

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Wednesday, May 21, 1980 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. JOHNSTON: I am particularly pleased to be able to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly three very distinguished visitors in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. Visiting us today is the distinguished Ambassador to Canada from Austria, Dr. August Tarter, who has had an opportunity to meet with several of our colleagues in government and members of the community at large in the province of Alberta. With him is the Honorary Consul of Austria in Calgary, Mr. Hans Ockermueller, and the Austrian Trade Commissioner in Vancouver, Mr. Herbert Holzer. I'm sure that all members of the Assembly have recognized not only the distinguished role of this particular ambassador, but I'm sure the role of other members of the Olympic ski team who have also distinguished themselves, most recently in the Olympic downhill series in Banff. I'm sure the members will welcome these distinguished visitors to the Assembly. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of our Assembly.

head: PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition to the hon. members of the Legislature signed by some 294 forest firefighters in the Lac La Biche area requesting better wages, working conditions, and recreation conditions.

head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to table the annual report of the Select Standing Committee on the Offices of the Auditor General and the Ombudsman.

head: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice of motion that under Orders of the Day today, I'll be asking the Assembly for unanimous leave to debate a resolution in the following terms:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta welcomes the results of the referendum vote in the province of Quebec and views them as a commitment to Canada and a call for constitutional change, and urges the federal government to fulfil its promise of a renewal of Canadian federalism which will reflect the aspirations of all provinces in Canada.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 209

The Crown Corporation and
Government Agency Disclosure Act

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 209, The Crown Corporation and Government Agency Disclosure Act. The purpose of this Bill is to ensure that provincial Crown corporations and government agencies listed in the schedule attached to the Bill provide annual reports, and that these reports be scrutinized by a select standing committee of the Legislature.

[Leave granted; Bill 209 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislature Library some seven letters and documents, supporting the forest firefighters' petition I gave to the Legislature today, from the Indian Association of Alberta, Native Counselling Services of Alberta, Native Outreach, the Federation of Metis Settlements, the Canadian Native Friendship Centre, the Alberta Federation of Labour, and Mr. William Beaver, vice-president, Treaty 8.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I realize this point is not specifically dealt with in *Standing Orders*. But I do have to have regard for the staff and space at the disposal of the administration of this Assembly. I would think there would have to be some reasonable limits to the quantity of paper we would be expected to file and have available.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 1979 annual report of K Division, RCMP, and two brochures which will be used in connection with the Check Stop program this year. Copies will be delivered to all hon. members.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to table the annual report of the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board for the year ended December 31, [1979], pursuant to the statutes.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to file the annual report of the Northern Alberta Development Council for the period 1979-1980.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, two teams of provincial champions, one from Lorne Jenken senior high school in Barrhead, and the other from J.R. Harris junior high school, also in Barrhead. Both teams have recently attained outstanding accomplishment status in province-wide scholastic competitions.

The first team, consisting of five students, is the CBC Reach for the Top 1980 provincial championship team. Of course, it has still not been announced on television, but will be in the ensuing weeks. That team attained that accomplishment several weeks ago, and I'd like to intro-

duce them to all members. We have Jeff Reitsma, David Tuckey, Jackie Sadie, Les Mills, and Bruce Wallace. Their teacher, coach, and advisor is Mr. Jim Cantwell.

In addition to that accomplishment for Alberta in 1980, two of the students have also accomplished other outstanding achievements this year. Les Mills was recently named student of the year in Lorne Jenken high school in Barrhead. Jackie Sadie received an award several weeks ago at Olds, and she will accompany the 4-H group visiting the Northwest Territories later this year.

The Reach for the Top team will represent Alberta in Ottawa from June 28 to July 5. They have a rich tradition, Mr. Speaker. In 1973 a school from Barrhead won the provincial and national Reach for the Top championships. In 1975 another team from that school lost in the northern Alberta finals. In 1976 it didn't participate. In 1977 it won the provincial championship and went on to the nationals, and in 1979 again. In 1980 it will bring back the championship to Alberta.

The second team, Mr. Speaker, is another provincial winner. It's a junior high school team that won ITV's Hi Q competition. That team consists of Brenda Waddle, David Ushko, Billy Eggleton, and Ian Wallace. They're accompanied today by their teacher/advisor Mr. Ken Wold.

Mr. Speaker, these students and teachers give all of us pride in saying that Alberta has, of course, the finest quality educational system in Canada. For some of us who represent rural constituencies, we're very pleased to say that within the boundaries of Alberta the finest quality educational system exists in our smaller rural schools.

Mr. Speaker, before I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House, I'm also pleased to acknowledge that they had a very interesting discussion with the Minister of Education earlier this afternoon. I might point out that the primary question they asked of him was, of course, the future status of departmental examinations.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this group of students and their teachers, in the members gallery, rise and receive the warm welcome of the House today.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you — briefly — [laughter] 30 members of the grade 9 class at the Edith Rogers school. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Bill Gordon. I must say that I think Edith Rogers is the champion visitation group for the Legislature. I personally know one of the classes — Mr. Sean Murphy has an active interest at the grass roots level. I'm pleased to see that it's extended to the show place, if you will. I'd ask them to rise and receive the greetings of this Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, some 58 students from the Acton district high school in Ontario who are visiting here on a student exchange, sponsored by the Secretary of State, with members of Ross Sheppard high school. These students range from grades 9 to 12, and they are the high school band from the Acton district high school. They are accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Sale, Dr. Elliott, and Mr. Adams, a teacher at Ross Sheppard high school. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly this afternoon.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's with some degree of trepidation that I rise to introduce to you, and through

you to members of the Assembly, guests in the members gallery. I have conflicting written reports as to their numbers; in one case, seven, and in the other case, 40. I'm sure there aren't 40, because of the number who have already been introduced.

On a previous occasion, May 12, I introduced students from the spring session for seniors at the University of Alberta, in the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona. These students from all across the province attend courses at the University of Alberta at this time of the year. I would hope there are at least seven, although in looking at the faces, I couldn't determine that there is one over the age of 65. [laughter] Maybe I'm fooled. If there are seven, I would hope they would rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly . . . My trepidation, Mr. Speaker, was well founded. [laughter]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm pleased to be able to ask the Assembly today to give recognition to a former member of the Corps of Commissionaires who served with distinction here in the Legislature for quite some time, Mr. Vincent Seymour. After his service in the British army, which included being gassed and wounded in 1918, he came to Canada, was a civil servant here, and served as both a commissionaire and a tour guide for quite some time on behalf of this Legislative Assembly. Mr. Seymour is now in the Speaker's gallery, and I would be glad if hon. members would welcome him and give him recognition for his service here.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Sulphur Industry

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Economic Development. The question flows from reports from the Sulphur Development Institute of Canada regarding the use of sulphur, and transportation difficulties that the institute sees in future markets for use of sulphur in concrete and asphalt paving. The problem seems to be in reaching markets outside the province of Alberta. Has the minister been involved in discussions either with the Sulphur Development Institute or companies interested in seeing the use of sulphur in these two areas expanded?

MR. PLANCHE: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation. Has the Minister of Transportation been involved with the Sulphur Development Institute on this question?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I have not been directly involved, but we are doing some research in the way of checking with people who are using sulphur. As a matter of fact, next month we are planning on going to Germany, where they are doing considerable work in this way. We'll be reporting back.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then perhaps I might go to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and ask if the minister or his department has been involved in discussions with the Sulphur Development Institute from the standpoint of now utilizing a process which has been developed to use some of our excess sulphur in the province of Alberta.

MR. LEITCH: I haven't, Mr. Speaker, but it may well be that members of the department have. I'll check on that and report later to the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to any of the three ministers. Do any of the three ministers have on their agenda discussions with the institute? It seems that discussions are now appropriate to attempt to remove some of the difficult transportation problems that the institute sees, so that we'd be able to move ahead with the development of this industry in the province.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can reply on behalf of the other ministers, because I happen to be involved in international sales of sulphur. I have to inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition that really the problem of sulphur is more significant than that. The present sulphur contract prices on the world market are approximately \$60 a tonne. The spot market price is as high as \$125 a tonne, not only due to transportation but the general shortage of sulphur on the world market. There again, while transportation plays a part in the excess of charges on spot prices, on the other hand in Alberta we have approximately 20 million tonnes of sulphur in reserve but only very small quantities in the pelletized form, which is the only form that other countries accept because of environmental problems. In fact, I understand that Gulf Oil is going to open the first prilling plant for sulphur sometime next month, which other companies have now engaged to construct. That in itself will again help the transportation problem, which is sometimes more an environmental problem than a transportation problem, which I would not want to diminish but still is only part of the overall problem of sulphur export to other countries.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might pose this supplementary question either to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the Minister of Economic Development. The concern I'm expressing to the Assembly isn't for international trade. It's a matter of using the sulphur technology developed at the University of Calgary in concrete and paving materials; for that process to be developed in Alberta, then used outside Alberta.

My question is really to any of the five ministers. What steps is the government taking to attempt to resolve this transportation problem which, according to the institute, is preventing the use of a great deal of surplus sulphur in this province?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I think the question ahead of this one asked whether we had any meetings scheduled. I do not have, but in response to the questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would certainly say that I will follow the matter up in consultations with my colleagues who would also have an interest in it. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that one of us will be following it up.

Aids to Daily Living Program

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It follows a question asked by my colleague earlier in the session regarding the aids to daily living program. The minister had indicated that the advisory committee had not been established yet, but that it would be established very quickly. My question now is:

has that advisory committee been established, and has it met?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker, the advisory committee has not yet been established. We're still awaiting several nominees from professional associations. I anticipate having those in the very near future. Once they've been submitted and approved, the appointments will be made and the advisory committee will get on with its work. Subsequently, subcommittees will be reporting to the advisory committee in a number of specialized areas.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I pose the question because of concern expressed to us by firms who want to supply materials that would be approved by the department for the aids to daily living program. If the advisory committee is not functioning now, to whom should representation be made, and what tests are available for equipment that various firms feel is suitable for the aids to daily living program? To date, there really is no place they can focus their application, nor mechanism for the testing of the equipment.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to respond to that. Some firms may not be aware of the process which is in place. Of course, the advisory committee is looking at areas that the program has not yet addressed but is looking at expanding into. In terms of acceptable equipment that has been proven in other jurisdictions or in Alberta over a period of years, there is a process through the department. In fact, I am aware that in a number of cases, tenders have been sought from a variety of companies to supply different types of equipment. If the hon. member would like more information on that matter, I would be pleased provide it to him within the very near future.

Quebec Referendum

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier, and it directly follows those questions answered yesterday with respect to the Quebec referendum. Can the Premier indicate if, as a result of the "no" vote victory last night in the province of Quebec, he is now willing to participate in discussion and communication in Quebec relative to changes in the constitution?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would only reply briefly now, and would be quite pleased to elaborate during the course of the debate — if there's unanimous consent on the motion before the House — to the effect that yes, definitely, the Alberta government would be prepared, as reflected in the communique at the Lethbridge premiers' conference, to enter into constitutional discussions. But we believe it would be important first to try to develop an atmosphere that would be conducive to some degree of progress. If such atmosphere is not developed, that doesn't mean we would not attend any constitutional conference and participate. We would, as we always have in the past.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is it the intention of the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to be in contact with Mr. Ryan regarding possible assistance or meetings in that area in the immediate future?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's a difficult question because it's important that the government of Alberta continue to work and communicate with the duly elected government of the province of Quebec. I do believe, however, that it would not be inappropriate for communication to occur with the leader of the federalist forces in Quebec as a follow-up to the discussions I mentioned yesterday in the Legislature.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question. Is the Premier indicating that the government will be willing to attend any constitutional conference called in the immediate future to deal with the future structure of Confederation, regardless of what the situation might be with Ottawa?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what I'm saying. On the other hand, I am also saying as clearly as I can that in order for such a conference to have an atmosphere which would create an environment of some probability of progress, it would be important that the atmosphere created include a recognition by the federal government of respect for the ownership rights of resources of the people of this province.

Bow River Pollution

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Environment. Has the minister received any recent studies on the recent report from officials in his department as to the condition of water in the Bow River downstream from Calgary?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, on request from the Member for Little Bow, we have done a further analysis of the situation downstream from Calgary. We'll be reporting the information we have, in response to both the petition and the comments made by the Member for Little Bow.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister requested his staff, any of the staff from Social Services and Community Health who are in charge of health units, or municipal health authorities to take weekly samples of water in the Bow River downstream from Calgary and in the Calgary area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we do that regularly, and co-ordinate it with the Department of Social Services and Community Health. In response to the Member for Little Bow, the information is available in document form, and we'll be giving it to him.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Has the minister met with officials of the city of Calgary to determine whether steps are being taken to accelerate completion of the treatment plant in Calgary, since the minister is giving \$3.6 million to help in developing a treatment plant in Calgary?

MR. COOKSON: No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't, although my officials at the technical level meet regularly with Calgary's.

There may be a misunderstanding with regard to the \$3.6 million. We're working on a funding provision for handling the phosphorus problem which we have not finalized yet. But in terms of the balance of the cost of upgrading the facility, that basically comes under our

water and sewer program, for which a city the size of Calgary, with its efficiencies, does not necessarily qualify.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Are water tests taken on the Bow River upstream from Calgary, say from Canmore and Banff east, to determine where all the pollution is coming from? Are their treatment plants working satisfactorily in that area?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I could check, but generally speaking we randomly sample all different parts of the river systems in Alberta. I could probably get that information in booklet form for the member.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. I understand that some of the tests taken by our inspectors downstream from Calgary have the coliform as high as 70, and this renders the water unfit for human consumption or even human contact. Has the minister made any plans yet to post the river as unsafe for swimming, drinking, or fishing?

MR. COOKSON: No, we haven't, Mr. Speaker, although on the first part of the question, with regard to taking steps to control the consumption of the particular water, we are responsible for seeing that municipalities and those at the hamlet stage are getting a good supply of water, and we are taking steps in that area. Until now, three or four hamlets in the downstream area obviously haven't understood the seriousness of using untreated water. We will be pursuing that particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister in charge of health units for the province. Has the minister had any reports from health inspectors east of Calgary, say the Medicine Hat Health Unit, that the condition of water in the Bow River is not fit for human consumption? Has the minister had any requests from people downstream to post the river as not safe for human consumption?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the questions are very similar to ones posed by the hon. Member for Little Bow several weeks ago. At that time I indicated that the department certainly has had discussions with the Medicine Hat Health Unit and its medical officer, Dr. Clementi. Of course it is a responsibility of the health unit to make information on water quality available to residents. Samples have been taken from the Bow River, and in addition from the main irrigation canal, as many of the smaller communities draw their water from that source.

In addition I indicated, and I believe it's reflected in *Hansard*, that if there was a shortage of personnel to provide that information, we would certainly do everything possible to see that the health unit has the manpower required. I've been advised since that time that in fact they have the manpower in place.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. One of the difficulties in doing samplings of water in the rural areas is that it takes longer than 48 hours to get the samples into the laboratories. I was wondering if the minister has considered funding methods or techniques by which the water sampling can be done right at the

spot. At the present time facilities don't allow that. Has the minister looked into that and considered that funding?

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker. No requests have been made for that kind of development. I'll certainly take the matter as notice and, in discussions with the Provincial Board of Health, try to determine whether any improvements need to be made in the ways in which local health units are involved with the Department of Environment and other government agencies in sampling water.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Environment. Looking at the condition of the Bow River at the present time and during the summer, is the minister looking at some type of interim plan that may deal with the condition of the Bow River? Are any plans available, or must we live with conditions as they are presently and will be during the summer?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we set the standards for the effluent that goes into the Bow River, based on biological oxygen demand. We think those standards are perfectly acceptable; they are in any other part of the province. The problem is the coliform bacteria, which we can't control by our present methods, and which I don't think are controlled anywhere else in the world. It's fundamentally important that anyone using raw water from the Bow River, or for that matter any river in the province, take steps to purify their water supply.

We do our best in Environment to guarantee the supply of water, but so far we haven't been able to get the man upstairs to produce rain when we need it. We're proceeding as fast as we can in terms of dam construction and all the other man-made devices that can be done to maintain a stabilized water supply. But some things are just beyond our control.

Forest Firefighters

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It follows up questions posed to the minister on the 16th. Is the minister in a position today to clarify in the Assembly the position with respect to stand-by time, at least in the Lac La Biche and Edson stand-by camps? In the question I posed last week, it was my understanding that workers would put in 12 or 13 hours but would be paid for only 8 hours. Is the minister in a position to clarify the government's policy with respect to stand-by time?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicated, he asked me that question of detail a few days ago. I haven't yet been able to check it out. I'll endeavor to do that and respond tomorrow.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly today whether he has received letters from both the Indian Association of Alberta and the Alberta Federation of Labour supporting the formation of an Alberta forest [fire] fighters' association to negotiate better wages and working conditions?

MR. LEITCH: I haven't seen such letters, Mr. Speaker. But from his question, I take it the hon. member has. In

the immediate future I will try to get as close to the situation as he appears to be now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the Assembly that he has received a letter from a representative of the forest [fire] fighters requesting financial support to aid in the formation of an association to negotiate with the government on the firefighters' behalf? Is the minister in possession of that kind of correspondence?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen any such documents.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I directed my question to the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall any correspondence of that nature crossing my desk to date.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. This also follows up questions on the 16th. Has the government given any consideration to the proposition of entering into some form of collective bargaining with the forest [fire] fighters in the province of Alberta through an Alberta forest firefighters' association? Has any assessment been done on that possibility by the minister's department?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the firefighters are specifically excluded from the terms and conditions of employment by our master agreement. As indicated by my colleague, should he receive representations and take that into consideration, he indicated he would discuss that with me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. On Friday last the minister indicated he would be prepared to review the \$3.95 an hour wage rate. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly a little more definitively under what conditions a review would be considered? Would that involve discussion with representatives from the firefighters' association? Would it be based strictly on a comparison with other provinces? Would it be based solely on a comparison with wage rates in the private sector?

I raise that, Mr. Speaker, because the minister indicated that in British Columbia the wage rate was higher because that province had to attract forest firefighters from other types of employment. My question is: under what conditions is the government prepared to review the issue of the \$3.95 an hour wage rate for forest firefighters?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any limit on the conditions. We're perfectly pleased to consider any fact which appears to be relevant in establishing a fair wage. I indicated earlier in the House that when the matter was reviewed this spring and an increase provided by a ministerial order, we had reviewed the wage levels in the neighboring jurisdictions and concluded that certainly on a daily basis, having regard to the payments made for stand-by time and travel time, the firefighters in Alberta would be above Saskatchewan and Manitoba but below

British Columbia. As I explained earlier in the House, British Columbia follows a different practice in connection with firefighting personnel than is the case in Alberta.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary to the minister. Do we have the same problem that New Brunswick has, where their wages are high enough that fires are purposely set in order to subsidize their income?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can comment on the problems that may have occurred in the province of New Brunswick. I would hope the problem to which the hon. member has alluded in his question doesn't exist in Alberta.

Natural Gas Explosion — Calgary

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, may I address my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and, by your leave, with a brief preamble. Friday last, a potentially dangerous explosion occurred in the constituency of Calgary McCall. A natural gas regulator station blew up, throwing debris 200 feet and flames 70 feet into the air. Telephone poles 200 feet away from the conflagration were scorched, and power lines melted.

My question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is whether his department is considering changes in the regulations which would place residences at a safe distance from any future occurrences of this nature.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, The Planning Act, 1977, really provided the authority to municipal governments for setbacks of such a nature. It would be my recollection that either the general municipal plan or the land use by-laws of the city of Calgary, or both, would accommodate the requirement that residential construction occur at a specified distance from such facilities. It would seem to me that jurisdiction should remain there and that representation to the Calgary city council would be the most effective means to alleviate the problem.

MR. LITTLE: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister been approached by the Canadian Western Natural Gas Company either to make or to change regulations to provide greater safety in occurrences of this nature?

MR. MOORE: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. In my view, the approach should be made to the municipal jurisdiction involved.

MR. LITTLE: A further supplementary to the minister. Has Alberta Disaster Services investigated this occurrence?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. They would be aware of the occurrence, but I'd have to check whether they've carried out an investigation.

MR. LITTLE: A final supplementary. Would the minister determine if Disaster Services has made the investigation? And if they have, would he assure the House that the report will be made available?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, without knowing whether there is a report or an investigation, I could only take the matter under advisement and let the hon. member know.

However, I would say that some of these matters also relate to the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour. I believe he would have something to add.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, at the moment I can't add detail on that particular incident, although I will take the matter under advisement. However, I can indicate that the question of the encroachment of residential accommodation near industrial sites, or anything which presents a hazard of that nature, is a matter which is presently being reviewed not only by departmental officials but by some municipal officials. I believe officials from the city of Calgary are among that group. I would expect that some better response to the hon. member would be available on my part by fall at the latest.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might briefly supplement the answers provided by my colleagues to the Member for Calgary McCall. The rather violent explosion referred to was a result of a medium-pressure reducing station. The investigation is going on right now and is being conducted by the Calgary fire department and Canadian Western Natural Gas. They have not yet completed the investigation. As soon as it is complete, we expect recommendations to be forthcoming. Part of the discussions, of course, concern the suggestion by the hon. member as to the type of buffer zone appropriate for this type of reducing station.

School for the Handicapped — Calgary

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, with regard to a question I raised earlier in the spring session about some 40 young people who needed accommodation and, potentially, schooling on September 1. I wonder if the minister has any progress on that matter at this time.

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker. I can't report any further progress at this particular time, other than to say that a meeting was scheduled. The department is currently working with the Department of Education to determine whether there may be an impact with other school jurisdictions in the province to ensure that if that does happen, the approximately 44 young adults who would not be provided with the service currently provided through the school jurisdiction would not be inadvertently missed in any forthcoming plans. Therefore, the discussions are ongoing with the sister department, and at the local level with the Calgary school board and other school jurisdictions. Once that information has been brought together, I'll be in a better position to assess it with my colleagues, and make whatever recommendations are necessary to ensure that services are provided.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I wonder if the minister has had further discussions with the Association for the Mentally Retarded with regard to the many institutions in southern Alberta and their function and purpose.

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Friday, I had a meeting with the president and two officials of the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded. During that meeting, the association again expressed its concern for the facilities. I indicated, as I had earlier, that we would welcome input from the association. I believe representation has now been made to the department so that in the

functional planning . . . One observation I made during the meeting was that none of the three individuals had had an opportunity to visit Baker Centre in Calgary. I encouraged them to do so, to look at the facility. It's not a normal facility, where individuals are kept in their beds; that is the case in very few cases. In most cases, they're up and around and provided with educational and other activity endeavors. Therefore, that suggestion was made to the president and her associates. I believe they're going to accept that and, in addition, work on a functional planning basis as to the needs of the medically dependent multihandicapped individuals who will require that kind of special care.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as we had indicated earlier, I indicated we would be pleased to work with the association and any interested parents to provide services for special and unique cases. I cited as an example: there may be a youngster whose parents live in Cardston. If we can find appropriate care in Cardston — whether through a nursing home if that kind of care is required, or through a foster home — depending on the client's level of activity there was room for that kind of flexibility in the program, so that the child could be closer to the natural parents and loved ones.

Hospital Construction — Calgary

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Since the minister announced the major construction plan for hospitals, in particular the 400-bed satellite hospital in northeast Calgary, which will be operated by the board of directors of the Calgary General Hospital, some concern has been expressed to me that the long-range plans for the Calgary General Hospital will be impeded by this action. Could the minister please indicate if any funds are available to the Calgary General Hospital for renovations to the existing buildings?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, essentially what we've worked out with the Calgary General Hospital is a plan to get more active beds onto the Calgary scene as quickly as possible. Therefore we asked them to delay their major redevelopment plan, which called for an expenditure in excess of what a new hospital would have cost. I met with the board last week and went through the details of that program, and indicated to them that any funds that were necessary by way of extraordinary maintenance in order to keep the building safe and clean would of course be forthcoming on an ongoing basis, as they are to all hospital facilities in Alberta; but that the major redevelopment program in the range of \$60 million would be delayed until the new hospital in northeast Calgary was operating.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think there are some major concerns about the part of the structure opened in 1952. I wonder if there are any specific plans to keep those beds functional right now. You did allude to the fact that some emergency renovations might be made possible. But is there an overall plan to try to update that original part of the structure, to make it a little more convenient for the nurses?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, knowing the special knowledge the questioner has, I have some trepidation in answering that question in detail. I should say that it's the

government's hope that that main wing of the Calgary General Hospital would remain operative, would remain an active treatment wing, and would not be rebuilt and its present use abandoned for the time being. In other words, the wing will be kept functional and in satisfactory condition. We need the beds that are there, serving southern Alberta, but the emphasis will be on the construction of a new hospital in northeast Calgary.

Electric Utilities

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Some time ago, in fact last year, there was discussion in the Assembly about the question of equalization of power rates across the province. The minister indicated to the Assembly that there would be some review of that by his department. What is the status of that review, and what conclusions did the government come to?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe I commented on that question during the study of Utilities and Telephones estimates, and indicated that the work was under way to examine closely the electric utility industry in the province and search for ways we might deal with a number of questions, one of them being differences in rates throughout the province. That question is still under consideration by me and departmental officials. At this stage, we have not dealt with it in a way that I could report to the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I raise the question in light of the present bidding war, if I might use the term, going on with regard to the control of a utility company in the province of Alberta, and the possibility — and I say only a possibility — that the Alberta Energy Company could enter into the bidding aspect, and that way the government could perhaps move in the direction of equalizing utility rates across the province. My question either to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones or to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources: have there been any discussions between the Alberta Energy Company and the government with regard to the Alberta Energy Company considering attempting to acquire a dominant or major role in Canadian Utilities?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I've had no such discussions.

MR. LEITCH: Neither have I, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. The minister indicated that the study was ongoing with respect to this business of attempting to find some kind of uniform rate structure for the province. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether there's been any target date for completion of this study, so that a policy could be developed?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the question is a very high priority of the department; determining an answer is very difficult. I think I have previously described in the Assembly the complexity of the electric utility industry compared with other utilities: the capital-intensive nature of electric utilities, the differences in ownership within the province, where some utilities are municipally owned and

some are investor owned. It's quite simple to identify the problem, but far more difficult to arrive at an equitable solution.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. minister. What specific assessment is the department giving to the question of Calgary Power's bid for Canadian Utilities and the fact that Canadian Utilities includes Alberta Power — of the value that having one dominant electrical distribution system would provide, in terms of developing an overall rate structure within the province, with cross-subsidy?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, no detailed evaluation of such an eventuality has taken place, but it's clear that in some other jurisdictions there are single utilities which provide a single utility service. So that sort of eventuality is something we would deal with if it occurs.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, relating to the question he answered a moment ago with regard to the Alberta Energy Company. If I understood the minister correctly, there have been no discussions between the minister and the Alberta Energy Company with regard to the possibility of AEC acquiring shares in a power-generating capacity in Alberta.

My question is this: on the matter of policy, is the acquisition of those kinds of shares within the mandate of the Alberta Energy Company? I ask the question of the minister from the standpoint that the Alberta government has more than 50 per cent control of the company.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, I would call the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to a letter which, as I recall, the hon. Premier filed in the Assembly at or near the time of the passage of the Alberta Energy Company legislation, which as I recall outlined parameters for its operation.

MR. R. CLARK: To the Minister of the Energy and Natural Resources, so that the matter is clearly understood. Is the position of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources that the acquisition of electrical generating capacity by the Alberta Energy Company — in the form we've talked about of the present bidding war that's going on — would be outside these terms of reference as set out in the Premier's letter that the minister referred to?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I should have added that, subject to a review of that letter or the legislation, I would consider such an acquisition to be a management decision. I put in the caveat, subject to review of those things. My present view would be that that would be within the management decision of the Alberta Energy Company.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister so that there is no misunderstanding. From the standpoint of existing policy, the Alberta Energy Company could go ahead and acquire interest in Canadian Utilities, and in fact even get control of the company, without approval from the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources? It would be a management decision?

MR. LEITCH: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Bow River Pollution
(continued)

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A follow-up question to the hon. Minister of Environment. Has there been any consideration of laying charges under The Clean Water Act against, say, the city of Calgary or any other municipality responsible for the high level of pollution in the Bow River?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, there is provision for charges to be laid under The Clean Water Act. However, I would have to explore whether it includes the parameters of the problems of bacteria and coliform. It's a highly technical area, and the terms of the licence or the BOD content spell out what can be emitted to the river in terms of solid materials. It also spells out what can be emitted in terms of elements or inorganic materials. I would have to check to see if it would even take into consideration emissions such as bacteria or coliform. I could do that for the hon. member, if he would like.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Has the minister any contingency plans to make sure that areas like Tilley, Rolling Hills, Scandia, and Rainier have safe water during the summer? If the drought stays, I'm sure the river is going to be low enough that it's going to cause a serious problem. The Minister of Environment indicated yesterday that he wasn't able to walk on water. But if it gets low enough, with the pollution we've got in it, the minister might be able to walk on water in mid-summer. [interjection]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated before on the question of responsibility between the departments, the Department of Social Services and Community Health has its responsibilities primarily through the local boards of health in terms of testing water. In no case is the department involved in providing either dugouts or other means of transporting water from one location to another. That's obviously carried on by another department. Our involvement is merely in the matter of testing water to ensure that it's safe for human consumption. If it is not, if there is any question about the matter, that information is immediately passed on to the individuals living in the area, so that they may make alternative plans or representation to local government, to the Department of Environment, or to other agencies.

MR. COOKSON: If I could perhaps supplement the answer, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important that, in terms of urgency and perhaps the problems of acute water supply, the public should know that the Department of Environment — and the Minister of Agriculture may want to respond from his department — has a substantial amount of equipment available on call, in terms of pipe and pumping facilities. We have this facility in place at the present time. We are in the process of expanding the equipment we will require. If there is an acute shortage, I would suggest to the public in general that they contact either the Minister of Agriculture or me in terms of facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: We've exhausted the time for the question period, but if the Assembly agrees, I have recognized

the hon. Member for Clover Bar. Perhaps we could have a brief question and a brief answer.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Grazing Reserves

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just one question and one very short supplementary to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. It has to do with the Rocky Mountain grazing reserve. The minister had a meeting this morning with a group from the area expressing their concerns. Can the minister indicate the outcome of the meeting with that group?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister responsible for Native Affairs, the Member for Rocky Mountain House, and I met with a group from Rimbey which has a concern regarding the Rocky Mountain grazing reserve. It was a very informative meeting, and we've agreed that sometime in the near future we will tour the area to take a look at their specific concerns.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just a short question. Can the minister indicate if he or the government has made a commitment to the retention of existing recreational areas in that area?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an area around Medicine Lake and Open Creek which will be reserved for recreational purposes. I should point out that the grazing reserve will also be utilized for recreation, particularly snowmobiling and cross-country skiing.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for St. Paul revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

DR. C. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm beginning to be apprehensive about introducing guests too. I was late for the last group that came in. At this time I would like to introduce some students, especially to my partner from Edmonton Strathcona, and show him a real, live group of visitors. Mr. Speaker, it appears that you and I have a hard time getting together; today it looks like the tour guide jumped the gun.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 55 grade 8 students from the Glen Avon school in St. Paul. This class has a special interest for me, because I have a son, Chris, in this group. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Zukowsky; Mr. Malech and Mrs. Krankowsky; and their bus driver Mrs. Krawchuk. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would now ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to consider the motion of which I gave notice about an hour ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly wish to grant the unanimous leave requested by the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity and thank the Members of the Legislative Assembly for waiving the normal notice process so that we can, I think for a very few minutes, reflect upon the results of a referendum which took place in our sister province of Quebec just yesterday, May 20. For *Hansard*, I'll read this into the record.

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta welcomes the results of the referendum vote in the Province of Quebec and views them as a commitment to Canada and a call for constitutional change, and urges the federal government to fulfil its promise of a renewal of Canadian federalism which will reflect the aspirations of all provinces in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, a very important message for us to pass, this day after the historic referendum in Quebec. I think it's clear to say that the people of Quebec have indicated very clearly their commitment to Canada. That was the significant outcome of that vote yesterday. I think it's [with] a sense of pride that we in this Assembly can say to our friends in Quebec that they share with us this strong sense of being Canadians. Just for the record, I think it's important that we note that in terms of the referendum outcome, 60 per cent of that vote was "no" and 40 per cent was "yes".

I think the people of Quebec, throughout this very difficult period, which started some three and a half years ago, have been under a lot of stress, have seen a lot of personal conflict in their minds, have seen conflict within their own families as they debated this very important issue. Through it all they have come to a very important resolution and, I'm sure, in years to come will look back on this as the keystone to the new constitutional change which will take place in Canada, and will be the focus of a new initiative for all members of elected governments to pursue that objective. There's no doubt at all in my mind that the referendum was a massive reawakening of this political process in Canada, and of course it did speak to the importance the people of Quebec attach to being members of the Canadian Confederation, and they recognize the very substantial opportunities which prevail within our Confederation.

What did the referendum state? We can probably outline three or four particular items, which should be noted today for the record. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a clear rejection of sovereignty association. Very briefly, that was the position, taken by the government of Quebec, which would suggest to the people of Quebec that they could have sovereignty — an independent state arrangement — and, after that was determined, to come back and find some new economic association. Quite clearly, that is no longer the principle or the mandate which that government has, and I believe the vote yesterday is a clear indication of that effect.

Clearly as well, on the other polarity, I think there is a rejection of the status quo. Not just in Quebec but I think right across Canada many political leaders, including our Premier, have said that if you vote "no" in this referendum question, you are really voting for a new kind of

change, for a renewed constitutional challenge. I think that has to be the other side of the question which we must all carefully weigh. There's no doubt that those who voted "yes" were actually voting for some form of constitutional change. They had to be recognized as incorporated in the large momentum of the "yes" vote, who were actually saying they were dissatisfied with the current status and were looking for some other opportunity, some other way in which the arrangements of Canada could be carried out. I suggest to you that in that "yes" vote, together with the very substantive "no" vote, there is a strong suggestion to us as leaders that we must get on with this constitutional process.

While constitutional change will not be easy, I don't want to dwell on that too much, except that I believe it's important to note that the role of the provinces in our Confederation is clearly becoming much more important. We need to strengthen the role of the provinces. There needs to be a decentralization away from the central government to the provinces as a continuation of the process which I think is in place. I think one of the recognitions and one of the problems which faced the people of Quebec as they dealt with this question over the past three years, was that they needed to have this new recognition of the role of the provinces within various regions, to recognize this diversity across Canada. That has to be fundamental to the constitutional change process which will likely be undertaken very soon.

Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about constitutional change, I want to put on the record as well the message the western premiers actually gave to all Canada, but more importantly to the Prime Minister and his cabinet. You all have copies of *Communiqué No. 1* from the western premiers' conference in Lethbridge. I'll quote a very brief part, so that we have the context for the order of change or the kinds of changes which are contemplated and which we see as priorities:

Among major constitutional changes are the need to confirm and strengthen provincial control over natural resources, including offshore resources, to provide provinces with increased powers in the field of communications, and to reform national institutions. The objective of constitutional reform must be to ensure that all provinces have the opportunity to build upon their strengths and thus to share in and contribute to a united and prosperous Canada.

I think that is really the heart of much of this constitutional process, which we must begin today. I wanted to be sure this was in the record as we move further into the debate this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, let me just note this attitude, to which I want to direct my attention for just a moment. I think we're very fortunate in Alberta that we took the time, under the leadership of the Premier and the previous Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, to debate this very important document, *Harmony in Diversity: A New Federalism for Canada*. The expression and the views gave us our outline, which we can proudly lay on the table at any constitutional debate. It focuses and, I think, restates these objectives — the objectives being expressed in Quebec in terms of strong provincial rights; the objectives outlined by the western premiers are reflected here as well. To some extent there's a strong similarity between the views being expressed by us in this formal document and the attitude I noted across Canada last night in the expressions by the various leaders of our governments, the premiers of the various provinces. To some extent the aspirants in the Quebec situation have

also stated similar positions. We've had the opportunity to debate it, we've laid it on the table, and I think it's a very important first step for the important constitutional change process we're now embarking on.

I have already noted the western premiers' positions. I think the debate by the western premiers must be significant in this outcome. Some have criticized the Alberta government for not having taken enough effort to pursue the "no" vote in Quebec. I think the contrary is really becoming much clearer. The consistent perspective put forward by our Premier and by the western premiers, suggesting that in fact we would not negotiate sovereignty association, that the people of Quebec had to come to that realization, is reflected in that very clear vote yesterday. As an attitude, we've found there is strong leadership in the western premiers and in our Premier. Clearly that has had a significant impact in the outcome of that vote.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the constitutional debate must be seen to be more than the debate of the federal government coming to the provinces. We have already outlined our position; other provinces have suggested what they see as a minimum; we now have an attitude in Quebec. I think it's extremely important that we give the message to our colleagues in Ottawa that in fact they have to lay their views on the table. They have to come to it in a negotiating framework. They have to be as flexible as we intend to be in terms of some of the items we have set out. We need to know their attitude; we need to know their position.

The Prime Minister has suggested to us on many occasions that he wants to pursue this renewed federalism. He said so in the Speech from the Throne, which I'm sure all members have read, "As part of its commitment to renewed federalism, my Government will revive the process of constitutional reform." At the same time, Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister joined the "no" forces, the pro-federalist forces in the Quebec debate, time and time again he indicated his priority of constitutional reform.

Mr. Speaker, I'd only note that we do need to know and we do have to understand that this is a process of all governments, not just the federal government indicating what is acceptable to them. There must be consultation and co-operation. We do need to know what they have in mind and how far they're willing to go in terms of their reform. It's not enough simply to bring back the constitution unilaterally and say, well, that's our constitutional reform package for today. I don't think that is acceptable in today's context, particularly following on the heels of the Quebec referendum.

Let me just note the efforts of Albertans in this important debate. I've already mentioned the efforts of our Premier. We extended a hand to Mr. Ryan; we met with him on many occasions and discussed the pros and cons of positions which have been taken across Canada. Our Premier took the time to visit not just with Mr. Ryan but with citizens of Quebec to discuss the perspective on Alberta and the perspective on Quebec. I think these are important. We also saw the debate in this Assembly, initiated by the Member for Calgary Currie, which I think added to the perspective of western Canada on this important resolution. We also saw the People to People petition led by the private sector of Alberta. I'm sure that had an impact as well.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can understate the role of Mr. Ryan, the leader of the pro-federalist forces in Quebec, who sacrificed much to lead the people of Quebec to the result we saw yesterday. In

the future I'm sure we'll see strong leadership in other areas from Mr. Ryan. I know that all of us commend him for his efforts.

Let me just note in closing, Mr. Speaker, that we've previously had an opportunity to debate the constitutional issues; we'll probably have another opportunity to bring those forward. I don't think that's our purpose here today. Our purpose is simply to recognize what has taken place in Quebec. I'm sure I speak on behalf of all the caucus when I suggest that ours is a real commitment to constitutional change. We're looking forward to the framework of working within that constitutional change process. I don't think we can limit ourselves to a specific date, but I think we need to get on with the process of constitutional change. Again, I'm sure the message the western premiers sent to the Prime Minister reinforces the viewpoint that in fact we should reinstitute some of the mechanisms which are in place for dealing with the very difficult issues of constitutional processes. I would subscribe to those.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all members of the Assembly, and those who speak today, will support this motion. Thank you very much.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate this afternoon. I want to say at the outset that I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in making arrangements for the debate this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, after some very brief introductory remarks, I really want to focus on two areas. First of all, I would like to make some comments with regard to what I choose to refer to as a new level of maturity among the provinces in Canada. It seems to me that this is one of the key factors the federal government in Ottawa must focus upon. The second portion of my remarks deals with the question of constitutional change from our point of view in Alberta and western Canada.

Before I become involved in my comments in those two areas, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I'm sure many Canadians stand much taller today and hopefully sing *O Canada* with a great deal more enthusiasm than has been the case in the past. From my point of view, last evening's vote is a vote for Canada but a rejection of the status quo, not only in the province of Quebec. When one looks at the comments made by leaders across Canada last evening, from the standpoint of provinces across Canada there was a clear rejection of the status quo. I commend those people who led the "no" point of view in Quebec. Certainly Mr. Ryan and his colleagues who led the fight deserve to be congratulated. I congratulate all those who made the results possible.

But, Mr. Speaker, I fear there's the real danger, now that the vote is over, that people outside Quebec, in the federal government in Ottawa and across the other provinces in Canada, will have the tendency to want to put the question behind us. It seems to me that all of us in this Assembly, and all provincial representatives across Canada, have a major responsibility not to let that happen. It's very easy for governments across this whole country to think back to all the struggles there have been to change the constitution in this country. I simply say to this government, and to everyone across the country involved in the process, that we must now go back to the table with a renewed commitment. Because the mandate the "no" forces received last night in Quebec was generated to a very great degree as a result of the willingness expressed by leaders of the federal government and of the provinces

really to say that "no" meant there would be substantive changes within Canada's constitution.

If in four years, or in a period of time, there has been no change of substance in the make-up of this country through changes in our constitution, the young people who were at the forum last night when Mr. Levesque spoke to the people in Quebec will be four years older; that commitment will be just that much deeper, and will have gained support in Quebec. To put it as crudely as one could, the vote last night bought Canada perhaps another four years. It is incumbent upon the federal government, the Prime Minister — who took a very active part in the campaign and who obviously had a tremendously deep feel for the issues, for it's his home province — and all provinces across this great nation of ours, to sit down seriously and commit ourselves to changes of considerable substance as far as Canada's constitution is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, that leads me to the next point I want to make. It seems to my colleagues and me that there is now a new level of provincial maturity within this country. As we go through the first year of the '80s, we have clearly across this country a desire on behalf of all Canadians to have a reflection in a new constitution of strong provinces within a united Canada. That message must be made abundantly clear to the government of Canada in Ottawa that, I'm sure, will be basking today in the results in Quebec. The real acid test for that government is going to come when the negotiations start. I trust those negotiations will start very, very quickly. We're now at a stage in this nation where if this nation is to survive as 10 provinces and two territories, there must be a clear realization of strong provinces wishing to develop their own personalities within a united Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the third and last point I want to make is on the question of the upcoming negotiations. I would say two things to this government. In our judgment there is one area where there is no room for negotiation. That's the question of control of our resources. There is no room at all for this government to change its position on that question. I'm sure I speak on behalf of all members of the Assembly on the question of resource control. For to change the position on that would be to change the heritage and the future of this province. Having said that, let me say to those people who will be negotiating on behalf of Alberta that the document the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs refers to, *Harmony in Diversity*, is a good starting place, but in my judgment it should not be seen as a hard-line or the be-all and end-all as far as Alberta's position is concerned.

Let me make the point very clearly once again. I would oppose with everything I possibly could muster a backing off on resource control. That would be an horrendous mistake. And I'm not suggesting this government would do that. At the same time, there's going to be a need for Alberta to be involved in some genuine give and take in other areas. The document *Harmony in Diversity* is a place to start from, but it is not the end-all. I hope this government would keep that view in mind when it enters the negotiations.

I also hope that in the course of these negotiations, the province of Alberta would give some leadership to the rest of Canada from the standpoint of developing a new national economic policy for Canada. Truly I believe we are not going to be able to resolve a number of the constitutional questions until there is some new kind of realization in the constitution of Canada of the changing economic circumstances of Canada. The old Sir John A.

MacDonald approach of way back when — there has never really been a significant restatement of that national plan since. I question very much whether we can make great constitutional changes until some of the new economic realities of the '80s are recognized across this country.

I think today is a day all Canada breathes easier and, hopefully, stands taller. But the real acid test may be four years from now, when if we have not made the kind of changes that were more than hinted at — basically promised to the people of Quebec when they were told, if you vote "no", you're voting no to sovereignty association but you're voting yes to sizable changes within Canada's constitution which will be of real substance, changes which will recognize what I'd call the new reality; that is, Canada with mature provinces that want to stay in a united Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly intend to support the resolution before the House this afternoon. I do that from the perspective of having differed on occasion with this government in terms of constitutional proposals. But when it comes to the spirit contained in the resolution today, it's probably fair to say that the resolution reflects a genuine consensus among members, regardless of their partisan positions in this Assembly. All members welcome the victory yesterday of the "no" side in what was perhaps the most important vote in the history of Canada. All members would join in congratulating Mr. Claude Ryan as the leader of the federalist cause.

At the same time, one had to admire the Prime Minister, who last night showed more than just a little class, indeed a great deal of class, while acknowledging what was perhaps the most important victory in that individual's political career, nevertheless acknowledging that in a sense everyone in Quebec had been wounded as a result of the referendum, that families had been split asunder. I think the minister introducing the resolution indicated the kind of controversy, contention, and the deep-seated views that came to the surface during the five weeks of the referendum campaign. I thought the Prime Minister was not gleeful in victory last night, but in accepting victory, showed a sense of toleration, a common sense that in my view bodes well for constitutional renewal in this country.

As both the hon. minister introducing the resolution and the Leader of the Opposition have indicated, the crucial question now is, where do we go from here? I think it would be a great disservice, not only to the results of the referendum in the province of Quebec but indeed to Canadians everywhere, if the process of constitutional renewal became bogged down in the never-ending debate that has plagued constitutional revision in this country for some 50 years. There is an urgency to get on with the job of constitutional renewal.

I think it would be very unfortunate if Canadians elsewhere in the country heave that sigh of relief and, yes, sing *O Canada* with a little more pride, but then leave it at that and say, everything is fine, we can go back to our comfortable positions and not face up to the fact that in the province of Quebec yesterday there was a very, very strong vote for change. To the people who voted "no", there was a very definite commitment by federal speakers, by Mr. Ryan himself, that there should be major constitutional change. And of course, even among the *oui* forces, many of the people who voted *oui* in the referendum yesterday did not vote because they supported the principle of an independent Quebec, but because they

wanted to strengthen the bargaining position of their province in constitutional talks. Over and over again during the referendum debate, *oui* speakers would stress the argument that this is almost like a trade union negotiation, that you have to strengthen your bargaining agent and a *oui* vote would do that.

I think what is significant, notwithstanding that rather compelling argument, is that almost 60 per cent of the people of Quebec voted "no". That has to be a tremendous victory for Canada, but also a warning to politicians at both federal and provincial levels that the status quo will not do, and we must get on with the job of constitutional renewal. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that means that all of us have to approach this with a degree both of generosity of spirit and flexibility, that perhaps has not characterized the last 50 years of discussions, and that perhaps it won't be possible to go into these talks with fixed positions.

There's clearly no question that the federal government is going to have to reassess some of its positions. In looking at constitutional renewal, it will be important to examine the concerns of Atlantic Canada and the yearnings and desires of a stronger and more buoyant west. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be important for us in western Canada to recognize that the issues in Quebec are profoundly important, and that particularly those issues that relate to language rights have significance and validity which will cause us, as members of this Assembly and as residents of Alberta, to have to reassess some of the positions we've taken as well.

I was pleased today to hear the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs advise the Assembly that the government of Alberta was going to take a flexible stand. I think that is very important, Mr. Speaker. Were the federal government to go into these talks with a rigid position, were all the provinces to go to these talks with, this is the bottom line and we're not prepared to negotiate at all, then there really isn't any hope of achieving a constitutional breakthrough, there isn't any hope of renewing federalism. And we'll be offering the people in Quebec who voted "no" simply four or five years, in which case we'll have yet another referendum and the possibility of the *oui* forces winning. So it is important that all levels of government approach this with a degree of flexibility.

That really brings me to a frank suggestion that I realize may not be the most salable position to take in this province. Many features of the Ryan beige paper are similar to proposals contained in *Harmony in Diversity*. But there are a couple of features where there are rather significant differences. I suspect that in Mr. Ryan's beige paper, there is perhaps the basis for more progress in developing a new constitution than in any other set of proposals that have been placed before the Canadian people.

I say as sincerely as I can to the minister, to the Premier, and to the people who are going to negotiate on Alberta's part, that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition: the question of ownership and control of resources is a position that the people of Alberta unanimously support, provincial control and clarification of provincial control. But on the issue of language rights — and I well recall the debate that took place at the constitutional conference in 1978. Not only did the province of Alberta object to an entrenched Bill of rights that included language provisions; so did the New Democratic government of Saskatchewan. One of the more eloquent opponents of that whole concept was the Premier of Saskatchewan.

I suggest not only to this government but indeed to my confreres in the province of Saskatchewan, that we're going to have to readjust our position on language rights; we're going to have to readjust our position on a charter of rights. Because it is fundamentally important that we recognize that just as keeping Canada together is not just an issue of linguistic rights, nevertheless linguistic rights cannot be passed off as insignificant. If the vote in Quebec is to be meaningful in this part of Canada, if we are to understand its significance, we're going to have to make some major moves on the question of entrenching the linguistic rights of one of the two great founding cultures of this country.

Mr. Speaker, that's what I mean by the governments of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Quebec, and the federal government going to the constitutional table with a degree of flexibility that will make it possible to arrive at a new and stronger form of federalism. The spirit we saw demonstrated yesterday in the referendum, will only be turned into reality if politicians who have responsibility at both federal and provincial levels, make an earnest effort to move beyond the rather slow — I would say painfully slow — progress of the last 50 years, and recognize that if we are going to keep this country together, we must move quickly to renew the federation.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to be able to participate in this motion, and wish to congratulate the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for bringing it forward on this important occasion. I, too, wish to compliment the leaders of the federalist forces in the province of Quebec on their success, and am certainly pleased with the result. I, too, interpret the result not as one for the status quo, but change; but not mere constitutional change. I wish to address that point in a minute, but I want to reflect on some comments made by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I note his concern for the separatist forces, or the forces in Quebec that cause separation. He, too, addressed the question of constitutional change. But one of the things he did not confirm, as did the Leader of the Opposition, is support for this government's position on right of ownership of its natural resources. As well, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview did not address the question of really strong feelings in western Canada and particularly Alberta — perhaps not as strong as separatists, but certainly very strong and dissatisfied with the status quo.

I want to reflect on how the situation in Quebec developed. The situation developed while the present Prime Minister and his government were in office over the last 10 years. In fact the separatist party won during his reign. The intensity of separatist feeling in the province of Quebec strengthened during that period. It's the same period of time that the stronger feeling of alienation developed in western Canada. Why? In my view, Mr. Speaker, the reason is that the Trudeau government is a very centralist government and in fact stretches the present constitution to extremes in terms of its centralist leanings. It has appointed — and I'm not commenting on the members of the bench at all; I have great respect for all of them — in fact a centralist court. With the court the way it is, the federal government has been given much greater ability to stretch the legislation in the area of its jurisdiction. In fact I don't think it's within the area of

their jurisdiction.

So not only do we need constitutional change; we need a change of attitude by the centralist government prior to real constitutional change. This constitution has worked for a considerable period of time, and can continue to work for a significant period of time if, during the interim, we begin negotiation of constitutional change. Our eyes are now directed at the province of Quebec. The question is: will the Alberta government, or should the Alberta government, make concessions — and as we know, every province has a veto under the present constitutional amendment. Should the province of Quebec and the western Canadian provinces make concessions without protecting their own rights in the constitution? That's certainly a serious question we all have to address when we talk about approaching the matter with flexibility.

I wish to briefly touch again on what hopes we can place on constitutional change in eliminating the problems of separatism in the province of Quebec and the feeling of separatism or alienation in western Canada. Let's talk about matters outside the constitution. Let's talk about Petrosar. Many of you may not remember the debate with Petrosar. At that time there were two competing petrochemical developments beginning in Canada: one in western Canada, based on natural gas, and another in Sarnia, which already had a lot of industry based on crude oil. Crude oil is now in extremely short supply, and Petrosar uses over 100,000 barrels a day. As an aside, I just made a calculation to indicate the kinds of emotions it can stir up if you really think about it. On the basis of 100,000 barrels a day used by Petrosar, if we consider our subsidization at \$20 a barrel over a year, considering a 40 per cent royalty on this oil, the Alberta government would increase its revenue by \$300 million. This would build six children's hospitals per year in Alberta. This is the Alberta government's contribution to Petrosar. These are matters outside the constitution. Even if we have constitutional amendments, it won't change those kinds of approaches by the federal government.

We're talking about freight rates and tariffs. They're within the power of this federal government to address right now. We're talking about movement of grain and port facilities so the western economy can strengthen. Most obvious of all, we're talking about fair pricing for depleting natural resources. This is clearly within the constitution now. Alberta is entitled to a fair price. Constitutional amendment isn't going to change this federal government's attitude.

I want to bring these matters forward, because so many people in Canada are placing so much hope on constitutional change. I too support constitutional change, and I think it will go part of the way in keeping this great nation together. But I do say that prior to placing our hope in constitutional change, let us see a change of attitude by the federal government, which reflects their sincere intent to bring this nation together through compromise.

Thank you.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I too am honored to have the privilege to participate in this debate in favor of this resolution this afternoon. Many of my comments will be similar to those made by all members who have spoken this afternoon. I'd like to congratulate the members on both sides of the House who have spoken thus far in standing together almost unanimously on most issues affecting not only the outcome of the Quebec referendum question but also the future with respect to the constitu-

tion itself.

Mr. Speaker, I believe very firmly that this was an important victory for Canada. It was indeed a vote on the part of the people of Quebec that said they wanted to remain within the country we now call Canada. It was a feeling the people had that they could still benefit from what we call Confederation. It was a definite rejection of the sovereignty association question, which to some extent the hon. minister alluded to in his opening remarks. At the same time, however, I believe there's no doubt whatsoever that the vote in the province of Quebec last night was a firm indication that the people want change: change in the status quo, change in what Confederation has been, change in terms of the kind of definition for their future. It's my belief as well that the vote last night was philosophically a vindication or a support for what has been the position of the people of Alberta for years. I sincerely feel that we have been saying for some time that the wheels that keep this country working have not been turning properly. Last night the people of Quebec, those who voted *oui* and said we want to negotiate a subject which could eventually take us out of Confederation, and the 60 per cent who voted "no", based on their promise from Mr. Ryan and Mr. Trudeau that there would be changes to Confederation which would give them a place to be, said as well, those wheels just aren't turning properly.

It's to that topic that I'd like to address myself this afternoon: the fact that somehow, for some reason, the Confederation we've known, felt part of, and indeed loved has not been working properly and things have been grinding together. There's been conflict and problems. I believe it's clearly because of the definition one has of how a government should operate or what a government should do, or how people within a given space should interrelate. I think we've been saying, and last night the people of Quebec said, indeed those powers that are not properly advanced or administered within provincial jurisdictions by the local government, the government closest to the people, should be left to a federal structure. Last night in Quebec they said, as we have said for many years, we want to be part of that general operation, want to be with a group of people with whom we can share those common goals and directions. But more important, or at least very much as important, we in this province, and in Quebec last evening, said that the powers the people require to take advantage of the individual and unique differences that exist in each of our regions in the country, must be part of those regions and must be part of those governments.

I said earlier that I agreed with almost all that was said thus far in the debate this afternoon. I very much appreciated the comments by the Leader of the Official Opposition — couldn't think of any I disagreed with at all in that speech — and most of the comments by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I qualify "most" because, although I didn't hear what usually are some very strong statements with respect to his opposition to directions the Alberta government has taken, I noted words such as "flexibility" — we cannot go into constitutional discussions having a fixed position.

I agree with that general statement. We can't go in unable to negotiate or unwilling to listen to how the ability to operate government is expressed by other provinces. But I think we must go in — for Quebec, as well as for Alberta, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan — with the fixed position that the powers needed by each individual province to operate those provinces effectively, to

deal with the unique difficulties the people have, must be operated within those provinces, and that should be inherent in the constitution.

Clearly, I think we are together with the people of Quebec. The topic of special status will inevitably come up in constitutional discussions. I believe the people of Quebec want special status, as the people of Alberta, British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island want special status: each with a special status that will allow them to operate within their own jurisdiction, again taking into account the special differences and needs of their communities. I feel we must go into the constitutional debate with the understanding that indeed we must be flexible in terms of specifics of definitions or interpretations in different areas, but that we must not give up the fundamental point of view that in almost all cases, the powers should accrue to the government that is closest to the people. Only when that is not practical should those powers be relegated to a higher or, more correctly, another government level, vis-a-vis the federal government. In my opinion, Harmony in Diversity outlined the basis for defining what powers can best be operated by the province and what must necessarily be operated or exercised by a federal government.

I support this resolution, compliment the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in presenting it this afternoon, and the opposition members who have spoken in favor of it, as well as my colleague from Edmonton Whitemud. I'm sure I stand with all other members of this House in supporting this and hoping that our Confederation will now come together, realizing where we have problems and what we have to correct in the future.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's an important occasion today. I'd like to thank the minister for bringing the resolution before the House. I'd also like to thank hon. members opposite for extending unanimous consent to debate this resolution; it's an important and timely topic. As Canadians today, I think we all feel somewhat relieved.

I'd like to take an historical approach to the background of Confederation in both 1867 and 1980, ask some questions and, perhaps, offer some observations. I think Canada, in economic terms, was an attempt in 1867 to give central Canada a colonial hinterland. It was an attempt to bail out a confederation, established in 1840, that was not working. If members think back, in 1854 there was a reciprocity agreement with the United States, which was abrogated by the United States at the outbreak of hostilities in the Civil War. Canada was also cast loose, much like an orphan child, by the British when they introduced the Corn Laws and did not give us preferential trade. In economic terms, Canada was in fairly desperate conditions in 1867.

In political terms, Canada wasn't working either. In the period from 1840 to 1867, there were something like 18 successive governments. Clearly, in 1867, Canada was not very stable politically. Another side to the political instability of 1867 was the foundation on which the union in 1840 was laid. It was laid on Lord Durham's report, which suggested that the way to solve the political problems of the day was to assimilate the French-speaking people. Clearly, that was not working. So we have to look at the origins of Confederation in 1867 as an attempt to bail out a political unit that was not working politically or economically.

Today, in 1980, we have to look and see if there are not

some similarities in our situation, and I think we can find pretty strong parallels. I think we have to deal with the two aspects of the Confederation bargain that I was alluding to, the economic side and the political side. We have to recognize that, in a sense, the Pequistes of today are the political sons and daughters of the patriots who, in 1837, got very upset with the terms of union they were laboring under, which prompted the British government to send Lord Durham to prepare a report and make some recommendations on colonial policy. In a sense, the Pequistes are the sons and daughters of the patriots, just as the federalists in Quebec are the children of LaFontaine and Cartier, who were determined to work with their English-speaking colleagues. There has been a conflict — a constant war in the bosom of the nation, I think was the phrase of Lord Durham — that has extended to modern times.

In a sense we can think of the west as having its spiritual leader in anticolonialist forces, such as Louis Riel, who really resisted the imposition by a central government of a system of values in government of which the west did not have a stake in setting the terms. There was no consultation in the purchase of the Northwest Territories in 1870. We don't have a colonial hinterland in the west today, Mr. Speaker. Economically, politically, and socially, the west has matured into a vibrant community. It's not the prairie wasteland that central Canadians proposed to colonize in the late 1860s and early '70s. We're dealing with a different reality, politically, economically, and culturally.

I don't think it's disloyal or un-Canadian to suggest that in the renewal of Confederation we have to look at the changing circumstances and change the Confederation bargain accordingly. I make a comparison of a very sick individual who has to have his poisons purged to be able to get up from bed and continue living a vibrant life. I think we really have to look at purging ourselves of some of the economic and political problems we have. I'm reminded of a Roman maxim: the subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures. I think that was the point our colleague from Edmonton Whitemud was alluding to: the present central government has some inherent biases that are arbitrary and unacceptable, and in both Quebec and the west we find it difficult to submit to those arbitrary measures. We don't think it's disloyal to suggest we don't want to submit to those arbitrary measures. In fact it's loyal to suggest that those measures are arbitrary and unacceptable. I don't think we in Alberta or the west are asking for special privileges, nor were our co-citizens in Quebec voting yesterday for special status. Rather what I think we're looking for, in Quebec, in the west, or in the maritimes, is an equal opportunity or equal access to the rights and privileges as Canadians to express ourselves in political, economic, and social terms. We're asking for nothing but an equal chance to express ourselves.

I would like to comment a little more directly on the referendum results and what it means for us. I don't think the referendum vote should be something we should heave a sigh of relief for and suggest it's a great victory. Quite frankly it's not. It's a 60:40 split, I grant you. But if a little more than 10 per cent of the people had gone in the other direction, we would have a very different resolution presented to the Assembly today. We would be in a very different position. It's that kind of delicate balance that we're in today, that requires us to act in a very responsible way.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggested we have to be flexible. Yes, we do. But we also have to be mindful of our interests. Because if we set in motion a series of events and chisel them in stone, our sons and daughters in years to pass will become pent up and frustrated and will put new tensions on the Confederation fabric. We have to recognize that we have a responsibility to rework the Confederation bargain in such a way that Quebec, the west, the maritimes, and Ontario feel they have an equitable share in the future of the country. If we do not do that, we are simply forestalling another date in history when Quebec, the west, or the maritimes may feel frustrated and aggravated enough to express themselves in much more violent terms.

I would like to think back to the night of the election in 1976, when I was a student at Laval and living in Old Quebec. It was a very emotional time when the Pequistes were elected. I walked out of my room and into the old town and the streets. It was a very exciting and emotional atmosphere; it was very charged. I think we have to recognize that we're dealing with a perceived reality; not necessarily reality in cold, hard terms, but an emotional feeling that something is wrong. I sensed that last night, watching the results in a hotel room with some Albertans who felt just as aggrieved and just as mad. I suggest that we have just as strong a case to feel there is something basically wrong in Confederation.

I think this government would be doing the people today and the Albertans of tomorrow a disservice if we were to react in an emotional and unthinking way, simply to cave in to the demands of a central government that perhaps will try to blackmail this region into addressing only the concerns of one region. I think we have to have a balanced approach. We have to rewrite the bargain so it's fair to all.

I think of the remarks of our former Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, who spoke of a community of communities. I think that's a fair phrase. What we're looking at is a country that is so vast and so diverse that it is impossible to have one central view that is right for all people, in all times, in all places. It's impossible, as a country, to develop that national consensus culturally and politically in all terms.

So we have to fashion a system of government that is flexible. I use this word in a different sense from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. We have to develop a system of government that is flexible to the needs of the different communities in the country. We have to bind the country together, not simply in economic terms, where we extract the resources of one region and ship them to another for their wealth, but rather on a higher plane. This country has to be founded not on economic principles but on political principles that express concepts of freedom, toleration, liberty, and the ability to express ourselves socially and culturally. Our failure to do that will simply force our sons and daughters 100 years from now, or at another time, to face the challenges we face today.

I would like to conclude by asking members to endorse this resolution, as I'm sure we will. I know that all members in this Chamber are of good will. I ask members to think critically about the future. The question is where we go from here. We have to respond in a positive way. We have to respond recognizing our own self-interests and the interests of others so no parties in the Confederation agreement or partnership feel aggrieved, and we have to respond in a way that we have some enduring values enshrined in that new constitution. On that basis I think

we can build an exciting, vibrant country. Anything less will force us to have forestalled problems that are so serious they can rip this country apart in a very emotional way.

I think back to the night of November 14, 1976. I suggest that with 40 per cent of the people in Quebec still of the mind that the Confederation bargain is so inequitable that they want to move out of Canada, we have to recognize that it's a very significant minority. If you added up the total votes, it would equal the votes of electors in all the western provinces combined. It's a very significant minority in Canada that feels aggrieved, not just in Quebec but in the rest of the country.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

On that basis I think we have to look to a new Confederation bargain. I'm confident that the Executive Council will act in the responsible fashion it always has. I look to the Executive Council for the leadership that all Albertans do in safeguarding our interests and building an exciting new future for the country.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join the debate on this very important motion this afternoon. I'm very pleased that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs brought it up for discussion today. As everyone knows, we've been in session and away from our home communities while the referendum debate has been going on in Quebec, so we've sort of been away from some of our friends and family. Over the weekend and last night, I spent a great deal of time on the telephone and talking with people, not just on the referendum but on a number of things. There is such a change in the country that I didn't really think it was possible. I suppose we can attribute some of it to dry weather, as that generally brings out some of the stronger views, when we have something that's irritating to the rural population in any case.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem in feeling confident that our Premier and our minister responsible will be able to work out a constitutional change with the federal government and other provinces that will be good for Alberta, good for Canada, and good for you and me. But it's the other section of this resolution that holds the most feeling for me; that is:

... urges the federal government to fulfil its promise of a renewal of Canadian federalism which will reflect the aspirations of all provinces in Canada.

If we go back a few months to when we had Prime Minister Joe Clark in office and Don Mazankowski as Minister of Transport, I have never seen the rural people more contented, more satisfied, and more believing. There was a great attitude in the country. They had someone they could talk to and trust. They knew he would make decisions for everyone, not for particular groups. Since the last election — and again, that's while we're up here, not while we're at home where we can talk to the grass roots — we've had this complete change. We're farther back than we were before.

One of the things that bothered me somewhat last night in one of my phone calls was a lady saying she was tired of Albertans being termed the bad guys. When anything happened that had to do with a monetary issue, she felt there was always someone out there saying: it's Alberta's fault; they're the bad guys; they're the ones who want the oil prices. At the same time, they forget that when they brought on this force majeure clause — which I thought

was a complete slap in the face — they go out and make a deal with Mexico and purchase 100,000 barrels a day, or whatever the amount. So there is no shortage of oil; it's just a matter of oil pricing.

When we have a federal government that can delay, destroy, manoeuvre, or do things within the present frame work to make us look like the bad guys, this lady said: no more of that; let's separate as soon as we can; let's take Alberta out of Confederation and be a separate country. This lady I talked to — in fact, she wasn't the only one who said that — is very, very clever, a very stable person and not someone who jumps to conclusions. It was something she had thought of. I talked to her husband as well, and he was of the same mind. It was tough language from two very clever people.

If we look over the list — and I had written down a list — of some of the things that have happened that really have nothing to do with the constitution but have to do with federal political policy within our present government, it doesn't look good. It's a situation where people in Alberta are probably feeling just as alienated as people in Quebec. My fears are that what has happened in the last 10 years — I'd never heard of separation in years gone by. It's just happened in the last few years, and it's building. I don't see how we can completely ignore the fact that we have a government committed to pitting one part of the country against another. I think this is a situation we really must address ourselves to, and be very mindful that we have people here in Alberta who would like to separate. I am not one of those people. I would like to see a strong Canada. But I would like to see an Alberta and a Canada determined to have an arrangement where it's fair play, where it's a community, not western oil or eastern asbestos or the central Canada seaway, western Canada's ports: it's all Canadian.

If people in other parts of Canada don't feel that Alberta and western Canada have given enough, they certainly haven't been looking. I remember well — I believe it was '75 or '76 — when cattle prices were so low. We had ranchers, cattlemen, and farmers on their hands and knees begging for a price for cattle, going broke and hanging in, selling whatever they could sell to stay in business, talking very kindly to their bank managers, and so on. Then, by gosh, we have a federal government that imports more beef. Mr. Speaker, we'll never have a country if we have a situation where when you're down, we'll keep you there.

Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a lot of sage, sincere words have been spoken today, and I don't know that I could add much to them. However, I would like to express very briefly my sentiments, in my own words. To illustrate the point I'm going to make, I would like to talk about my grandfather, who was a native Albertan. My grandfather was a scout for the North West Mounted Police, out of Fort Macleod. He participated in one of the last great manhunts in North America. There was a double murder in that area, and he and the other officer set off on horseback to find the perpetrator of the crime. They rode west through the Porcupine Hills and searched around there, until eventually they found the criminal holed up in a coyote hole. At that time, they didn't have any radios, cars, airplanes, or things of that nature to help them.

My grandfather died just a little while ago. I always wanted to take him in an airplane to show him what flying was like and to demonstrate the size of this coun-

try. But I could not coax him into an airplane, because he was rooted more in the past. Things had changed dramatically since he was a youth to the time when he was an elder person. We now have television, airplanes, radios, cars: things that couldn't be imagined in his early youth. Now, as I think of my young son and daughter, I can see the point in time when rocket ship travel will be just as common to them as airplane travel is to me. And just as I couldn't coax my grandfather into flying in an airplane, I'll bet you that my children won't be able to coax me into flying in a rocket ship.

The point I'm trying to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, is the dramatic changes that have taken place in this country since we first got our constitution over 100 years ago. The constitution has been a very workable document, and for the most part has served this country well. But the drafters of that constitution couldn't imagine the changes that have taken place since then, nor the changes that are going to occur in our future. I'm relating this simply to dramatize the need for change in our country and, more importantly, the need for change in our constitution.

I don't believe the referendum in Quebec was a problem. I believe the referendum in Quebec was a symptom of the problem. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it would be dangerous to conclude that the problem has gone away now that that vote is over. The problem hasn't gone away. It will be one of the greatest challenges of the people in this country to meet that in the future. However, I can't agree with the leader when he says we have to go into constitutional discussions with a certain amount of give and take in our minds. I have studied economic history in Canada, and I've found that over the years, it's been Alberta giving and the eastern provinces taking, more than being both ways. I think this is the time in Alberta's history for us to be resolute in our needs and requirements, and stand firmly behind them and our leader's attempts to acquire them for the people of Alberta.

In a way, I also agree with the words the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs used in terms of a message to Ottawa: come flexible to negotiations, as we intend to be. I submit that we in Alberta have come to negotiations flexible, not only now and recently, but in the last 10 years, in terms of the subsidies — subventions, in effect — that we've given to eastern Canada for lower petroleum and natural gas prices. We've demonstrated our flexibility; we've demonstrated our good faith. We now require a similar demonstration of good faith from the people in Ottawa.

The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs also pointed out a need to know and understand this as a process of all government. I agree with that, but I would also like to point out that it's not only a process of all government that has to be known and understood, but a process of the people of this country. It would be well to bear in mind that the present federal government does not represent too many people west of the Lakehead.

I believe we face a great challenge in the next few years, in terms of constitutional change. To the hon. Premier, I believe this challenge will be greater than the challenge we had on petroleum pricing in 1973, and greater than the challenge we have on petroleum pricing today. Regardless of the outcome of those negotiations, I think it's easier for a country to overcome economic ripples than it is to overcome emotional tears, and that's what we have facing us today.

That challenge doesn't exist only for the Premier and other political leaders in this country; it exists for all the

people of this country. Mr. Speaker, it's a challenge we all have to face. If I may borrow the words of someone else: there are no great men or women; there are only great challenges that all ordinary men and women must rise to meet.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, after the May 20, 1980, vote in Quebec, I expressed a sigh of relief. I'm sure all of us did in Alberta, and across Canada. I would like to rise to support strongly the extremely important government motion and say that I know all in the Legislature will actively participate to maintain, in part, the historical view of Canada, and yet bring about a clarified and fresh view of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in a most sincere way, which I feel expresses all of our beliefs, may I say, *Vive le Canada*, Long live Canada. We now, indeed, have a challenge.

Thank you.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, in strongly supporting the resolution before this Assembly, I hope I can fairly represent the views of all residents of Edmonton Mill Woods, many of whom are new Canadians and new Albertans. I should also hasten to add that there is a significant number of second generation Albertans in Edmonton Mill Woods, such as myself, so I would submit we're a fair cross section of Albertans. I'm sure Mill Woods residents were pleased at the inherent good sense of the majority of Quebecers in their response to the referendum, and I would support the view of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that, as it turned out, the vote was a clear rejection of sovereignty association by the majority and, for both sides, a clear rejection of the status quo. That rejection of the status quo, Mr. Speaker, was well evidenced at the western premiers' conference in Lethbridge, that I had the honor to attend, and I think a commitment for constitutional change from Alberta is clearly stated in Harmony and Diversity.

I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that Canadians stand a little taller today. In fact, I understood the Canadian dollar stood a point taller today as a result of the referendum. I also agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have, in fact, bought time for the necessary constitutional change. But let us hope that the federalist jurisdictions do not squander the time that was bought, in the same manner they've squandered the time since 1973 when the writing was on the wall with respect to the need for energy self-sufficiency in Canada.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview spoke rather glowingly, I thought, of the present Prime Minister's conciliatory posture. Well, Mr. Speaker, although the member opposite may feel impressed, I think the constituents in Edmonton Mill Woods are sceptical of the present Prime Minister, and rightly so. I feel they need to be demanding in their expectation for fair and meaningful constitutional change in the very near future. "Fair" is the operative word in Edmonton Mill Woods, where Alberta is evolving in a position of strength to make an even greater contribution to our great country; if you will, a strong province in a strong and united Canada. For those of us who were here pre-1970, it's obviously the realization of the dream of the people where I was raised, in next-year country. For those who have moved from their homes in other parts of Canada — and let's face it: they have moved their families from comfortable circumstances to make a new start and grow and build with our growing province — and for those who moved from other

lands, where the circumstances of democracy and things we take for granted were just not there, there is a need and an expectation of fairness. If we change the rules, and I think there is a consensus that we must, those changes must be done fairly and with full consultation of all those involved in the game. Let's remember some of the basic rules of the game, for a tyranny of a majority is not the federalist system in the Canadian spirit.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Canadians in Edmonton Mill Woods, I support the resolution, and the spirit represented in Harmony and Diversity as a starting point for meaningful and necessary constitutional change.

Thank you.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to participate with hon. members in this debate on this important motion before the House today. I did want to make a few observations, having regard to the fact that we may be under the pressure of a timetable of constitutional discussion that may occur when the House is not sitting. Therefore, I think it important for me to make some observations on behalf of the government and as the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Calgary West.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I trust the motion very effectively represents the view of all members in welcoming the results of the referendum vote in the province of Quebec. I think that has been the mood of the debate we have had so far today.

In assessing the results of the vote in the province of Quebec yesterday, it is clear, as a number of speakers have pointed out, that it is a rejection of the concept of sovereignty association. I think we can take that fairly clearly from any analysis of those results. As I said last night in a news conference, I believe that was due to the fact that it really is a concept that won't wash, and it was recognized by the people involved in Quebec that it would not wash. To a degree, I think the part played by the provincial governments and the premiers representing the provincial governments in communicating to the citizens of Quebec in various ways that sovereignty association as a concept was not acceptable, was helpful for the federalist forces within the province of Quebec. It certainly was put that way to me by Mr. Ryan. We took that position, and I took it on your behalf at the western premiers' conference in Brandon in 1977 initially, and thereafter at other western premiers' conferences, and finally, as the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs mentioned, at that western premiers' conference in Lethbridge.

I also raised the matter directly with the premiers when all 10 of us were in attendance. I believe I have mentioned in the Legislature that it was rather a difficult matter to raise it when the host was Mr. Levesque, the Premier of Quebec, but I thought the matter should be raised. It was raised during our premiers' conference last August in La Malbaie, Quebec, at which time we discussed the matter and, I think, made it abundantly clear to him that it just wouldn't fly. Perhaps that meeting with him might have had an impact on the soft wording of the motion and the backing away from the concept. Perhaps that had some bearing in terms of the result, too, of a rather weak position that was moving away from sovereignty association as the decision was reached by the people of Quebec on May 20.

As other members have said, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the results yesterday of the vote in Quebec are also quite clearly a rejection of the status quo, that the people who voted "yes" in the referendum vote yesterday were

quite clearly voting for change. I submit that the general view we have, and that has been expressed by many others who have commented upon that vote, is that those who voted "no" were voting equally, and perhaps just as strongly, for change, for a new arrangement in Confederation. As Mr. Levesque put it, fairly I think, in his remarks yesterday, the ball is now in the federal court. I want to make some reference to that.

What sort of change in Canada? I want to discuss a few aspects of that at this time in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. In my judgment, there is no way we can have a constitution where a given province, even with some definite historical and cultural differences, can have special status within Confederation. There is no way I can see that we can develop a new constitution which will reflect special status for only one province.

I do believe, though, that a germ of a good thought developed out of the Pepin/Robarts report and was part of a submission we made to that task force. It's reflected as well in the document *A New Canadian Federation*, by Mr. Ryan, called the beige paper, which recognizes jurisdiction can be transferred to the provinces and they can opt into the utilization of those jurisdictions if they wish and, to an extent, there can be special status to a number of provinces, but not special status to only one province. As we approach these important constitutional discussions, I trust that members of this Legislative Assembly will be aware of the view, which I believe is the view of the people of this province, that an approach of special status for one province is simply not going to be acceptable.

I was delighted, and that's why I took the time and effort with the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and we had a number of discussions with Mr. Ryan and his associates, to review the beige paper presented by Mr. Ryan, who became the leader of the federalist forces in Quebec. In our interpretation, that document does not call for special status for Quebec. In fact there was, if you followed it, some considerable criticism within the province of Quebec by various commentators and others, stating that this document was not strong enough because it did not call for special status for the people of Quebec. For that reason, and for others, we found we were able to support it in a significant way, and made that statement in the city of Montreal in early March this year.

Mr. Speaker, I agree as well with other participants in this debate that the discontent is there, as it is here in western Canada, with the present state of federalism. As the Leader of the Opposition noted, and I concur, that discontent will not go away. It is there, and I think there is a period of trial in which there will be very careful assessment as to whether the Prime Minister of Canada will follow through on his commitments to a renewed federalism, a renewed federalism of substance. In my judgment the pressures that exist in western Canada — and I want to emphasize this — are as strong as the pressures for constitutional change and fairness in the province of Quebec. They're there, they won't go away, and I think it's important for us to recognize that as a reality in Canada today.

We have had a lot of talk in the last number of hours about constitutional change, a lot of comment made throughout this nation. I just want to state that it's important for the people of Alberta, the Legislature of Alberta, and the government of Alberta, of which I'm a part, to express quite strongly the view that, yes, we will welcome and participate fully in discussion for constitu-

tional change. But I do not feel we are prepared to be stampeded into constitutional discussions based on some euphoria of Canadianism that arose out of the decision yesterday, that involves us in a constitutional discussion or atmosphere that means we're down in Ottawa at conference discussing how we can meet the aspirations solely of the people of Quebec, important as they are. I think it is very important for the people of Quebec, for the government of Canada, for the people of Ontario, to recognize that the people in the western provinces and the Atlantic provinces also have aspirations, also have frustrations with the federal system. That's reflected in the motion before us today.

For my part, I don't intend to enter those discussions without recognizing the very nature of them — and I think they will continue in the essential form, because of the nature of the British North America Act, which is, after all, our constitution — as being discussions between the leaders of government of the 10 provinces and the federal government. Others may be involved, and input from others will be welcome. But that will be, in all practicality, the essential nature of the discussions, under the British North America Act. If there is constitutional change, it will come about when the federal government and the 10 provinces — all 10 provinces — concur.

When I look around that scene, Mr. Speaker, I look at the reality of who will speak for Alberta. As the Member for Calgary Buffalo mentioned, I think it is incumbent to recognize the pressures that are on us. We're there to speak for Albertans, for Albertans as Canadians, from Edmonton Mill Woods and others. But we are there charged with the responsibility to speak up for the interests and the aspirations of the people of Alberta. I put it in the bluntest way: if we don't, who will? Because within the present framework of the federal government, and the rejection of the current federal government by the people of western Canada, I don't see an awareness or understanding by the current federal government, despite how many senators they wish to put in their cabinet, of the aspirations of the people in the west or the people in the province of Alberta.

So I believe it is incumbent upon us who will be at that table to recognize that we do have a responsibility. As has been pointed out, when you refer to constitutions they can be settled and fixed for another 50 to 100 years. So I think it is very important for us to recognize that when we're at the constitutional table, we're there to speak up for the people of this province.

We have some firm positions, and I will deal with those in a moment too. In other areas we have positions of flexibility. But we have some positions of bottom line, if you like the phraseology, and those positions are there. We have a number of other areas where, if we see there is the proper atmosphere and attitude, which I wish to speak about, I think there is the flexibility for us to work out some of these areas with other provinces and the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, what is the position of the Alberta government when it goes into these constitutional discussions, which I presume from Mr. Trudeau's statements today are going to be requested relatively shortly? We are the only provincial government in Canada that developed first an advisory committee of citizens on the constitution, which brought forth a report in the fall of 1978. Then the government presented the report entitled *Harmony in Diversity: A New Federalism for Canada*. For those members of the Assembly who were not in the Legislature at that time, I refer them to the report and the

recommendations contained in the report, which formed the subject of extensive debate in this Legislative Assembly in the fall session of 1978 — some 29 recommendations in total. They are presented there, with the fundamental recommendations on resources and on the amending formula that have been mentioned before as being very significant in terms of the priority of the government of the people of Alberta.

I was somewhat puzzled — and I don't mean this in an adversary way — at no reference being made by the Leader of the Opposition on the matter of the amending formula. I would point out, as hon. members will recall, the debate and vote in the Legislative Assembly on November 4, 1976, when the Leader of the Opposition proposed an amendment. We had some concern that that amendment would create some lack of flexibility on the government of Alberta. Nevertheless we accepted that amendment. The vote on that occasion was 67 to 1, with regard to the amending formula. That is the position this government had at the time it went to the constitutional conference. It's contained specifically within our document *Harmony in Diversity*.

I think it's important for hon. members to understand the atmosphere we are now in. We had these constitutional discussions in the fall of 1978, and then in early February of 1979. We took positions at that time, and having taken those positions, with a considerable amount of public debate, there was an election in this province on March 14, 1979. Included among the aspects of our mandate was a mandate to follow through on the position taken in *Harmony in Diversity*, which includes that amending formula, and that is the position the Alberta government has when it approaches the table on constitutional discussion during the course of this summer.

I think it's important for us to recognize that this amending formula — and maybe there is an appropriate time later to go into more detail — is very, very fundamental to the people of this province. It is very fundamental. We are not prepared to consider that there could be a situation of an amending formula where groups of provinces, pulled together by the federal government, could take away rights, responsibilities, or jurisdictions that exist under the current constitution, by way of some amending formula. If some people want to refer to that as inflexible, so be it. That is the position we have as we enter these constitutional discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few brief words about the prospects for our making progress in these constitutional discussions. Frankly I'm not very optimistic. I've been listening very carefully to reports from Ottawa today, and I'm not any more optimistic. We will approach it in the spirit that we hope it will work out, because we know how important it is that we work out a new constitution for Canada that reflects the aspirations of the people of all regions. But I want to remind hon. members of the position taken by the present Prime Minister and his associates, who were the government of Canada at the constitutional discussions I have mentioned in the fall of 1978 and in early February 1979. No matter how you read it, after you strip away some of the sort of pretended aspects of progress that are contained in the proposals, it comes back only as one document, and that is a document of a highly centralist federal system, with decision-making made and left in Ottawa in a very significant way.

Mr. Speaker, polls across Canada have continued to show that that is not the mood of Canadians; certainly not the mood of Canadians in the west, in Quebec, and in the Atlantic regions. It's not the mood. They want to see

a new constitution. They want to see a new constitution where more responsibility is left with the provincial governments to control the economic and other destinies of the people in the regions. They recognize, as members have expressed very clearly, the fact that in this nation of ours we are a huge country in geography and small in numbers, and that it cannot be run on a centralized basis from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, that point of view, which was part of the federal election this winter, was responded to by the people of the west in the results on February 18, and a couple of the participants have made it clear, and I intend to continue to make it clear, that the present federal government does not have a mandate in western Canada. I intend to continue to press that. [applause]

Mr. Speaker, what about timing? We're prepared to go to the meetings if they're called. But frankly I think it is important, as I've mentioned, that when these constitutional discussions get under way — and they should get under way soon — they are developed in an atmosphere that takes into consideration not just the views arising out of the post-Quebec referendum but from all parts of Canada. I think it is important for that to occur.

There's one other fundamental aspect with regard to the constitutional discussions, that was raised very effectively by a number of members who participated in this debate. We now have a constitution. That constitution gives the ownership of resources to the provinces under Section 109, Mr. Speaker. What does ownership mean? Surely it means that if you own something, you have the right to determine how it should be developed, the extent to which it should be developed, whether or not to develop it, and whether or not, under the circumstances, it is in the best public interests of the people of the province that owns those resources to sell those resources. That is what ownership means to me.

Mr. Speaker, if the threats that have emanated so far with regard to the negotiation of a new oil and gas pricing relationship are a reflection of the views of the present Trudeau government in Ottawa, I have said before publicly, and I say again here in the Legislative Assembly, I am very deeply concerned. And I think it is important for us to recognize as legislators, as we come close to the adjournment of this spring session, that these two matters are not separate matters. I want to repeat that sentence. These two matters are not separate matters. For after all, the fundamental position of the government of Alberta on the constitution refers to the matter of resources. And what the members have been saying in the debate here, for those who have been listening carefully, is a recognition that there must be respect for the existing terms of the constitution. There must be respect by the federal government in terms of the constitution as we now have it, and the rights of provinces. For how can we enter into a constitutional discussion for change if we do not enter that discussion in an atmosphere of co-operation and good will?

Mr. Speaker, I have failed to see how we can have any serious prospects of success if we enter those discussions on constitutional change, threatened as we are in terms of encroachment on our resources, until we've had a fair arrangement with regard to the development of the re-

sources that are so important to the people of this province. I think it is not practical for people to believe there can be success in these constitutional discussions when there is outstanding at the same time an unresolved situation that is so fundamental to the people of this province and, I believe, to a number of other provinces in Canada.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with trying to describe what I believe is not the mood — I love the word that some have used — of politicians. I don't consider myself a politician. I've said that, time and time again. I'm proud to be a politician. But when I speak like this in the Legislative Assembly, I speak as a representative of the people. I hope I'm expressing the views of Albertans and Canadians, and they happen to be the same.

The view of Albertans and Canadians is: yes, we have to have a new federalism, and that new federalism has to have some essential aspects. First of all, it has to have fairness. It has to mean that the provinces and the regions of Canada are treated fairly, that there isn't a tyranny of the majority in a federal system, and that provinces are treated without discrimination simply because they're not within the inner councils in Ottawa. I feel very strongly about that, as you can sense, and I believe Albertans do as well. We cannot accept a Canada with a federal government that attempts to move arbitrarily without fairness and without equality.

There has to be equality between the provinces. That's the essence of our amending formula: an equality between provinces that reflects the fact that a province has just as much rights whether it is small or large in terms of population, fewer or more members in the House of Commons and in the federal government, and that there is not discrimination but equality and fairness throughout Canada. In my judgment, that has to be the essence of the attitude we need, which I believe reflects the attitude of Canadians as we approach this constitutional discussion and as we approach the very interwoven negotiations on natural resources by the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with this observation: we will do our best to represent the people of Alberta, who are very strong in terms of an approach to a new Canadian federalism, which will show respect for the rights of the provinces, the people of the regions, and will have as its fundamental criteria fairness, equality, and not discrimination. [applause]

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in light of the hour, perhaps we would be calling it 5:30. I would just indicate that the business outlined yesterday for today and tomorrow, is the business we plan to do tomorrow.

I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:20 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]