MLAs to try to establish what role Transportation could play, if any. At the moment no firm offers have been made or requested. I have had a letter from the county of Sturgeon indicating that a road would be necessary to make it happen. But we haven't entered into negotiations yet.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has received a proposal for a new Alberta game farm?

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have had a couple of opportunities to meet with the two gentlemen who are quite interested in establishing a game farm in the Bon Accord-Legal area, namely Mr. Walter Jerram and Mr. Bill Cochrane. As you know, they are presently operating a very successful recreation establishment, which is known as the Red Barn, and they are doing an excellent job.

They talked to me about their proposal. They have some preliminary plans drawn up. They would be quite interested in being able to establish this farm and purchase some of the animals presently at the Alberta Game Farm and retain them in this area for the good of all Albertans.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the associate minister would indicate to the House whether he's committed support for the game farm, recognizing the importance for our heritage, educationally, for tourism, et cetera.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in all my discussions with Mr. Jerram and Mr. Cochrane, their main concern was access to the facility. They recognize that the road would have to be upgraded. A meeting was held in Morinville, at which I understand public support for the proposed game farm was very extensive. They feel that if they had a suitable road to the facility, they would be in a position to go ahead and develop the farm.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. Can the minister indicate what support we are talking about, in terms of ballpark dollars, when we talk about support for the proposed game farm?

MR. MILLER: As to direct support for the game farm, no dollars were requested. The request was for the government to give some consideration to upgrading the road to the farm.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. Can the minister indicate if the figure of \$4 million support for the road to go into the area is a figure we're looking at?

MR. KROEGER: We don't have accurate figures, Mr. Speaker, but I think they would be something less than that, in the order of \$2 million to \$3 million.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. I sure hope so, because we could have bought the entire thing for around \$6 million if the government had got off its butt and done something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question has been asked.

Olympics Bid (continued)

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks. It concerns his recent trip to Montreal. My observation has been that part of the reason for winning that for the province of Alberta was the enthusiasm of this minister.

DR. BUCK: It was all his money, John. It was the money.

MR. GOGO: To the minister: was any financial commitment given to the Olympic authorities in Montreal on behalf of the government of Alberta?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that during the presentation of the bid the question was asked of me: how large was the heritage trust fund, and what would be the total fund in 1988? I can assure you, Mr. Speaker and members, that I gave them that answer, but I left no money on the table.

Transit Workers' Hours

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Labour. It's in regard to the recent investigation carried out by the labor standards department on hours of work as they relate to Edmonton Transit workers.

Can the minister indicate to the Assembly what steps have been taken, what steps will be taken, and what the impact might be on the workers, and perhaps on public transportation for the citizens of Edmonton, when the labor standards are applied?

MR. SPEAKER: The last two of those four questions would appear to involve matters of opinion, but the first two obviously involve matters of fact.

[Motion carried]

AN HON. MEMBER: Answer the ones you know.

MR. YOUNG: I'm having tremendous assistance in responding to the question, Mr. Speaker, so much so that I've almost forgotten it.

As I understand it, the hon. member's question to commence with was: what steps have been taken, what sort of review? I would say to the hon. member that labor standards did review the question of hours of work for Edmonton Transit drivers, and the report was then reviewed with officials of the city of Edmonton.

There is provision under the board orders that in situations of necessity or a type of emergency there can be extensions of the normal hours of work. My understanding is that an arrangement has been made with the city that at the earliest opportunity the conditions which gave rise to the present situation will be terminated.

MR. MACK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly whether the violations were of a profound nature or of a minor nature?

MR. SPEAKER: Surely that is also a matter of opinion.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, indeed it is, and it is one on which I don't wish to express an opinion.

MR. MACK: It is, however, a very important area, Mr. Speaker, particularly as it might relate to safety, and that is of concern to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Did the hon. minister wish to comment on the last comment?

Loans from Treasury Branches

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and relates to the ministerial statement last Thursday. At that time I believe the minister indicated that it would take approximately a week to crystallize the policy with respect to the treasury branches and the rethinking of lending to small business.

Is the minister in a position today to outline a crystallization of this policy?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the crystallization of policy is taking slightly longer than anticipated. I would not be in a position to make a definitive statement this week, but I anticipate being able to do so next week.

head: ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that the four motions for returns, numbered 115 through 118, stand.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

219. Moved by Mr. Notley:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to establish a royal commission to inquire into the operation of all registered charities in Alberta, such commission to inquire into fund raising distribution of funds, accountability, and the provision of services including the question of which services are best provided under public auspices and which are best provided by private charities.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to address this motion, I really want to deal with five separate questions: first of all, the general philosophical question of what should be undertaken by private charity and what should be the responsibility of all Albertans; secondly, to discuss some of the problems that I believe exist in sheltered workshops in our province; thirdly, to assess the issue of accountability of private charities, with respect to both making information available to those who donate and ensuring that the moneys are properly spent; fourthly, to deal with the implications of some of the present controversy of gaming laws as they apply to charities; and, finally, to assess the role of the government itself in terms of some of the conditions that appear to be placed on certain organizations — and I will deal with the Fish & Game issue in some detail a little later on.

Mr. Speaker, turning to the first question: the role, if you like, of private charities on one hand, as opposed to public responsibility for those less advantaged in our society on the other. I would say that the dividing line between public responsibility and private charity will be a source of constant review in a changing society. If one goes back 200 years, schools were provided as a matter of private charity. The night before last, I had occasion to talk to a person from Britain, raised by a British fellow who was in India and whose wife died. That person was sent to a charity school in Great Britain to acquire his education. Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that the role, if you like, of the public on one hand, versus charitable organizations or foundations on the other, must be reviewed from time to time.

I want to make it very clear — and I hope that in making it clear I don't disrupt the speeches of various backbenchers here — that this motion is not in any way an attempt to attack charities, but is rather to take an honest stocktaking of what should be the role of private charities on one hand, and government services on the other. Mr. Speaker, I should just point out that we've talked to people who have worked in a number of voluntary organizations, including the United Way, who really don't have any objection to this kind of royal commission. One of the people who worked very hard doing research on this particular resolution is my present research assistant, whose father was the director of the United Way in Edmonton for 10 years.

As we look at this first issue, Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns that I think has to be noted is the government's rather superficial commitment to volunteerism. I remember the debate that took place during the 1975 election and subsequently the Speech from the Throne in 1976, as I recollect, where the government indicated

that a tremendous emphasis was going to be placed on volunteerism. At that time we had a voluntary services branch of the Department of Social Services and Community Health, a branch which did some excellent work, in my judgment and as far as people in my constituency were concerned.

Those of us who have been involved in voluntary organizations — and I can't imagine any elected member of this Legislature not being involved in a whole host of service clubs or voluntary organizations of one kind or another — know there is a real role for the kind of expertise, whether training in fund raising or the kind of assistance in developing a program, that can be extremely useful to the volunteer in our present society. But what happened after this bureau operated for a little over a year, Mr. Speaker? Well, for some reason it seemed to get caught in the restraint program and was phased out. One really has to question the commitment to volunteerism of a government which phases out the voluntary services branch of the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there, if I can, to deal for a few moments with the question of sheltered workshops in the province of Alberta. Twenty-four sheltered workshops in Alberta are authorized to pay less than the minimum wage. For hon. members who wish information on the names of the groups, at the conclusion of my remarks I would certainly be quite happy to table the list of the 24 workshops, which the Minister of Labour was good enough to provide.

Of course there is quite a range in the amount of money paid to people who work in these sheltered workshops. We all know the controversy that occurred last September at the CNIB. There, some workers were paid as little as 40 cents an hour. But to put that in perspective, the people who were paid 40 cents an hour were already on social allowance. On the other hand, some people obtained as much as \$3.70 an hour.

[Mrs. Chichak in the Chair]

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would also have to point out to members of the Assembly that at least one instance has been brought to my attention of a group that wanted to pay as little as 10 cents an hour. I would say that that really raises the rather philosophical question of where the role of the state begins, in terms of insisting on proper wages, and where the role of the state as a supplier of welfare or social allowance, call it what you will, ends.

Let's look at this question of the people who are receiving 40 cents an hour. One of the reasons they were receiving 40 cents an hour is that they were on social assistance and, because of the present regulations, the maximum amount of money these people could earn was 40 cents an hour. So to be fair to the CNIB — and I think there are a number of criticisms one could make of that particular operation — the reason 40 cents an hour was paid had more to do with the rigidity of the regulations concerning social allowance in this province than with any deliberate decision on the part of that national organization.

Mme. Speaker, I would have to put to members of the Assembly the rather basic philosophical question: in a sheltered workshop, should we be saying, fair wage, living wage, or should we be saying that the person will receive social allowance? People argue that if you insist on fair wages, workshops that employ people

who are handicapped in one way or another, whether it be the blind or the mentally handicapped, are just not going to be able to compete on the open market, and that it is therefore necessary, if you like, to have wages that are more tokenism than anything else. Mme. Speaker, I just don't believe that is the correct approach.

If society as a whole is in fact going to subsidize those people in our midst who are handicapped, I would argue that we should make available the funds that are required to whatever organization — any one of these 24 sheltered workshops could be singled out — so they could pay fair living wages, so the person does not feel he has to ask for or receive charity. I know people can argue that that's not what we mean with our present social allowance scheme. That may be, Mr. Speaker. But the fact of the matter is that that is how many people, including the handicapped, see it.

At present, Mme. Speaker, we have a rather peculiar situation with respect to sheltered workshops, because the Board of Industrial Relations, of all people, is having to evaluate social programs. Having some knowledge over the years of members of the board, they are not jumping up and down with enthusiasm at their new role as social motivators. Quite frankly, Mme. Speaker, they feel their responsibilities lie elsewhere, and I agree with them.

If we look back at what happened in September, that very unfortunate situation — unfortunate because seven of the 11 people who were working in the CNIB sheltered workshop are still without any kind of work — it seems to me that we have to ask ourselves: is it best to have people receiving a very small wage supplemented by social allowance, or is it better that we make enough money available, to whatever the workshop may be, so that workshop can pay a fair living wage? I would say very definitely and very strongly that the last course is the best.

Mme. Speaker, I want to deal with another question, the accountability of private charities both in Alberta and in this country. In 1976 there were changes in the federal income tax. There is now a public information return. In fact, charities in Canada are required to spend 90 per cent of their income or 5 per cent of their assets on charitable activities of one kind or another.

But there are some deficiencies in the present federal legislation. The analysis of the returns indicates a misunderstanding about the detail of information required. For example, information has been brought to my attention that frequently the names of officials are missing; charities are not required to list their grants or their investment portfolios; and one of the most glaring omissions of all in the federal legislation is that no lists of addresses are published. The hon. Member for Peace River, who from time to time is in disagreement with most of his friends in this Legislature on a lot of issues, attempted to obtain a list of charities in Alberta, and found it was impossible to do so because we don't keep the list.

For those who argue that there really isn't any problem, because we have the Bill passed in 1976, changes made in the Income Tax Act, and the introduction of form T3010, a public information return, therefore everything is fine, Mme. Speaker, as I review this question at the moment, I would simply have to argue before the Assembly that everything is not fine, that there are still deficiencies in the legislation, and that these deficiencies stand in the way of the public's

right to know, in terms of whether the moneys are properly spent as well as the donors' right to know how this money is being collected and expended.

I want to move from that issue, if I can, to deal with yet another one; that is, the question of gaming in Alberta. It's certainly relevant when it comes to charities, because last year the whole area of fund raising, from bingos to lotteries and casinos, netted approximately \$135 million. Mme. Speaker, I would have thought that at this stage of the game the government would have formally tabled the advisory committee report on gaming, because it has already been unofficially tabled by the CBC. The information contained in this report leads me to the conclusion that, at the very best, we have a very confused state of the law in Alberta; if not of the law, at least of the application of the law. I think that comes through loud and clear.

You know, Mme. Speaker, when one looks at this document, one finds all sorts of rather shocking statements contained in it. For example, Mr. Sheppard says, yes, the charities are getting ripped off. How was this found out? Mr. Sheppard goes on to say: management abdicated its responsibility and placed the responsibility of pull tickets into the hands of other people. They do not question, so they do not miss, say, \$109,000. It was not until our inspectors went down on a random inspection that panic struck.

Mme. Speaker, I must confess that that's a rather jolting observation by the man who is presumably in charge of gaming in this province. Then a little further on in the report Mr. Sheppard says:

One other point on lotteries is that we require that prizes do not exceed 40% — some charitable organizations have made as little as 4% profit.

I think the question really is: when are we going to have some clear-cut idea as to where this government is going on the gaming question? We have that phantom group of backbenchers who are here and there, sort of like the Scarlet Pimpernel. But unfortunately, like the French who were never able to see the Scarlet Pimpernel, it appears we're never able to see much evidence of this committee's work either, because at this stage of the game we still haven't gotten anything from the government to examine.

You know, it's been an issue that, my heavens, I've seen debated in this Legislature on a number of occasions since 1972 and 1973 when questions were first raised, and still no response from the government. General complacency. This report goes on to suggest that we have no end of confusion in the provincial Attorney General's Department on how we deal with gaming. Mme. Speaker, yet no action from the committee, no report, no move at this point in time.

I just have one other point on this subject, Mme. Speaker: who should provide the equipment and facilities for charity gambling? I raised questions on this matter a few days ago in the House, and I would respectfully suggest to the Assembly that we have to take a close look at just who in fact is involved in this kind of thing. Are we ensuring that charitable organizations are being well served when they undertake casinos or games of chance?

We've had comments made from time to time, both by the former Solicitor General and the former Attorney General, alluding to the danger of organized crime in this province. I do not suggest we are facing that kind of immediate prospect, but I would say to the House and to you, Mme. Speaker, that if there is any

place where it is likely to begin, it is in this sort of thing, unless we have a clear demarcation of the rules of the game, as it were. I would say to the Attorney General that perhaps one of the things we have to look at is: is there a role for the provision of these kinds of services outside of those firms now providing them? I would hope, Mme. Speaker, that the minister would respond during the course of this debate.

Finally, I want to deal with the issue of the Fish & Game Association in Alberta. Yesterday the Attorney General indicated he was going to check, and I would hope he would use this opportunity to advise the House whether or not people within the department were a little, shall we say, overexuberant in administering the regulations. I would hope, Mme. Speaker, that we are not getting into a situation where this or any other government becomes, if you like, a censorship board to determine how moneys raised will be spent: that it's all right to spend it on this, but not on that, because that happens to be a favorite pursuit of the government; this is something that is fine for you to spend money on, but that is a sensitive area.

Mme. Speaker, if we get into that kind of situation we're on very, very dangerous ground indeed. It involves an extension of government authority, whether by commission or omission — in this instance I suspect it's omission — that concerns me a good deal.

We all know that the Fish & Game Association in this province has been very, very active in promoting a point of view. And we all know, Mme. Speaker, that that point of view sometimes coincides with this government; frequently it doesn't. But I would hope that during the course of his remarks the Attorney General, since he didn't have the information yesterday — and that's reasonable enough; one doesn't expect ministers to be walking encyclopedias — but if, during this debate, he can take the opportunity at least to assure the House that we're not in fact going to censor how organizations use funds that are collected, in a way that is inconsistent with the precedents these organizations have enjoyed over the years.

Mme. Speaker, what I suggest to members of the House is that we consider how we review this large question of charities, accountability, the role of private charity versus public responsibility, the issue of gaming, and the implications of gaming on charities; and the question of the role of government in administering charities. Members can say that there really isn't any problem because, as I said before, we have this little group of backbenchers who are looking at the gaming question. I don't think that's the way to deal with it.

DR. BUCK: Keeps them busy.

MR. NOTLEY: The hon. Member for Clover Bar says it keeps them busy. That's always helpful.

But, Mme. Speaker, I suggest there is a better way to deal with it; a way that would allow society collectively in Alberta to evaluate where the line should be drawn. No one is suggesting that this kind of royal commission, were the government to set it up, would draw up a set of rules and regulations which, like the law of the Medes and the Persians, could not be challenged. Society does change, as I mentioned when I began my remarks. But at least at this time in our history, it does seem to me that there is substantial evidence to indicate that now is the time to take an honest look at it.

Whether one supports more volunteerism — in other words, taking certain services now funded by the government and shifting them to the voluntary sector — or whether one feels that perhaps there is a larger role for government in certain areas now handled by the voluntary sector, no one in this House that I know of is suggesting that we do away with volunteerism. No one in this House is suggesting that we suddenly shift volunteerism into areas that are handled in total by the government. Mme. Speaker, it is the question of drawing that line and making sure that the public is served most efficiently, and that those who receive benefits are also helped in the most efficient manner.

Mme. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by saying to the members of the House that there is no question, and should be no question, about the excellent work of a myriad of voluntary organizations in this province. That work, that sense of helping other people, is a very, very important part of a free and democratic society. But having said that, no group of people, no group of organizations, no way of doing anything is so sacrosanct that it should not, from time to time, be subject to review and assessment, to consider whether there is a better way of doing it.

With those observations, Mme. Speaker, I commend the resolution to the members of this Assembly.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mme. Speaker, I rise to speak on Motion 219 as, I'm sure, the first of many members of this Assembly who are going to wish to respond to this rather heavy-handed assault on charitable organizations in Alberta, unleashed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

I note with great interest how the hon. member has gone out of his way to assure us publicly that he has no intention of launching a witch hunt and how, in fact, he can assure us that charitable organizations throughout this province will welcome the kind of investigation he is advocating: the royal commission.

But to borrow a phrase, Mme. Speaker, methinks he doth protest too much. Surely a witch hunt is exactly what would ensue if the hon. member's resolution were adopted by this Assembly. I noted with considerable interest how the hon. member has watered down his remarks. From time to time I reviewed the wording of the resolution just to be sure we were talking about the same subject. Because it seemed that in so few instances during his presentation were we dealing with the exact words that are before us. I think he mentioned the words "royal commission" once, and with great pain. I think the hon. member recognizes he's treading on eggshells and is being very, very careful in trying to deflect us from the true intent of the resolution that he had perhaps in a . . . [interjection] Mme. Speaker, he's getting a little concerned, but he's had his time to speak. Now it's ours. We're the people he refers to as the quiet, unspoken members of this Assembly. I think we're about to assure him that that's not the case.

Mme. Speaker, I'm going to deal with the wording of the resolution before us, as much as his comments, because I'm not going to allow him to wiggle out of it quite that easily. In the exact wording he has put before us, he hasn't even got the iron fist in the velvet glove. He's got it in a baggie; so transparent is his attempt to call into question the activities of charities in this province. By his advocacy, in the wording of this resolution, of a commando style of probe into the aspects of volunteerism here in Alberta, he's given a

black eye to every charitable organization and community-minded citizen in this province, regardless of whether he happens to realize it.

I want to say loudly and clearly to this Assembly, Mme. Speaker, that I do not accept the implicit allegations of impropriety that he has put before this House in this resolution. I reject those allegations, and I hope that other members of this Assembly do too.

Mme. Speaker, if we're to treat volunteers in this province like would-be criminals, as guilty until they prove their innocence through the findings of a royal commission, we're going to deal a body blow to volunteerism in this province, from which it may never recover. But perhaps that wouldn't bother the hon. member a great deal, because he's suggested there may well be a case for more government control in the area of charitable work. He says that that might be a more effective and perhaps a more efficient way for us to operate, if one can believe the reports we've been reading on his views of this matter, and what he said before this Assembly.

With due respect to the many hard-working and capable civil servants in this country, I have a real question in my own mind about whether a government bureaucracy is going to be more efficient than the private sector. But then again, Mme. Speaker, I suppose that's why I belong to the political party I belong to, and he belongs to the one he does. There may often be solid arguments in favor of government involvement in our lives, but surely the argument of efficiency isn't one.

I'm sorry to say, Mme. Speaker, that this resolution in itself — and again, with due respect, the hon. member doesn't seem to realize the full implications of what he's putting forward here — would deal a black eye, and has, in fact, by even being placed before this Assembly, to the hundreds and thousands of Albertans who work as volunteers with service clubs, community associations, senior citizens' groups, athletic associations, and all the other charities. The hon. member's attempts now to whitewash that issue by assuring members that the public would welcome an investigation just won't wash, to use the popular term of the House these days.

I would like to stress that I don't think one has to be a lawyer to recognize the most fundamental tenet of our legal system, that an individual is innocent until proven guilty. I'm very concerned that the principle that one is innocent until proven guilty, is going to be reversed by the effect of this kind of resolution. It doesn't call for a royal commission into the activities of a specific charity. No, Mme. Speaker, it calls for a royal commission into the operation of all registered charities in Alberta. With one wipe of the brush he has cast all charitable organizations into the same mould. Frankly, I'm very, very concerned about the implications of that kind of resolution. Surely we can't allow the guilt by innuendo which would surely result if we were to follow the rather treacherous and perilous course advocated a few moments ago.

From time to time in this House, and in this instance, the hon. member has argued the need for more government control. I recall very vividly that when I campaigned from door to door in the last provincial election, the single biggest issue in my constituency, Calgary Forest Lawn, wasn't that we needed more government control in charities; it was that we had too much. In fact, Mme. Speaker, that is why this very

worth-while citizens' advisory committee on gaming regulations was established. I can accept the frustration of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that he isn't part of the government and wasn't able to share in any of those deliberations with members of the committee. But I implore him to be a little patient. In good time those recommendations will be publicly stated in full. I'm certainly not about to comment on the hearsay we may read in the media[interjection] even though the hon. member chooses to use that as the source of his information, which he then places before this House as fact.

With respect to the giving of the message: the message I got from my constituents was, let's have a little less government control. The hon. member, if I can use the expression, is sending a different message to members of this Assembly. He's saying, let's spend more of the taxpayers' dollars; let's have a fancy-dancy royal commission; we're going to see how we can get government to impose tighter controls on people's lives in this province. The most ironic part of it, Mme. Speaker, is that he would impose those controls on the volunteers, on the doers, on the people in this society of ours in Alberta who make things tick.

Surely this has to be one of the most thinly veiled and poorly disguised attempts to impose government on Albertans to a degree and excess that has never been experienced before. The real irony is that it's all done in the name of the so-called public good. As a fairly new member of this Assembly, over a period of some six months I've developed a very healthy scepticism whenever that very convenient and all-purpose rationale, that we have to protect the public, is trotted out, or one of its many variations is invoked with some sort of religious fervor by a well-meaning but frankly, in this instance, badly mistaken member of the Assembly.

The question I would put before this Assembly is: is it really in the public interest to shackle our volunteers, to make them targets for suspicion and doubt in the way the hon. member has done by putting this resolution before the House? In fact, Mme. Speaker, this kind of policy statement by this House is going to cause more people to say, why should we bother; let government do it. That may not bother the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He may believe that more government is not only acceptable in his philosophical line of thought, but inevitable.

Mme. Speaker, probably the most fundamental dimension of this whole resolution is that question of more government control in our lives. I want to go on record as stating unequivocally that I don't accept the proposition that more government control is desirable or inevitable. I don't believe that, and I hope other members of this Assembly share my view.

DR. BUCK: You'd better change parties, John.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Let's take a look at the kinds of controls that are in place presently. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview went to great pains to try to assure us of all the loopholes that exist in the regulations. In the present status of the gaming control regulations — and I think it might be somewhat inappropriate to speculate on the final determination of those regulations, given the fact that we've asked the citizens of this province to give us their very direct counsel on this matter.

But let's take a look at the federal regulations. The Income Tax Act requires that all registered charities and charitable organizations — and these are the same ones the hon. member would have us launch a royal commission upon — must file annually a public information return, form T3010. It requires disclosure of the following information — I think it's important to let the House know what sort of information is required because, from hearing the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, it sounded like we were asking them for their names and nothing more. Here is what's required: name, address, and occupation of the executive or directing officer of the foundation; the primary purpose of the foundation; a description of the activities of the foundation during the fiscal period covered by the return; revenue for the fiscal period, including receipted gifts, non-receipted gifts, grants, investment income, capital gains, other income; expenditures for the period, including total salaries and benefits, administration costs, gifts to qualified recipients; and it goes on and on. In the case of foundations whose capital surplus and property accumulated, with a written approval of national revenue, exceeds \$100,000: details regarding total assets, liabilities, and equities.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Speaker in my outlining those kinds of requirements, because I think it would be entirely erroneous for this House to believe that the requirements were slight. One thing the previous federal administration was good at was passing lots of laws and regulations. We certainly recognize that they were having a field day when it came to requirements imposed on volunteer organizations.

Even with those very strenuous and stringent requirements of the federal government, the poor community volunteer or service club worker isn't through yet because, I'm sorry to say, the provincial government has gotten into helping with the labyrinth of red tape. We have The Alberta Public Contributions Act, administered by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It requires charities from the Edmonton Opera Association to the Canadian Cancer Society to file financial statements within two months of the close of their fiscal year.

I have with me today the annual report of The Public Contributions Act, which makes great bedside reading and is a very thick and voluminous document. I might say that charities might well operate more efficiently and effectively, as apparently hoped by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, if they didn't have to spend quite so much of their time fighting through that losing paper war with government, and through all the red tape.

But having said that, I think it's fair to make it very clear that I'm sure no member of this Assembly, and certainly no charitable organization in this province, doesn't recognize the need for accountability of public funds. We have to make that very clear and put it on the table in that fashion. No one is suggesting there shouldn't be accountability. The question is: how much is enough? I would submit to hon. members of this Assembly that we may well have passed that enough mark, although the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview certainly thinks we need more and more red tape.

Mme. Speaker, in conclusion let me simply say that I believe in volunteerism; I happen to think that the charitable organizations in this province are doing a very fine job for the citizens of this province; and I

believe we have in place very adequate, to put it mildly, controls exercised by government. I would submit to members of this Assembly that what we need at this time, what our charities need, is support; not having the rug pulled out from under them, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would do.

The very real danger that I see in this resolution before us — by which the hon. member, whether he likes it or not, is tarnishing all charities in this province with the same brush — is that by that kind of action, we're frankly going to kill that spirit of community that has built this province. We're going to create a situation where ultimately we've got these various groups, the doers in the community, knocking on the doors of government and saying to government, you've destroyed our initiative, you've destroyed our incentive to get in there and roll up our sleeves and help out, so now you give us the money. Frankly, I think that would be a fatal step to occur in this province. I don't want to let that happen.

For those very reasons I don't want to support this resolution of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and I implore hon. members of this Assembly to defeat this resolution and to defeat it today. Thank you.

MR. KUSHNER: Mme. Speaker, I feel compelled to enter the debate on Motion 219, proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I cannot understand how the hon. member would have the outright gall to ask the members in this House to support a motion that will launch a province-wide inquiry by, of all things, a royal commission, into the manner in which funds are raised, the manner in which those funds are distributed, the degree of accountability — and the icing on the cake — the provision of services of all registered charities in the province of Alberta.

With all due respect, Mme. Speaker, if the hon. member doesn't realize what he's in fact doing by this motion, I think he had better take a few minutes to read it. On second thought, considering that I don't have much time to speak, I think I had better explain it. What the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is asking this House to do is in fact duplicate what is already being done with the over 10,000 registered charities in this province. Allow me to explain.

Firstly, the royal commission is to inquire into fund raising. Mme. Speaker, I take that to mean the method by which funds are raised. Before I get into that, let me remind the hon. member that the Alberta gaming control policies and guidelines are established by direct reference to Section 190 of the Criminal Code of Canada. Therefore, breach of many of the Alberta policies and guidelines, by reference to Section 190, is also a breach of the Canadian Criminal Code.

So the hon. member wants a royal commission to inquire into the way funds are raised. I'm sure he is probably not too concerned about the door-to-door canvassing by the United Way, the Heart Fund, or the Cancer Society. Possibly he is questioning why those many worth-while organizations' volunteers are donating their spare time and asking for donations, sometimes on very, very miserable evenings. If he is, then quite frankly, I'm appalled. If he's not, then I must understand that he may mean that the inquiries are to be made into raffles, casinos, bingos, or pull tickets. If such is the case, Sections 188, 189, and 190 of the Canadian Criminal Code define very meticulously me-

thods of conducting lotteries and games of chance which are in breach — not which are not, but which are — of the Criminal Code, and it provides that offenders are liable for imprisonment for two years. Not up to two years, just two years. In Alberta, all applications for licence to hold games of chance, bingos, and raffle lotteries must be made through the Attorney General's Department and under very careful scrutiny of the licensing and gaming control officers. In fact, Mme. Speaker, the public is complaining that the policies in Alberta are too rigid, and because they are too rigid a lot of charitable organizations are unable to raise the funds necessary for their projects.

Mme. Speaker, this may be an opportune time to state that because the government recognizes that a good number of charitable organizations are unable to serve their communities due to the inability to raise the needed funds for many excellent community projects, as a result of too restrictive gaming regulations, the government has established the citizens' advisory committee on gaming regulations. That is because this government is responsible to the people of this province regardless of what some of the members way out there want us to believe.

Now it's very obvious that methods of fund raising are strenuously controlled. The hon. member should ask the Association of Kinsmen Clubs, who were almost in the position last summer of being unable to provide the public who attend our two great annual exhibitions in Calgary and Edmonton with their Kinsmen car awards which, I might add, along with Kingo Bingo made possible the construction of playgrounds, parks, the Kinsmen fieldhouse here in Edmonton, the Kinsmen children's cancer research centre in Calgary, and many, many more worth-while community projects throughout the province of Alberta. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview should ask the Kinsmen Club of Barrhead why they couldn't start raising funds to build a desperately needed community swimming pool.

He wants a royal commission to inquire as to how funds are being raised, and possibly tighten the regulations on fund raising; I can't see that he would want recommendations to come out of a royal commission to loosen it. Good grief, let's hope the citizens' advisory committee on gaming regulations helps this government to assist groups like the Kinsmen in Barrhead to complete their projects, not make things more difficult as the hon. member is suggesting by establishing a royal commission.

Distribution of funds. He wants a royal commission to inquire into the distribution of funds of all registered charities in the province of Alberta. Once again, Mme. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, it is obvious that he is not aware that the many charitable organizations — which include service clubs such as the Lions, Kinsmen, Knights of Columbus, Uncles and Aunts at Large, Rotary, Legion, and many, many more — are truly in complete control of the distribution of their funds. All one has to do is look around and see the many projects by charities which have benefited people of all age groups in Alberta: playgrounds, parks, senior citizen accommodations, health care facilities, sporting facilities and teams, even going as far as providing an aunt or uncle for motherless or fatherless children.

This government requires, in addition, that a detailed report on every game of chance, bingo, or raffle

held in Alberta be meticulously completed by the organization which held that event, and that that report be submitted to the Attorney General's Department for their scrutiny. In that report, along with other detailed information must be included the name, or names, of the recipients of the net proceeds of the fund-raising event.

Mme. Speaker, being an ex-auditor, and after reviewing the detail required on each of the reports, for the life of me I really can't see how stricter controls than those already imposed can be introduced to make the method of reporting, which includes distribution of funds, more effective. And if in fact the reporting methods require revision, the citizens' advisory committee on gaming regulations will most probably make their recommendations accordingly.

Now let's take accountability. I take it the hon. member means accountability to the people of Alberta, who have elected this government as their representative. So I further understand that the accountability would be to this government, in which there is the Attorney General's Department. Therefore, Mme. Speaker, I am led to believe further that accountability would be to the Department of the Attorney General. To that end I must be repetitious for the benefit of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview: upon conclusion of every event which is a game of chance, bingo, or raffle, a report must be submitted which details, and I emphasize the word "details", gross receipts, all expenses, net proceeds, names of officers of the organization running the event and, in addition to other details, the names of individuals and respective organizations receiving the net proceeds. Just so the hon. member doesn't feel I'm exaggerating the detail required, I invite him to get involved in organizing and running an event with any of our charitable organizations, and then come back to this House and advise us, after completing a report and submitting it to the Attorney General's Department and, Mme. Speaker, possibly having to resubmit that report because — and I'm serious — of not having an "i" dotted or a "t" crossed ... I challenge him to say that the people in this province do not hold registered charities accountable. I won't elaborate, in addition, on the various inspectors and auditors who continually investigate and audit the registered charities in this province.

Mme. Speaker, in view of what I've said in the last few minutes, for fear again of being repetitious I won't dwell long on provision of services. But I must make one point. If provision of services is of grave concern to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview — and I assume it must be; otherwise he wouldn't have included provision of services in his motion — I once again invite him to speak to children playing in a playground or park that wouldn't be there if a service club or other charitable organization didn't take the initiative to work darn hard and build that playground or park and donate it to the community. Ask them or their parents if the donating organization's services to the community should be subject to inquiry by a royal commission.

I invite him to speak with any senior citizen living in one of the many beautiful accommodations either initiated or paid for as a result of hard work performed by a charitable organization. Ask that senior citizen if those organizations' provision of services to their community should be investigated by a royal commission. While he's in an inquiring frame of mind, he

should also ask the people benefiting from health care facilities, sporting complexes, community halls, companionship for their children, swimming pools, and many more projects too numerous to mention, if they feel a royal commission should be established to inquire into the provision of services. I know he won't do it, Mme. Speaker, because by now I'm sure he realizes how ridiculous this motion really is, with of course all due respect to the hon. member. [interjections]

In closing, Mme. Speaker, the terms of reference of the citizens' advisory committee on gaming regulations are to review existing government policy respecting licensing for all gaming matters currently administered by the Department of the Attorney General, and to make recommendations to the special caucus task force on gaming. Since the gaming control regulations are patterned after the applicable sections of the Criminal Code of Canada; and if the citizens' — and I emphasize "citizens" — advisory committee on gaming regulations follow their terms of reference; and since fund raising, distribution of funds, and accountability are controlled by gaming regulations; and since provision of services is controlled by demands placed on the various registered charities by community needs in the province of Alberta, I simply ask the hon. member, what is this royal commission he so desperately urges the government to establish going to do after we have wasted who knows how much of the public's money establishing it?

Mme. Speaker, I simply cannot support any motion that, number one, implies there are not registered charities that fall under any of the categories of being honest, having integrity, and being trustworthy, responsible, and accountable, regardless of what the hon. member attempted to lead us to believe in his preamble. And the second thing is that establishing a royal commission at great expense with nothing to do but duplicate work doesn't make sense.

MR. MACK: Mme. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity participate in the debate on Motion 219, introduced by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Reflecting very briefly on the preamble of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, perhaps it would be fair to say that he did strike a common chord with me in some of his reflections on gaming. We recognize that, by and large, gaming is a a moral question which has to be addressed and that there are various differences of opinion. I have some concerns. I ask the question of myself, and I share it with the Assembly: at what point can we say which cripple is helping which? Is advantage being taken of the unwary or of individuals who cannot help themselves, entering a gaming house and perhaps spending the weekly pay cheque and not having sufficient for the family? Having said that, it's a moral question that probably will be debated for a long time to come.

I guess where we come to a broad widening of opinion insofar as Motion 219 is concerned is in calling for a royal commission. In reading the motion, I was intrigued with the manner in which it was co-uched, the word "study". I think that was very ably put, and I wondered how one might be able to handle that if the preamble and comments of the hon. member had stayed in that context. However, in his opening remarks he very quickly went into the real crux, the bases and reasons for the requested royal commission, zeroing in on the CNIB. I believe the real reasons and the

spirit of that were really born out of a royal commission not necessarily to study the volunteer charitable organizations but in fact to investigate them.

I believe that implicit in the language of the motion, Mme. Speaker, is a focussing on suggestions that all voluntary agencies are suspect, perhaps of mismanagement or, at worst, of wrongdoing. I believe firmly — and I think the hon. member concurred with that feeling in his amplification of the bases and reasons for his concerns, and why he felt the government should immediately establish a royal commission to study voluntary agencies. I would submit, Mme. Speaker, and I'm certain the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview will agree with me, that there is no substitute for the measure of quality other than by performance. Respectfully I would further submit from personal knowledge, working as a volunteer for many years with voluntary agencies, that by performance I believe they have earned a much higher rating than the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is prepared to extend to them.

Certainly no blanket aspersions on the vast number of voluntary agencies are acceptable. Mme. Speaker, it has been my experience that, as individuals in voluntary agencies and as agencies themselves, the agencies' sole enrichment is best equated in terms of giving, sharing, being a friend, giving hope, reassuring, providing lodging and food, being a good listener, providing counsel, and one could go on and on. Money cannot buy this type of service, this kind of commitment. It is a personal commitment which people undertake through organizations.

Government can assist, which this government has in many, many different ways. But the bottom line has to be the volunteer, that committed individual who is prepared to be available to the call of someone in need, no matter what time of day and they respond to it. There is just no substitute for that type of devoted commitment. I respectfully suggest to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that his call for a royal commission is not one of enhancement, but one which would have a very deleterious effect on the many hundreds of volunteers whom it has been my honored privilege to work with over the years.

However, in a sincere attempt to appreciate the logic of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, since it appears at least to be plausible, I believe I had attempted and overcome any of the biases I may have had, particularly because I have some seniority working as a volunteer over a number of years. I have said many times, and I think it bears repeating, that when one works as a volunteer, the greatest benefactor in that experience is the individual who participates as a volunteer. I very readily confess that I have been one of the greatest benefactors in having the opportunity to participate as a volunteer. To suggest that that requires a royal commission or study is totally unacceptable. I think it's almost preposterous to make that sort of suggestion, couching it, if you will, Mme. Speaker, in the word "study".

Really what is implied, what is meant in the motion is to have a commission to study the total scene and cover very broadly the many hundreds of organizations and people who have the feeling that no money can buy, the kind of commitment that it's just not possible to buy; it's voluntary. I think that we have been enriched as Albertans, as Edmontonians, and in many other parts of our province, by the fact that we do have

organizations prepared to take the time to organize and study community needs. Many of them are not large organizations. We have some large service clubs, but by and large the real work in the trenches is done by small groups that really require moral support, as well as our own voluntary support, rather than being dissuaded from working in the various aspects of community need by superimposing a royal commission on them.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The Kinsmen have been mentioned earlier. I think of the Aquatic Centre: a monument for years to come. It's what I would interpret as a preventive social service, if you will, because it's an area where our young people can go and use it for a variety of reasons, as well as learning to swim. From the civic scene we made a fairly substantial contribution to that particular complex as well, in a specific area, simply because we believe it's a preventive social service. It gives an opportunity and provides the community with a place for young people to go rather than around the street corners.

I'm not by nature a critical person, but I sincerely have some difficulty appreciating this motion, coming from an individual whom I perceive to be ... In fact, I've always enjoyed some of his comments, not all, have agreed with some and disagreed with others. If I may respectfully suggest to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, perhaps it was an overreaction from the little problem that occurred this fall, and maybe ill conceived. It might have been better if this motion had died on the Order Paper rather than being debated, because of the implications inherent in it. They are not healthy implications. They are not the kinds of implications which will cause people to rally and become involved. The opposite would be the effect. It would dissuade people from becoming involved, and in fact may well already have had some deleterious effect on people by casting aspersions that perhaps there is impropriety in some of the agencies.

When we're speaking of concerns, I think we should address the specific concerns, rather than generally blanketing a tremendous amount of good work that is being done in our community for the benefit of the community. I think of the golf course the Kinsmen have given to the citizens, asking for nothing but perhaps volunteers. Again, preventive social services, if you will. I applaud them. I applaud the kind of organizations where young men take of their time and a lot of effort, including their families, in the middle of the summer if you will, during the height of the vacation season, and they address themselves to community needs.

I think it's very important for us to recognize the benefits to our community of having some of these organizations and the kind of support, the kind of benefits and facilities they give to our children, our grandchildren, and their children, hopefully, because I believe these facilities stand as monuments. They provide leadership. They provide a facility where leadership can be exercised and young people can go in, learn to become leaders, and ultimately take their role in the community.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. It's not a royal commission we need. There's no question that we need to address areas that may have some inequities. But that does not require a royal

commission; it requires some common sense, some addressing. I think it should be remembered that most of the voluntary agencies have voluntary boards and those boards have eminent, distinguished people serving as volunteers. Again, that reflection on those kinds of people is totally foreign and totally unacceptable to me, and I'm sure it's unacceptable to the majority of this Assembly. We cannot embrace that kind of methodology. It just cannot be. If there is wrong, it's so insignificant in terms of the value that we should not start measuring and detract from the good for an insignificant area of concern that we should and might well address in a minor way to correct the wrong, rather than detracting from the good being done.

I think of the Lions Club. They have left my constituency with facilities for our seniors. They're being used, and the seniors are extremely pleased with those facilities. When I visit the seniors in those facilities, I have some difficulty appreciating that that particular organization would be under the scrutiny of a royal commission. I think of the Canadian Travellers: predominantly young men who spend literally hours raising funds, not for personal aggrandizement, but because they feel the need of Albertans who are less fortunate than so many of us.

I think of the crippled children. I think of Rundle Park, for example, a facility second to none. Again, not wishing to overwork the word "monumental", but indeed it is. It's moneys; the park has been created and paid for predominantly by voluntary dollars, by people making a commitment to help. I think that should be recognized in far greater terms than by suggesting that we should have a royal commission.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret interrupting the hon. member, but I must draw to his attention that the time allotted for the designated motion has expired.

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

**Bill 210
An Act to Amend The School Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In moving second reading of Bill No. 210, I must first of all say that I'm delighted that we finally got a bit of life in the back bench here. I hope we have the kind of discussion on this Bill that we had on the resolution just past.

AN HON. MEMBER: It'll be short-lived.

MR. NOTLEY: Short-lived? Well, I hope they can hold out for at least an hour, hon. member.

In beginning, I'd like to say that after reading over the comments of the Minister of Education on the resolution proposed by the hon. Member for Little Bow ... Hon. members will recall that during that discussion of several weeks ago, the Minister of Education assured us that we really didn't need to worry, that everything was fine, and that as far as he was concerned the right to an education for the handicapped in this province was clearly spelled out in The School Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, after reviewing the comments

of the Minister of Education and having an opportunity to discuss this matter with a number of organizations — the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded and the action committee for the physically disabled — I am convinced that there is a need for Bill 210. Notwithstanding the soft-soaping of the Minister of Education two weeks ago, there is a good deal of ambiguity in this government's position.

I'd like to begin my comments by saying that I think we have to go beyond the confines of Bill 210, which clearly sets out the right to education for the handicapped in Alberta. One of the standing scandals in this province is that almost five years after the Human Rights Commission came to this government and said, look, we need an amendment to The Individual's Rights Protection Act to set out clearly the protection of handicapped people in Alberta, this government still hasn't moved. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if the government had amended The Individual's Rights Protection Act, as has been requested, I'm not so sure how necessary Bill 210 would be. The Individual's Rights Protection Act would have priority and would be such that we probably wouldn't have to amend The School Act or, if we did, only in a supplementary fashion. The fact of the matter is that this government is still dawdling on the question of changing The Individual's Rights Protection Act, as requested by the action committee for the disabled and even the Human Rights Commission.

Whenever I hear the hon. Minister of Labour equivocate in this House ... A few moments back hon. members were very concerned about commissions and studies. My heavens, nothing has been studied longer than this question of moving to provide some kind of legislative protection for the handicapped. In introducing the debate on Bill 210, I would say to the members that this kind of legislation is overdue; it's necessary, particularly because of a clear-cut record of inaction in this important field.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal specifically with some concerns that have been brought to my attention subsequent to the speech of the Minister of Education. First of all, the action committee for the physically disabled has argued that, if we're going to look at a right to education and if that right to education is going to make some allowance for the disabled and the handicapped among us, local advisory committees should be established in the various school jurisdictions in the province. I think that's a pretty important place to begin. It's not just a case of what the superintendent decides can or should be done. If we're really serious about enshrining a right to education in this province, it seems to me that this government should seriously consider the proposal for local advisory committees as suggested by the action committee for the disabled. Secondly, the action committee has brought to my attention that in some cases special resource centres have met neighborhood opposition. While that's regrettable, neighborhood opposition to a special resource centre none the less leaves the disabled or the physically handicapped as the odd man out, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, the most important criticism I got from various groups is that it's fine for the Minister of Education to stand up and talk about the sections in the present School Act — although there's a good deal of ambiguity in those sections, notwithstanding the fact that we now find the minister is something of a

legal expert. But even if we were to accept all his arguments of two weeks ago, those arguments don't amount to much unless some money is made available. You can say to many of the divisions in this province: move ahead with programs to provide the right to some kind of education for the handicapped. But it really doesn't mean much if you say it in the absence of any serious budgetary commitments.

Right now, division after division — and the rural members particularly should know just how precarious many of the budgets of school divisions in this province are. Simply saying that if school divisions are not complying with these ambiguous sections of The School Act, bring that to my attention and I'll see that they comply ... Where is the commitment from this government, sitting on the surplus revenue we have in Alberta, to make funds available? Members will say, we do make funds available. But the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded has suggested that if we're going to give any kind of meaning to education for the physically and mentally handicapped, the financial support should be from ages 1 to 24, not just 6 to 16.

In addition to some of those concerns, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I was a little amused, two weeks ago, when the minister stood up and made the distinction that there's a difference between the right to an education and the right to a quality education. He suggested that no child has the right to a quality education, but he has a right to an education.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to education for the handicapped, that distinction so adroitly drawn by the minister — and I'm sorry he's not here to hear what I say — can be pretty fundamental. As every group that has fought for the rights of the handicapped has said for some time, we need funding so that we can provide that additional time and resource material and make meaningful the right to an education.

Simply saying, yes, you can be in the classroom, doesn't really mean much unless we have a commitment to the extra dollars required. Whether you look at the school bus that picks up the child — and I noticed the government did make an announcement a few weeks ago which will be of some value to rural school divisions, making it possible to transport the physically handicapped — or whether you examine the entire day in school, there are extra costs. And unless we have some commitment from this government that those extra costs are going to be borne, we have a very shallow commitment at best.

Hon. members will say, why bother passing Bill 210? The Member for Spirit River-Fairview is saying we need a fiscal commitment from the provincial Treasury, and it should come up when the budget is debated next spring. But I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the best way to make sure that the budget contains the funds that are required is to have it clearly spelled out, so there is no ambiguity.

I hardly need remind members of this Assembly that at the present time, under sections 134, 136, and 138 of the present legislation, superintendents are able to allow temporary exclusion or absence of students. Frequently that is used, not because school divisions wish to do it, but because of the absence of training on the part of staff — and not just the training the Minister of Education referred to two weeks ago. The Minister of Education talked about training programs at our postsecondary institutions. No one needs to talk to me about the need for those programs; clearly that's im-

portant. But in addition to having people who are properly trained at postsecondary institutions, there is a need for in-service training.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, some boards have said, look, how can we possibly talk about in-service training? We don't have the money; you have to be joking. This government has such a rigid restraint program that in fact the availability of personnel is qualified not only by the number of graduates from our postsecondary institutions but also, to a very large extent, by the ability to have in-service training programs that are meeting the need.

In addition, the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded has said to me that there is no special curriculum for the moderately, severely, or profoundly handicapped. There is a curriculum for the mildly retarded but, in their view, it's out of date. They go on to suggest that the province should start to move towards integrating the mentally handicapped with normal children and that there should be as many teachers' aides as necessary to allow for this.

Mr. Speaker, as I read it, the bottom line is really twofold. First of all, we have the question of "biting the bullet" when it comes to legislative change. It's too long in coming — both the request the Human Rights Commission has made to change The Individual's Rights Protection Act and the need to clarify the ambiguity that still exists in The School Act. That's the first thing this Legislature has to decide.

Mr. Speaker, the second thing is deciding whether we are prepared to make funds available. In my judgment, we have a moral obligation to make those funds available.

Mr. Speaker, for these and other reasons it is my view that the discussion this Legislature held two weeks ago is just the beginning of what must be an ongoing discussion, in this Legislature and beyond, among Albertans, as to our obligation to set out certain basic rights in such a way that there's no uncertainty; so that we don't have to see the thing tested in a court, as in the case of Mrs. Carriere, who had to take the thing to the Supreme Court to establish a right that is still uncertain because of sections of The School Act that permit temporary absences.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude my remarks on this Bill by saying to members of the House that it is a commitment which, in my view at least, is consistent with the right of every child to be educated to the extent of that child's ability. If we are not able to set out clearly the right to an education, and a quality education, in a province as wealthy as Alberta, where else can it be done? Surely, this is a province that can lead on that score at least.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill 210 this afternoon.

I would suggest to the hon. member that none of us disputes the principle that handicapped children should receive the same education as all other children. Public schools can and should be adapted to the special needs of the handicapped, regardless of cost, if the child is best suited for that type of education. We must remember, though, that there must be an equitable distribution of teacher services, in order that no group of students suffers from an inordinate amount or lack of attention.

It also must be realized that, as mentioned in the Chipman school program evaluation report, teachers

can and do face extra pressures and demands. They are unprepared or unqualified to handle special circumstances surrounding the handicapped child. Additionally, we must ensure that the overall quality of education is not diminished by a particular instructor's spending extra time on specialized cases.

However, this is not to say that handicapped and disabled children should not be permitted into public schools. They most definitely should have equal access. But we must be cognizant of the special care that accompanies their attendance and perhaps unnecessarily complicates the educative process.

One must also consider the handicapped child himself. Will a public school education increase or decrease peer pressures? Mr. Speaker, I can certainly tell of this particular facet from an experience in our own family.

My elder daughter was a victim of the 1952 polio epidemic, and attended school following her recovery. There were the special, built-up shoes and the odd walk; and peer pressures and criticisms became so intense that it was almost impossible for the child to go to school. Yet, at a later date she was placed in the children's hospital for surgery and took additional education there, and she was totally happy. First of all, expert people were looking after the education. And the children were surrounded by others suffering from similar disfigurements and handicaps. Indeed, after spending well over a year in those surroundings, my daughter was very reluctant to leave and come home again. I do recognize the difficulty in that environment also, in that a person can become institutionalized and not want to come out and face the world again.

For some children the whole concept of integration may ultimately backfire as peer group pressures cause unnecessary demands. Of course, it is academic to argue along lines of how much a handicapped child may benefit from or be hurt by an education in our public schools. Expert advice takes both sides. In considering this question, we must not lose sight of all the school children in the system. Are the interests and rights of all children going to be compromised in order to adopt the system?

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it might be well to consider what a handicapped person is. I don't think a blind person finds any difficulties operating in a photographic darkroom. I don't think the stenographer or secretary with crippled feet or legs finds that she is unable to cope with her particular job.

One of my subordinates in the police organization was also stricken in the polio epidemic of the '50s. He was away from his position for six years and returned in a wheel chair, paralyzed from the neck down. Yet that man became one of the most expert fingerprint examiners in the whole organization. From the point of view of his training, his education, his ability to cope with his job, he was not functionally handicapped. I think this is something we must bear in mind.

The Act as it now stands ensures for every child the right to access of the resources of a public or separate school, as expressed under sections 133 and 136. The judgment handed down by Mr. Justice O'Byrne on the Carriere case clearly does not address itself to the question of whether or not handicapped children should be permitted to attend public schools. It does deal with a judgmental decision on the part of a local board as to whether in this particular case a handicapped child can best be educated in a public school or a special school. This of course becomes an individual evaluation. The

board seemingly felt it could not supply the required resources for this child.

Not all schools can realistically meet the needs of handicapped children. The School Act as it is currently constituted guarantees the right of any child to education in the public schools.

I would suggest then, Mr. Speaker, that it is therefore unnecessary to amend the Act in order to add something which already exists.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to speak also on Bill 210. I'd like to speak against it.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in introducing this Bill and highlighting it ... I'm certainly not against the spirit and intent of the Bill. However, the current legislation says a number of things that I think cover adequately what he wants to have in Bill 210. The current legislation does give all children in Alberta the right to an education, whether they're handicapped or not. Section 136(1) of The School Act says "every pupil", and I've no reason to think that every pupil means anything but every pupil. Section 134 of the Act says pupils with special educational needs may be excused temporarily. But the school board is still responsible, with the parents' approval, for providing for those children.

I would think that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would rather state or suggest that the government continue its high priority on the education of the handicapped. In many ways "handicapped" is difficult to define because handicapped means different things to different people. There are different degrees of handicaps, different kinds of handicaps, and different ages of the handicapped; and there's certainly a difference between being handicapped in a rural setting and being handicapped in an urban setting.

The hon. member opposite should be aware that during 1977-78, 8,547 children, including the mildly

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I call the attention of hon. members to the rule with regard to passing between another member and the Chair when the other member is speaking.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: I'd like to restate that during 1977 and 1978, 8,547 mildly retarded, moderately retarded, deaf and blind, and partially deaf and blind children with learning disabilities and other special problems were being educated in Alberta schools. In the Willow Creek School Division, in the area I represent, five students are severely learning disabled. They're in the school in Granum. They're not from the Granum area, but they're bused there. There's one full-time teacher and one full-time aide for five students. Before this program was started, these children would not have been able to go to school or would have had to go to some sort of institution. In a rural area, where there's a problem with distances and everything, I think much is being done.

This government made a priority in the Speech from the Throne. There were six priorities in the spring speech. I think it's a good time to restate the third one:

Handicapped Citizens. The interest and concern of Albertans for the needs of our handicapped citizens will be reflected and re-emphasized through the expansion of existing programs, and by introduc-

tion of a number of new approaches, sustaining Alberta's position in the forefront ...

And I'd like to restate that point,

... in the forefront in Canada in services for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, because of a number of these things, I would ask hon. members of this Assembly to vote against this Bill.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has left the Assembly for a time. Earlier this afternoon he was kind enough to pay a compliment to those of us members of the government who are commonly referred to as backbenchers. We were referred to as being like the Scarlet Pimpernel. I think at the time he didn't realize that he was referring to us as being romantic persons who rescue others from mortal danger. For such is the description of the book entitled *The Scarlet Pimpernel*.

The Bill before us, it obviously brings up a whole emotional area, one which is very difficult for all of us to deal with. Quite obviously the first line of interaction is with regard to the handicapped child or adult and other members of his or her family.

On behalf of the Assembly, I want to thank the hon. Member for Calgary McCall for sharing with us, earlier this afternoon, his personal experience with regard to one of his own children.

Certainly this is the whole crunch of the matter with regard to all residents of this province who have children who are in this so-called handicapped category. I know it relates to every riding in this province of ours. On a number of occasions in the recent election campaign when I was door knocking, I came across situations where the parent obviously was carrying on with great courage as well as great sensitivity in dealing with his or her own child. For just a moment, we should pay a great amount of tribute to those parents and members of families who are looking after their own children, no matter what age the child may be. Again, of course, we owe a great debt of gratitude to all those teachers and other related personnel who deal with those afflicted by any kind of handicap.

Obviously, we have this kind of situation occurring in homes as well as in schools and hospitals. Not every parent is able to deal with the degree of handicap his child has. When it comes to the matter of education, we then must call upon other resource personnel to help out, so that this person is able to develop to his maximum potential. One of the greatest difficulties encountered by any person involved in this educational process is to be able to find oceans and oceans of patience. Within this province we have people who have developed a high degree of sensitivity to the various forms of handicap that afflict the human frame.

One of the great difficulties, of course, in terms of education is the matter of a one-to-one relationship. That raises all sorts of difficulties with regard to cost, let alone time. The whole matter of involvement or of raising the matter of the education of a handicapped individual calls for special demands in terms of special facilities and resource centres. Again, these kinds of demands, in terms of their fiscal ramifications, deal with a multitude of departments of government and not with the Department of Education alone.

I believe this provincial government has shown its commitment to seeking a better quality of life for all Albertans, and certainly with regard to handicapped

Albertans. In February 1979 the then Minister of Education announced that an additional \$0.5 million was being added to a \$57 million annual program for education of the handicapped within this province. Less than a month ago the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower announced yet another program, a five-year program which puts \$4.5 million into education and training programs for handicapped persons and personnel working with them. Specifically, there were three areas of focus under that new program: special education required for teachers of handicapped children in the basic school system, training and education of workers and professionals involved in rehabilitation services for the handicapped, and long-term and ongoing vocational training for adults with mental, physical, and sensory handicaps and learning disabilities.

Quite obviously, the programs of the province are not perfect. But then again, because of my background I realize that nothing in this life is perfect, not even the NDP.

On more than one occasion the Minister of Social Services and Community Health has ducked when he saw me coming, with regard to a number of issues, but in particular the matter of supplying electronic aids for the hearing handicapped. I believe that when one produces and then peruses the statistics for the hearing handicapped within our country, the statistics show that a tremendous number of people are in the hearing handicapped category. When I went home last night and listened to my daughter's new hi-fi set, I realized that I may soon be coming under the qualification of "hearing handicapped".

Also making an approach to the Associate Minister of Telephones on this whole area of the hearing handicapped, hopefully this government will come through with sufficient funds and enlargement of its program so that these persons will be able to use electronic devices to help them communicate, not only in terms of education but oftentimes in terms of sheer survival — access in an emergency to such facilities as the police department or an ambulance.

In *Alberta Hansard* on October 16 the Minister of Education quite cogently set forth and made his comments with regard to the present legislation; that indeed we now have in place sufficient mechanism whereby the education of the handicapped will indeed be carried out and further enlarged within this province. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was kind enough to comment on one incident in terms of this mechanism. As evidence of good faith on behalf of this government and of the Minister of Education, there was the announcement that would enable school buses to be rearranged to allow for transportation of handicapped children.

I find that present legislation seems to be well in place with regard to this issue. I also believe this government is showing every evidence of good faith in carrying out the provisions.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to be able to rise and speak against Bill 210. At present I too am under a handicap, but I wouldn't fit into this category because it's not permanent. I hope.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview started out his speech using all the possible tactics, using emotionalism and saying, the standing scandal in the province and, the government still hasn't

moved. He then goes on to use The Individual's Rights Protection Act. At the same time as he uses emotionalism, he also goes on to use inappropriate effect when he's speaking. I'd like to draw out to the member of the opposition that the government is doing a lot in the way of educating our handicapped and looking after the needs of those who are less fortunate.

On October 16, 1979, the Member for Clover Bar stated:

A disability doesn't have to be a handicap. Unfortunately, however, through the indifferent or discriminatory treatment of its disabled citizens, the government, and we, have handicapped them.

Stating that the government is responsible and a cause of the handicapped person. I don't believe that is true. Handicapped situations occur; they are not the result of government interference or the lack of it.

He also went on to state:

At the same time we are looking at children who are handicapped, Mr. Minister, we must also look at children who have learning disabilities because this area is almost as crippling as the people who have physical as well as mental handicaps.

Mr. Speaker, our government has looked at the learning disability situation. At home I have a situation close to my heart, with one of my children having a learning disability involving reading. That has become more apparent over the last few years. I would expect that this problem has been there for years, only it wasn't diagnosed quite as readily as it is now. The government has provided funds to identify those children and get them into proper training situations.

Going back to the comment about the government being responsible to ensure that our handicapped will be provided for, I'd like to say that it's not only the responsibility of the government but the responsibility of our people and our school boards. I'm not saying that our people and our school boards have not been responsible.

In St. Paul we have a situation that is second to none in Alberta. St. Paul has been running a school agenda for the disabled and handicapped for a long time. At present in the St. Paul school jurisdiction, involving the regional, separate, and county systems, they have approximately 28 students who are being supervised with a three-to-one pupil/teacher ratio. It's a regional program taking in children from other jurisdictions where they can't provide that service. The region is charging approximately \$700 per child to the other jurisdictions to educate their children in the system.

Mr. Speaker, the member stated that we were not providing funds to properly train our handicapped, yet in September the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower announced a five-year program that will provide \$4.5 million for education and training programs for both the handicapped and the personnel working with and teaching them. The three main areas of focus under this new program are: special education required for teachers of handicapped children in the basic school system; training and education of workers and professionals involved in rehabilitation services for the handicapped; and long-term and ongoing vocational training for adults with mental, physical, and sensory handicaps and learning disabilities.

Mr. Minister, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview stated that we should be looking not only at the

children from 6 to 16 but people from 1 to 24. If we're worried about 1 to 24, why not go 1 to 100? Why do we draw a line at a certain arbitrary figure? I also state that through our adult education system we are looking at those needs.

Members of the opposition have said that we haven't been providing funds. Look at the programs that are in existence today and see what they do. The elementary component of the educational opportunity fund provides for grades 1 through 6, and in 1979 it is funded up to \$32.15 per pupil. Then there's the compensatory component. A learning disability fund, special education teaching position grants, schools for the handicapped, orientation and mobility training grants, and out-of-province grants for the handicapped are provided. If we don't have facilities here in the province to provide for them, we will provide that even if it is out of the province. Vocational education grants, extension program grants — all these special education services are available. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that we are doing a job. The legislation is there, and with the Carriere case and the ruling that came down, we have the necessary legislation. We don't need any more, and I ask members to vote against Bill 210.

Thank you.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be able to participate in debate on Bill 210. I'd like to begin my comments in a non-partisan fashion by congratulating the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview on the concern he has shown with this particular Bill. I'm not sure I can promise to keep the remarks in that vein throughout my comments. None the less, throughout the past number of years I have had a special concern in this area, and I'm glad to say that the hon. member opposite shares that concern at least, if not the method or direction through which we should try to achieve some improvements in areas of services for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, when I originally threw myself into the political arena, I did so in fact with a topic very close to this Bill, the topic of services for the hearing handicapped, as the hon. Member for Calgary Millican talked about so eloquently earlier this afternoon. At that point, I had become very aware of one particular child in the Calgary system who had not had the facilities he required to bring him up to the level of education he should have had. By phone and letter I went through people in the United States, individuals who had been involved with education of the hearing impaired, and found he was three years behind the level they could have brought that individual to in the United States' system. That was specifically as a result of a lack of aids for hearing [impaired] individuals.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I found throughout that election campaign was that those aids were not being held back because this government or the school board in the city of Calgary did not want to supply that particular service, but because of a lack of knowledge of what was available and the kind of program that could be initiated. If we take a look at this Bill and the specifics of it, I'd like to suggest that it is so vague that any attempt to meet the standards it suggests would be futile. Day after day we would go through saying that we're providing the best education and special services for the handicapped, yet we would not be able to ascertain whether we were in fact up to date on that particular topic, whether we knew of the latest

development taking place in London or Hong Kong or the southern part of the States. It would tie the minister to providing the best possible education, yet would leave him wide open to criticism when he could not prove that a given child at a given time was being provided with the best education available in the world.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I support the intent of the legislation, to improve the situation for those with handicaps and difficulties. But I cannot understand how, in its current state, this Bill, this particular document, will change anything. In his initial remarks, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview indicated that we might indeed think he should make these remarks during budget period. Despite the fact that I listened to the rest of the hon. member's remarks, I would indeed suggest that. He suggested necessary improvements and called on us to move in given areas, and yet today he has provided us with a Bill which does no more than restate, in different words and with some dramatic attempts to underline the difficulty, the policy as it currently exists. I also found a lack of continuity to his remarks. The hon. member indicated that maybe we should be looking at providing services for individuals from ages 1 to 24, yet he clearly states in the Bill that this would be for persons 6 to 16. Perhaps the hon. member would now want to reconsider the Bill in light of his own remarks.

MRS. CRIPPS: At least he was on the topic.

MR. D. ANDERSON: I won't comment on whether the hon. member is usually on topic. However, I would like to continue to say that some of the comments made by other members of this Legislature in the course of this debate would give the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview information he'd need to update his position. I look forward to his contribution during the budget debate next year and would be more than happy to talk to him about needs in the handicapped area.

In a partisan manner, not in keeping with my initial non-partisan remarks, I think he clearly left out that the government has in fact provided a great deal. We have moved toward providing the best education we can at this point, and we're willing to look at ways of improving that situation and expanding. There's no doubt that for as long as I sit in this Legislature and, I might suggest, for as long as this Legislature exists, we will be able to say: not enough is being done, not enough is available, people are not being cared for to the extent we could care for them. While that is true now, and will be true in the future, we should indeed look for ways of providing services.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall talked very eloquently about the difficulty in determining what is or is not a handicap, and other members added to that particular aspect of this debate. Indeed that's true. Again going back to my own experiences, in the city of Toronto I was dealing with a girl who had an I Q of 185, far above average, who had no physical handicaps whatsoever but had had a very difficult childhood and from age 14 on had been addicted to a particular drug to such an extent that she could not mentally function in a consistent way and therefore could not operate her life effectively. Her I Q was there. The poetry she wrote was among the best I have ever read.

The kind of experiences she had in terms of being able to converse with an individual were excellent. Still that person was handicapped.

Where do we define that? Where do we draw that particular line? There are those who would suggest that there are members of this Assembly who are handicapped, and it's been suggested of me in certain ways. At times, Mr. Speaker, I feel that way. But where is the line drawn? Where in this particular Bill 210 would the minister be charged with the responsibility of not carrying out his duties under the Act?

I think this puts him in a very precarious position. I'm not a lawyer, and I wouldn't mind hearing comments from a person with more legal expertise than myself. But I have a great deal of difficulty with the section which says:

... a board shall, notwithstanding any [section] of this Act, provide educational facilities and services satisfactory to the Minister and in accordance with regulations under this Act for every handicapped child ...

What is satisfactory to the minister? If I were that minister, nothing short of the best in the world would be satisfactory. But would it be practical to be able to provide that in St. Paul at a given moment, at a given time?

I suggest this would provide an excellent opportunity for the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview to question the minister in the House in terms of, is this satisfactory to you, or is that particular instance in the north or south of Alberta satisfactory? If not, why is the minister not exercising his abilities under the Act? But I can see no practical benefit in our passing this Bill today.

For that reason I would have to vote against it although, as I indicated earlier, I very much support the intent and theory of supplying the best possible education for individuals with handicaps.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate on Bill 210, proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

I would like to assure the members of this Assembly that I support the right of children with handicaps to receive a quality education in this province. However, it is my opinion that the legislation proposed in Bill 210 is both unnecessary and undesirable. I suggest this for two reasons, and in view of the time I don't think I can get through my reasons. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's not proposed that the House sit this evening. Tomorrow we'll be returning to Committee of Supply and, in the event there's time available, in the proceedings following that we would go on to second readings and committee study of Bills. They will be in order as they appear on the Order Paper, with perhaps one or two exceptions: one or two Bills have been held throughout the session.

[At 5:24 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]