

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Friday, October 24, 1980 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 234**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Child Welfare Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being An Act to Amend The Child Welfare Act.

The purpose of Bill 234 is twofold. Firstly, it will ensure that all medical, surgical, psychiatric, and psychological care administered to children in the care of the government must be approved by the director of child welfare or his agent. Secondly, the Bill will include psychological care administered to children in the care of the government within the safeguards that guarantee standards of specific types of care under The Child Welfare Act. Mr. Speaker, one of the intents of this legislation is to eliminate problems such as we had in the Peace River area.

[Leave granted; Bill 234 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the response to Motion for a Return 116.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, as required by statute, I wish to table four copies of the Gas Alberta Operating Fund financial statements for the year ended March 31, 1980, and the supplemental report of the Gas Alberta Operating Fund for the year ended March 31, 1980.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 44 junior high students from Chipman school in my constituency. They are seated in the members gallery and are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Safranovich and Mr. Guglich, and the principal Mrs. Zacharkiw. I would ask that the students and teachers rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to introduce a group of students to you and other members of the Assembly this morning: 50 very enthusiastic grade 9 stu-

dents from Sturgeon Heights school in the municipal district of Sturgeon. They are seated in the public gallery and are accompanied by their leader Mrs. Fowler. I would ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****RCMP Manpower**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the first question of the hon. Solicitor General. Can he report the progress on the negotiations for the RCMP contract in Alberta, especially as it applies to the projected increased costs of the RCMP?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, a telegram has been received by all the provinces that have contracts regarding the use of RCMP. The chairman of the group of provinces that are negotiating has responded to that. There will be a meeting next week, at which I hope to be present, to discuss that matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General. Can he indicate if it's going to be just a token increase, or a substantial increase in the cost of RCMP contracts?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of assessment. Before a conclusive answer can be given to that matter, I think further information is required from the federal Solicitor General. That has been asked for. It is then a matter of making an assessment of the actual costs. It certainly will be a substantial increase but, on a costing basis, it would be difficult to make an assessment along the lines you've indicated.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that we already have a very acute shortage of RCMP officers, especially in our rural areas, will this cause further shortages?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, that will depend on whether, in the agreement, there is some improvement of the present situation, whereby the recognition of the need must receive approval of the federal Treasury Board before personnel can be assigned to the provinces requesting additional personnel.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we seem to have a chronic shortage of RCMP officers, can the minister indicate if there have been any discussions between the government and the federal government as to reopening the Penhold training station?

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I won't ask why. The answer should be quite obvious.

Can the minister indicate what directions have been given to the RCMP as to an increased use of, say, the highway patrol branch, which is under the minister's department, to alleviate some of the shortages and take the RCMP into more important uses than checking lights out of cars and things?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that the province should leave all its options open.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we seem to have this chronic shortage of police officers, can the minister indicate at this time if the government is seriously considering moving to a provincial police force?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat the answer given just previously.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Solicitor General. What discussions have taken place with some of the larger municipalities — particularly a city like Grande Prairie, for example, which is now at the level where it could perhaps be looking at a city police force, which would alleviate some of the pressure on the RCMP in the area — that are perhaps at a level where they could consider some variation, perhaps dealing with traffic offences in the city?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the present legislation and contract provide that urban municipalities with populations of 1,500 and over are entitled to establish their own police forces. Eleven communities in this province have done that. Certainly there is an idea that if cities like Grande Prairie or Red Deer were to have their own policing, that would in turn free RCMP officers for other duties in the province. Unfortunately, there are no guarantees that police officers freed in that way would in fact be retained in positions in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister then in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government has made any representation? It seems to me that if a city like Grande Prairie or Red Deer moves into a field, perhaps just maintaining traffic control, the freeing up should not mean the people are moved out of the province. My question is: has there been any direct representation to the federal Solicitor General with respect to that question, so we have more flexibility in terms of policing in Alberta?

MR. HARLE: A number of representations have been made, by both myself and my predecessor, to the last three federal solicitors general. I would say, however, that I have not in effect been trying to indicate that there has been a change in the contract situations with regard to cities such as Grande Prairie and Red Deer.

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

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just so there is no misunderstanding. The government is prepared at this time to make representation to try to make the effort to clarify it, so we do have more flexibility. Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. HARLE: Certainly on the question of flexibility, yes. But it was the decision of the two cities in question to establish contracts with the RCMP, and I wouldn't want to interfere with that decision at this time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I just have a short supplementary to the Solicitor General on policing. In light of the fact that because of the increased cost of manpower, especially in the major centres, can the minister indicate that we really have fewer policemen per capita than we did before? Can the minister indicate what support is

going to go to the major cities to increase their police protection?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this summer a special warrant was obtained to increase funding for policing. If the grants made as a result have in fact increased the dollars given to virtually all communities for policing, a couple did not receive an increase because their population had either remained the same or not increased as much as the vast majority of communities in this province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. acting leader would like to go on to his next question, if he wishes. If there's time, we can come back.

DR. BUCK: Can I not get the question I asked answered, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's question was put, and there was a response. If he wishes to proceed with his second question and there's time afterwards, we can come back to the original topic.

#### Heritage Fund — Advisors

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of that fact, I will ask my second question. First of all, I'd like to address this to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Number one, I'd like to know why this press release was not the minister's announcement this morning on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That just shows the disregard of this government for ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the hon. acting leader wish to ask a question, or does he wish to put a motion on the Order Paper for debate?

DR. BUCK: No, I'd just like the people of Alberta to know how this government operates. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise the Legislature why the announcement made this morning was not made in the House?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thought it was important for the hon. member who asked the question to have an opportunity to read it and consider it in advance. As well, I know of no parliamentary rule which requires or necessitates that all announcements of all kinds be made in the Legislative Assembly or in the parliaments of the British Commonwealth.

DR. BUCK: Just arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

The question I'd like to ask is: can the Provincial Treasurer indicate if there was an open competition to select the two firms selected?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, there wasn't an open public competition around the world, Mr. Speaker. I think hon. members will appreciate that that would have been totally impracticable. But there certainly was a review of all the

various available firms around the world and in Canada before these two were chosen.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. In light of the fact that the day to day decisions will remain with in-house staff, can the minister indicate if the department has been able to replace the senior investment staff who resigned previously?

MR. HYNDMAN: I wouldn't describe them as senior investment staff, Mr. Speaker. Over the course of about seven months, we were sorry to lose the services of three of the highly skilled technical people who are involved in the day to day money management. As members will recall, authority was given in the budget in the spring for a number of new people in that area. We have been continuing recruitment successfully. I would expect that by next spring we would be able to get to, or close to, filling all the positions that were set up.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the minister. Can the minister indicate if the upper ranges of the salaries offered have been opened, so we can get very competent people to act for the minister?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to assure the Assembly that we do have very competent people and have had competent people in both the management and technical areas. We have been looking at the question of the requirements and parameters of the positions. I think that at the moment they are in a position to attract, and we believe we will continue to attract from right across the country, the people we need for those positions.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister advise how large the advisory committee to be selected will be?

MR. HYNDMAN: No decision has been taken on that, Mr. Speaker. This is an Alberta advisory committee to the minister, as stated in the news release. We don't know at the moment what the numbers will be, but it will be to take advantage and to tap the increasingly wide range of talent in the financial and investment community in the province.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Will it be the intention of the government to table the contracts with the two firms involved? Is the Treasurer in a position to give us some indication as to the cost to the people of Alberta of engaging these two firms?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, in the ordinary course of the parliamentary system, in public accounts, all the amounts paid, and to whom they will be paid, will be made public in respect of these two advisors. As to the amount of money involved, it's impossible to predict at this time what that would be. However, looking at the heritage fund, its size and its goals, comparing it to similar funds around the world, and bearing in mind that this is in-depth national and international advice, I would think that over the course of a year fees and expenses to these two advisors could well be into the six-figure area in total.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I wonder if he would clarify the statement "that

the appointments do not involve discretionary investment management". What is the minister indicating in that particular statement?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the day to day investments will continue to be made, as they have since the fund was established, by members of Treasury and members of the government under the purview of the investment committee. It was to emphasize that the advisory committee will be simply that, advising in an overall strategy way in respect of the heritage fund over the years ahead. That is their goal, and it will not change the existing day to day management situation in Treasury or the government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister on a question relating to that. Can the minister indicate if this Alberta advisory committee will be remunerated at the same rate that most advisory committees are, or will they receive special status?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would not contemplate their being remunerated with respect to the advisors mentioned in the release. The national and international advisors mentioned here: we will require their senior management to be here in Alberta. We will require tens or hundreds of hours of their time and attention. The Alberta advisory committee to the minister that is mentioned will be essentially a different kind of approach, and I haven't yet thought about compensation for the time that would be involved — perhaps for the expenses.

#### **Constitutional Resolution — Legal Action**

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Mr. Minister, could you advise the Assembly of the decisions, and their timing, made during your meeting with the attorneys general of the provinces initiating court action against the federal government's unilateral patriation of the constitution?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of reporting briefly to the House on what was a very important meeting of attorneys general of six provinces yesterday in Winnipeg. The meeting was very satisfactory in all respects and led to a number of important decisions. One of the decisions was that the six provinces would not at this point launch proceedings in all six provinces, one of the reasons being that that would create an extraordinary number of law suits aimed at basically the same questions.

Basic agreement was achieved on the content of the constitutional questions to be submitted to courts in three provinces. The three provinces represent the full spread of the background of the Canadian provinces, in the sense that the province of Quebec, which will be involved, is one of the founding provinces. The province of Manitoba, which will be involved, is in a similar position to Saskatchewan and Alberta in that it was a province created from the Territories. The province of Newfoundland is similar in character to British Columbia, in that both provinces entered Confederation by agreement some years after Confederation — in the case of British Columbia about four years, and in the case of Newfoundland, of course, many years after Confederation. It was thought that with the tests in the courts being put forward in the courts of appeal of those provinces, the cases should in due course find their way to the Supreme

Court of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that the three provinces, including Alberta, which are not commencing their own proceedings at the present time, apart from our involvement in the framing of the questions for presentation to the courts, will be involved as parties in the courts of the other provinces when the arguments are presented. We'll be there with legal counsel on behalf of the province of Alberta in all cases.

DR. C. ANDERSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, could you advise the Assembly how the horrendous use of closure in the House of Commons last night affects the timing of the decisions arrived at yesterday at the meeting in Winnipeg?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's hard to try to guess at all the intentions of the federal government in the various steps it is taking in connection with the constitutional matter. One doesn't know whether or not to believe the most outrageous statements made, but the contemptible use of closure in Parliament yesterday may well be calculated to try to achieve a tentative legislative result prior to a decision by the courts. All I could say is that in due course the courts will decide and, of course, judgments are binding.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. As a result of the discussions of the attorneys general yesterday, is the minister in a position to give the Assembly any more definitive idea of the time frame that may be involved before a judgment in one of these three provinces could take place? Are we looking at a matter of months or several years? No doubt that would have been discussed yesterday.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The only guidance that can be given as to when judgment might be made in one of the courts of appeal would be to base it on similar experience in other constitutional cases. I might note that most, or at least the majority, of decisions which have been made over the years in Canada relative to constitutional matters have been made by way of reference. So the experience would indicate that, in the first instance — that is, the court of appeal stage in one of the provinces — a judgment could be expected by early next spring at the earliest. That's my guess. That is subject to the desire, I think, of all parties to do nothing to slow the process in any way, in order that matters be expedited at every step of the way. When the parties attempt to do that with issues of such magnitude, the courts are generally willing to accommodate something like a special timetable for the arguments to be made before the courts.

The one other factor involved in timing is that all the provinces intend to proceed quickly with the presentation of their references to their courts of appeal. In the case of Manitoba, I believe the Attorney General of Manitoba indicated yesterday that they were ready to proceed with filing their documents — their first presentation to the court in the sense of the questions themselves, as distinct from the other arguments and so on to be filed later — within a matter of days.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. I understand that the Attorney General has told the House that the earliest possible time a judgment could be made would be in the spring. I also understand that the

timetable for the joint address is early in the new year. What contingency plans have been made by the six provinces with respect to the court decision, should the joint address already be sent to the British House of Commons? Will it be the intention of the province of Alberta to make formal representation to the British House of Commons, should this court case not be heard before the British Parliament begins debating the joint resolution?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the only aspect to which I can respond is relative to the legal proceedings themselves. As to representations, whatever consideration might be given to that matter, my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs may want to comment on that in some way. It would not be considered a part of the legal processes which are being set in motion very shortly, to make representations in that sense to the British Parliament.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the answer of the Attorney General on that important matter. It would seem to us that for a constitution of Canada to be altered in the dramatic fashion proposed, when a majority of provinces have challenged the validity of such action, I believe raises, and will raise in the minds of Canadians, deep concern of a presentation by the federal Parliament to the United Kingdom Parliament when the matter is still before the Canadian courts.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General. I think I understand the answer, but I'd appreciate the clarification. The constitutional legislation is now moving into committee for discussion and potential change. Will that committee discussion, or the outcome of the committee results, have any effect on the legal proceedings of the provinces?

MR. CRAWFORD: I wouldn't think so, Mr. Speaker. I suppose there would be the minor possibility that because the content of the constitutional questions being referred relate to what the federal government proposals are, if there were changes in the proposals there might be an amendment to one or more of the references in order that all the relevant issues would be before the courts.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the possibility that some changes may have an effect on the legal proceedings, is it the intention of the Attorney General or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to make presentations to that committee?

MR. JOHNSTON: In terms of making presentations to parliamentary committees, Mr. Speaker, this province has normally taken the position that we do not appear before them. Having said that, I think everyone recognizes the unique situation facing all Canada, the importance of the debate before the people of this country, and the very difficult process which the Prime Minister has imposed upon us in terms of reacting fully to the problems, issues, and principles before Canada. So in that sense, Mr. Speaker, I think it's safe for us to say that we are now in the process of considering our position, and I think we'll make that decision very soon. However, we need to know first of all what the principles and the guidelines for that committee will be and, secondly, how

it is expected to operate, because at this point that's not known to us. If the Prime Minister continues with his unilateral moves to continue to gag the operation of Parliament and the committee, we'd have some concerns about the process itself.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address my question again to the Attorney General. Some time ago, I guess within the last week, federal Justice Minister Chretien indicated that he wasn't really concerned at all if the provinces were to take this matter to court. I wonder if I can sense that the Attorney General's opinion is that in effect the federal government is running scared at this point, feeling that we have some substance.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly this very interesting assessment could be made elsewhere.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. It really arises from a question asked by the hon. Member for Little Bow about possible changes. Of course the fact is that the unilateral nature of the action won't change. In that regard, could the Attorney General advise the Assembly whether this very question of the legality and validity of a unilateral move by the federal government will be one of the principles that will be raised in these court actions?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the attorneys general who met yesterday generally agreed that the manner in which the substance and content of the constitutional questions would be made known would be by publication of the orders in council defining the questions in each of the three jurisdictions.

However, I do not think it would be any breach of that arrangement to indicate that the entire question of unilateral action is based on the assumption that a constitution does not belong to one order of government alone. A constitution which distributes powers belongs to the partners in the federation. Therefore, the constitution of Canada is as much a part of the property of a province — in the sense of the rights of the province to have its rights legislatively and otherwise defined by it — as it is in any sense an object for the federal government to possess. This type of issue is at the heart of the whole question of the constitutional matters that will be before the courts. In other words, a unilateral approach is deemed to be entirely inconsistent with the constitution as it was originally conceived, and in all respects as it has been amended until the present time.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the Prime Minister's refusal to allow an immediate reference to the Supreme Court of Canada so that this matter could be determined judicially and as quickly as possible, does the Attorney General have any indication as to whether the federal government intends to engage in protracted representations before the various courts that are to be involved in these references, in order to prevent judicial decision prior to passage by the House of Commons?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to believe that the federal counsel involved in the case will conduct themselves in that way, or that they would be instructed to conduct themselves in that way. The process, as it is, has the prospect of taking some considerable length of time within the limits, as I indicated, of the

efforts of all parties to hasten and shorten that length of time over the course of the proceedings. So I would think that all the parties would be working toward getting a decision as soon as can be.

#### **Constitutional Resolution — Closure**

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Premier. Regarding the matter of federal closure of the debate on the constitution and the serious consequences of that, which undoubtedly increases the confrontation between the federal and provincial governments, and which should cause the NDP to bow their heads in shame ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly that kind of bowing could be done outside the House.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact.

In either case, I wonder if the Premier or the minister could indicate to the House whether they have communicated to the federal Leader of the Opposition the support in our policy regarding this matter, in view of the most recent action.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think last night all Canada experienced perhaps one of the most repugnant and reprehensible moves of parliamentary power I have seen in some time. I think the use of the closure movement last night to gag the official opposition will go much beyond the precedents set in the pipeline debate and the flag debate, two important uses of closure in our history. When it's used in such a fundamental way — to challenge the rights of all Canadians and all provinces to have a free expression of their views on the constitution — clearly this will be shown in the textbooks of history to be the most unilateral use.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize the topic is extremely important, and I also recognize that there has been very free discussion on both sides of the House — both in the questions and in the answers — but perhaps we should now get to the answers.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to give a specific reply. As a result of last night's efforts in the federal Parliament, I will be communicating directly to the Minister of Justice simply in the context that over the summer we had a long opportunity to debate these issues. Why is it now that suddenly, after six months of debate, we have six hours of debate in the Parliament? I will be communicating that directly to the Minister of Justice. I would add that I would encourage all Albertans to add to that correspondence as well.

#### **Sulphur Dioxide Emissions**

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Environment and ask the minister if he's had an opportunity to read the memo he sent to my office with respect to the 49 SO<sub>2</sub> violations of the Syncrude corporation, and whether it is the government's intention to recommend charges in view of the fact that with six violations in 1976, they recommended prosecution against Suncor?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I have not only had an opportunity to read it but to interpret it, which the Lone Ranger over there hasn't been able to do. [laughter] I'm referring to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in case no one recognizes the relationship.

I wanted to respond to the question because it was raised yesterday in a very flamboyant and, I might add, rhetorical manner. The question was whether Syncrude has been violating — I'm quoting Alberta clean air standards under The Clean Air Act — on a half-hour, one-hour, and 24-hour basis during the last two years. This does relate to the question the member has just asked.

I would like to table with the Assembly the letters of communication to the hon. member so the correspondence and what the readings indicate are clearly made public. The readings range for a period of two years, from '78 to 1980. Essentially what happens is that we record emissions that exceed half-hour and one-hour periods. We've got down to the half-hour period now. This is done by means of at least five stations located around Syncrude itself.

What I transferred to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was the information which indicates that during specific periods of time during that two-year period, there were times when the emissions exceeded the standards, which are 0.2 parts per million, and which we now have in the area of 0.17 parts per million. So the member has a record, which is now public knowledge, of these brief periods of time when emissions exceeded what would be acceptable during a half-hour or one-hour period.

On those emissions, it is interesting to note that it represents a total of 2.03 days in two years when the emission was in excess of 0.17, based on the reading. That represents about 0.3 per cent of the time in which Syncrude operated.

The member asked a question as to whether we would proceed with prosecution on those violations. Let me further add that the standard for total emission from the stack is 287 long tonnes per day at the stack. That has happened on occasion. But over the two-year period, when one takes the mean average, the emissions have fallen below what is required under licensing. To reaffirm the point, it is not unusual to have fluctuations during a long period of time.

These things vary for a number of reasons. When we get the reports from the five stations — and it's a system we use throughout the province — the reports will indicate essentially why it happens, in most cases. In some cases it may be due to a flaring of sour gas. In some cases it's due to a temporary plant shut-down. In some cases it may be due to things which are beyond the control of the plant; that is, the weather conditions at the present time.

The report does not indicate that the plant is in default. I can assure the member that if we were to shut the plant down on the basis of the information he reported yesterday and which is in this document, many of the social programs that this province is enjoying at the present time would also be shut down. And I know the Lone Ranger supports those programs. To conclude . . .

DR. BUCK: On a point of order, the hon. minister doesn't have the right to address an hon. member in that manner. Mr. Speaker, you know that. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me just rise on that point of order. As a matter of fact, I don't mind being called the Lone Ranger at all. They've called me so many worse things over the last years that I rather welcome the

phrase "Lone Ranger", particularly from a minister who was so obviously ill-prepared to answer my questions yesterday. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem to me that we're going into a great amount of detail which should perhaps be handled by means of the Order Paper. I did think it was fair that there should be a certain amount of detail, because in the question there was an implication that the minister wasn't doing his duty.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister, who has now had time to interpret a memo he wasn't aware of yesterday, or seemed to have forgotten about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister: one of the aspects that concerns me is that these excessive emissions seem to be getting worse. When one reads the memo, from 1979 to 1980, the most serious emission excesses are this year. What specific steps has the Department of Environment taken to deal with the excesses this year?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, let me answer this way: one cannot really relate the time frame, because if I look through the document, it does range from '78 to '80; it varies from month to month; it's dependent on weather conditions. This is a very difficult thing to assess on that basis. But let me make perfectly clear that these are normal kinds of eruptions. If they were for a long period of time, then we would look at it more closely.

The Syncrude plant has a licence to operate until 1983. The infrastructure that was designed for this specific plant is built into the system, and therefore we would first of all look very closely at any kind of retroactive requirement for changing the complex system of air controls. Mr. Speaker, we now have new technology. This new technology will require any new plants to reduce the total amount of emissions into the air.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the minister himself had an opportunity to discuss the question of employing the best possible technology with the officials of Syncrude? It is my understanding that it would not cause a shut-down at the plant or the loss of any jobs. It might cost some production for a period of time, but it would not cost any jobs. Has there been any discussion between the minister and the officials of Syncrude on the possibility of employing the best possible technology, in view of the fact that the capacity of Syncrude to do that is much greater now than it would have been five years ago?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we have ongoing discussions with Syncrude and other plants that are proposing start-up. The member referred to a study commissioned in about 1973, the Federal-Provincial Air/Atmospheric Committee report. That report came out following the design of the infrastructure for Syncrude. In both federal and provincial discussions, we have come to general agreement that the design meets both federal and provincial standards for emissions.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, has the minister himself, as Minister of Environment, had an opportunity to sit down and discuss this matter with the officials of Syncrude?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared at any time to meet with anyone on any issue. I have not had a request. If a request is made, I'd be happy to meet with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The question of the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking appears to have been answered. The hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, we have time for a fairly short question and a fairly short answer.

#### Public Service Negotiations

MR. PAHL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. It is my understanding that the instructors at NAIT, known as Division 6, are operating and working under a 1979 wage settlement. In view of our labor situation in Alberta, I wonder if the minister would care to assure the House that Personnel Administration or the government in general is in no way withholding settlement for these very important instructors.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, Division 8 includes our educational services employees. There are about 1,500 employees throughout Alberta, not just at NAIT or SAIT but at the vocational colleges, the correspondence branch, and the School for the Deaf. Those employees received the benefits of a master agreement that was quickly negotiated in June. Divisional bargaining commenced in June and reached a memorandum of agreement, which was rejected by those employees in September.

I might add that those employees are among the highest paid employees in the bargaining unit. The settlement we negotiated for the instructors involved a first-year settlement of 8.25 per cent, plus 2.5 per cent effective the date of their signing of the agreement, which they rejected. They represent about 90 per cent of that division. Their salaries would have been up to around \$29,700 within the second year. The matter is now before the Public Service Employee Relations board. I believe a hearing is scheduled for this Friday.

As I indicated previously, it's not the government's position to delay any settlement. We don't set the schedule for bargaining. I've indicated to the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees that we would be prepared to make a retroactive adjustment immediately, backdate it to April 1, without prejudice to that hearing. It's the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees who seems to be prepared to turn that offer down.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A short supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We've gone past the time. I would also like to apologize to the hon. members for Little Bow and Bow Valley for not having been able to reach them. In view of the interest in the constitution, I think that's understandable for today.

May the hon. Member for St. Albert revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the second time this morning I have the pleasure of introducing students, this time from two schools in the constituency of St. Albert, both in the city of St. Albert. The first group is 90 grade 6 students from the Vital Grandin school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Kordyback, Mr. Bruseker, and Mr. Tchir. Accompanying this group is a class from V.J. Maloney school in St. Albert, and they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ehalt. They are sitting in both galleries, and I'd ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ended March 31, 1982, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to Section 6(1)(a) of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta, but which will not by their nature yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same the Legislative Assembly.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums, not otherwise provided for, required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ended March 31, 1981, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to Section 6(1)(a) of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta, but which will not by their nature yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

15. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the operations of the government since the adjournment of the spring sitting.

[Adjourned debate October 22: Mr. Bogle]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise today and join in the debate on Motion 15. Although the two looming issues facing our nation and our province are in the areas of energy and the constitution, and indeed both issues seem to be rapidly moving from the critical to the crisis stage — and I refer briefly to the regrettable regressive actions taken by the Prime Minister and the federal Liberal majority last evening, October 23, muzzling Parliament and closing the open debate on second reading of the constitutional proposals, whereby through closure

fewer than one-fifth of the Members of Parliament have been given an opportunity to speak on this most important matter, which affects not only the federal jurisdiction but also provincial jurisdictions and indeed all Canadians.

As much as I would like to address these two issues, Mr. Speaker — and from a number of meetings and conversations I've had with both individuals and groups, I know how very strongly the residents of the Taber-Warner constituency feel about both — as Minister of Social Services and Community Health, I feel it's important that I use the time allotted today to review with members of this Assembly the policies, programs, and services of the department, in terms of a progress report over the past 155 days. When this House rose some five months ago on May 22, to end the spring sittings of the Second Session of the 19th Legislature, a number of important activities were under way or in the planning stages. Now, some 155 days later, it's my pleasure to provide that review of progress within the department, in terms of the services we provide to Albertans.

I would like to do this in about five different categories, and break my remarks into services to the handicapped; secondly, child protection services; thirdly, family and community services; fourthly, citizens' input to the department, in terms of decision-making, advisory, and otherwise; and in my conclusion I'd like to look at some of the work and programs that are currently under way.

I'd like to begin my review, Mr. Speaker, in the area of services to the handicapped, by looking at Michener Centre, the largest institution the department operates. As all members know, Michener Centre is the result of a combination of the old ASH and Deerhome of some years ago, an institution which was developed very early in the years of this province's history, and grew to house in excess of 2,300 residents. Over the past nine years there's been a considerable effort to deinstitutionalize the residents. Today the population at Michener Centre is 1,600 and dropping, and the employee component is about 1,400.

Obviously, because Michener Centre is such an important facility within our system, it's a facility I've taken a personal interest in, having visited and spoken with staff members, with members of the community of Red Deer, and with some of the residents at the facility. There were requests by the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded for an independent, outside review of services provided. Upon my decision, two members of this Legislative Assembly, the Member for Calgary North West and the Member for Red Deer, visited the facility. This, of course, is in addition to the visits made, first, by the Health Facilities Review Committee and, more recently, the Social Care Facilities Review Committee.

Upon the input of a number of groups and organizations, including the very special interest taken by two members of this Assembly, certain actions were initiated immediately following the session this spring. A decision was made to add 37 staff positions to Caribou Lodge, and that approximately \$1.5 million would be allocated for significant renovations and upgrading of Elk Lodge. It would be our intention to use the renovation work at Elk Lodge as a model for renovations of other facilities. In essence, Mr. Speaker, it's an attempt to take the larger wards and break them down into smaller units, so the service is more personalized and the staff/client ratio is more in line with an objective we are reaching for.

Mr. Speaker, I might also mention that during the spring sitting I requested the Health Facilities Review

Committee to look into certain allegations regarding Mark L'Heureux and the way the young man was treated. I had an opportunity to meet with the review committee on Monday, July 14, prior to the conclusion of their report, which was issued on July 16, and to share with them some of the innovations we were planning. One of those included 100 additional staff positions.

One of the things the two MLAs who visited Michener Centre reported to me was that any additional staff provided should be staff who would be providing direct services, and that they should not be part of the administration of the centre. In providing the additional 100 staff, it was decided that 60 would be institutional aides; 30, rehabilitation practitioners; and 10, therapy assistants. In other words, all 100 positions added to the 37 positions approved earlier in the summer would be providing direct aid and assistance to the staff. In total, 515 residents of the lower functioning residents at Michener Centre are receiving enriched services today. I'm extremely pleased and proud of that initiative.

On a slightly different matter, but also relating to Michener Centre, I had a most interesting meeting on May 22 with John Keats, the president of the parent/school organization for Michener Centre. I might mention that other members of the organization were present; the meeting was kindly arranged by an Edmonton M.L.A. During that meeting I was brought up to date on the history of the organization, which was founded in 1954 and has provided valuable recreational support activities to residents of Michener Centre. This has been done through the provision of summer camps at Gull Lake, which have been in operation since 1955.

The parent organization had raised approximately \$250,000, and the money was to go towards the construction of a new camp. As the money has been raised over the past several years, inflation being what it is, there was a shortfall. The request was that government match dollar-for-dollar the funds raised by the parent/school organization. As there's no set policy as to how that could be done — it couldn't come from Recreation; we didn't have the provisions for it within our budget — I made a special request of cabinet for matching funds. That was approved on August 22, and plans are well under way for the enrichments which will take place at Gull Lake. It is my understanding that Mr. Keats is now heading the building committee, and I look forward to reviewing the progress with that organization through Mr. Keats at an early time.

The Dependent Adults Act was proclaimed on December 1, 1978. With it was a provision for a Public Guardian. Initially the government approved 10 staff positions to be attached to the Public Guardian's office. In the estimates for 1980-81, four additional staff members were allocated on the basis of the projected workload increase for the year. It became apparent early in the summer that there were considerably more applications for guardianship than had been anticipated. Therefore in August, cabinet gave approval for 12 new permanent positions and 13 one-year contract positions. At the end of the year we will assess whether any or all of those 13 positions need to be made permanent. Again, rather than allowing the need to go unfulfilled, to allow guardianship orders to back up because we do not have the staff to respond, a decisive action was taken by the government responding to that very important need.

Members of this Assembly will recall that certain amendments regarding The Dependent Adults Act were proposed and passed by this Assembly in the spring sit-



ting. I'd like to report today, Mr. Speaker, that those amendments have not yet been proclaimed. Some concerns were raised by the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council; the Calgary committee, Horizons '84; and the Alberta Association for the Mentally Retarded, regarding several aspects of those amendments and how they might affect dependent adults and the services provided. We've agreed to stay the implementation through Royal Assent until those matters may be carefully reconsidered in a very open and direct way with the organizations I've mentioned.

Next I'd like to move to The Assured Income for The Severely Handicapped Act. I know the hon. Member for Little Bow will be interested in this, because he raised some questions on the matter last fall. Members of the Assembly will recall that the Bill was passed in the spring of '79. The first applications for the new program were made available on October 5, and the first support payments provided on December 1, 1979. As of October 15, 1980, 6,317 Albertans are receiving support payments under the assured income for the severely handicapped program.

Members of the Assembly will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it is our estimation that approximately 14,000 Albertans are eligible for support under this program. One of the questions raised by some members of the Assembly, as well as Albertans in general, related to the regulations and difficulties that some severely handicapped Albertans whose spouses were working had in qualifying for the program. Therefore, on August 20 this year, I announced certain refinements to the program by allowing the exemption for a married couple's income to increase from \$346 per month to \$600 per month, and for a single person's to rise from \$104 to \$125 per month. That's the minimum amount, Mr. Speaker, and of course the amount payable is on a sliding scale, so there's also a maximum level. We believe that with these new refinements to the regulations, approximately 1,000 applicants will now be eligible for this very important program. It is our estimation that by the end of the fiscal year, approximately 9,000 to 10,000 Albertans will be benefiting under that program.

Mr. Speaker, 1981 has been proclaimed by the United Nations as the International Year of Disabled Persons. For the past nine months, this government has been working on programs to initiate in commemoration of that year and to assist handicapped and disabled Albertans. During the recent interprovincial social services ministers' conference in Fredericton, New Brunswick, which was held on September 11 and 12, all 10 provinces and the two territorial representatives agreed that the primary emphasis in International Year of Disabled Persons should be on public awareness, should be an attempt to better educate the public at large of the special needs of handicapped persons and those persons' abilities to function in a society.

On September 23, I had the pleasure of attending the Edmonton Association for the Mentally Retarded annual meeting. At that time I announced the initial steps being taken by government in International Year of Disabled Persons. I announced that a special fund would be established, and a committee much like the committee in International Year of the Child. Two hundred thousand dollars would be made available through the committee, so that requests could be made from groups across this province. Those requests would be received, reviewed, and approved or denied on the basis of one-time applications by the citizens' committee. In addition, a guidebook

of information on services for handicapped Albertans, offered both by voluntary agencies and the government, would be established. We estimated that guidebook would cost about \$50,000.

A research fund for applied research so that, again, a citizens' committee — and this will be ongoing; it will not terminate with International Year of Disabled Persons at the end of 1981 — of Albertans working with the handicapped, some of whom will be handicapped themselves, will decide which needs cannot be met through any of the existing programs in government, and therefore need special assistance, special one-time projects. A public awareness campaign of \$150,000 will be handled by the committee handling the special \$200,000 fund. That \$150,000 fund, Mr. Speaker, will be something the committee will work on with advertising agencies and involve other handicapped persons to ensure we're maximizing the uses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch briefly upon rehabilitation centres and sheltered workshops, because in my view this is a very important area. Over the past five months, three members of this Legislative Assembly have been working very hard to assist me in developing both short-term and long-term strategies: the MLAs for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, Edmonton Kingsway, and Wainwright. On Saturday, October 18, I had the pleasure of meeting representatives of the 32 rehab. centre sheltered workshops from across the province and discussing both short-term initiatives that might be introduced to assist those in need of assistance today, and long-term policy changes. It was agreed there would be a follow-up meeting in December. Between now and then an independent review would be conducted, comparing the services available in Alberta with those in the other nine provinces. I might also mention, Mr. Speaker, that we've been working very hard with organizations to help the 62 graduates from the Christine Meikle school in Calgary obtain other employment and benefits under a sheltered workshop environment. Nineteen of those have been assisted through the Calgary Association for the Mentally Retarded. We're working with other organizations to place the others.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move next to the important area of child protection services. On July 22, the cabinet approved an additional staffing component so that in each of the 41 district offices across the province, at least one-half of a social worker's time would be devoted to child welfare case load reduction: a very important step, I think in attempting to provide services across this province in a very, very important area. I will speak more about that particular decision of July 22 under family and community services.

Another important initiative, Mr. Speaker, is the establishment of the child abuse hotline. At the present time we operate a child abuse registry, which allows an Albertan anywhere in this province to phone in and raise a concern as to alleged abuse and/or neglect of a child. There are times when we do not have staff members to take the calls. In those instances an answering service is used. Under the present system the calls are received by a clerical person, then referred to a social worker. In early December we will be implementing a system whereby trained professional social workers will be on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to receive calls. There will be one Zenith number to cover the entire province. The social worker will then decide whether the call merely needs to be discussed with the social worker on duty within that region, or whether the police or any other departments or agencies need to be involved. Mr. Speak-

er, this is a direct result of discussions I had with Grace McCarthy, the Minister of Human Resources in British Columbia, on July 11, the evening before our first joint cabinet meeting in Victoria. It was one of the very positive results of those meetings.

In the area of family and community services, I'd like first to touch upon day care. Following the announcements in the spring session as to the moves by the government, in June the government commissioned the firm of Price Waterhouse to do a comparison of services available in this province with other provinces. On July 22, new staff positions were created so we would again have social workers in each of the 41 district offices to respond to day care needs. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we increased our staff in the financial division to provide the family subsidy program payments: two very important steps. On September 4, Mr. Speaker, we made a very significant announcement as to the enrichment of higher staff/child ratios, maximum group sizes for different ages being improved, and greater requirements for indoor space, and these were to be implemented by August 1.

One of the most important decisions made, Mr. Speaker, related to the establishment of the Provincial Day Care Advisory Committee, which is being chaired by Dr. Audrey Griffiths. I won't repeat the discussions yesterday, so very well covered by the hon. Member for St. Paul, as to the workings of that committee.

In the area of PSS, Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly mention that in addition to the review undertaken, reported to the government, and the reports made public, it was our decision that some initiatives should be made now on an interim basis. Therefore, the decision was made to add an additional \$1 per capita to all participating municipalities in the preventive social service area. The guidelines placed on these funds were that they be used for projects, not central administration, and that priority be given to voluntary group projects over municipally operated budgets. We also indicated that on or before February 1, 1981, some new initiatives would be announced. Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to meet with the preventive social services annual association on November 8 to further discuss some of these initiatives.

Professor Lesley Bella conducted a study supported by the federal government. I might mention that the province of Alberta supported that work in that Professor Bella indicated she needed some additional assistance, and therefore through a STEP project from May to August 1979, some \$12,000 worth of support services were provided so that Professor Bella could work on her study.

Involvement of citizens. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there's a department in government more involved in a wide variety of ways with citizens' input — through advisory councils and boards, review committees, and appeal committees — than the Department of Social Services and Community Health. I'm not going to touch on them all, Mr. Speaker, but I briefly want to mention the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council — the most recent two appointments, Dr. Larry Anderson from Medicine Hat and Miss Helen Hunley from Rocky Mountain House, who is now the chairman, and the very excellent relations we have with that organization. The Aids to Daily Living Provincial Advisory Committee [was] established in June, and again a wide variety of backgrounds are represented to ensure that we have proper professional and public input in the decision-making.

The Alberta Family Planning Advisory Committee —

the recent appointment, on August 12, of Miss Judith Dicks of Fort McMurray. That committee is under the very able leadership of Dr. David Biggs. The Provincial Senior Citizens' Advisory Council: the recent appointments of Mrs. Erna Goertsen from Coaldale, Mrs. Hazel McDonald from Calgary, Mr. Raymond Clark from Burdett, again under the able leadership of Duncan Rogers. Many members of this Assembly will know Mr. Rogers as a former deputy minister of the department.

Very important, Mr. Speaker, is the Social Care Facilities Review Committee, which was established by order in council in two stages. On June 22, the first five members were appointed, including the M.L.A. for Calgary Millican, who serves as chairman; Mr. Jim Falconer from Edmonton, vice-chairman; Don LeBaron from Lethbridge; Carol Wilmot from Calgary; Rita Nyback from Camrose; and of course the M.L.A. for Highwood, who's also an important member of that team. On July 23, a further five members were appointed: William Klufas from Edmonton, Raymond Desjardins from St. Paul, Mrs. Doreen Orman from Calgary, Jim Wocks from Red Deer, William White from Grande Prairie, and Mrs. Marion Cairns from Vegreville. So, Mr. Speaker, you see we have a wide variety of geographic areas and interests represented on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I note that my normal time is up. With the indulgence of the Assembly, would it be permissible to conclude my remarks within the next 10 minutes?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly mention the citizens' appeal committees. Through social assistance and the Alberta assured income for the severely handicapped program, we have systems whereby decisions made by officials in the Department of Social Services and Community Health may be reviewed by your peers and mine and, most important, by the peers of the person making the application. There are occasions when decisions made by department personnel are overturned, are altered. We have 146 Albertans serving on 39 committees at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I've not touched upon all the committees that work with this department, but I've tried to give the members of this Assembly a feel for the kind of input and involvement that we in the department receive from our peers to help in the formulation of policies, procedures, and programs under way.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave the Assembly with the view that it's my view or the government's view that all that needs to be done has been done, and that in the past 155 days we've solved all the problems. You know that's not true, and I know it's not true. I would like to very briefly share with you some initiatives which are currently at one point or another of the planning and implementation stage. I anticipate some movements within the next number of weeks and months on all or most of these areas.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is the need for additional child care social workers. We're currently in the final stages of reassessing this matter. We think that if there's one area in our system that must be staffed at a level which will leave no questions as to our determination to provide proper safety, protection, and care for children in this province, it's that area.

Mr. Speaker, we've also got to accelerate our activities in attracting more psychiatrists and psychiatric nurses to

this province. On September 17, meeting with the staff members at Alberta Hospital Oliver, I had an opportunity to sit down and very frankly discuss the matters. I've also discussed these matters with the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council and a number of other organizations equally as concerned, because we can build the finest of buildings — and I assure we're doing that with the new forensic unit at Alberta Hospital Oliver — but unless we have the staff to provide the personal services, those buildings will remain empty shelves. That's a challenge we're facing in both the short term, in terms of recruiting from other jurisdictions, and the longer term, in terms of encouraging more candidates into the field here in our own province.

A third area, Mr. Speaker, is increased support for the foster parent program. I'll be meeting on November 8 with the foster parents' organization. I recall that a number of requests and suggestions were made at our last meeting approximately a year ago. As a government, we were able to respond to some of those requests. I hope to be in a position by November 8 to indicate to the people providing the services on the front line — the foster parents, who are providing much needed services through approximately 3,000 homes ... Let there be no illusions; if young people are not cared for in a foster home setting, our only other alternative is to go to a group home, a facility, or an institution. For those youngsters who do not require that level of care, a normal home setting is by far the desired approach.

Increased emphasis on preventive health and social programs, the recent announcements regarding PSS — and I appreciated the comments by the Leader of the Opposition. I intend to ensure that the review will be deemed by all members of this Assembly to be not only worth while but necessary, so that we can reaffirm our belief in preventive programs and determine the roads we should be following and the courses followed during the years to come.

Enriched services for disabled persons. Earlier I outlined the initial thrusts, which have a total budget of \$500,000. No member of the Assembly should believe that that will be the extent of the government's involvement in the International Year of Disabled Persons. A number of my colleagues are working very hard on programs that will affect disabled persons. We want to ensure that 1981 is seen as a year when, through public awareness, we become better educated as to the special needs of handicapped persons, and that some services for those people are put in place during this significant year.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we are reassessing, with the various agencies which have contracts with the department and provide much needed services to children and other clients, those contracts. This is an area of extreme sensitivity and importance. We have organizations like William Roper Hull Home in Calgary and many of the associations for the mentally retarded, to name but two, which provide much needed services to our citizens. There are concerns at the present time that the contracts signed early in this fiscal year will leave employees in those organizations in a disadvantageous position relative to our own provincial employees working in government facilities and institutions. Over the next 30 days or so, Mr. Speaker, we're determined to find ways to rectify that situation so there are no inequities, so that services may be provided by voluntary groups and organizations and they are in no way penalized so that, in essence, they lose some of their best people.

I want to conclude my remarks by relating a single

incident. On October 10, I was invited to appear on the Ron Collister phone-in program here in Edmonton. The first person to call was a lady by the name of Lynne. Lynne described herself as a single parent receiving social assistance, and indicated she had a teen-age son and that because she was not given special provision for her son to attend a swimming class, he was on the street. She was concerned about the impact that would have, both on their family unit and on society in general. I assured Lynne that I would personally look into that matter to see, first of all, what the present regulation and procedures prescribed, and what could be done about it.

To report, Mr. Speaker, there is a personal allowance under the present procedures, which allows \$17 per month to be provided to an adult, \$8 per month for a youth between the ages of 12 and 17, and \$7 per month for a youngster 11 years or younger. Out of that personal allowance, it's expected that out-of-pocket expenses like haircuts and such would be provided. In addition there is a camp fee for children, to a maximum of \$104 per year. So if your youngster wished to go to a YMCA recreation camp, the department would provide up to that amount per youngster per year. Upon looking at the statistics, we find that about 1,000 youngsters took advantage of that camp this year. When you look at the total number of youngsters in families receiving social assistance, we're not meeting the total needs by any means. That's a small percentage of the total.

We are now in the process of initiating a recreation allowance for youth, so that families who have youngsters who wish to attend YMCA swimming classes, hockey schools, and the like, will have dollars available up to a certain maximum amount. Through our social workers, we'll be encouraging that this information be disseminated to families receiving social assistance so they're aware of the services available. Because we think — and I'm sure you would join me in believing — that it's much better that Lynne's teen-age son be enrolled in such a course than hang around on the street.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my review of what we have done and are doing in the department. I haven't covered all the areas. It's a big department and an exciting department. It's a people department, and that's one of the things that gives me the energy to carry on in it. In conclusion I'd like to say that if we can help the Lynnes of this province in providing a better quality of life for their children, then surely we are reaching our objective of helping people to help themselves. That's my main philosophical approach to working with this department; not to impose government programs on people, not to dictate how people should live, but to help people to help themselves.

Thank you.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to have an opportunity to speak to the motion before the House, and particularly to follow some of the excellent remarks by the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Before I get into the body of my remarks, let me say that I personally, and on behalf of the constituents of Calgary Currie, very much appreciate the initiatives that have taken place, particularly in the last few months, in day care, preventive social services, and other programs that help to deal with the difficulties now faced by Alberta society. I look forward to further discussions in that area, in particular to the discussion about the institute of gerontology, a report on which was tabled in

this House earlier, and hopefully to some discussion and action with respect to problems faced by Alberta families.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, I believe my constituents would want me to deal today with the topic that has dominated discussion in the homes and streets of Canada for the last number of weeks, and indeed the discussion on this motion in this Legislature, and that of course is the topic now before us, the constitution of Canada. I'd like to do that by dealing briefly first of all with an historical perspective, discussing what a new constitution for Canada should have, discussing the federal document that is now before us, then dealing with some conclusions with respect to why the federal government has made the moves it has in recent days, and talking about some of the actions Alberta has taken and might take in the immediate future.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in 1867, when this country officially came together, it's obvious there was a completely different structure in this nation, a different society than exists today. Basically we had a centrally operated economy out of Ontario, and a centrally run decision-making process; necessarily so, because throughout the west we had a series of forts and colonies, a bit more settlement and permanent community in the maritime provinces, and some developing on the west coast, but essentially a need for a central authority that would deal with the needs of the people of the country. In that sense it's actually quite amazing that the Fathers of Confederation defined an initial constitution, in terms of the British North America Act, which so clearly defines the rights of the provinces versus the rights of the federal government. I suppose this speaks for the foresight of the Fathers of Confederation, as well as to the difficulty they immediately recognized in ensuring that the unique differences of the French-Canadian culture were dealt with correctly.

It wasn't that long after Confederation, though, that we began to discuss the need for a new Canadian constitution. Those discussions took place at the dominion/provincial conference in 1927, followed by a second in April 1931; another attempt in January 1935; in 1949; in 1950; in 1960; in 1964, where the Fulton-Favreau formula was discussed; in 1968; and then of course, the famous Victoria conference in 1971, which almost resolved some of the difficulties of Confederation; later, in April 1975; in June 1978; in February 1979; and of course in the few months that precede this discussion. We must ask ourselves, as the Prime Minister asks constantly in this debate, why did all these attempts fail? The Prime Minister suggests it's because of bickering among the provinces, and the provinces on occasion have suggested that the failure is a result of the difficulty of the federal government to accept the need for change.

I guess I'd like to present two other possible reasons. One is that changes in fact constantly took place throughout those years, in terms of statutes, legal precedents, and negotiated changes to the structure of Confederation. So there was no pressure for a new constitution throughout all those discussions, because changes were constantly taking place to meet what was in fact the changing nature of our Confederation.

The second point I'd like to make is that it's my firm belief that it would have been wrong at those points in history, prior to at least the last 10 years, for a constitution to have developed that would enshrine for all time an operating guideline for this country. The face of Canada

had not yet evolved; we had not yet moved fully from that centrally operated economy to what is now 10 viable operating societies and economies throughout this country working, for the betterment of all with the resources of those given regions.

If we accept the conclusion that a constitution could not or should not have been evolved earlier to tie us to rules affecting a country in the future, then I guess we must say today: what does the nature of this existing Confederation tell us is required in a constitution at this point?

If we've indeed developed — and I sincerely believe we have — 10 viable, independent, operating economies based on the natural resources in the area, and evolved with the expertise of the people in that region being geared towards the nature of their province, then a constitution, perhaps first and foremost, must include safeguards for those particular regions of the country so that development might take place for the good of all the country unencumbered by external forces; so that those economies might plan and develop without any restrictions from without that would indeed inhibit that kind of development.

The second thing, of course, recognizing that change from a centrally operated economy to viable economies throughout the country, is that the role of the federal government surely must be one of co-ordinating and facilitating that development to ensure that practically we communicate and discuss and recognize the needs of other parts, and where there is need for assistance and development, that assistance is encouraged by the federal government.

The third point is that from coast to coast in Canada there are 4,000 miles plus, yet the majority of the population exists in two central provinces — the majority, therefore the decision-making power. A constitution is perhaps the only safeguard the regions of this country have against control by the majority in the interest of one particular region. One would think a constitution would naturally include that kind of provision.

The fourth point is the reality of the nature of Quebec, the promises made to that province during the referendum campaign still so clear in our minds, and the need for a constitution to recognize the unique nature of that province, and I suggest as well the unique natures of all provinces within its bindings.

If I have correctly analysed the four needs this country now has in a constitutional sense, then we must ask ourselves: is the federal government's document designed to meet those needs? Is the pressure which is on us to move so quickly and so arbitrarily indeed a result of a correct analysis of these needs of our country?

If we look at question one, in terms of guaranteeing the rights of the provinces to be able to freely develop their own economies, this perhaps does the opposite in terms of jeopardizing the guarantees we've historically faced in Confederation. If we look at the fact that the federal government's role should have changed [to] a facilitating and co-ordinating function with, of course, overriding powers in areas of defence and external affairs that are required to bring a country together, this document, if anything, goes back to the original basis of a centrally operated, centrally run, distant government.

Third, and I suppose this is the main point: because it's the only safeguard against a tyranny of the majority, the constitution must safeguard the regions. This constitution does exactly the opposite through an amending formula which I'll discuss in a few minutes.

That leaves us with nothing but the fourth point: that the referendum campaign in the province of Quebec and the concern we expressed unanimously in this House that those people remain within Confederation, be looked at and dealt with. Indeed this is the issue which the Prime Minister claims is his reason for moving so quickly, so irrationally in my opinion, perhaps toward a disastrous conclusion for this constitution.

Let us look at that. Do the people of Quebec believe he is, by this action, safeguarding their interests? The Premier of that province says no, and is combining with us in court action. The Leader of the Liberal Party in that province has said this document does not deal with the concerns of his people. In fact, he worries about rights which may be infringed upon by this document. So if those suggestions are correct, we have what is essentially a sham.

We need to look at what this document does include. If it doesn't include those things which, off the top, would seem logically necessary in a constitution, which I emphasize will enshrine our way of operating for decades to come, then what does he include? There's a basic charter of rights, vaguely worded, which puts the rights of the people not in the hands of the people's representatives but in the hands of lawyers and the courts which, in a number of instances I won't take the time to outline this morning, has the potential for taking away rather than giving rights. Presumably it entrenches a guarantee of French and English language rights; however, it disregards a recognition of the rights of other minorities throughout this country and the needs we have in that respect.

Most of all, an amending formula is included in this constitution which, through all its process, gives a veto power to those central Canadian provinces that have the majority of the population in this country, exactly the opposite of what is necessary to safeguard individual needs in the individual regions of this nation.

Why the Prime Minister chooses to proceed is open to speculation. I can only come up with two reasons. One is that a massive federal debt has been developed through the years the Prime Minister has been in office, and taking over the resources of the provinces may be one way of dealing with that in future years. The second is to protect the power base, the central region of the country — the only reason the Prime Minister was elected.

I hope I'm wrong in those. I hope his vision of Canada is greater, that he recognizes what these proposals will do and that we're having a bad dream right now. But he's taken unilateral action, unprecedented in Canadian history, designed to force upon this nation his concept of what Canada should be. The very, very unusual and, in this case, very questionable action taken last evening with respect to closing off debate, not only among the provinces but among the members of his own federal House, has already been alluded to. Not only do we not have a debate taking place among the provinces themselves; we don't even have a full and adequate debate in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, that leads us to what Alberta does now. I think we've got to remain rational and open. We've got to continue to put forth constant positive alternatives which, if I had time today I'd love to outline, but which I believe have been fair, compromising, and more than going half-way to meet the needs of this nation. We've got to be ready to talk at any time. The opposition members suggested that, and I agree. We need to talk at any time. But we have been talking, and I had a chance to observe to some extent the talks during the summer. We have been

talking for years, and obviously that talk has not been listened to by the federal government.

I personally believe we need a united Canada, that we need a tomorrow designed to fulfil the dreams of Canadians, and that the harmony, imagination, and initiative that have characterized this country in the minds of people across the world, must be safeguarded. That unity, that tomorrow, and that harmony and imagination, have now been jeopardized by the federal government. I can only hope the citizens throughout this country will stand with us, even those in the central region of the country who may, on the surface, have something to gain by this but in the long term will be jeopardized by what will be an improperly operating nation, if indeed the nation can hold together. As my Calgary colleague has indicated, we'll all lose if this takes place. I hope the Prime Minister is now ready to reconsider this question.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise this morning and speak in debate on Motion 15. Frankly I'm saddened and somewhat depressed when I contemplate the future of our country. I am sure that all hon. members following in the debate — and I know that all members who have spoken up to this point have stated their loyalty to the country in firm and certain terms. We are all proud to be Canadians. But I would also like to ask some rhetorical questions and come to some hard choices and conclusions at the end of my speech.

I'd like to ask rhetorically what prompted the Prime Minister to act in this most repugnant and unilateral action. He has no mandate, Mr. Speaker. If you remember the election just a few short months ago, this issue was never discussed by the Prime Minister in the election. He has no mandate from the Canadian people. He has no mandate in the western parts of the country. He only has two representatives, those two east of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, several features of this constitutional proposal are just intolerable. All westerners must object to them vigorously. His unilateral action destroys the fabric of the country. The constitution is more than a mere piece of paper, it's a spirit. And he's crushing that spirit with his unilateral actions. The amending formula is totally unacceptable. It provides a veto for Ontario, which would prejudice our interests if we are ever to have Canada's fundamental purpose altered from that of a mercantile or imperialistic kind of economy structured to enrich the central provinces. The veto proposed by the Prime Minister would prevent any fundamental altering of that purpose. It's unacceptable. He also provides for a referendum in constitutional amendments which in effect allows him the opportunity to become the worst of demagogues in history.

This is a terrible threat to our provincial rights, our control. All westerners — New Democrats, Conservatives, and Liberals alike — must resist this. History will remember those who do not. History will remember those people among us who have sold out. I believe the Prime Minister's action is unconstitutional.

I'd like to ask first of all, what is a constitution? As I mentioned, it's more than a mere piece of paper. I think there are about four tests of what a constitution should embody. A constitution must forbid a government from taking certain actions. It must act as a restraint. Does the Prime Minister's initiative show restraint? Does the Prime Minister's action show a willingness to abide by that spirit? No. It should require a government to operate strictly within the rules. Is the Prime Minister operating strictly within the rules? Clearly not. He's infringing on

provincial jurisdiction.

A constitution must be federal in a country like Canada. It must respect differences. Does Mr. Trudeau's constitutional proposal respect our differences? No. It proposes to impose, unilaterally, one man's view of the country. There's no respect there, Mr. Speaker. Government must be based on the consent of the governed. I would suggest there is no respect for the Prime Minister's package from the governed in western Canada, and damn little in the maritimes.

A constitution is more than a document; it's a spirit. It's written and unwritten. Mr. Trudeau is clearly violating the constitutional framework of this country. He may be found to be illegal as well. I commend the Attorney General for his actions in fighting this initiative in the courts. Although I like to separate what is legal and what is right, sometimes it comes to pass that a man can do some things that are quite legal but morally repugnant. This may be such a case. I hope not.

I mourn the passing of Canada, Mr. Speaker. I think that's what we're doing; we're eulogizing the country we used to know. Canada will be fundamentally altered if this package goes through. The Canada we've known will be at an end, and I'm sad.

If Mr. Trudeau's actions succeed, we will all be for the worse. I think we have to ask ourselves, why the Prime Minister is doing this. Well, the immediate response is probably the Quebec referendum. I'd like to ask all hon. members: does the Trudeau package bear any resemblance at all to the debate that went on in Quebec just a little bit earlier this year? Clearly not. We should examine the beige paper by Claude Ryan. We should examine the PQ manifesto. Those are the two key documents of that referendum debate. Does the Trudeau package bear any resemblance to the initiatives, the proposals? The beige paper provided for increased recognition that Canada is a community of communities, for a more decentralized state, for respect of differences not just of French and English but of other minorities as well. Does the Trudeau package meet those tests? Clearly not.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most illiberal, most intemperate package I have ever seen. Liberty is based, I think, on the need for compromise. It's based on the inability of any one person to impose his or her views on the rest of the community. Here we have a man imposing his views. He's the only author of these proposals, Mr. Speaker. Who are the other fathers of this confederation package? Just Mr. Trudeau — perhaps Ed Broadbent. And we will remember Ed Broadbent, and Grant Notley. [interjections]

This man has resorted to some of the most despotic means available. He is one of the slipperiest characters ever produced by the federal House. In the leaked documents, he proposes a set of actions that are Machiavellian — cold-blooded. He is going to frame a constitution in order to rule himself. I think that is the definition of a despot: one man who wants to rule a country in his way with little or no consultation by the others.

I think this could be the end of democracy, Mr. Speaker. Can we trust a man to respect our liberties, who gave us the war measures actions of 1970? I cannot. Mr. Speaker, history has written pages and pages about demagogues seizing power, seizing control in times of crisis — in Mr. Trudeau's case, apprehended crisis; he doesn't even have to rely on concrete problems to take actions that are repugnant to reasonable men. I suggest to hon. members that we cannot trust this individual, who proposes to run this country by himself and in his image.

DR. BUCK: I hope you wrote that speech yourself, Rollie.

MR. COOK: Walt, I can write a better speech than you, I think. You're good at quips, Walt, but not good at very much in-depth thinking.

AN HON. MEMBER: Walt's pretty good at economic theory.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to challenge members to think back in history to Magna Carta, the battle of Parliament with the Stuart kings, and the revolutions in the Americas in 1765 and 1775. When a country was in crisis it produced leaders. It's time today for Canada to produce leaders and challenge this man. We had the nobles meeting the king on the fields of Runnymede, and we need to meet Pierre Trudeau on the fields of western Canada. We had a Cromwell who met and defeated the Stuart kings. We need a Cromwell today, and I'm pleased and proud to think we have leadership, in quality and amount, in our Executive Council here in Alberta. I look with favor on the provincial leaders in western Canada as well. We have in Ottawa a government that is hostile to our interests and to our people. It's intolerant, and I think we have to take appropriate action.

I'd like to dwell a little on one facet of history that is disturbing, because it offers some parallels to the experience we're having today in Canada; that is, the two American revolutions. I say "two American revolutions", because in 1765 there was a revolution in ideas, and in 1776 there was a revolution on the fields of battle.

The first revolution took place when the Stamp Act was signed into law by King George III. It was clearly a prejudicial action by a government, a central authority that did not understand, nor care to understand, the people in disparate parts of its empire.

It's interesting to note that in the first and second continental congresses, Benjamin Franklin, Tom Jefferson, and George Washington all protested their loyalty to King George III. They all said the last thing they'd ever want is independence or separation. It's interesting to note the comments of the Prime Minister in the House of Commons yesterday when he dismissed western separatism as mere speculation. I think hon. members should be reminded of some remarks by an Alberta Member of Parliament, Jim Hawkes from Calgary, who said it's inconceivable that the arsonist who put the match to the gasoline should be accusing people of fanning the flames of separatism and asking other people to be the firemen. I suggest that Mr. Trudeau is the person who is pushing us to reconsider Canada, just as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and George Washington, who were all loyal to the Crown, were forced to re-examine their relationship.

It's interesting to note too, Mr. Speaker, that when Pierre Trudeau became Prime Minister, Rene Levesque was still a federalist, and it's interesting to note where he has taken that province. Mr. Trudeau is the author of more than just western separatism. He is forcing Canadians in other parts of the country to re-examine their allegiance to the country.

That's the first American revolution, Mr. Speaker, that took place in 1765. It was a revolution of ideas. For the next 10 years it forced the American colonials to constantly re-examine their relationship with the British Crown, with the Imperial tie. It forced them to polarize. It was a failure of leadership. We're experiencing the

same thing today in Canada: a failure of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the actions Mr. Trudeau is proposing are clearly unconstitutional. They violate the spirit of our constitution. The Stamp Act did the same thing. It violated the spirit of the constitution. It was legal; Parliament had the legal right to impose those duties on the colonies, because they held to the time-honored view that Parliament could do anything it wanted to do. Perhaps Mr. Trudeau is taking a very legalistic approach, but certainly it's unacceptable and impolitic to do such a thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's not legal either.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude on a few sad notes. Over the last few weeks I've been thinking about my relationship with the country. I'm proud to be a Canadian, and I hope we never have to consider doing anything to disrupt the union. But I think we have to act resolutely in the months and years ahead. I think we have to do everything we can within the system to challenge the Trudeau initiatives. I think we have to do everything we can to challenge the tax on the export of natural gas, if and when that should take place. I think we should challenge within the system as long as we can. We must also have the fundamental purpose of Confederation changed from enriching the central provinces to one that allows people to develop and mature.

I look at the west, a part of the country that did not even exist when Confederation was proposed to the people at Charlottetown in 1864. Today we see a society that is economically and politically mature, that is producing artists, entrepreneurs, people in all walks of life who are making tremendous contributions to the rest of the country. I don't think we're the stunted child Mr. Trudeau wants us to be, and I refuse to have that relationship with the rest of the country, to be a stunted child of Confederation. I think we in this House all demand the equal opportunity to be Canadians, and share in the partnership and responsibility of governing this country. Anything else is unacceptable.

So we have to produce a package of proposals that is going to challenge this initiative and any infringement on our liberties. This government is based on consent of the governed. If our interests are continually prejudiced as they have been, then I'm afraid that many Albertans, many westerners, are going to re-examine their relationship to the central government.

Edmund Burke in the British House of Commons warned the government of Lord North about the actions it was taking. I am proud to say that we have in the House of Commons a resolute defender of our interests in Joe Clark, and I think he deserves our warm support.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

History should warn Pierre Trudeau that if he succeeds in imposing his views temporarily, it will be a short victory. History should warn people in western Canada that if they sell out for a few pieces of silver, a vague guarantee of the control of natural resources, they will be remembered in infamy as well. Ed Broadbent should be warned not to proceed with the package he is supporting. The members of the New Democratic Party who are supporting that package should be warned. But if they do not heed that warning, their names will be recorded in history for us all to remember.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close on that note. I'm sad-

dened to even be forced to think in these terms. But I don't think I'm alone. I think westerners have all got to fight vigorously, to show their support in the House of Commons for the actions of Joe Clark and the Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament. I think we have to show our willingness to be followers of the leadership of the members of Executive Council in Alberta and the other provinces that are fighting this battle. We have to do it with more than just words. It may come to writing letters, petitions, trying to demonstrate our very real concern and interest.

Mr. Speaker, I close on that note. I'm reminded of the funeral oration of Pericles, the man who reminded Athenians when they lost their sons on the field of battle that they had to look to the future, that they should never stop trying to develop Athens as a liberal and great republic. I think the actions of this government speak well to that challenge that Pericles issued so many thousands of years ago. We have to watch well our social programs, our development as a society, as a people, but we also have to fight resolutely for our interests and our liberties.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, arising from the member's statement that the unilateral action by the federal government was improper, and recalling the statement of the Leader of the Official Opposition on Wednesday that he was prepared to accept that unilateral move — but he said he spoke only for himself and not for his party — is it not incumbent on the Acting Leader of the Official Opposition and, I see, the only ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the hon. and learned member's diagnosis of his proposed point of order probably anticipated mine.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure for me to participate in Motion 15, that the Assembly approve the operations of the government since the spring session. Truly, there are many operations, and very beneficial to the people of this province I think. I notice that almost all the previous speakers took time to elaborate on the constitution, the energy pricing, and so forth. Today I would like to stress some different, probably a little more pleasant, areas. However, I must say I do agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, the four Social Credit members, and even for the first time I agree with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, that the provinces must be in a position to accept the concept of give and take to have a good and strong Canada. Only it seems that Alberta has been giving for the last 75 years and now Ottawa wants to take for the next 75.

I would also like to mention I have a copy of a telex of yesterday, and here is another blow, more to Alberta than any other:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL BE  
ASKED TO RETURN COMPLETE CONTROL  
OF THE DOMESTIC FEED GRAIN MARKET  
TO THE CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD.

This is to take effect next crop year, August 1, 1981. Mr. Speaker, when Alberta produces much more feed grain than any other province in Canada, this gives a clear indication of how the federal government is interested in the constitution and the well-being of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this summer has been an exceptionally busy one because of Alberta's 75th Anniversary celebrations. In our constituency particularly, anniversary celebrations are nothing unusual. I get a chance to attend one

or two every week. Tomorrow evening I'll be attending a wedding anniversary. When I think back to 1970, even Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, when she spoke at Government House, said Albertans sure believe in celebrations.

I was at the 75th celebration of the Vegreville exhibition this morning. This year I was invited to 34 anniversary celebrations in the constituency, and I was able to attend 27; the very first was on June 22. There were four 75th celebrations in the constituency, I was not able to attend them all, but I tried to attend many. The following Sunday, a week later, there were five on one day. That has carried on through the entire summer. I am glad I missed just seven celebrations in all. Of these, there were a number of homecomings, where the families made their celebrations together, and there were a number of school reunions in the constituency. That is not finished. Just a few days ago, this past Sunday, I had the privilege of attending the 75th celebrations in Holden, a community of only 422 people. There was a two-day celebration, and on Sunday there were 750 people for breakfast. So it does show that the celebrations this year were a real success. And as I mentioned, they are not over. I got a call this morning that Hairy Hill is going to hold a 75th celebration on November 22. So likely they'll be going on until the end of the year:

A number of times I have heard — and this spring in this Legislature I heard the Leader of the Opposition mention that the 75th celebrations are a fiasco. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be so. But I remember the smart words of my father, who once told me: your sleep is going to be just as pleasant as the bed you sleep on. And it's very true. If the hon. leader saw that it was a fiasco in his constituency, I think he had better review some of his own policies.

Also a very interesting and very important function this summer, and it wasn't in the Vegreville constituency but quite close, was a Ukrainian day sponsored at the Ukrainian heritage village some 30 kilometres east of Edmonton. The purpose of this was that the Ukrainian people of the province felt that since they formed the third largest ethnic group in Alberta and since this province has been good to them for 75 years, they should show their appreciation and make a celebration. The committee formed a society, called Alberta Ukrainian Commemorative Society, for the purposes of planning a Ukrainian day and soliciting funds to provide a sculpture depicting a pioneer Ukrainian family. This was done on August 10. The hon. Premier was there to unveil this sculpture, also to accept it as a gift to the province from the Ukrainian people of Alberta. This sculpture cost \$50,000 and weighs over a ton. The reason for this was that the Ukrainian sector felt that they like and appreciate living in a province such as Alberta.

I refer to the very first piece of legislation, The Alberta Bill of Rights, introduced by the hon. Premier in 1972. Even though maybe this Bill does not seem too significant, it did provide an invitation to all people, regardless of what language they spoke, that the door was welcome to them if they were willing to be loyal citizens and participate in the development of this province. The Ukrainian people felt that they appreciated living in a province where such legislation exists.

Another very important phase of the celebrations was the distribution of the golden medallions. Being fortunate, or unfortunate, there were 246 in the Vegreville constituency, the second largest number in the province. Now, things went reasonably well in the distribution, but

there were some difficulties. I must say that the Vegreville constituency is a predominantly Ukrainian area — most of the people are of that origin — and many came to the province before any of the towns or villages were incorporated. The first thing they did was name their communities, and what other names could they use but the Ukrainian names of the communities they brought from Europe. That's where there have been a number of difficulties with the gold medallions. These senior citizens, when applying for these medallions, had to fill out a questionnaire and on there it said: where were you born? Well, they were born in the Ukraine, all Ukrainian names. And there was even one that put Moscow. Well, the commission rejected it at once; they didn't qualify for a gold medallion. They didn't know in Edmonton that there is a community, Moscow, just 10 miles south of Mundare. A lot had to be done to fix up these things. This was the situation.

What really bothered me the most, even though I respect the *Alberta Report* — about three weeks ago I got a call from the editor. He said, you have the second highest number of medallions to deliver. We're interviewing the three highest in the province, and we'd like to know how you've been distributing them, how things are going, and so forth. Even though I was a bit late, because I was away for two weeks on the irrigation tour, things went reasonably well. I was expecting that by the end of September, within two weeks, they would be totally distributed. When the next copy of the *Alberta Report* came in, it didn't mention anything about the interview with me because things went well. They mentioned other constituencies where there were problems. It seems to me that it is not right of the media to use this.

Also, I'm glad the Member for Clover Bar is here. I remember reading in the *Alberta Report* that he too sort of felt it was going to be such a big job to distribute 150 medallions. Well, if he ever falls into that problem again, the hon. member could just get in contact with his surrounding colleagues, whether it be myself or the members for Camrose or St. Albert. I'm sure we could have taken over and distributed those medallions for you without too much problem.

DR. BUCK: I had mine out on September 1, John. September 1 was the birthday, not three months later.

MR. BATIUK: Another very important phase of the summer that I would like to mention is the irrigation tour. I and two of my colleagues had the chance to tour in Europe. With a fair amount of experience and knowledge about irrigation — I served on the Agricultural Service Board in the county of Lamont for several years, and I attended a regional meeting at Fort Macleod some 10 years ago and had a view of some of the irrigation districts. When I was vice-chairman of the caucus committee on irrigation — the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower was chairing that committee — I had a good chance to learn about irrigation and to view it. I saw its merits and benefits. On a number of occasions I have given my support in this Legislature. I believe maybe that was one of the reasons I was asked to go on this tour.

But I must say I hesitated when the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade asked me if I would go on this tour. I asked him to give me a few hours' time. The reason was that I had a couple of commitments for the 75th celebrations. One was a very important commitment, dear to me and to many others.



The Chipman community was celebrating its 75th anniversary on September 7, a date that I would have been away. When we realize the first Ukrainian immigrant to Canada was Wasyl Eleniak, who came in the year 1891, settled in Chipman, and farmed in that district until his passing in 1956 at the age of 96, I would have liked to attend that function more than any other. However, before I did commit myself to the minister I made sure of getting back to this community, told them the situation, and with their blessing I went on this tour. Otherwise, had they wanted me to be present, I would not have gone.

What really bothers me is the attitude the press has taken after our tour. I disagree [with] some of the things: September 3, 1980, "City slicker heads tour of irrigation projects". Mr. Speaker, in no way do I want to defend the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. I think she is equipped with a good mouthpiece and would be able to defend herself. But I think this is a wrong attitude. I think it was only right that somebody from the cities should have been delegated for that tour. When we see that our decisions are made in caucus and look at the number of members of the Legislature who live in the cities, I felt and still feel that somebody from these urban areas should understand irrigation to be able to convince the others to support it when this comes up.

There was a feeling, maybe, of why should a lady have gone? Here again, when we take the office of M.L.A., we put up our right hand and say we will serve faithfully. Regardless of whether you're a man or a lady, if you take that obligation on yourself, you have to be prepared to take the rigors of everything and do the job. I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood had that experience. Sometimes, walking through the freshly irrigated fields, through the mud — if you had seen her shoes at the end of the day. I think she took the brunt, as anybody else. However, if there is a feeling that there should have been somebody else or some other lady, that would have been up to the minister to decide. But I think this is wrong, to put statements such as this into the paper.

Another thing: when we were asked to go on this tour, nobody was asked to head the tour. These M.L.A.s went as individuals. Another one: "Reason for European trip doesn't hold water", Monday, September 15, in the *Journal*. Well, maybe it doesn't hold water. But still we derived a great deal of information, which I hope to mention very shortly.

I went to Israel, which has really high technology for irrigation — a country that has to use every drop of water they get, because there is such a short supply of water that it cannot be wasted. When you see that they use every drop of water, and the way they use it, the types they irrigate: it's totally different. When I saw the system in southern Alberta, I was quite happy with it. But it hasn't changed in the last 50 or 60 years, ever since irrigation has been on. And it's not the best.

Furthermore, in Israel there is no assistance for irrigation whatsoever for the farmers. Some years ago there was provision for lower interest loans. But because of the economic standing of the country over the last few years, there is no financial assistance whatsoever. So the farmers have to do all this on their own. Whether it's the research laboratories or anything, it all has to be provided by them. The lower standard of living and the type of farming they have through the kibbutz, or maybe I should say the communal type of farming, make this possible. Also, in Israel they do not have any precipitation from April 1 until November. So you can imagine

that with temperatures of 40 degrees Celsius anything must be irrigated or else it will not grow. Celsius.

Another area I just might say — and I guess I shouldn't miss this — another publication of September 5, "Alberta is not Israel". True enough, it is not Israel. Neither is the *Lethbridge Herald* the same as the *Edmonton Journal*, but many times you find the same garbage in one as in the other, or vice versa. Even though Israel is not Alberta, I think that we had a great deal to learn there. I think the commitment of our government to provide \$0.3 billion to expand and improve irrigation in Alberta was a must because of our trip out there.

I must also say that I hope nobody feels this was a holiday. Of the 11 days, we spent two in Israel, three in Italy, three in Hungary, and the other two days were used for travelling. Our tour started at 7:30 in the morning and we were brought back at 6 in the evening. It gets dark there pretty early, so we really didn't have much sightseeing besides the rural areas.

We did face some hardships. When we got off at Milan, there was a strike at the airport. We had our baggage lost, or whatever. It took us five hours. We sat past midnight until 2 o'clock to get them, and they were damaged. I had to purchase a new suitcase right there, otherwise I wouldn't have been able to bring my things home. The other two members had theirs damaged.

In Italy, much as in Israel, precipitation is almost nil. In southern and central Italy, precipitation is nil. However, in northern Italy you do get the odd shower. As we drove through the fruit belt, I was really surprised when I saw canopies over the grapevines, over certain fruits. I inquired about that. I thought it was just to prevent the direct heat from the sun. They told us that the reason for this was that they do get a shower now and then, and they did not want the moisture to go on the plants. Here they irrigate. I was very surprised. But research there has shown that every plant has a certain amount of disease resistance, and any plant that gets water on it loses resistance, particularly the fruits and some vegetables, including cucumbers. Now, we were never aware of that. In Alberta it's only the pivot or the flood system. This was something that we learned. Any water going directly on the fruits and plants reduces the quantity and greatly reduces the quality.

However, I must say that our trip in Hungary was not quite as fruitful, because the precipitation in Hungary is about 500 millimetres or about 20 inches. So you can well imagine that irrigation is not that essential. Back at home, I could raise three crops with 20 inches of rain, particularly if it came at the right time. So their irrigation did not overimpress me, but the others did.

Also, in Italy there was a very reputable industry that, when they learned of our intention to expand irrigation and to commit ourselves with such funds, indicated to us that they would be willing to come to Alberta to look at the possibility of setting up a manufacturing industry here. If this should materialize, what would this mean to the province of Alberta.

When we look at many of the complaints we hear about our taking this trip and so forth, I would just like to say, whether it is to the press, to any members in the Legislature, to my constituents, or anybody in the province of Alberta: if they feel they have been slighted by my going on their expense, I ask that they send me a written request with a self-stamped envelope, and I would be willing to refund the portion they contributed. With 2 million people, and the probably \$3,500 that that trip cost, it would come out to about one-sixth of a cent to

every Albertan. That's their contribution. So if you know anybody who feels slighted, I'd be glad to refund their contribution.

Furthermore, as I mentioned on irrigation, in Alberta there is the flood system, and I think there is a great waste of water. The irrigation districts estimate that about 20 per cent of the water is lost by this system. If this is so, and if we expect that 50 years hence Alberta may be in the same water shortage as some of the European countries, I think we will have to look at irrigation in a different area. The same with your pivot.

In Italy, they have a different system. They have either the trinkler or the drop system, and they can use it twofold: for irrigation and to apply mineral fertilizers. As I mentioned, their technology has advanced to a great extent. In southern Alberta, if you need water you have to go in, phone for it, and they tap it on. There it's automatic. There are hydrometres in the ground, and once the ground reaches a certain dryness the water comes on itself and shuts itself off. So I think that even if this one firm came and opened up an industry in Alberta, our trip would far more than have paid off.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have left, I would refer to the announcement yesterday of the Minister of Agriculture of the processing deal in Leduc. I can well agree that Leduc should be the area, but I am looking into the future. Particularly, our government is looking at the regional water systems. One is on its way — the easements are being taken from Edmonton to Vegreville — which is going to go through Fort Saskatchewan, Bruderheim, Lamont, Chipman, Mundare, and Vegreville.

I would strongly suggest that the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Economic Development take a strong look toward the future. We see that one industry wants to put a poultry processing plant in Alberta. They would be willing to go anywhere in the province, but because of the conditions — water, sewer, and other things — Edmonton and Calgary are the only places they will be able to locate. They'd be willing to go anywhere in the province. If they can't locate in Edmonton or Calgary, they'll go beyond the province. I would hope that the Minister of Environment, along with the Minister of Economic Development, would look at future needs and provide an infrastructure that should industries appear that could be set up in other than Edmonton or Calgary, our government would be in a position to say — which we have now; we can direct where anybody is going to set up their firm — all right, there are five places in the province that can provide it, we are ready to go now.

So I would strongly urge the Minister of Environment to take a good look at this. Maybe he should make those provisions now, and this would fulfil our commitment of decentralization of government service, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, my time is in. Thank you.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to be able to participate in debate today on Motion No. 15. Basically I intend to address my remarks to the constitution, and look at the substance of the amendments that have been put forward by the Prime Minister in his constitutional package and at the process by which he is attempting to ram this constitution through the House of Commons and upon Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity this summer to view the process of constitutional discussions first-hand in Montreal, and later in September. I must say I was deeply saddened on September 13 that the first ministers'

conference came to such a conclusion. I believed there was a true opportunity to succeed, to bring true constitutional reform to a conclusion, and to bring back a document supported by all Canadians, by all provinces. That process started with so much hope, and it ended in my view because of the intransigence of the federal government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I'd like to congratulate our officials, our ministers, and our Premier, who worked so hard. I regret that their efforts ended in vain. Why did they end in vain? Because they were subverted by the federal government's 64-page confidential document, which is Machiavellian and cynical, and makes you ask yourself the question: did they really want an agreement?

I was further saddened, tragically saddened, and I was made angry and am angry because of the unilateral action taken by the Prime Minister on October 2 to bring back the constitution and put forward substantial amendments to that constitution without the agreement and consent of the provinces.

I'd like to speak briefly on the question of the court challenge which is being put forward by the provinces against this move by the federal government. I feel that by passing the resolution and moving through the British Parliament prior to our courts ruling on the legality of the constitution, the Prime Minister and the federal government are making an end run on the process. I believe their approach is not acceptable. I ask, why the hurry? I'd like to quote from the 64-page scam document, if I could have the indulgence of the members. On page 52, Legal Strategy, Section (6):

There would be a strong strategic advantage in having the joint resolution passed and the U.K. legislation enacted before a Canadian court had occasion to pronounce on the validity of the measure and the procedure employed to achieve it. This would suggest the desirability of swift passage of the resolution and the U.K. legislation.

Don't let the Canadian courts rule, move it through quickly, is the suggested strategy, and I suggest that's what the federal government is following. Section (7):

On the other hand, it will be difficult to explain, if the matter is before the courts or is to be referred to them, why the Canadian Parliament and the U.K. Parliament are being asked to act prior to a judicial pronouncement on the validity of this procedure.

I think that is the basic guts of this issue, that's the question Canadians should be asking the federal Parliament and the Prime Minister of Canada: why proceed before the courts have had an opportunity to rule?

That's all I'm going to quote from this document. I think it probably deserves deposition someplace else. The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway is obviously disturbed by the document also.

DR. PAPROSKI: Agreed.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the setting up of this all-party committee of the House of Commons and the Senate, and how, from my understanding, it's going to approach the process in the committee stage of gathering the opinions of Canadians, or getting the thoughts of Canadians on this constitutional package.

Mr. Speaker, they're going to hide in Ottawa. They're going to deny the people from the regions the opportunity to express their views on Canada on their home turf. It's another example of centralized decision-making in

Ottawa. What do they fear? That the people of the regions will strongly oppose their package? That people in western Canada, where the Prime Minister's party has only two seats — no seats in Saskatchewan, no seats in Alberta, no seats in British Columbia, no seats in the Northwest Territories, no seats in the Yukon Territory. Is he afraid they might express a view different from that of his appointed cabinet ministers from Alberta, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia?

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to comment on the closure measure which was put forward yesterday to end debate in the House of Commons. I think it is the most odious, repugnant, objectionable use of that measure, in a matter which is so fundamental to the lives of Canadians as the constitution. Closure has been used before in this country, regrettably, in the pipeline debate in 1956, after extensive debate. In the flag debate, Parliament sat for approximately 150 days before closure was invoked. It was used again to unilaterally change the rules in the House of Commons; they invoked closure in that matter in 1969. Now we have a constitutional resolution before the House of Commons, debated for two weeks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Longer.

MR. BRADLEY: Ten days? Ten days' debate in the House, and they've invoked closure.

I'd like to quote from the Prime Minister's address to the people of Canada on October 2: "Every member of Parliament from every corner of this land is asked to participate in this historic act". So what does he do? He invokes closure, he invokes the axe, he brings down the guillotine, he uses a bludgeon, he muzzles our Members of Parliament. I'd like to congratulate our federal leader Joe Clark, and the Members of Parliament from Alberta and across this country for their valiant efforts to stop the invocation of that repugnant measure of closure. I believe every Member of Parliament should have the right to participate, to express his opinion on behalf of the people he represents. They've been denied this right to speak by this act of closure. Every Canadian should ask himself, of the actions of this federal government: has my Member of Parliament had the opportunity to speak on the principle of this resolution which affects the basic fabric of my country? The answer is no.

In my judgment, this decision reflects the most blatant abuse of the responsibility of the office of Prime Minister that this country has ever witnessed. To use closure denies basic parliamentary debate; it abrogates rights of Canadians and the Canadian Parliament. Finally, in speaking on closure, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to paraphrase a distinguished British parliamentarian, Sir Winston Churchill: If the federal government can move arrogantly to bludgeon the rights of Parliament, I say, some way to guarantee freedom of speech, some way to entrench a charter of rights, some way to make a constitution.

The Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, says we should still be negotiating. I ask, what is there to negotiate? Does he suggest we should acquiesce? Should we give in on the amending formula? Should we allow our natural resource jurisdiction to be invaded? Neville Chamberlain followed a policy of appeasement. We must oppose those measures with every instrument available to us. In my mind, negotiations ended by the statement of the Prime Minister on October 2.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the NDP?

MR. BRADLEY: I'm going to get to them. The federal NDP compromise doesn't offer anything substantial to the people of Alberta. Confirming management rights could put us in the position of the maritime provinces with regard to offshore resources. It does not strengthen our ownership position. It does not remove the threat of the federal declaratory power, it is mere window dressing in order to gain NDP support. The federal NDP has sold out.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to the matters of substance contained in the federal constitutional package. The Prime Minister wishes to patriate the constitution. I don't think any Canadians disagree with simple patriation of the constitution, provided it reflects the current jurisdiction, rights, and privileges, which the people of Canada enjoy and which the provinces have. But Mr. Trudeau doesn't propose to solely do that. He intends to patriate with amendments which will change the basic governing of this country. He wants to do in Great Britain what cannot be done in Canada. The customs and conventions we have followed in Canada with regard to amending the constitution have required consent of the provinces. He is disregarding this traditional process, and I ask why. I say his unilateral move is not the Canadian way to do things.

The amendments the Trudeau package proposes will take away some of the present jurisdictions and rights provinces have in the area of property and civil rights, in the area of education, and in the basic, fundamental area of amending the constitution. He intends to move in unilaterally on the responsibility of the provinces without their consent. I suggest it's illegal and unconstitutional. He could not do that today by an amendment in Parliament alone. He has to go to Britain to have Westminster do his dirty work for him, and that's regrettable. These laws should be made in Canada, by Canadians, under an amending formula made in Canada and agreed to by all the partners in Confederation, the 10 provincial governments and the federal government.

Again I ask why. What is the federal government afraid of? What is the rush? They are moving with an amending formula without unanimous consent and against the traditions, customs, and conventions we have seen before in the amending process in this country. Mr. Trudeau is acting unilaterally. I suggest there was an opportunity in Ottawa in September. There was a consensus on an amending formula in September. Ten provinces agreed to the Vancouver consensus, which was initiated by the Alberta government in, I believe, February 1978. But the federal government did not agree to the Alberta amending formula or Vancouver consensus. It could have. I believe that formula treated all provinces equally, and did not set up special status for some provinces.

I submit that the federal proposal will see the creation of a unitary state. Rights and jurisdictions which provinces currently have could be taken away from them without their consent. Alberta's ownership of natural resources could be taken away from us without our consent. Prince Edward Island could lose its status as a province without its consent. But neither could happen to Ontario or Quebec under the federal amending schedule, because they would have a veto. My concept of Canada has all partners in Confederation treated equally. This Trudeau amending formula will create second-class provinces out of most of the provinces, and that is just not fair.

I have some questions which I have asked myself about the constitutional proposals, and I ask Canadians to ask themselves these same questions. Does this constitutional

package address the concerns and aspirations of the people of Quebec who voted "no" last May? No it doesn't. Does this constitutional package respect the rights, privileges, and jurisdictions which Alberta and other provinces enjoy under the present constitution? No it doesn't. Does the constitutional package strengthen and protect our ownership and control of our natural resources? No it doesn't. Does it treat each province as an equal partner in Confederation? No it doesn't. Does the process outlined by the Prime Minister allow for due consideration and sober thought? No, the Trudeau package doesn't. He intends to move unilaterally. He abrogates the rights of Members of Parliament to speak out on the issue. I just think it's deplorable.

What is this package? I submit it is a con, it is a sham, it is divisive, and it is not worthy of this great country of ours. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Prime Minister hopes to con the Canadian people by suggesting that he alone only wants to bring the constitution to Canada, to finally make Canada an independent country, to remove the last vestige of colonial rule by Britain. That is his message. He says: who would oppose such a move? Certainly not our premiers. Who would be against finally bringing the constitution to Canada from Britain?

What Mr. Trudeau does not tell the Canadian public is, firstly, that the amendments he will have the British Parliament pass will make Canada a unitary state, dominated by and centralized in Ottawa. He does not tell us that Canadian Confederation, as we know it, will end. The partnership will be fractured, the compact will be broken, the checks and balances provided by the provinces will cease to exist. Our federal system will be dismantled. The Trudeau constitutional package will result in the end of Canada as we know it.

Mr. Trudeau is also using the feelings of Canadians as part of his scam. He suggests, by implication, that if one does not support his view, one is not patriotic, one is somehow less a Canadian. I resent that. Because my view of Canada is different from the Trudeau view, I do not believe that makes me less a Canadian. I may not be a great Canadian in stature, in respect, like the late, great John George Diefenbaker, but I feel that I am just as good a Canadian as the Rt. Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I resent that if I reject his constitutional approach, his centralized view of this country, and if I support strong provinces, by implication I am somehow less a Canadian

than he.

The future of our country is at stake. The kind of Canada we know and would like to see will no longer continue to exist. Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on each of us to reject with all our will, strength, courage, and moral fibre the federal government constitutional package. They should be made to withdraw it. I hope the Prime Minister will realize his approach is wrong, and that he has made a mistake, that he will return to the Canadian way through agreement and consensus and not through unilateral divisive action. This country means too much to Canadians to have the symbolic dreams and aspirations of one man, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, be the only reason for moving to constitutional change by imposed deadlines.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that Canadians will not be taken in by the Trudeau con, that they will reject his approach, and that Albertans and Canadians will support the efforts of this Alberta government to move fairly and equitably towards constitutional reform.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate in this debate, but that is a hard act to follow today. I want to congratulate my colleague the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest for his excellent address. Therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, a number of hon. members have also indicated their desire to speak in regard to Motion No. 15. Therefore, on Monday afternoon we would proceed with Motion 15. It is not possible for me to indicate this afternoon whether it's proposed to sit on Monday night, but I'll try to get that information to hon. members as early as possible on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:55 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]