

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, October 23, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 62**

**The Petroleum Marketing  
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Petroleum Marketing Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill is to provide the legislative authority for the Petroleum Marketing Commission to market and otherwise deal in products from the Alberta oil sands.

[Leave granted; Bill 62 read a first time]

**Bill 63**

**The Natural Gas Price Administration  
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Natural Gas Price Administration Amendment Act, 1980.

The purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker, is to make certain amendments to the existing provisions relating to the calculation of the Alberta cost of service. These amendments are similar to amendments earlier dealt with by the Assembly in respect of The Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 63 read a first time]

**Bill 65**

**The Rural Electrification Revolving  
Fund Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 65, The Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Amendment Act, 1980. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of these amendments, Mr. Speaker, is to increase the amount of funds available in The Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Act from \$35 million to \$45 million, to further assist rural families in receiving rural electrification.

[Leave granted; Bill 65 read a first time]

**Bill 67**

**The Students Finance  
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce

Bill 67, being The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of the Act is to increase the membership on the board to 11 members and to provide for two students, being postsecondary students, on the board. The need for the increase is due to the recent announcement by the minister of the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund and the expanded funding announced early in May.

[Leave granted; Bill 67 read a first time]

**Bill 69**

**The Irrigation Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Irrigation Amendment Act, 1980. This Bill will be of special interest to some people of southern Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cardston, having requested leave with admirable brevity, for the introduction of Bill No. 69, The Irrigation Amendment Act, 1980, does the Assembly agree?

[Leave granted; Bill 69 read a first time]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills nos. 67 and 69 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and to other members of the Assembly, 33 students from Harry Collinge high school in Hinton who are here today to see the deliberations of this House. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Zwickel and Mr. Capps. I would ask them to rise and receive the greeting of the House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Department of Agriculture**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the plans for the construction of a \$7.7 million Food Processing Development Center. It is anticipated that the proposed 20,000 square foot facility, which will be located in Leduc, is scheduled for completion in the summer of 1983. Subject to legislative approval, funding will be through the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The Food Processing Development Center will be a unique addition to the food processing community of Alberta and western Canada. The center will house equipment and facilities designed to assist the food processing industry develop new products, improve and expand existing product lines, develop new and improved packaging techniques, and adapt and modify food processing engineering and technology.

Mr. Speaker, this will ensure that our food processors will be in the forefront of supplying consumers of Alberta and the world with safe, wholesome, innovative food products required by today's convenience-conscious consumer. Current and advanced technology is required and

will be applied to meet the demands of today's discriminating consumer.

Of particular interest to the small- and medium-sized processor, the center will provide specialized testing facilities and technical expertise necessary to the long-range development of the industry. The facility will be federally inspected, where required, to allow the processed product to return to the market place for further market evaluation and testing.

The Food Processing Development Center will contribute substantially to the value adding activity across the major commodity and specialty manufactured food product lines that are produced in Alberta and is a further step in the government's commitment to diversify and expand the province's economic base.

The Food Processing Development Center will concentrate on the development of technologically complex consumer items and will be staffed and operated through the marketing services division of Alberta Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, we in Alberta are limited to some extent in what we can do by way of diversifying our economy. Therefore, we have to build on our strengths which, in a significant way, means taking our abundant agricultural products and processing them here. It means selling them to our citizens in place of a product that comes from other areas. It means building on this base and entertaining international markets. Our success in terms of economic diversification will depend to a very great extent on our ability to be successful in agricultural processing.

Mr. Speaker, the Food Processing Development Center is another significant step in meeting our objective of developing a diversified economy. The project will complement the efforts of the industry in developing our agricultural resources in a way that will provide long-term economic benefits to the citizens of Alberta.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Oil and Gas Pricing**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's with regard to an order in council that was approved October 21, under the Natural Gas Price Administration Act. I was wondering if the minister could clarify the intention of making that change at this point in time, and whether it's the intention of the government to raise natural gas prices upon the expiration of the current agreement with Ottawa, which I understand expires October 31.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite correct in stating that the current agreement between Ottawa and the province of Alberta relating to the pricing of natural gas will expire on November 1. That is the reason for proclaiming The Natural Gas Price Administration Act and passing the regulation that was passed last Tuesday. That will give the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission the authority to implement a natural gas pricing arrangement, which it is now doing under The Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Act as a result of the agreement with the federal government.

With respect to increasing prices as of November 1, 1980, the answer is that there will be no natural gas price increase on that date.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the relationship be-

tween oil and natural gas prices. I understand at the present time it's around 85 per cent. Is there any intention of the government to change that relationship so there's a greater incentive for the use of natural gas as a substitute, possibly for oil?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we have no present intention of changing the relationship of pricing between natural gas and oil with respect to currently flowing volumes of natural gas. But Members of the Legislative Assembly will remember that in the offer the Premier made to the Prime Minister on July 24, 1980, with respect to an overall energy package, we included a proposal whereby new volumes of natural gas, for the next five years, would attract a price of 65 per cent of the price of oil calculated on a BTU basis at the Toronto city gate. That proposal, Mr. Speaker, was specifically designed, as result of numerous discussions with a number of the consuming provinces, for the express purpose of pushing out imported oil and thereby reducing Canada's vulnerability to interruptions in world oil supplies.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister with regard to the proclamation through this order in council. It's been four years, and now we have proclaimed the Act. In the negotiations with Ottawa, was this very strategic to implement this order in council and proclaim the Act at this point in time? Are there any other strategies the minister or the Premier are going to use with the Act?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, there is no particular significance to the date of proclamation of the Act or passing the regulations, apart from what I'd outlined in answer to the first question; namely, that the natural gas pricing agreement, under which natural gas is now being priced, expires at the end of this month. There is no new agreement in place or no extension of that agreement contemplated. Therefore, we needed this legislation in force to enable the Petroleum Marketing Commission to implement a natural gas pricing arrangement.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the government or the minister any plans to meet with the federal government to further negotiations or establish plans following November 1? Or is the government awaiting the federal budget prior to making any decisions as to further meetings with the federal government?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we have no meetings of a negotiating or any other nature presently scheduled with the federal government. As Members of the Legislative Assembly will be aware, we have been carrying on negotiations extensively with the present federal administration and, of course, with the preceding federal administration, all in the hopes of being able to reach an agreement on oil and natural gas pricing and other matters. Again, as Members of the Legislative Assembly would be aware, we haven't been able to reach an agreement.

##### **Departmental Examinations**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Education. It was brought to my attention as of yesterday that the Alberta government may reintroduce grade 9 and grade 12 departmental

examinations. I wonder if the minister could bring us up to date on that matter.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, that's one of a number of opportunities that have been under consideration since 1976. I'm pleased that it has finally arrived at the attention of the hon. member.

DR. BUCK: We're wondering if you've made a decision, Dave.

MR. KING: To every thing there is a season, Walter. In 1979 the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement was presented to me after the committee had done about four years work. Hon. members will recall that at that time we invited the public to respond to the recommendations of that committee. Subsequently, Dr. Gordon Mowat of the University of Alberta was commissioned by me to represent the office of the Minister of Education in personally relating to interested parties to discover their interest in the question of student evaluation in the province. He commissioned a number of questions in the Gallup omnibus poll.

The results of his work and of that survey were tabled in the Legislature, at which time I announced that I hoped to make a statement about student evaluation by the end of August of this year; that is to say, seven weeks ago. Unfortunately, events preoccupied me during June, July, and August, so I am seven weeks late with my announcement. But I expect to be making that announcement within 10 days.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the purpose of my question is very clear. Seven weeks ago, we were to find an answer and, finally, I had to ask when. Now we know: within 10 days.

Would it be the intention of the minister to indicate in his announcement that there would be tests that would measure learning and general skills as well as the specific type of curricular knowledge?

MR. KING: The hon. member has been very patient for five years. If he could be patient for 10 more days, his questions would be answered.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. In light of the fact that we are looking at the possibility of introducing exams, can the minister bring us up to date on the status of the possibility of entrance exams being used at the University of Alberta and all the other universities in the province?

MR. HORSMAN: Those will clearly be matters for determination by the boards of governors of the various institutions, not a matter of government policy imposed on them.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what discussions have been taking place between the minister or the minister's department and the governors, as to the feasibility of having entrance exams at these universities?

MR. HORSMAN: I've had no such discussions.

MR. KING: Just to be perfectly clear with respect to the last question and the answer to it, while my colleague has not had such discussions with representatives of the

boards of governors at the universities, I have had informal discussions with presidents of the universities.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I am pleased to see we have a layman who doesn't play lawyer games in the Legislature. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

### **Sulphur Dioxide Emissions**

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Environment and ask if the minister is able to advise the Assembly whether Syncrude has been violating Alberta clean air standards under The Clean Air Act, on a one-half hour, one hour, and 24-hour basis, during the last two years.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the record for the member. We normally publish any certificates of variance, and they're tabled in the Legislature. I recollect that a certificate of variance was issued temporarily because of some work that was done on the equipment and because of the danger of freezing up at the time. I can review that and report to the member.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What discussions have taken place between the department and officials of Syncrude concerning the application of the best possible technology in controlling SO<sub>2</sub> emission, the difference between 287 long tonnes and 80 long tonnes. In asking the question, I refer to the report on Syncrude Canada Limited, prepared by the Federal-Provincial Air/Atmospheric Committee, a joint committee of the federal and provincial governments.

My question, Mr. Speaker, very specifically to the minister: is the minister in a position to advise what steps have been taken subsequent to this report, in view of the fact that the best possible technology would cost in the neighborhood of 23 cents a barrel?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we establish our emission standards primarily on what we consider safe standards across Canada, and our standards are probably as restrictive as any across the country. We update those on occasion when new plants are coming into production. I understand, for example, that the Syncrude operation emits far less SO<sub>2</sub> into the air at the present time in relation to GCOS or Suncor, because the standards and expertise were not really there at the time of the construction of GCOS, or Suncor, as it is now known.

I would have to check to see if there's been any further shift, but generally speaking those guidelines and rules are laid down at the time of construction when the permit to construct is issued. It is therefore built into the whole plant structure. If, for example, a new plant is eventually to be constructed in that general area, under our permit and licensing we will set the standards for that particular one. If the expertise and technology are there, we will reduce them accordingly too.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government prepared at this stage to look at the application of the best possible technology on a retroactive basis, in view of the fact that this joint committee report suggests it can be done at a reasonable cost. My question, Mr. Speaker, very specifically, is not with respect to new plants, which I assume would employ

the best possible technology, but whether we're prepared to ask the Syncrude people to employ this technology.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm always open to representation about the way of improving the SO<sub>2</sub> situation. That's really all I can respond in that area.

I think it's important to note to the public in general in both Alberta and Saskatchewan that we recently set up a joint group of scientists with particular expertise in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, to review the whole northern part of the province, both Saskatchewan and Alberta, to determine whether in fact the total cumulative effects of SO<sub>2</sub> are having any impact at all on that total area. I hope to be able to report publicly at a later date the results of those ongoing studies. No doubt they will have considerable bearing on whether we make the decision to adjust rates downward on already established plants.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what specific review was made of the federal/provincial report, with respect particularly to that report and the background information attached to it, specifically with regard to the observation dealing with the 287 long tonnes of sulphur from Syncrude, and I quote, "it is apparent that the decision was a political, rather than a purely technical one."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's debate is equally unacceptable in the question period, whether he is giving it on his own or quoting someone else.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, can I then ask the minister, very directly, in view of this observation in a federal/provincial report, whether in fact those decisions are based on technical or political reasons.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be quoted properly if I didn't say that generally many of our decisions are political decisions. That's democracy in action, so I don't necessarily make the distinction between political and technical decisions. I might add that when we make political decisions, we weigh them very carefully. I would suggest that, in view of the single member over here, who has been a single member for many, many years, some of his political decisions haven't been that great.

MR. NOTLEY: No question about that, Mr. Speaker, but I think the same could be said of the hon. minister.

Mr. Speaker, the supplementary question I would put to the hon. minister, in view of the fact he's now told us that political decisions are obviously a major factor in deciding on the number of long tonnes of sulphur emitted in the atmosphere, is whether it is the policy of the department to automatically refer to the Attorney General's Department for prosecution violations as they occur?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the general procedure through our department is to work with any companies or organizations on the basis of monitoring, submission of their own reports, and our own analysis. The first procedure is to approach that organization and ask them to account for excessive emissions. We do that in co-operation with industry, which I think is the most practical way to function. Then, if we are convinced that because of complications, as in the particular case of

Syncrude, where shutting down a major operation could simply result in chaos, particularly in the middle of January at low temperatures, we will issue certificates of variance under which they will operate for a specified period of time. If you reach the point where a company, an organization, or an individual is consistently exceeding the emissions and violates the certificate of variance, then the procedure we take is clearly spelled out if we deem it necessary to prosecute.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Due to the fact that excessive emissions have been a problem here for several years, what is the time frame before the government decides to take that next step and refer the matter to the Attorney General's Department for prosecution?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check to clarify the statement that it has been excessive, as I understand, continuously for several years. I wouldn't want to accept that as a fact. Therefore I can't answer the question any better than I did the original question, in which I outlined the general procedure we follow.

MR. PAHL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary question is to the Minister of Environment. I wonder if he could clarify or confirm to this Assembly whether it is still the government's policy and commitment that an operating licence is granted to an operator with a commitment to run for a period of years, and then a review of the technology and the parameters of that licence.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods asks a good question. Let me respond in this way: our licences to operate generally exist for a period of time, perhaps two, three or, in some cases, four years — whatever. If technology has reached the point where it can be deemed practical to upgrade and improve the facility to reduce the problem of emissions, then at the time of issuing the new licence we would take those facts into consideration.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Environment on the last question and a variation of that. Can the minister indicate, or does he have any information, as to how many plants can be located in that area, using the present emission standards and maximums? Can the minister indicate how many plants that area can carry before we have an acid rain problem or a great change in the environment? Does the minister have that information?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we are exploring a very complex area in terms of the impact of SO<sub>2</sub>, specifically, because that's the matter which was raised in the first place. It is only one of the many types of elements released into the air. It is complex to be able to determine the long-term effects of SO<sub>2</sub> on the soil and the loading of the air. That's one of the reasons both I and the Minister of Agriculture are now working closely on a program where we will be able to monitor on a continuous basis throughout the province the long-term effects of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions on the pH of the soil.

Aside from that, we have a problem with NO<sub>2</sub>, nitrogen dioxide. A lot of that is emitted, for example, by heavy concentrations of vehicles in a specific area. We are mostly concerned with the area known as Refinery Row, on the outskirts of Edmonton. Some time ago we made it

quite clear to industry that no new plants would be established in that area; however, we would give consideration to expansion of existing plants.

So to answer the question we, both ourselves and industry, are monitoring continuously the loading of the air. In the particular case of Refinery Row we feel, without really being able to project the impact ahead, that that area has reached a practical capacity in terms of air-loading. We will insist that any new industries be located out of that area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's chemistry lecture, but the question was: can the minister indicate, or does he know, how many plants can go in the Fort McMurray area before we have a potential danger?

MR. SPEAKER: That would seem to me to be a question that might properly be placed on the Order Paper. It's going to require some calculation as to . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I simply asked if he knew, approximately, if it could hold 50 plants, five plants. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the minister would know that.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister happens to have the information available at his fingertips, I suppose we might deal with it now. It still appears to be the sort of question that ought to go on the Order Paper, because it does require detailed calculation.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I am just asking the question again because I think he forgot what the question was.

MR. COOKSON: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the member had forgotten what his question was. I think he was referring to Fort Saskatchewan, which is his area, but he actually meant Fort McMurray.

DR. BUCK: Tar sand plants in Fort McMurray, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: But I thought you'd be more worried about your own area.

MR. NOTLEY: Let's have the answer, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: I hope that the member from Fort Saskatchewan isn't against construction of new tar sands plants, that that wasn't implied in the question. But at this time I cannot determine the total number of plants. I don't know whether the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources wants to get into this one, but it's really beyond my jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the minister could get into it, as the hon. minister suggests, by way of the Order Paper.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods with a final supplementary.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question has been well buried in air-borne emissions, and I'll defer it.

#### **Federal Constitutional Resolution**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Could the hon. minister advise the House whether the provincial government was consulted

by the federal government prior to the invocation of closure on the present constitutional resolution before the House of Commons?

DR. BUCK: You wield a big stick there. [interjections]

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we were not advised of the movement by the federal government to impose closure on the very important debate which is before Parliament. But I understand they are now in their final hours of the debate on that important resolution, which will end at 1 a.m. tomorrow, Ottawa time.

I guess in terms of context, the only thing we have is the Prime Minister's words to us, which I thought was a commitment of types, when he said he had hoped that every Member of Parliament from every corner of this land would have an opportunity to enter this very important debate. I see that won't be the case as closure will be used and the debate will end. I know for sure that not all Members of Parliament will have an opportunity to proceed on this important motion.

So the answer is no. I think the significance of this unilateral move is well understood by all Albertans, and certainly all Canadians.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether the provincial government has received information with regard to the terms of reference which will be used by the all-party committee of the House of Commons and Senate on the constitution?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that's of course one of the difficulties with the resolution as it has been presented. You have to read through it very carefully to find out what they intend to do with the committee. As a matter of fact, assuming the debate ends tomorrow morning, the committee will obviously be formed. The guidelines for that committee are not known to anyone; they're extremely unilateral. The only thing I can say is that I understand the two points are that it will meet in Ottawa; it will not be available for all Canadians across Canada to participate. Secondly, you have to be an informed person to participate. That again is the kind of interpretation the whole resolution seems to smack of, and I think it will be very difficult for many people to participate because of that criterion.

In effect, we're waiting for the guidelines to be presented to us, and we hope it will be open for all Canadians to participate in this important debate.

MR. BRADLEY: A further supplementary to the minister. Has the provincial government received an invitation to appear before this all-party committee, or has the provincial government been advised by the federal government whether they will in fact have an opportunity to appear?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the answer of course is no, we have not been invited. The only advice we have had is the resolution which has been tabled.

MR. BRADLEY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs could advise the House as to whether any substantial changes have been made in the Victoria Charter

amending formula by the present resolution before the House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, that would clearly appear to be a matter of interpretation, concerning which every member would be entitled to arrive at his own conclusions.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether there will be any change in Alberta government policy or action in constitutional matters because of this very serious action by the federal government.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to note that the six attorneys general of the majority of provinces that are proceeding with legal action against this resolution will make their case in court very soon. It might be concluded that the federal government's move to evoke closure is to counter the thrust of the collective movement by the provincial governments; that is, to have the resolution completed before the court action can be introduced. That might be part of the strategy. But specifically, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the court action.

#### **Hazardous Chemicals**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Environment. Has the minister had an opportunity to check in his department to find out if there is a central registry where people who have had effects from pesticides can contact the minister's department?

MR. COOKSON: I have no such thing as a central registry, Mr. Speaker, other than the procedure to call the number which is published in the directory across the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister indicate if there is a central registry or central clearing area in his department where people who have had problems with or are using herbicides can forward information to the minister's department? Is that registry available?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as a general rule anyone who is having trouble with the use of any of the insecticides as normal procedure has directly contacted the field man in his local municipality or made use of the district agriculturist. That information, of course, is sent directly to our department. We do have a registry, I suppose, not tied so much to the individual as to the material and the compound that's used. For two basic reasons the federal government is responsible for the licensing, and of course we're certainly deeply concerned in its use and application. Back again through a request from an individual, we would like then through our own DA in a particular area check to make sure the individual has been using the various chemicals according to the label. In many cases we find that is one of the difficulties. But we do keep track of the material and the problems that arise from it.

DR. BUCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In his program of disposing of herbicide containers that have been emptied, can the minister indicate if those containers are being collected and if that program is working?

MR. SCHMIDT: The program has been working and is workable. One must remember, of course, that before we instituted the collection of containers, a number of containers was scattered throughout this province and was one of the reasons for the initiation of the program. Perhaps some of the problems that have arisen in the past are because of the mishandling of the container itself. Anyone who makes use of any type of herbicide recognizes that the residue hangs in the containers for some length of time and certainly can do as much damage, even though the container may appear empty. So the program is definitely working.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Can the minister indicate if there has been any effort on the part of the minister or the department in relation with the federal department to have uniform labelling of materials, so that people who are handling them know what they are, also in case of fire when firefighters have to know what compounds are in different containers?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my officials... As a matter of fact, Dr. Buchwald is a member of the national Occupational Health and Safety Centre, which was set up under the federal program. There is ongoing dialogue to co-ordinate and standardize labelling and knowledge about some of these chemicals throughout the country. So they are involved in it.

At the same time, they are assisting in the research and education program with the Department of Agriculture in Alberta to make the agricultural population aware of the chemicals they are using and to be able to interpret the labels on the containers.

#### **Sulphur Dioxide Emissions** (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go back again to the hon. Minister of Environment and ask how long the government proposes to wait before referring to the Attorney General's Department the question of excessive emissions from the Syncrude plant. The reason I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister expressed some doubt about the number of excessive emissions. I do have an unimpeachable source...

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it would seem to me that the question is complete as it stands.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of this unimpeachable source — namely, the minister's memo — can the minister advise when he proposes to do something about it?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could receive the unimpeachable source.

DR. BUCK: It's your memo.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be glad... It's July 31, 1980, signed by the Hon. Jack Cookson, detailing the excessive emissions.

I think the question needs to be put again. In view of this information, has the minister seriously entertained the violation both of the Syncrude licence to operate and the excessive emissions under The Clean Air Act? Has

this been discussed with the Attorney General's Department, and is it in fact the government's intention to enforce the law?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd really have to review the information the hon. member is referring to before I could make any comment on anything I might initiate.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 125 and 126 stand on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

221. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that this Assembly express its commitment to the public, private, and non-profit quality day care facilities by urging the government to:

- (a) provide support services to day care centres,
- (b) provide incentives to encourage more quality day care services,
- (c) co-operate with local authorities to develop a day care policy that would leave more control in the hands of the communities represented by the local authorities, and
- (d) promote day care service as a preventive measure.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to rise and speak on the first designated motion of the fall session, the subject of which we are all very aware; that is, day care. In my remarks this afternoon I want to speak in a broad philosophical sense rather than in terms of specifics and nit-picking as to whether one thing is right or another wrong.

Some time ago the Social Credit caucus, through their research staff, put together a day care policy. We released it to the public and circulated it very widely. Since the release of that day care policy in May 1980, we have had an excellent response. We have had support, and we have had disagreement. Certainly at this point we recognize that the public supports some things, but at the same time they have said we should revise our policy in certain areas. At this point we certainly agree with some of the suggestions from local governments, from local persons, and are in the process of revising some of the specifics.

In my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reinforce and place before this Assembly, as guidelines for the day care program of Alberta, the broader philosophical sense that we put forward there and have supported as a Socred caucus. I would also like to comment on the earlier announcements of the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, in that we supported and certainly appreciated very, very much a number of the recommendations that were made by the minister and policies that were put in place. And I'm hoping in my debate here today that the suggestions I make only enhance some of those moves and also clarify the policy enunciated by the minister, that has been implemented over the summer; clarify it not only for the

Assembly but for many local governments and local personnel who are a little concerned about some of the things happening at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to recommend to this Assembly four basic things with regard to day care. Firstly, planning of day care should be based on the view that day care is a preventive social service; secondly, the provincial government should work with local authorities — and, for funding, with the federal authorities — to bring about a more comprehensive and cost-shared day care program; thirdly, incentives should be provided to encourage more quality day care across the province; and fourthly, the government should provide support services to centres when they are beginning, and later when they are operating. Mr. Speaker, I believe the resolution on the Order Paper encompasses the four suggestions I have just made. My colleagues and I are concerned at this point that the day care program administered throughout the province doesn't become a regulated treatment program, but one that is more community based and that serves and meets some of the social needs in the province of Alberta. But there are three things, in terms of the broader philosophic sense, that I would like to speak about today. They are very specific: first, the preventive philosophy; secondly, the principle and the importance of local autonomy; and thirdly, various incentives and support services that should and can be offered to day care centres and services in the province of Alberta.

Let's talk about the philosophy first of all; it's my first concern. I have tried to examine the day care policy of the government of Alberta in its implementation and in its perception from the local level. At the present time there doesn't appear to be a comprehensive or deliberate type of philosophy being utilized as a basis for day care in the province. We have recognized that sweeping changes have occurred in the delivery system in the past few months, but in those changes we feel there hasn't been a philosophic thrust or some really meaningful consultation with local authorities in the province of Alberta. It is my belief that policy for all family support services requires this sound philosophic base, which recognizes the profound differences in family patterns and family activities. To that end we must clearly define what day care is and what day care is not, and I'd like to make some comments with regard to that.

Too often people have failed to see that proponents of quality day care can also be supporters of the family unit. It is important for citizens of this province, and for us as legislators, to understand that day care is not intended to be a cure for social problems, nor does it constitute a baby-sitting or dumping ground for children. In my estimation, day care has never been advertised as a replacement for the family. Let's hope that never happens, Mr. Speaker. It is not a means for the state or a government to assume responsibility for child rearing, nor is it a means to place children in a structured learning situation at a very early age. Furthermore, to me day care is not a means of lowering the age at which a child's academic training begins, and it most certainly is not a way of transferring universal values and aspirations to young children in their early years.

On the other hand, I believe day care has some very significant and important qualities. Firstly — and I believe we all agree with this — it should be a complement to the family that enhances, strengthens, and supports family life. Secondly, day care is a means to assist parents in fulfilling their child rearing responsibilities — I think we should be placing emphasis on the words "assist and

support" — and as such is a valuable source of parent education and assistance.

We recognize that in society there are many economic and social pressures on the family at the present time, and I don't think I have to elaborate with regard to those pressures. But I feel that in years and at the present time those social pressures will continue. I think we must accept that. So the best thing we as legislators and as persons who set government policy can do is establish programs that continue to support the family unit and certainly support the family in facing these pressures which are on them from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, because of what day care is, it must be promoted as a preventive, enlightened social policy that contributes to family life and the quality of life in Alberta. Its primary objective must be to support family life by providing comprehensive, good quality child care service. Within this context, day care becomes a home-strengthening child development program which provides for child care outside the home in situations where the parents really need the help. I think we can look at the tenet — and it's often said — that our family unit, as established in our communities and in this province specifically, largely determines the environment of our total society. From that general comment, Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon us to renew our commitment to programs and various ways to strengthen the families in the province of Alberta. And we must view our policies as preventive, and investments in the future.

I recall when the preventive social service concept, the preventive concept, was established in the province of Alberta in the middle 1960s. Two programs were to be core programs in that whole area. One was a program with regard to support to senior citizens, assisting them to be continuous members of every community. The second program that was to be the core of the preventive programs was the concept of day care. Certainly I recall a lot of debate in the 1960s about the pros and cons of day care and the establishment of the program across the province. The preventive social service program was a leader in that particular area. I felt the concept of prevention through day care was an established, good relationship and, certainly, a good philosophic attitude to use in describing day care. I recall that in those years of the 1960s on that basis I could openly and very easily support day care under preventive social services in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, my argument, and certainly my argument to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, is that a social service system should be based upon some basic tenets. I feel it's the minister's responsibility to make these basic tenets clear to us here, either in the Legislature or certainly at the earliest possible time, so that we know the direction the program is going. I think it's very significant for the long-term objectives of the day care program in the province of Alberta.

The other point I would like to look at, Mr. Speaker, is with regard to local authorities. Until local authorities are included in defining some of these program goals or, at the very least, are informed of the government's philosophy, there will be uncertainty and confusion at the local level. Until then it will be impossible for local governments and communities to define their respective roles in achieving goals and bringing about good day care.

Mr. Speaker, to me, that is incumbent along with the basic philosophic attitude. At this time local governments want to know which way day care is going. Does the government support it fully? Is it a preventative measure,

or is it not? When I examined the minister's department and the make-up of the delivery of day care — not only funding, but the service across the province — I became a little concerned. I could recognize that right from the department there is not a clear thrust of the day care program. When I examined the department I noted that the day care unit and the licensing unit are both under community social services on the health side of the department — I believe that's correct — whereas at the same time, we have the subsidy unit being provided through the income security program.

Mr. Speaker, the question I raise is: are those three areas co-ordinated? Are they working toward a common purpose? Is the philosophic goal the same within the three units, or does it lack co-ordination? I feel that if it does — and from some of the feedback we have received from the local governments, it is that way. It isn't clear as to how they should participate as a local government or local group with the department. So before there can be a good working relationship, I would say that within the department itself we must be assured that there should be a philosophic base, and that there is a good working relationship with the local group whether private, public, or otherwise. I'd certainly like the minister to comment on that and clarify that particular aspect.

I think the other item with regard to local government is that there is confusion when people are not clear with regard to the subsidies and the licensing programs. There was a complete reversal in the last announcement of the minister, when you compare that particular announcement to the announcement made by his predecessor on March 13, 1978. At that point the hon. Helen Hunley stated — and I felt the proposal was a good one. A thrust was the type of thing we were looking for. She stated:

... day care must be a joint provincial/municipal venture. The success in developing its potential and achieving its objective is predicated on the belief that a co-operative and sharing relationship must exist between the province, local government, and day care centres working on behalf of people in need of service.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that that certainly is a good objective. But at the present time the subsidies and the licensing programs are within the department of government. The support programs — which I want to talk about in a few moments — are supposedly going to come from the Department of Social Services and Community Health. We're not sure what kinds of support services are coming forth. We see this unclear position of people at the local level. I think that certainly has to be clarified in the program.

Mr. Speaker, what I feel we must recognize and propose at this point in time is, one, that the philosophic base should be clarified by the minister. In my feeling, there should be a greater emphasis on prevention. The second item and area that should be clear is with regard to the relationship with local government. Thirdly, I feel that we must be able to look at the support services and assist day care at the local level whether they're public, non-profit, or whatever ownership or framework they may have.

When I look at the minister's department, at one of the announcements he made some time ago — this was earlier, in our last Assembly — he stated that a number of day care staff would be added to his department to ensure the provision of day care support. But at that time, one of the things that didn't happen — and I don't think it has happened at this point in time — was that the roles of



these people were not defined. We're not sure whether the new positions have been created, whether existing vacancies have been filled, or exactly what has happened. I think when they are filled one of the things we must remember, Mr. Speaker, is that the government will have to contribute more to day care than merely dollars and licensing. That supports my third point, which is support services.

Mr. Speaker, to support day care centres and to aid in dealing with the shortage of quality day care spaces, I'd like to make a recommendation. That recommendation means that the department will have to hire additional staff. This staff should have some specific purposes to fill the gap at the local level with regard to day care services.

The first suggestion is that the government should assist established and emerging day care centres in developing some of their programs. Secondly, the department should have the ability to provide ongoing program consultation. Thirdly, there should be provision for advice and referrals for the personnel working in day care centres to be provided with a means of education, to upgrade and better qualify them to deliver the service in their respective day care. Fourthly, I believe there should be support for communities in their understanding of the criteria for quality child care, the cost of that care, and the responsibility of parents to ensure quality programs and staff. Fifthly, there should be aid in developing the working relationship among parents, operators, and staff in developing child care programs. I feel that has not been clarified by the department at the present time. What types of support services will be available, and what will they do?

In my research, Mr. Speaker, I contacted the federal officials with regard to some of these changes I have just suggested. I found that it is extremely probable that costs to implement and operate these recommendations could be cost-shareable under the Canada Assistance Plan. I think it should be incumbent upon the minister to say, we are not working toward sharing some of these costs under the Canada Assistance Plan; we intend to get a lump sum of money from the federal government, or we are opting out of any cost-sharing programs. At this point in time, we should know that kind of thing. What is the policy of government? Are there funds from the federal government that we are not taking? Are we not taking advantage of those possibilities? If there are, maybe there are some good reasons for it. I understand at the present time, under the present ground rules, that the way the department is putting the program forward there is some doubt with regard to the money coming from the Canada Assistance Plan.

Mr. Speaker, providing proper support services in itself can be expected to provide incentives to encourage increased quality day care service. Recent changes in regulations and funding will most certainly affect many of the existing centres in the province of Alberta. However, I am concerned that these changes will do nothing to aid communities presently struggling to set up centres. The major problem facing rural Albertans in this respect is a lack of capital funding. In all my research, Mr. Speaker, incentives and support are lacking.

One of the reports I referred to — and that report enunciates it very clearly — is a report of the Northern Alberta Development Council. They stated that the absence of a realistic capital cost or renovation policy is creating considerable confusion or resentment in northern communities that wish to start, renovate, or expand their day care facilities. The report also points out that signifi-

cant fund-raising suggestions are not always feasible or possible. They did try to do some things. As they report, initially some of the capital funds were available through preventive social service grants. These funds are no longer available. In any event, the policy did little to remedy some of the current problems. Unfortunately, presentation was made to the Alberta Opportunity Company. This company offers little reprieve, because its main objective is to assist some of the profit-making operations. It may be a source for private entrepreneurs, but not likely for non-profit community-run day care services. Private foundations and municipal councils do not have the funds in one case, or the mandate in others, to handle all the requests.

Neighborhood improvement grants may be available in older neighborhoods, but again we've found that they have been of little use in providing capital moneys. We've found it is often difficult even for hospitals and health units to become active in this particular area because of lack of funds. I've also found that several day care societies have tried to obtain funds, and licences as well to hold bingo, lotteries, and raffles. But they have been turned down by the gaming branch of the Attorney General's Department and even that source of funds, which I don't think is a good way to go, has dried up.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these problems, I recommend that to deal with the problem of capital finance in rural and isolated areas the government should consider some capital grants and loans at preferred rates of interest to help people open, maintain, expand, and upgrade day care centres in our province.

I think there should be some other support services incentives to be considered in the allocation of support, and funds as well. Firstly, I think there should be support to assist employers and other institutions in establishing day care centres. A number of private enterprises would certainly like to get involved in providing day care for their employees but, one, they haven't all the expertise; two, often they haven't access to some of the capital; and three, there isn't anyone giving them some good back-up or informed information about how a day care program or centre could be operated.

Secondly, I see support and funds to expand the opportunity for day care workers and personnel to be better trained and educated. Certainly we can talk about the various ways that can be done through seminars, workshops, universities, and so on.

Thirdly, I could see support and funds to implement the registry of day care workers, as recommended by the working advisory committee; and the sooner we implement that recommendation, the better. Fourthly, there should be support and funds to actively encourage centres to modify their facilities and programs to accommodate handicapped children. Where necessary, as I've said, funds and support should be provided for this. Fifthly, I would support an allocation of funds to provide additional subsidies to day care centres that exceed minimum standards to accommodate handicapped children.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, in the ways I have outlined, the province must encourage and support various types of day care centres to meet varying needs. As I have mentioned, this must include support of centres at places of employment.

All sectors of society must work together. This includes parents, voluntary and co-operative organizations, private day care operators, local governments, private employers, and the provincial government. I know this can happen with encouragement, support, and good, qualified

personnel working with the various communities. To initiate such co-operative spirit, I think it's incumbent upon this government to do the following things: one, publicly state its view of day care — what day care is, and what day care is not. In my mind, the basis of the government philosophy should be one of a preventive service. Secondly, work with and for the communities in this province to develop a comprehensive day care policy and social services delivery system in which each of these sectors of society can contribute to that specific policy. Thirdly, assume a leadership role in providing support services and incentives to encourage more quality day care service in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the comprehensive system I envision cannot be implemented overnight. However, I believe that by passing this motion we can make a comprehensive commitment in principle to expanding and improving day care facilities throughout Alberta, with a significant but not exclusive role to be played by the provincial government in facilitating services for our people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to this motion before us. I must say that we live in troubled times. We live in times of world crisis and crisis within our own country in dealing with the constitution and the energy negotiations. These difficulties are putting increased pressure on the family unit, which we as a governing party still believe is a main unit of our society. The increase in the trials and tribulations our family units have to deal with is putting more pressure on that unit. We have more working mothers trying to cope, to provide the extra income needed for homes and the essentials of living. We have more single parents trying to raise their families and look after themselves. We have single parent wage earners and the low-income problem.

With these problems, our government has three main concerns in dealing with day care. First, we believe it should be accessible, affordable, and quality day care. It's surprising to find that the hon. Member for Little Bow is the person to introduce this issue in these troubled times. As most of you may recall, he has been a member of the Legislature since 1963 and was the Minister of Social Development from July 16, 1968, to August 1971.

ANHON. MEMBER: What did he do then?

DR. C. ANDERSON: Prior to 1971, the sole source of public funding was the preventive social services program, with 80 per cent of the deficit operating costs of day care centres being paid by the province. Private centres and centres not specifically approved by a municipality for PSS funding were not eligible for any public funding. Only families on public assistance could receive subsidy through public assistance to use the private centres. In 1969 and 1970 the provincial day care budget was \$525,000. By 1971-72 it had increased 30 per cent to \$682,000. Today, with the \$11 million increase announced in September 1980, the day care budget in this province is \$44,772,000.

In that day, there were no regulations covering day care standards, although the homes and institutions branch did issue operating licences to centres that met a minimum level. Day care was one of several programs tended to by a PSS consultant, and that consultant spent approximately 10 per cent of his time on day care.

In 1976 Miss Hunley presented for public discussion a

proposal and set up a task force on day care to prepare recommendations on standards and licensing procedures, and explore ways to channel financial assistance through municipalities to day care users. That was in January 1977. The approval of day care regulations was to be phased in between 1978 and 1983. There was approval of a day care policy, which changed the base of subsidy from the operating deficits of centres to a subsidy for families at centres of their choice that met the new regulations. That was effective April 1, 1978. An additional \$10 million was put into effect over the two years commencing January 1978. A day care unit was created with a day care director and two consultants, and a licensing unit was established.

Prior to July 1978, the PSS system for funding day care services in municipalities was based on the funding of the deficit operating budget of selected municipally approved day care centres. A sliding scale for individual family subsidy was used. Effective July 1, 1978, the subsidy to low-income families requiring day care was augmented. Through this provincial policy the fees paid by the individual families are subsidized, rather than the operating deficits of specific centres. That allows for considerable expansion in the number of spaces available to families eligible for the subsidy, where the family could place their child in any centre they chose. Prior to 1978 subsidized families could only place their children in approximately one-third of the centres. The province then assumed total provincial funding, administration, and delivery of the day care subsidy program, effective August 1980.

It's interesting to note that in July 1978 only 27 municipalities were taking part in PSS programs offering day care funding. Since that time two municipalities have entered into the cost-sharing agreement. So presently a total of 329 municipalities are not involved in the PSS programs offering day care to their citizens and, therefore, are not using the facility which is available to them. We have the problem in all those municipalities in rural Alberta as well as in Edmonton.

The official opposition has stated that the government is treating day care as a non-issue. I beg to take issue with that statement, because I feel that a number of things have been done to show that we are not saying it's a non-issue and have taken a number of steps to deal with the problem.

In October 1979 the minister appointed a special caucus task force on day care to look into the problem. The committee was given a mandate to deal with the regulations and review them. The committee received reports and delegations from day care operators, both private and public. We received reports from educators, concerned citizens, parents of the children in day care centres, and single parents. We dealt with day care regulations during those meetings involving child/staff ratios, staff qualifications and training, day care standards, nutrition, and corporal punishment. We did not deal with funding initially, but as we got into it we realized that whatever we did in the regulations also affected the funding.

The committee initially made its report to the minister in February, and then in March 1980. As a result of that report, on April 29, 1980, the minister made his initial ministerial statement and reconfirmed the stand that provincial support would follow the child rather than directly to the day care centres. This would allow the parents to choose a licensed day care centre of their choice, whether operated privately or publicly. He an-

nounced that effective August 1, 1980, the province would provide 100 per cent the basic family subsidy. The maximum subsidy would be \$215, and the minimum paid by the parent would be \$40. A three year phase-out on the deficit funding was announced. This was covered by an advance payment by the minister in block funding. He then stated that effective August 1 all the licensing would be handled by the province and that the regulations would be reduced and simplified. Then he announced that on August 1, 1980, and between that and August 1, 1982, further meetings would be held to have public input and to evaluate further.

When this ministerial statement was released, a lot of segments suspected that this was the end and that the day care issue was not being dealt with further by the committee or by the minister or his department. However, shortly after that the minister commissioned the Price Waterhouse study to see what the province was doing in comparison to other provinces. With that study we were able to see that in referring to accessibility on a per capita basis Alberta ranked first with 0.078 spaces per child in the zero to 5 year group. In the affordability category, Alberta ranked well with the other provinces at \$170.55. In reviewing the child/staff ratios, in some areas the standards of care were low and in other areas we were medium. However, there was the ability to have conflicting information in that study because non-primary staff were allowed in some of the other provinces. In total expenditures Alberta ranked third, but it was next to Quebec in the highest government grants for day care services.

On September 4, 1980, the minister outlined in his news release further changes in the day care program. He announced that the number of day care staff in Social Services and Community Health was being increased to ensure provincial support that was available, both to parents and to day care operators. He announced that the family day home would be put into preventive social services, and that infants up to 18 months would be cared for in that setting.

The family subsidy was to carry on and would not be affected. However, there would be a direct operating payment of \$55 per month per child to each centre meeting the increased standards. This \$55 was to be phased in according to the level of day care the units were giving — therefore announced three different levels at which the different day cares could get extra support. With the announcements in September, we ensured that day care spaces would be available in all areas of Alberta, and we also ensured that day care spaces would be affordable, that every person and every child in the province would have an opportunity to go there and to deal with that problem with 329 municipalities not being covered.

The announcement increased and improved the child staff ratios. It dealt with maximum group size and the minimum indoor space requirements per child. Another improvement the minister made to increase the level of care and the feeling within the department for the needs within social services and day care was the announcement of the appointment of Dr. Sheila Durkin as Deputy Minister of Community Health. As most or some of you may know, Dr. Durkin was the former medical officer of health at the Sturgeon health unit, and is well in tune with the needs of the community and of young children and parents in the family unit.

The minister has also set up a new executive director of the day care unit, Mr. Melvin Finlay. The number of day

care staff in Social Services and Community Health has been increased to ensure provincial support to parents and to day care operators across the province.

Another important step taken by the minister was the setting up of the Provincial Day Care Advisory Committee, which the Member for Little Bow failed even to mention in his report. It's very appropriate that our chairman of this committee is Dr. Audrey Griffiths of Leduc. You may remember her as the chairlady of the International Year of the Child for the province in 1979. She's also a practising physician and well aware and in tune with the needs of the community.

It's also interesting that during the time the caucus committee met, evaluated programs, and met with different groups, one of the International Year of the Child committees from Edmonton met with our committee and presented a brief on day care. That brief was considered. So I think Dr. Griffiths is well qualified for the job.

Other members of the committee are Mrs. Frances Litke, an Edmonton parent; Mrs. Ann Moritz, chairman of the board of the Grant MacEwan day care centre; Mr. Ray Petrowitsch, an industrial arts teacher, private day care operator, and president of the day care operators of Alberta; and Mrs. Diane Campbell, a Calgary mother. So we have a good cross section of people in that committee dealing with things that need to be dealt with in the near future.

Since its establishment and the announcement on September 4, 1980, this committee has been very active. It's had six meetings since September 4: three in September, and we'll be having the third October one on October 28, 1980.

The committee is working on three areas. First, it's reviewing the operating allowance grants application form for the \$55 per month per child subsidy for centres which meet or are approaching the levels of staffing or space requirements of the new day care standards. In this way the committee is having input to the operation before it's even considered to go to the day care facilities for their application. The committee is also reviewing day care regulations and has a mandate to reduce and simplify them so they're easy to understand and easy to do. One of the biggest problems we had in going through it as a committee was difficulty with the complexity we found. They are also reviewing and trying to come up with the development of the registry, to put it into effect. So I think that's been a major step. That committee will be having input to the minister on several other items, and has been doing a good job.

The opposition has said the government should return to its deficit funding plan instead of the family subsidy plan. Well I can't agree with that, because when we have 329 municipalities that are not taking part in the program, we need to do something to stimulate day care centres to be established throughout the province. We can do that by providing this funding to everybody, or to anybody, whether they're publicly or municipally run or whether they're a private day care centre. This should encourage people to go into the business and provide good quality day care.

We've been accused that the decision to handle the applications for day care subsidies at the regional welfare offices was demeaning the parents. However, that has not been the case. We've allowed the parents to go to the day care centres and meet the social workers there, and allowed them to fill out their applications and to retain their own dignity.

In May 1980 the official opposition asked that we

should reduce our child/staff ratios. The recommendation was that the zero to 18 month old children be changed from one staff for six children to 1:4. Our level at present is 1:3. They stated that the 5- and 6-year-olds should be increased from 1:15 to 1:12, and our level is 1:10, so we've more than satisfied that obligation.

During the same time, the opposition suggested that the funding be increased by \$5 million. I don't think they were aware of the increase in costs to come up to that level. We are at the top in Canada in providing day care, and our level has been \$11 million.

There has been a request by the opposition to improve the educational standards of our day care teachers. We agree that this is a desirable thing to do. We've asked that an apprenticeship-like program be established to carry this out. This can be done in conjunction with the colleges or whatever means is available to us. But we also believe that people who have been in day care for a long time and have been serving that purpose have gained some experience and are also providing the service to the centres.

It has been mentioned that we should improve the conditions for handicapped children to be involved in our day care centres. This has already been accomplished by aids for daily living, aids for the handicapped, and the services for the handicapped program. That's already covered. The opposition has stated that we should have a maximum group size. That's been covered in group sizes for each age group. We have not dealt with the requirement asking that we should limit the size of any centre to a specific number, whether it's 65, 30, or whatever. We find that there are different locations and different areas that require different numbers to make an efficient mix.

It's also been suggested that centres should be available where the parents work. Now, with the new policy of the subsidy following the child, this is available. Anybody can build a centre and provide quality day care wherever they might want to, whether it's at work or at a community centre.

One of the last things I requested was that we should have loans and grants for capital projects to provide space for day care centres. We have looked into this matter, and we feel that we would like to use some of the excess school space that's available throughout the province, to provide day care centres in a setting where Johnny's little brother may be in the same centre so they may have some family relationship that way as well.

There has been an accusation that there has been lack of co-ordination. I would like to say that I think the co-ordination is improving steadily and constantly, with Dr. Durkin, Dr. Griffiths, the executive director of the day care unit, and the communities involved all having input, all finding out public opinion and trying to make things work and come up with a policy.

In his opening remarks, the speaker from Little Bow felt that we should deal with the broader philosophical issues, and he discussed four basic things: one, day care program planning, and that day care was indeed a PSS function. He stated that the provincial government work with local authorities and provide consultation to them; three, that incentives be established; and four, that support services be established while beginning and operating the centres. I feel that we have already accomplished those, although we can go further. That's presently being looked at and come up with.

We've been asked for additional support services and additional staff, which has already been dealt with. Programs and program consultation — I contend that that

too has been looked at and has been upgraded. Advice on referral to education centres — we have asked that, by a specific time limit, a certain number of people within each day care have qualifications. This would be covered in the day care registry. And four, that the communities be lectured and told why quality day care is essential — I think our communities already know that day care is an essential service. Up to this time, some of the municipal councils have been afraid to get into the 80:20 deficit funding. A lot of them have been trying to balance their budgets, and have not gone into the program because of that. With the new announcement of the 100 per cent funding by the province, and with the incentive of \$55 per child, I am sure we'll find that more of these municipal bodies will go into day care.

The Member for Little Bow stated that we should be approaching Ottawa to get into cost-sharing arrangements with the federal government. I point out to him that we are doing that already. We're getting a share of approximately \$3.5 million from the federal government. Not all of our programs are cost-shared because the federal government won't enter into any agreement that supports private enterprise, and we are a private enterprise government.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I'd like to say that I feel this government has shown faith with the community, the day care operators, the municipal governments, and our citizens in providing day care that is accessible, affordable and of good quality.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of the House some 62 young Albertans from a grade 6 elementary school in Mayerthorpe, Alberta. They're accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Kezar, Miss Rattray, Mrs. Woods, Mr. Alm, Mr. Jervis; their principal, Mr. Roy Barker; and two bus drivers, Mr. Halhead and Rev. Rutten. They are in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the House.

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

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Motion 221, because I believe that day care is a very important issue. I believe it is an important issue because it affects the family unit. I don't often find myself in agreement with the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition, but he said something in Hansard yesterday which I totally support. I would like to quote him: "I think that a province, a country, and communities start from strong families."

I listened very closely to the hon. Member for Little Bow during his 25 minute presentation, and I am still not sure whether he joins the hon. leader and myself in supporting that. I don't think his motion supports that view. Early in his remarks, when he got on to the family

unit and philosophy, it almost seemed like he was supporting the view. Later on, it seemed to me that he slipped away into trying to strengthen the family unit by manipulating the current day care program, with a heavy emphasis on capital funding. I am not sure we can achieve that.

I look at the motion. Motion 221 asks this government to express a commitment to facilities; not to people, not to the parent, not to the child, and not to the strengthening of the family unit. I think we must keep in mind that day care is a people program, and any commitments this government makes should be made to people.

My hon. colleague from St. Paul has done an excellent job of outlining the existing day care program. I believe the Legislature is clearly aware that the provincial government is now assuming 100 per cent of the basic family subsidy, handling of all licences, has established a higher child/staff ratio, has established maximum group size, and has provided a financial incentive of \$55 per child to centres that meet the higher standards.

If we explore this financial incentive a bit, you must realize that six out of 10 families are paying full fees, and that all children in higher quality day care centres will be receiving this subsidy. I ask myself if maybe we're not going a little too far in subsidizing children whose families really don't need it. Mr. Speaker, we are among the leading provinces in day care, not among the followers. This causes me some concern, as I am not totally convinced we are moving in the correct direction.

At this point I would like to raise a number of questions. Number one, have we overreacted to the pressures of lobby groups, to the noises from the opposition? Number two, is the current direction we are moving in day care strengthening or undermining the family unit? Number three, are we placing too much emphasis on institutionalized child care for children during their early, formative years?

Mr. Speaker, my basic philosophy is that child-rearing is a family and not a state responsibility. Philosophically, I firmly believe that if people wish the pleasures of parenthood, along with that goes acceptance of the responsibilities of parenthood. I believe further that if parents are incapable or unwilling to accept the responsibilities of parenthood, then the state has a responsibility to the child, probably fulfilled through foster homes, adoption procedures, and other forms of institutionalized care. Although that is my philosophical ideal, I am practical enough to recognize that for a number of reasons, such as a single-parent family and the high cost of shelter, we must assist in child rearing. I do not agree that we should use economic incentives to force mothers into the working world, especially when their children are in their early years.

However, Mr. Speaker, once one accepts that the government must provide financial assistance for child rearing, it does not logically follow that the government must decide and be responsible for the conditions under which the child is raised. Yet I think we are leaning to do this in our current programs. We say to parents, we will assist you only if you send your child to an approved day care centre or day home. We do not provide assistance to the single parent or working mother who has made arrangements with the grandmother or elderly aunt to take care of their children during the daytime hours. Yet I submit to the Assembly that this resource of grandmothers probably knows more about child rearing than the workers in our day care centres, because I think these were the people who raised you and me. We do not provide assist-

ance to the mother at the lower income level who chooses to stay in the home to raise the child or children.

Another question I have is, who decided, and on what basis, that a group environment is the proper environment to raise children in the young, formative years? Do we have any evidence that this type of group environment in the early years will not contribute to serious problems later on in the young person's life? The work of some psychologists would suggest that the child needs an I-centred environment in his early years, and I think our current program does not provide the I-centred environment. Maybe we should be looking at our current program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we take a serious look at where we are going in day care. Should we be playing big brother and assuming responsibility for things that historically have been the responsibility of the family. I would argue that when you remove responsibility from an individual, organization, or institution you are indeed weakening, not strengthening, the group you are taking it from.

Should we consider expanding the day care concept to a child-rearing assistance concept, where eligible parents — in other words, those qualifying for financial assistance — are responsible for deciding where and how they want to raise their children, and still receive the benefits of the government program? I am suggesting that the responsibility should be on the family to decide whether they use the group day care centre concept, the group day home concept, the grandmother resource of this province, or raise their children in their own homes.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one thing very clear. I am not opposed to day care centres. I recently officially opened one in my constituency, and I think it is a beautiful place. What I am opposed to is government taking away from parents a decision-making responsibility. Hence I would urge my fellow members that another look be taken at the direction day care is leading us in this province and that they vote against Motion 221, because I would suggest that a vote for Motion 221 is a vote against the family unit.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have this opportunity to speak to Motion 221, addressing itself to day care within the province of Alberta. I did find it interesting to note from the remarks of the hon. Member for Little Bow that the Social Credit Party and their research staff sat down to set Social Credit policies on day care. That's a little food for thought.

I don't intend to repeat the points mentioned by the hon. Member for St. Paul, but I would like to make a few short remarks. A provincial day care advisory committee has been established and, I might add, is made up of extremely qualified people. The committee's first responsibility is to identify the qualifications and training requirements for day care personnel, and to assist in designing on-the-job training programs over and above the postsecondary education programs available today. To ensure that provincial support is available to parents and operators of day care throughout Alberta, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, the hon. Mr. Bogle, is increasing the number of day care staff in his department. Extra money is to be injected to provide financial support to preventive social services. A focus on family home services for infants up to 18 months is also among the programs announced by the minister's department. The day care centres that meet the standards of this government are receiving \$55 per month per child, at

a total estimated cost of \$11 million per year. The parents will not suffer any increased cost to have children in a licensed day care as a result of the additional \$11 million. These funds will be solely the responsibility of your provincial government.

Just a short word on standards, Mr. Speaker. The provincial requirements on standards in our day care centres have had some very positive changes over the last year. The number of staff per children ratio has been increased. Limits have been imposed on the number of children grouped together in a centre. The amount of indoor space per child requirements have increased. Nutritional requirements for day care centres have also been upgraded. A ban on corporal punishment in all centres in Alberta is being seriously considered. The president of the Private Day Care Society of Alberta stated that she considered the new standards were a set of positive proposals.

Mr. Speaker, with the new changes and from feedback I've been receiving to date, the parents are happy, the children are happy, and the day care operators are happy. However, some people you just can't make happy. I'm proud to say that Alberta day care standards rate with the best in Canada.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the debate. It's an area I have been very interested in for some time. Last year I served on a committee, and would like to make a few comments that would perhaps enlighten a few members in the Legislative Assembly, although I notice that one has moved out.

In former years the extended family was a relatively self-contained unit of society. It served as producer, consumer, often educator, sometimes physician. But with specialization and very rapid transition from a rural society to a technological and industrialized society, the family has become much less able to do some of the traditional tasks and functions. Some of these functions are now shared with many socialized institutions.

Day care services have been caught in the conflict between traditional attitudes — that a mother should be in the home — and the realizations of today's society. With a change in traditional life styles, it takes time for day care to become an integral part of community services. Some of the old attitudes die hard. With 70 per cent of the women in Alberta in the work force today, there is an increasing public demand for day care services.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to have to draw to the hon. member's attention that the time provided for debate of this motion has now run out.

MRS. FYFE: I agree to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It's automatically adjourned under these circumstances. I don't mean to be facetious; I mean to say that when it's adjourned in this fashion, the hon. member has the right to speak first when the matter comes up again.

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

**Bill 215**

**The Home Energy Conservation Act**

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure this afternoon to rise and to lead off the debate on Bill 215. It's basically a Bill that provides for incentives to improve home energy conservation in Alberta.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank some of the people who have been involved in the development of this Bill. I think they deserve some special recognition. I'd like to thank our hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones, who has provided a great deal of information, ideas, and sober second thought. I should note that as a private member the minister introduced some ideas in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, when he was a member of that committee, to provide for the design of energy-efficient housing in Alberta. I think we should be following up on that excellent idea the minister had several years ago. I'd also like to thank the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, whose department has been very co-operative. In particular I'd like to single out Ian Burn, the very capable director of our energy conservation section in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. I'd like to thank several government members' researchers: Gerry O'Neill and Lloyd Robertson.

Finally, I'd like to thank some people in the United States: the public relations department of the Pacific Light and Power Company in Oregon, and the Department of Energy, conservation section, in Washington, D.C. In developing this Bill over the last year, I had occasion to go down to the United States and look at some of their programs. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is probably five years ahead of Canada in terms of facing the reality of high energy costs.

In Canada a Liberal government has sheltered Canadians from reality and, I think, has put back the cause for energy conservation, the cause for trying to prevent the profligate use of energy, to the disservice of Canadians generally. I think that's the crux of a lot of the energy debates we're going to be facing in the next little while. Canadians are going to have face up to some tough questions, and it might be a bitter pill to swallow. To the credit of the government of Alberta, though, we have been moving away from price shelters and encouraging energy conservation. The Minister of Utilities and Telephones recently introduced the natural gas price protection plan amendments, which would provide for a much faster acceleration in the cost of home heating in Alberta. I think that's a laudatory move. It might have some political downsides, but in the long run I think Albertans will appreciate that kind of leadership.

It's precisely on the historical view that I'd like to focus my remarks this afternoon. Albertans have been sheltered from the effects of price, both by the federal government and the provincial government. We're in a transition phase. Clearly we can't afford to do that much longer. The natural gas price protection plan in Alberta is costing the taxpayers of this province some \$140 million. That's quite a burden the government is bearing. Also I think it's fair to note that we only pay roughly one-half the true cost of home heating in the country because of the federal government's price supports. So Bill 215 should be

viewed in terms of a transition phase, an attempt to help consumers who are going to be facing high energy costs in the next little while to prepare for those costs by cutting their consumption of home heating fuels.

It's a forward view that we're going to have to look at in the next little while, and Bill 215 is part of that package. Mr. Speaker, I plan to introduce a sister Bill this fall that would provide for energy standards in residential building starts, new commercial buildings, and industrial buildings. I think that's a sister part of the package. This Bill is concerned with trying to refit the existing housing stock in the province, and it's considerable. But we also need to plan ahead and make sure that new buildings constructed in this province are energy efficient. So there will be a Bill coming up this fall that will try to set the framework for setting standards for energy consumption for new buildings in the province.

I'd also like to see a more aggressive pursuit by municipalities in the province which have the authority, under The Planning Act, to design subdivisions so that they are energy efficient. In terms of transportation planning, we should be encouraging public transit. The layout of streets should be in a direction that encourages houses to be faced on a north-south angle. In that way, Mr. Speaker, home-owners can use passive solar heating, which is economically viable in this province right now.

I'd like to go from the background of the Bill to some of the details. If members would like, I'll take them through the Bill and the various features. We start off, Mr. Speaker, with a set of definitions. What we're trying to do in these definitions is provide a very broad framework, some specific suggestions to home-owners on how they can improve their homes. This set of definitions is much broader than the Canadian home insulation program, or CHIP as it's commonly called, which is very narrow in its application. For example, in contrast to the CHIP program, this program would provide the ability for home-owners to receive compensation for improved doors and windows. We're thinking of storm doors, perhaps a vestibule on the inside or outside of the home, which would prevent cold air from coming in during the winter. Framing and drywalling on basement walls — we're presuming there, Mr. Speaker, that home-owners would want to insulate their basements, but the Canadian home insulation program does not provide for the actual drywalling or studs that would go in. This program would. This program would provide for improved heating systems and air-to-air heat exchangers to be installed by the consumer. I'll be going into some of the opportunities for home-owners there in just a few minutes. Shutters and other forms of window protection or insulation — for the first time in this province it would provide the opportunity to have home-owners receive incentives for solar heating devices, or passive solar which is now quite viable in this province from an economic point of view. It would also pay for labor costs and auditor fees.

Now I'm going to go into the auditing feature of this Bill. By the way, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not unique. The state Legislature in Oregon has a similar plan. The Pacific Light and Power Company has a similar program, and one of the features is that a home-owner would receive an audit of his or her home.

A number of questions have been raised by people in the province over the last six months since the introduction of this Bill. They've asked: why would we provide for an energy audit of a home, and what would an energy audit entail? I think that's a very good question. Basically in this program we're going to provide for someone with

some expertise to go through a home-owner's dwelling and look for cost-effective ways to improve the home heating efficiency to get the biggest bang for the dollar.

What we're seeing right now with the Canadian home insulation program is that often insulation companies will take the \$500 available in the program and simply insulate the attic. That's all. They're in the business of providing insulation, Mr. Speaker, and they're not interested in finding out if weather stripping would be a better use of that dollar, if perhaps a more efficient home heater would be a better use, or if a vestibule should be installed in that home. They're not interested in that at all. They're interested in simply doing a fast job, throwing some cellulose in the upstairs part of the home, and giving a bill to the consumer.

So again, coming from the experience in Oregon, an auditor would provide for a much more efficient way to spend the money provided in this Bill. It would get the biggest bang for the buck. It would mean that someone would go through a home and look for those cost-effective ways. The individual would fill out a form, submit it to the consumer, the home-owner, and after the home-owner approved the schedule of improvements, the auditor would submit that to a competitive bidding system.

Again I would go to the Pacific Light and Power Company experience, Mr. Speaker. Their experience is that the prices are considerably lower on the bid list the utility company provides, for several reasons. The first reason: the contracting companies do not have to search out business. They find that they have a steady supply of business, so part of their overhead is cut. They don't have to go out and advertise and search for business. Secondly, it's a very competitive system, because four or five contractors will all be bidding on the same job. And it allows the consumer to get the best value for the dollar. So the auditing system provides for a much greater dose of competition in the actual contracting.

Again, going back to the experience of Pacific Light and Power in Oregon, in following up on the contractors they found that fully one-third of the work was shoddy in the beginning of the program. By that, Mr. Speaker, I mean that an energy auditor would follow up on the contractor, go through the dwelling, and see what kind of work had been done by the contractor, if the quality was up to standard and, if it was not, ask the contracting company to return.

I think it's evident to all members of the House that in a very sophisticated or complex area — for example, in the home heating or air conditioning system — a person might not have the expertise or background to know whether the work had been done properly. It's very helpful to have someone go in, review the work, identify problems, and ask the contractor to come back and redo an area that is substandard. Fully one-third of the work in Oregon at the beginning of the program a few years ago was substandard. So an auditing program provides a check on the contractors.

I'd like to go through the financial section of the Bill. This Bill provides for \$2,500 available to consumers in a grants and loans package. Sixty per cent of the money would be available in terms of a low-interest loan, and 40 per cent would be a grant provided by the government of Alberta. The reason I argue for this feature is that the government of Alberta has intervened in the market place by providing a cost shelter to consumers. It seems to me that we should have a corresponding intervention in the market place to provide to consumers those incentives to

save energy. It's a system of grants and loans, Mr. Speaker, because we want to make sure that the consumer bears some of the cost — in fact, bears the majority of the cost — and therefore takes on areas of renovation that are important and cost-effective and for which the consumer will derive some considerable benefit. It might be noted, for example, that if a consumer were to improve a basement facility, he would in fact get a considerable amount of new living space in the home. That would be a desirable advantage as well. So we would not only be cutting back on energy consumption, but the home area in the basement would be far warmer, more livable, and that would be a desirable feature of this Bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned that the audit probably would be done by a utility company. The reason for that is simply that I don't think we want a lot of bureaucrats being added to the payroll of the Department of Housing and Public Works or the Department of Utilities and Telephones. I think we want to turn it over to the private sector. Again, the experience of the Pacific Light and Power Company suggests that the cost of an audit is about \$50. It allows for a person to come into the home one or two times, look it over, identify the best areas to improve home energy conservation, and then return and inspect the work.

A question about the availability of auditors has been raised by some consumers. Wouldn't we have a shortage of auditors? Well, not really. We have a very good program. The Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower is to be commended for the quality of the graduates from NAIT and SAIT. There are building trades programs which provide a ready source of capable people, who might have a small refresher course dealing with energy conservation in particular. I don't think we'd have a real problem in providing auditors — perhaps at the beginning of the program. I think that would be a start-off phase only.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I think this program is timely and practical. It's cost-effective. The Department of Energy and Natural Resources has been working on some ideas consumers might take on. Some of the suggestions that have been identified ... For example, in the average home perhaps \$20 would be used to weather strip, yet fully one-third of the heat in a home is lost through gaps between doors and windows. For \$20 home-owners can make a significant cut in their energy consumption. Storm doors cost about \$150 a door. There again, we can cut back on the energy consumption in the average dwelling in the province. We can have improved windows by putting in thermal panes. We can have improved furnaces.

I'd like to dwell on this point just very briefly, but at some length. A new gas furnace will be available on the market place in 1981. The average forced-air gas furnace in this province has an efficiency rating of about 55 per cent. Mr. Speaker, that simply means that about 55 per cent of the natural gas is turned into heating energy that is readily available in the house. The rest of it is lost either through the chimney stack, inefficient combustion, or the use of a pilot light. To the credit of the gas utilities and the gas industry generally, a lot of research work has been done in Canada and, as I mentioned, a new gas furnace will be on the market next year. It will be 95 per cent efficient. It will mean that we will have almost a 40 per cent increase in efficiency for average consumers next year if they choose to install a furnace of this type. It will cost about \$1,200. So here is a great opportunity for

Albertans to cut their energy consumption by about 40 per cent. I think the purchase of a furnace would be a very good investment for most Albertans.

It has been noted that if we have a lot of insulation installed in a home the air will become stale, because there won't be much leakage of air from the inside of the home to the outside during the winter. That is desirable, but one of the downsides of that feature is that the air might become stale and moist. Mr. Speaker, air-to-air heat exchangers are available. A person can build one for about \$400 or purchase one for about \$900. There is another good example of what might be considered by a consumer using this program.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding the section of this Bill, I'd like to say that a number of design features that are available to consumers and are coming onto the market now are not costly and are well within the range of a program like this. Twenty-five hundred dollars is probably a good number to shoot for. This bill might be increased somewhat because I understand there are other features that might be considered, but \$2,500 is probably a reasonable package to look for in improving a consumer's home.

Mr. Speaker, in my few remaining minutes I'd like to turn briefly to a couple of other concerns I think we should have as legislators in this province. Alberta is rapidly increasing its housing stock. We have figures that show 2,000 new Albertans are coming into Edmonton, 2,000 new Albertans are coming into Calgary, and 2,000 new Albertans are coming into some of the rural areas. That's heartening in one sense, Mr. Speaker, but scary in another. It's heartening because people are voting with their feet and coming to, I think, one of the finest places in Canada. It's discouraging in an energy conservation sense because the housing design standards in place today are very, very low in terms of energy conservation. The housing industry really does not have to provide a high standard in insulation or heating efficiency. That should be changed quickly because we're increasing our housing stock that will have to be retrofitted. It will have to be refitted for energy conservation. If we don't move quickly, in the next few years we're going to have a lot of housing stock on our hands that is energy inefficient.

That's also true of the commercial and industrial buildings in this province. Mr. Speaker, if you go down to Calgary or look at the Edmonton skyline, you can see for yourself the massive monuments of glass and concrete which are energy inefficient. I think we have to move and set some design standards. Again I look to the United States for some leadership. Publications are just coming out now for energy performance standards for new buildings. They are working in the United States to set those standards, to set energy budgets that are technologically feasible without any fancy frills or design concepts. It's quite practical to design features into a new building that are going to cut the energy consumption by about half. Over the long haul, Mr. Speaker, that's the way I think we should be sheltering consumers. We should be providing incentives and technical assistance to developers and construction companies to help the private sector meet those design standards. We should be providing that kind of leadership and doing it as quickly as we can.

Mr. Speaker, I'll close by simply outlining some of the programs the government is embarking on, I think to its credit. We are setting the design standards, which I've spoken of, for public buildings. We should be encouraging the private sector to move in that way. We are providing grants for assistance for senior citizens to



improve their homes. The pioneer home improvement grants are a credit to this administration. We are making programs available to encourage consumer awareness of new design features. I'd like to refer hon. members and the public to a new publication, Energy Efficient Housing — A Prairie Approach. It's a program financed by the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan. It has some very important design standards and features in it that people should look for when considering building a new home.

The price of natural gas is moving up quickly. I think that's to the credit of the government as well. So we are moving ahead, Mr. Speaker. We do have some items on our legislative agenda for the future. Bill 215 should be seen as part of a package. It's an attempt to improve the energy efficiency of existing housing stock, but we should be making attempts to improve the design standards for new housing and new commercial and industrial buildings. We should be providing right-to-light legislation, so if people install passive or active solar heating, they do not suffer if someone builds a large structure immediately to the south and blocks sunlight and potential heat.

I think we should be moving in those three ways, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is part of the legislative agenda. We need another Bill, which I'll be introducing shortly, to set standards for future construction. We need to protect consumers who are going to install solar-efficient heating systems or design in new construction so that, after making a considerable investment, that investment is not lost by construction to the immediate south blocking light and potential heat.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'll close the debate. I'm anxious to listen to other hon. members in the debate on Bill 215.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on this Bill and commend the Member for Edmonton Glengarry for introducing it. I support his objectives. I'm not so much in support of the methods he endorses, but that's understandable.

At this time I'd like to say that private members' day is a very good time for private members to bring a variety of subjects to the attention of the Legislature. At times many of us downgrade private members' day. But I think there is a good example today of a subject that is current, and I think we should be considering it. I, like the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, will be listening to other people in the debate on Bill 215.

The conservation of energy in all its forms is very important. Some of the forms are electric, gasoline, and of course today we're talking about heat. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are at the end of an era of cheap energy. I live 35 miles from Lethbridge, and the day when I run into Lethbridge just to have dinner and go back home — I've done it many times in the past. I think we're coming to the end of those days, for a variety of reasons. I think the price of gasoline will be going up to where we'll take a second look at it. This is for the good, because there's no doubt in my mind that we have wasted a great deal of energy in the last 30 or 40 years and we're at the end of that period. We're being forced to adjust in a variety of ways.

A couple of examples we all know are that the size of cars is decreasing, the efficiency of motors is increasing, and we're spending a lot more time, effort, and money on promotion of public transportation in our bigger urban centres. This is for the good too, because there is just no way we can continue in the future as we have done in the

past.

However, the general public seems to have difficulty accepting this fact. I was in southern California about three years ago and was going to the LA international airport at about the time people go to work. There were four lanes of bumper-to-bumper traffic going down this freeway. Maybe 3 per cent of the cars had two people in them. A funny thing happened down there a couple of years ago, Mr. Speaker. They ran out of gasoline, and they had to have a form of rationing. The even-numbered licence plates got gasoline on even days, and the odd-numbered licence plates could get gasoline on the odd days. It really brought home to those people just where we are on a shortage of gasoline, and of course the effect was that the demand for small foreign cars increased dramatically. To this very day, U.S. automobile makers are in trouble over this fact. So I feel that until something of a comparable nature happens in our province, people will never really believe there is going to be an end to our energy. But the day is coming, and there's no doubt about that.

Most of the domestic heating in Alberta is done by natural gas. In fact 20 to 25 per cent of the natural gas consumed in this province is for home heating. Although the supply of natural gas in this country is no problem at the present, it is something we should really keep in mind. As the member said, the price of natural gas is tied to the price of our crude oil, and as the price of crude oil increases the price of natural gas is going to increase at the same time. I think there's no doubt that whatever system we use — and there's a variety of them — we should be using them all to try to conserve our natural gas, because it's a very valuable product.

One of the big things in its favor is that it's very economical to transport. There's no doubt that it's far easier to send those BTUs down a pipeline than it is to load them on a train and haul them either west or east. So that is one advantage it has. Another advantage: it is used in a variety of chemical processes. As time goes by, I think people will wonder why we wasted natural gas as a source of home heating.

We all know that we have a lot of gas wells capped in this province. But as a farmer, natural gas is the basic feedstock for nitrogen fertilizer. I can see that natural gas is going to become more important in the future for that reason. If the federal government won't allow us to send it down the pipeline, possibly the best way is to have more fertilizer plants and ship it down as nitrogen fertilizer.

The thing that really amused me a day or two ago was the fact that down in our area the price of natural gas increased 34 per cent. Of course every time I walked into a coffee shop, or wherever I went, I was reminded of that fact by my constituents, and wondered what the government was going to do. The thing that surprised me is that very few people are aware of our natural gas protection plan. I noticed the government has allocated over \$609 million in the last six years to protect the consumer from the increase in the price of gas. But I think one of the pluses to this program is that when you have the people themselves involved, and the government in there encouraging and supporting the program, they become far more aware of how interested the government has been in the past in protecting them from these increases.

Now getting down to the Bill itself. I'm a great believer in education, and I can see how the Alberta Research Council could spot in various parts of the province older homes that are poorly insulated. Now you'd want to go

all over the province, because we have a variety of weather and what would happen in Calgary doesn't necessarily happen in Hines Creek. But if we had a group of something like six or eight homes and we went to the utility companies and found out the consumption of gas over a period of five or 10 years in these homes, used the techniques we have here today to insulate them to the best standards we know, and then kept track of the amount of gas consumed in those same homes for a period of five years, the people in those regions could see themselves that it's economical to refit their homes and save on their gas bills. I think that is an approach that possibly the government should consider.

The member mentioned something about the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation and the role they play in building new homes in Alberta. There's another area. I think the building codes should be increased. I think they should be standardized. The fact that the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation finances a lot of the homes here — they have a responsibility to the people who are going to live in these homes to see that they are insulated to the best standards there are. The insulation is a one-time thing. Once it's done it's there for the life of the house. It may need a certain amount of maintenance, but basically the initial cost is 90 per cent of the cost of the program. There's no doubt in my mind that it would pay high dividends to do something like this over a period of 20 or 30 years.

Now the Bill suggests a combination of grant and low interest on a ratio of 40 to 60 per cent. That's 40 per cent grant, 60 per cent loan. This may have some merit as an inducement to get people involved in the program. But I favor just a straight low-interest scheme, and I'll tell you why. The home-owner makes his decision for economic reasons alone. Also, in my opinion, when the matter of grants is introduced in any government program, you increase the amount of red tape involved in those programs. It seems to me it's just part of the game. The minute grants are involved, the department involved is far more careful in letting this out. I don't think we need any more red tape in the government of Alberta.

In conclusion, I would again commend the Member for Edmonton Glengarry for introducing this Bill and for giving me an opportunity to speak to it. I thank you for your attention, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion I've had to participate in debate this fall sitting. I do so today because of my interest in and my general support for Bill 215. As I attempt to express the reasons for that support, initially I'd like to compliment the Member for Edmonton Glengarry on both the quality and quantity of research and effort that he, as a fine legislator, has expended in developing the Bill to this stage. I feel that the arguments he has presented here and in other places, as well as the arguments advanced by the Member for Cardston this afternoon, have been somewhat persuasive. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one qualification to the conservation argument; that is, the argument about how much natural gas could be saved or conserved with this kind of legislation. After I've done that, I would like to suggest an additional argument in support of this Bill, an argument that has implications for the current national debate on constitutional patriation and energy pricing.

The one qualifying comment I'd like to make is simply to observe that Alberta's proven natural gas reserves are immense and, given the proper economic and regulatory

environment, our petroleum industry is certainly capable of finding and developing additional reserves that are equally immense. And as laudable as any home energy conservation program might be, the potential for natural gas conservation as a proportion of our proven or potential reserves is really comparatively minuscule.

My primary reason for supporting this Bill today, Mr. Speaker, is its potentially positive implications for the perception the consuming provinces have of Albertans with respect to their natural gas reserves. I suspect that many residents of central Canada think we in Alberta are somewhat wasteful of our energy resources. Of course that perception undermines Alberta's position that our energy resources are extremely valuable and seriously underpriced. Although that perception of Albertans as energy wasters is not totally accurate, there is considerable evidence to support those who try to make the case for our wasteful approach to energy consumption in Alberta. Earlier today one of my caucus colleagues observed that the new office towers under construction in Edmonton and Calgary seem to share one architectural feature in common; that is, they are made practically entirely of glass.

In speaking to Bill 215 prior to my participation today, the hon. Member for Cardston made reference to the automobile industry's need to design and build smaller cars with greater energy efficiency. Standing in stark contrast to that industrial development is the fact that here in Alberta automotive dealerships thrive on the larger car. On a per capita basis, it's widely appreciated that Albertans lead the way in large car purchases. I suppose another piece of evidence to support the argument that we're energy wasters here in Alberta would be our highway speed limits. I suggest that only because it has been my observation that those who would dare to advocate lower speed limits in Alberta seem to have great difficulty in enlisting others to their cause.

Opposition members in this House and critics elsewhere in the country have mentioned that perhaps Alberta, with its great economic resources, isn't really very enthusiastic about pursuing alternative energy research. Of course there is no provincial tax on motor gasoline. Reference was made earlier today to our natural gas price protection plan. I was intrigued to read in the feature material that was put out by the minister's department on August 8 this lead sentence: Albertans have always had plenty of natural gas, and for the last six years the natural gas price protection plan has seen to it that Albertans have paid less for their natural gas than anyone else in Canada. Of course that is a true statement, and I suppose that for an Albertan it makes great reading. But for others elsewhere in the country I suppose it serves to fuel the skepticism or the suspicion that we are somewhat energy wasteful here in Alberta.

There is ample evidence in Alberta that we as legislators and as citizens are taking increasingly greater interest in the need for energy conservation. Perhaps this is not the time to present a catalogue of those, but perhaps I could summarize these for at least the benefit of the Member for Clover Bar, who is looking somewhat skeptically at this reference.

Of course the province has been active in end-use energy conservation measures for several years. If the hon. Minister of Government Services were here today, perhaps I would take additional time to mention the comprehensive program, begun perhaps three years ago now, to reduce energy consumption in provincial buildings, with what I understand are significant results to date

in cutting energy costs. Also I understand the Department of Housing and Public Works has taken steps to ensure that new government buildings are designed to be even more energy efficient. Members will be aware that more recently the government approved funding for several projects, including an industrial energy conservation program to be managed by the Department of Economic Development. This will involve participation in the federal/provincial energy bus program, a service designed to assist industry in identifying ways to reduce fuel consumption and costs. A number of other provincial government departments have implemented similar programs — similar, that is, with the goal of energy conservation. Earlier today I was handed a publication, dated October 1980, being distributed by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources here in Alberta and the Department of Mineral Resources in Saskatchewan — a publication entitled *Energy Efficient Housing — A Prairie Approach*, perhaps a more current illustration of the point that in fact this government and governments elsewhere are taking seriously the need for energy conservation.

One year ago the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources in this province, when making a statement with regard to International Energy Conservation Month, concluded his press release with this observation:

These are practical programs [that] will supplement to a very real extent the long-standing policies of the Province's Energy Resources Conservation Board, designed to promote efficient production and conservation of Alberta's fossil fuel resources at the wellhead or plant-gate.

He concludes with this comment:

Taken together, the production-oriented and consumer-oriented conservation programs will play a large role in ensuring the availability of energy supplies for future generations of Albertans.

As all members will be aware, in its July 25, 1980, energy package Alberta proposed the following: a \$5 increase in the price of our crude oil, to be brought in two stages in 1981; another \$5 a barrel increase, again in two stages, in 1982; an estimated \$5.5 increase, again in two steps, in 1983; and a further estimated \$5 increase in 1984. As part of that energy package proposal, this government has put forward a proposed natural gas pricing provision that would see that our presently flowing volumes of natural gas in Canada would be priced at the Toronto city gate at 85 per cent of the cost of Alberta oil, including the Syncrude levy on a BTU equivalent basis.

The federal government ministers and the Prime Minister have obviously ignored these provisions and other provisions in the July 25 proposal, presumably because of their misunderstanding of how best to protect the interests of the residents of central Canada. Now it seems to me that any communications effort on our part to generate consumer understanding of the need for significant oil and gas price increases will be assisted, will be reinforced, by the impression that we Albertans attach great intrinsic value to our hydrocarb resources. And that's reflected not only in our pricing proposals but also in our conservation efforts, conservation efforts not just in our institutions or our public buildings, or by departments of government, but by individuals in their homes, for example. It's for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I choose to participate today.

To summarize my support for Bill 215, it has many laudatory qualities, but the quality that I feel most strongly about is its communications implications — the

implications it has for the perceptions held about us by our fellow citizens in eastern Canada. It seems to me that for this reason and others brought forward by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, all members of the House should support Bill 215.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, one of the advantages of coming into the debate late like this is that most of the points you were going to make have already been made. However, I have a few items. I appreciate the opportunity to debate this Bill, but not for the reasons other members have mentioned.

I think one of the best ways to conserve anything is to make sure that the people who buy it appreciate how much it's worth. I think the best thing we could do is get the price of gas and all energy up to what I think should be the true value.

Some of us can remember when a gas bill was equal to about two months. A two-month bill today would have equalled a whole year's supply of gas not too many years ago. Some of us can remember when the province of Alberta was allowing millions of cubic feet of natural gas to be burned every day because the oil and gas industry at that time didn't know what to do with it. I think that rather than spend our time worrying about research on how to save fuel, we may send a little message to the people and suggest that they wear sweaters in the winter-time, because that helps you to keep warm and it's pretty cheap.

I can't agree with the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who suggests we should have bureaucrats. I don't care whether they work for government or for a utility company; they're still people who are probably doing something that would best not be done. I can't see why I should have to pay money to those kinds of people to do things that a responsible person should do himself. He mentions that it only costs \$50 for an audit. Well, in this booklet — which by the way is sponsored by the government, and the hon. member mentioned that it was government policy — I would point out that on the front page it said:

However, the views and opinions of the authors expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the respective provincial governments.

I'm glad we say that, because on the very first page it tells you that for \$1 you can get a book from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation on frame house construction, which tells you how to make sure that a home built of wood is the best — certainly the cheapest book on house construction in Canada, for \$1.

While we're on it, Mr. Speaker, it concerns me that we have a book with a glossy cover and a two-color print job. I would like to know how much that cost and how much energy was used in producing it, when we already have one you can get from Ottawa for \$1.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I'd like to make is that while the hon. member mentioned that he supported the minister's price support plan because the percentage was declining, I would point out that the percentage may be declining, but figures are very misleading. As one of the hon. members mentioned, we've spent over \$600 million on the program. The new program is certainly lower in percentage, but the amount of money we're going to be putting out is \$1 billion, which is about double what we put out in the first five years. I think for us as politicians to be suggesting we're going to eliminate a program of this nature, we'd better get our political hats on, particu-

larly here in Alberta where we have shut-in gas wells that can't be sold at any price.

Similarly, I would like to point out that this price protection plan brought in what I think is an excellent idea. Those Members of the Legislative Assembly who are with me on the surface rights committee will be pleased to know that my education is gradually being broadened as far as rural members are concerned. But one of the good things about this program is that the purchase price of fuel oil and propane is going to be reduced for those areas of rural Alberta that previously were not served by natural gas. This part of the program alone will amount to a saving of \$10 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's rather unfair that we sort of pick on the house owner to be the person responsible for conserving energy. If we want to make a very simple approach, we could send him a little note with his fuel bills telling him how he could save energy. I frankly can't see why this government should be spending good government money on citizens who are either too lazy or too rich to improve the efficiency of heating methods in their homes. Why should you take my tax dollars to tell somebody else to do something which it is fairly obvious he should be doing anyway? If he wants to spend his money in that manner, let him go to it.

Why worry about heat exchangers and fuel-efficient furnaces and things of this nature? Surely you can train people to turn the thermostat down at night; surely you can tell people not to have their car heaters plugged in in the wintertime. They could put timers on them; they only need to be on for a short period of time. Did you ever think of the cost of waterbeds and the fact that the water has to be heated all the time? You know, the areas of saving are endless. How many people wear the same type of clothing year-round? They don't put on heavier clothing in the wintertime; they turn the thermostat up. I can see some hon. members smiling, but I notice a lot of them are wearing light-colored suits regardless of the time of year. Obviously, they like to turn the thermostat up and wear light clothing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention just two

items. A huge amount of fuel is burned — and those of us from Calgary appreciate this — in PWA. It's one of the most inefficient uses of fuel available. Jets travel best when they travel at the highest altitude for the longest distance. They are the most inefficient when they are up and down like they are between Calgary and Edmonton on the milk runs. As the president of Pacific Western has said, in a few years that run is going to be eliminated for the simple reason that it's far too costly. The other item I'd like to mention, Mr. Speaker . . .

AN. HON. MEMBER: Heresy.

MR. MUSGREAVE: No, not heresy, just good common sense.

I do feel that we have to have more consistency in our building codes. For us to be belaboring the poor homeowner, that he should be saving fuel when that steel plant burns as much fuel in one year as a city of 500,000 homes . . . Just think of the efficiency there if they were able to convert by 20 per cent.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's not proposed that the House sit this evening. By way of business tomorrow, we will be dealing once again with Motion 15 on the Order Paper. I would therefore move that we call it 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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