

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

[No one rose] [laughter]

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

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 84****The Health Occupations Act**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 84, The Health Occupations Act. The Bill is substantially the same as Bill No. 30, which was introduced in the spring of 1979 and subsequently withdrawn.

In the interval there have been a number of discussions with various interest groups, Mr. Speaker, and Bill No. 84 incorporates a number of changes suggested by a variety of those interest groups.

[Leave granted; Bill 84 read a first time]

Bill 83**The Court of Queen's Bench
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 83, The Court of Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 1980. The two features to this amendment are: firstly, to change the number of judges on the court; slight increases occur from time to time, and that's a necessary administrative change. The other is to introduce the position of Associate Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, a position which hasn't previously been on that court.

[Leave granted; Bill 83 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, it's my distinct pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of 27 residents of the constituency of Calgary Forest Lawn, who have joined us this afternoon. They are accompanied by Mrs. Bonnie Ladner, the constituency office co-ordinator for the constituency of Calgary Forest Lawn. I would ask that they all please stand and receive a very warm welcome from the Assembly.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise in my place and, for the first time, introduce guests from my constituency. [applause]

I would like to introduce three people from the historic and progressive constituency of Macleod: the chairman of the Macleod Hospital Board, Mr. Jim Burger; a board member, Mr. Frank Van Ee; and the administrator, Mr. Neil McMartin. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents from Calgary Westbourne Place to appreciate that the House is not chuckling at my antics here.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to be able to introduce to you, and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, 47 senior citizens from Calgary Westbourne Place, who are visiting the House today accompanied by their director, Mr. Lloyd Snyder. I would ask them to rise and please receive the welcome of the House. They are seated in the public gallery.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Federal Budget**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Could either minister indicate whether any contacts have been made between Ottawa and Alberta since the presentation of the federal budget?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for the experience I have had since budget night: I have not had any.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Lalonde, and I were both on the same phone-in talk show this morning. That might fall within the ambit of the hon. member's question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in my question to the hon. ministers I was looking to see if there had been any advances by the Alberta government to the federal government, to make presentations; or the federal government coming to Alberta, via the Prime Minister, to discuss the concerns we have as Albertans. If the minister's reflection on the question is right, there have been no presentations by either party, Alberta or Ottawa, at the present time.

MR. JOHNSTON: That is accurate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, with regard to the implications of the federal budget.

The federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources rather admitted that the federal government may reserve up to 25 per cent of any existing or future interest in frontier areas. I was wondering if the minister could indicate what effect that may have on independent oil and gas companies, and certainly service industries that support those respective companies.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I take it the hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition is asking about the effect on their activities within the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the officials of the department have been and are now reviewing all the details of the energy program and the budget, but have not yet been able to complete that review, nor have I had the opportunity to consider it. So I think it will be some time before we can form judgments on the question that has just been asked.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary in this area. I had other information that I would have liked to have been aware of as well.

One, will the officials' information be made public, or tabled in the Legislature, so we as members of the Legislature may look at the various implications?

The second part of my question is related to the first: is the government of Alberta planning to invite the Prime Minister to come to Alberta and discuss some of the things that have occurred from the federal budget? Or are any meetings planned with the federal government after today, relative to the implications of the federal budget?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, unquestionably a good deal of information will be made available to the public and to members of the Assembly regarding the energy program and the budget. I wouldn't want to leave the impression, though, that I'm making a commitment that departmental reports and things of that nature, which are normally not made public, would be made public in this instance.

But certainly our analysis and conclusions about the budget, when we've had the opportunity to reach them, will be made public along with relevant information. In that connection I might point out that some weeks ago we did release an analysis of the various offers that had been made, including the agreement we had reached with Mr. Clark's administration.

With respect to meetings or attempts to hold meetings on this issue, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Acting Leader of the Opposition of the letter the Premier had written to the Prime Minister earlier this month, which was tabled in the House. The Premier advised the House of the Prime Minister's response to that letter. To respond specifically to the question: have further meetings been arranged? The answer is no.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's a follow-up to a question I asked yesterday. Has the minister received any communications from the Alsands consortium or the Cold Lake project as to the status those two projects now have, after the budget came down?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I've had some discussion with officials of Alsands, but I think it fair to say that their position ought to be expressed by them, as opposed to being expressed by me in the Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Minister of Environment or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In light of the fact that we seem to have some problems with the federal government, can either minister indicate if the financing and some of the projects that are starting, as far as water and sewer works and so on, especially in the Cold Lake area — will those projects keep on going?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, most of the funding in the Cold Lake area, other than community services, is done by the province. Insofar as we are concerned, we have committed certain funds toward expansion of the area. At the time, we are reassessing some part of the works until we're certain as to what direction we should be taking.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the hon. Minister of

Energy and Natural Resources for clarification. Subsequent to the phone call of the Prime Minister and the Premier, when the Prime Minister indicated that the budget was locked up and there would be no possibility of any meeting between the Premier and the Prime Minister, my question to either hon. gentleman is: were there any other overtures by ministers or officials of the federal government between that time and the MacEachen budget in the House of Commons?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only indicate again that there were none that I knew of. I guess you would have to canvass all the ministers to get that total comprehensive answer. In terms of my department and the immediate ones that I am aware of, I think there were none.

Disease Outbreak — Michener Centre

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's in regard to the flu outbreak in Michener Centre in Red Deer. I was wondering if the minister feels that has been looked after, that it's under control and there will be no further incidence at that centre.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the hon. member is aware, Dr. John Waters, the provincial director of communicable disease control, has been spearheading the investigation and research regarding the flu epidemic at one of the lodges at Michener Centre. We have, of course, involved the local medical officer of health from the health unit in Red Deer. As well, an official from the federal government, through the Department of National Health and Welfare, has been involved. They've been monitoring the situation very closely over the past two weeks or so, since the first case was reported.

I'm sure the hon. member is aware that of the 26 individuals who have had the flulike illness, unfortunately there was a death of one of the residents of the centre. There will be a full medical examination under the inquiries Act, which is normal procedure at the centre. In addition, I believe that at present nine residents are still in sick bay.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is there any possibility that the flulike epidemic has some relationship, or potentially part of it is Legionnaires' disease?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, while there is no evidence to indicate that we are dealing with the so-called Legionnaires' disease at present, that has not been ruled out. There are a number of possibilities. Of course, extreme precaution has been taken. All individuals who have become ill have been placed in sick bay and in isolation. As I've said, we are working very closely with a number of agencies and monitoring the situation. In order to provide speedy results of various tests which must be taken, we have as well called upon the services of the Center for National Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia. It may be two to three weeks before we have definite identification of the particular virus strain.

Premier's Telecast

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Government Services.

Could he outline to the Assembly whether the Premier's speech scheduled for tonight is going to be televised on every station in the province, and whether the government, or the taxpayers of Alberta, will be assuming the cost of that telecast.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the speech will be available to every Albertan in Alberta. Yes, the taxpayer will be picking up some of the cost.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. As the minister in charge, is he in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government has developed a budget for the telecast? If so, what is the approximate budget?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that detailed information before me, but certainly we will have developed a budget. I would be pleased to respond when the total figure is available. I have a rough number right now. I think it would be \$50,000 or thereabouts, but I can't be any more precise than that. I would suggest that because of the detail involved, either I should reply within a day or two when we have the total number or, alternatively, the member might put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister in a position to advise the Assembly — in view of the fact that debate did not take place in the House yesterday, but a caucus meeting occurred last night — on what grounds the taxpayers are being asked to assume the cost of this telecast when the discussion had not taken place in the Legislature first?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is embarking on a great deal of debate. I would suggest that he watch the broadcast tonight and, if there's any doubt at all as to the need for the broadcast or whether it is in the public interest, that he re-enter the debate at a later time.

DR. BUCK: Air it in this House.

MR. McCRAE: I just can't believe what I'm hearing, Mr. Speaker, that a member would challenge the right of the Premier, at the expense of the taxpayer, to broadcast or come before them on this tremendously vital ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. NOTLEY: Nevertheless I have a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the fact that last night the Prime Minister, speaking in Saskatchewan, that the telecasts of that broadcast ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Move to Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Possibly we should revert to the purposes of the question period. Those do not relate to the travels of the Prime Minister, nor to the actions of caucus, regardless of which side of the House it happens to sit on.

MR. NOTLEY: In that case, Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister is: will any of the costs of this telecast tonight be recovered from the Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta?

MR. KUSHNER: Would the minister please reply as to whether any of the costs will also be borne by the NDP and the Social Credit caucuses?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate what breakdown there is in his budgeting process that both sides of the Legislative Assembly be given equal opportunity to go to the taxpayers of Alberta with a similar broadcast? Can the minister indicate what budget ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: When you're Premier, Walter.

DR. BUCK: Does the minister have an indication in his budgeting process, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to this Assembly and the people of this province if both sides of the Legislature can be represented in a situation such as this?

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to intervene again, but as I understand the hon. member's question, he's asking about what's in the estimates of the minister's department. It seems to me that's dealt with here in the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the hon. Member for Clover Bar has a right to question how public funds are in fact being administered by this government. The question the hon. member put was very simply this: if funds are going to be available for the Premier to telecast to the people of Alberta, is there going to be any provision for funds to the opposition parties?

I might just point out further, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker ... [interjections] Just hold it, gentlemen. Calm down. Don't get carried away. On the point of order, the fact of the matter is that under federal broadcasting regulations, any statement made on the CBC must be answered by the opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's a matter of federal law. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Without getting into the peculiarities of the CBC, which I think ... [laughter] I have to agree with the hon. member's original point of order. If the question is put in that way, of course it's acceptable in the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, then ...

MR. SPEAKER: But I understood it was the question of the Member for Clover Bar. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Big deal, big deal.

MR. NOTLEY: They're a little touchy, Walt.

DR. BUCK: It shows the respect they have for the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister indicate which section of the budgetary mechanism he is using in his department to have the expenses picked up by the taxpayers of the province?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, obviously the money would come from the Public Affairs Bureau budget, the appropriation vote there that has money set aside for matters of wide public interest such as this. In all sincerity — throw aside the politics — I would hope there's no doubt in anyone's mind as to the need for a communica-

tion at this time, as to the wide public concern and interest at this very critical time.

DR. BUCK: That's why we wanted him here yesterday, Stu.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McCRAE: In response to the specific question as to whether there will be an allocation of funds for the Social Credit Party: no, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] outline to the Assembly the reasons why no funds will be made available to opposition parties, in view of the precedents in other jurisdictions. [interjections] We want the reasons! Don't be so arrogant. Stand up and give us the reasons.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, there's no arrogance on this side of the House. The answer is pure and simple. The government is sitting on this side of the House. The government feels it has a duty, a responsibility at this critical time to make a response to the taxpayers, to the people of Alberta: the employers, the employees, the people in the gallery, all the people. The Premier is the spokesman for this House tonight at 7 o'clock.

DR. BUCK: How come he's not here in the Legislature, Stu?

MR. McCRAE: I do hope the members opposite will take time from their political doings to watch the show.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go right back to the first question the hon. minister answered and get a clarification. The question was: will the taxpayers be paying for it? As I recall the minister said, for the most part. Very specifically, my question is: will every cent of this telecast, including the advertising, be picked up by the taxpayers of Alberta, or will any of it be raised from any other sources? Let's get it on the table so we know what we're talking about.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the total amount of any charges for this governmental broadcast tonight will be paid with taxpayer funds. Not all of the telecasting is being charged for, but whatever is charged to the government will be paid for by the taxpayers.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. We've all stood in our places here and condemned unilateral action. Certainly, this is just another example of a government doing it.

MR. JOHNSTON: What's more important?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Well, we weren't involved in the decision.

DR. BUCK: What's more important to the Tories?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Maybe what's more important is that someone else gives a point of view in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The Premier can give his point of view to the public. What about the rest of us?

My question to the minister is very clear. One, he has enunciated unilateral policy; is that policy in written form, and can he table it in the Legislature? Two, the minister also mentioned other costs that weren't going to be charged. Who will pick up those charges?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, when the member talks about unilateral action, surely the government has the right to respond to public demand and concern. That is what the government is doing. When we talk about unilateral or 'uni-things', I would have frankly hoped that there would have been some unanimity in this House about the need and desirability of the broadcast happening tonight.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Yesterday afternoon, members felt that they weren't able to debate an emergency debate because they hadn't had time to understand the budget. Could the minister outline to the Assembly what revelation took place between 3:30 in the afternoon and 7 o'clock, that we can now justify public expenditures on the basis of ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. McCRAE: I do really hope that in spite of the lack of interest on the part of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the people of Spirit River will be watching television tonight.

DR. BUCK: I presume the Premier's not here in his place because he's getting his make-up. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member has a question, would he please put the question.

Constitution — Parliamentary Committee

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Can the minister indicate what input he or his office had to the Alberta Tory caucus in Ottawa, as to the make-up of the parliamentary committee on the review and proposals of the constitution?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Surely it is not one of the public duties of a minister to come in here and discuss intraparty matters in the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, this government is representing the people of Alberta. The Members of Parliament are representing the people of Alberta. My question is: has there been any discussion as to the make-up of this parliamentary committee between the minister or his department and the Alberta Members of Parliament? Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is in the public interest.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not the question. The hon. member asked about the caucus.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Alberta government has been, attempting to give direction to the federal government for the last few months, and I can assure you nothing has

come about from that.

In terms of this caucus committee, we've attempted to find ways in which we can have input. Unfortunately, they're moving over our heads. We have very little information as to the guidelines, as I've reported before, and we have even less information as to the time frame in which they expect to operate. We don't know from where they will operate. Those are the pieces of information we have. Unfortunately, we do not have the opportunity to appoint that committee, although I can assure you we would make a much better selection than has in fact taken place with respect to the government side of that committee.

MR. NOTLEY: What about the opposition side, Dick?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, does the minister know if the parties were involved in the selection of the members to this committee by the federal jurisdiction? Was there any input from the provincial government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we had no input. That's what I said.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I guess that's Joe Clark's thank you to Peter Lougheed, because we don't have ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate ...

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the remarks the hon. member has just made are of course objectionable and completely out of order. He makes them against a background of having asked a question in regard to procedural arrangements in the House of Commons in Ottawa. Your Honour has been very patient with this sort of thing, and the whole House puts up with a great deal from the hon. member. Sometimes it's almost enough to make one's hair stand on end, Mr. Speaker — with certain exceptions.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point, if I might, in order to emphasize that asking about procedural arrangements in another parliament or legislature is not a matter the hon. member is entitled to ask about here.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs indicate to this Assembly what representation the provincial government is going to make to the parliamentary committee on proposed constitutional changes?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, that's a reasonable question, Mr. Speaker. I answered that one previously, but I will state it again for the acting leader — I guess he's an acting leader. I'm not sure which one is.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's certainly acting.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is he the acting member? No, he's an acting leader. [interjections]

As recently as yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we attempted to determine what the guidelines for this committee would be. Interestingly enough, the committee's organizational meeting took place this morning. They are attempting now to provide information to us which will set out the parameters or principles under which that committee will

operate.

As to whether or not Alberta will appear, I think it's a reasonable question. Because it is a unique opportunity to express the Alberta views on this Canadian problem, I think we will consider it very seriously. Likely, once we know what the guidelines are, where the hearings will take place, and who in fact can appear before that committee, we will then consider our position.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Were there any discussions between the government of Alberta, through the minister or any other minister, and the federal Leader of the Opposition before the appointment was made of opposition members from one of the caucuses.

Mr. Speaker, I raise that because there are no Alberta members on the joint committee. In view of the importance of that and the composition of the Alberta delegation being exclusively from one party, were there any specific discussions between this government and the Rt. Hon. Mr. Clark concerning the advisability of having at least one member from the province of Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the point made by the House leader with respect to the process of appointing in another jurisdiction is applicable to that question. From my own point of view, I can say that I had none with the Leader of the Official Opposition, Mr. Clark.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the fact that there are still 10 senators to be appointed, is the minister in a position to indicate if the provincial government will be making a representation asking that one of those people be a senator from Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has made his point.

DR. BUCK: But you haven't done your job.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the importance of this committee — and the minister has indicated that the government may in fact be making representation to it, and we have some distinguished senators from the province of Alberta — is the minister indicating that the government would look carefully at the possibility of making a formal request on this matter, either to the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe I'll take that as input. As I've said to the members for Clover Bar and Spirit River-Fairview, I'll take that as information.

Rent Control — Vacancy Rates

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. Does the minister or his department have any statistics on the trend of vacancy rates for rental accommodations as a result of the retirement of rent controls in Alberta?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, we recently published a survey that is taken throughout the province in other

than the major metropolitan centres. The study in the major urban centres is done twice a year by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I guess I could summarize the statistics we've got by saying that the vacancies are slightly lower than they were in the spring, but probably not as low as we had anticipated a few months ago.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the department monitoring the vacancy rate in the province of Alberta, as well as the increases in rental accommodations, since the controls expired?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the vacancy rates and the increase in rental accommodations are of course a very important aspect of the responsibility of my colleague, and he has provided the hon. member with information in that respect. I'm sure the hon. member recalls the many excellent programs announced in this Assembly during the spring session. My understanding is that many if not all of these are progressing well, so as to provide incentives and funding for the construction of new accommodation in the province.

One of the aspects of the budget announced the other evening is the reintroduction of the multiple [unit] residential building or MURB, which may also be effective in meeting the needs in this area. As the hon. member will recall, Mr. Speaker, over the past year we expressed a concern that removal of the incentives by the federal government, combined with high interest rates, was having a damaging effect on the encouragement of new construction in this province. We stepped in to provide incentives to encourage such construction. Those incentives, plus the MURB concept, could go a long way toward filling the needs of the many people from all over Canada and outside Canada who, on a daily basis, are moving to this province. We've been coping with it and providing accommodation for these people as well as can be expected.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister had any notices of exorbitant rent increases since rent controls have been off?

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

Cultural/Recreational Activities

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks. It arises from the resolution of the Calgary city council on April 21 of this year, requesting that the minister conduct a review of the present formula for funding major cultural and recreational activities, with a view to substantially upgrading that grant formula. Can the minister advise the Assembly at this time as to what steps he has taken to complete that review since receiving a copy of the resolution in May?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, since I received a copy of that resolution, we've done a complete study of our MCR program. My understanding is that the city of Calgary can apply for their funds on a two-year basis. They have not applied sufficiently to take care of even one year. So the funds are there; all the city of Calgary has to do is make application for them.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister saying that the \$1.8 million worth of projects that were turned down this year because of an apparent lack of funds can now proceed?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the \$1.8 million that was a shortfall could have been a shortfall of the city government and not this government.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could you please indicate if you have reassessed any operational grants under that program?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, that's an important question, and one that I have had raised to me by a number of members. I'm looking at a review of that policy and, hopefully, I might have some success in my forthcoming budget.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. While the *ad hoc* arrangements the minister advises of are most appreciated, can the minister advise whether or not he has reconsidered his earlier position that he is not prepared to increase the per capita grant from \$10 to \$15 per year, notwithstanding the impact of inflation on that grant formula?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to say I would not consider an increase, because I don't think that would be a factual statement. I would consider an increase. But I want to point out again that the funds now available to Albertans are not being picked up. We're at more than 50 per cent of the program in years, but we're under 50 per cent of available funds.

Child Abuse Reporting

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is regarding child abuse reporting. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether the child abuse phone-in hotline proposed by the minister's department is now in operation for suspected and, of course, actual cases of child abuse?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, on October 15 I announced the establishment of a new child abuse hotline and indicated that the program would be fully operational in the first part of December of this year.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to amplify and clarify. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether operation of this child abuse phone-in hotline will be 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and across the province?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, a significant enrichment of the present child abuse registry is being proposed, which provides services in the cities of both Edmonton and Calgary, to all Albertans. Calls are received by a clerical person, referred to a social worker, and then there's consultation with the district office social worker, who is on call. There are times when an answering service is used.

The program, which will be implemented early in December, will mean that a professional, trained social worker will be on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Therefore, the call will be received by the social worker. If there's a need for consultation with the social worker

or other authorities in the field, that will be done.

In addition, one Zenith number will be advertised across the province, and therefore a very simplified approach in terms of responding. It's an enrichment, an improvement of the present program. It's one of the very positive results of contacts we've had with our colleagues in British Columbia, as it was raised by the Minister of Human Resources from that province during a meeting we had on July 10, I believe.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to hear there will be widespread advertisement of that number. The question is — if the minister has the information — whether the number of reported or suspected child abuse cases has in fact increased over the past year or two.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the present child abuse registry has been in operation for about five years. The number of calls received on a given working day would total about 50. Of the 50 calls received currently, two to three have substance and require action.

It's our belief, from conversations with our colleagues in British Columbia, that if the same experience happens in this jurisdiction when the new program is implemented in early December, in the initial stages there will be a number of prank calls, if you like. We accept that. As the program goes on, those numbers should decrease. It should be a more efficient and effective way of dealing with both intervention and prevention.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition would like to introduce a special visitor. Possibly the hon. Provincial Treasurer might wish to join in that, in view of the identity of the visitor.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives me pleasure to introduce Mr. Ted Hinman to all the members of the Legislature. I'm sure many of you have been friends of his and are well aware of his accomplishments as Provincial Treasurer. He has also had other portfolios in the government of Alberta. It's certainly a pleasure to have Ted with us. I know that over the years I have gained a lot of knowledge from Mr. Hinman with regard to provincial financing and political activity. He's certainly a good friend and adviser.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. Deputy Government House Leader proceeds, I believe one of our hon. members now has his guests in the gallery and would like to make another ...

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure I can do it right this time. I rehearsed it before, so I'm sure I'll get through it fine.

It's a pleasure to introduce to the Assembly again, now that they're here in the public gallery, the chairman of the Macleod Hospital Board, Mr. Jim Burger; one of the board members, Mr. Frank Van Ee; and the administrator, Mr. Neil McMartin. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 127, 128, 129, 130, and 131 stand on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

223. Moved by Dr. Buck:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to increase its commitment to the protection and enhancement of our environment to ensure that hazardous chemicals and wastes, and air and water pollution do not endanger the people of this province together with a rigorous and consistent application of the law.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In leading off the debate on designated Motion No. 223, I have purposely made the motion very, very wide in scope. I'm sure many members of the Assembly will be pleased to partake in the debate this afternoon, because I believe it's a motion that deserves debate and is in an area I'm sure we, as Albertans, are all concerned with.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that my friend who sits to my right, but whose philosophy is to my left, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, smiled at the last section, which said "rigorous and consistent application of the law." I'm sure he will probably be dealing with that part of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe protection of the environment is a topic that all of us as elected members are concerned with. I feel these concerns are not just ours in a province starting to develop its economic potential. The issue is not unique to this province, but it's of concern to all Albertans, all Canadians, and all members of the world community. The challenges that face us are basically the same challenges that face other provinces and other countries. But there is one difference: surely we should not make the mistakes that older and more densely populated areas of the world have already made. Let's not follow in their footsteps. Let us not have the situation they had in England, where fish could not swim in the Thames, where people could not swim in the rivers or the lakes; the chemical dump at Love Canal in the United States and its implications. Whenever uncontrolled dumping of hazardous wastes occurs, the effects of agent orange as we saw in Vietnam, acid rain, potential for acid rains ...

I was really quite taken aback, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Environment did not seem to have any feel for the question I asked: how many plants can we put into the Fort McMurray area before we have a problem with acid rain? I'm sure that now the Minister of Environment has had an opportunity to speak with members of his department, to be able to tell the people of Alberta how many plants we can put into that area, using the present standards of emission before we have a problem.

We look at the bewildering array of new chemicals. Many of them have been proven carcinogens. As written in book form, the prospect of a "silent spring", because of the indiscriminate use of pesticides and the magnitude of air and water pollution in general ... These are questions

we all are concerned with.

An article I read, Mr. Speaker, in *Time* magazine: the concern the American public has about what is happening through deep-well injection systems of disposal of chemicals, the potential for polluting underground rivers and underground water. And when these areas become polluted, it is that much more difficult to clean them up.

Here in Alberta we are blessed with wide open spaces, fresh water and fresh air. So we must make sure that we protect these very, very important positives we have in our province. We are at the headwaters of many rivers that flow eastward, so the responsibility on us is even graver to make sure that we do not pollute the waters that go east.

There is growing concern about the quality of our environment because it seems — and the people of this province are getting the impression — that this government has forgotten its commitment in the early 70s about the protection of the environment. Let's just have a look at that record. We are a province rushing to develop a massive petrochemical industry. We dump around 70 million pounds of sulphur into the air at our natural gas and tar sands plants. We are in a province where the production of sulphur dioxide and hydrogen sulphide causes fences to corrode and vegetation to be lost. Mr. Speaker, in my tenure in this Legislature I've learned that when we first become elected we come in here pretty starry-eyed. We think we can really, really change some of these things around. But one of the things that seems to bother me as a legislator, and I'm sure bothers other Members of the Legislative Assembly, is that once we get in here we seem to be protecting our own departments. It just seems to be a natural sequence of events. Instead of taking the side of the aggrieved persons, we seem to protect our own departments.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying this to be malicious to the people who work for us in departments; I'm saying that this is one of the failings we seem somehow to develop as elected people. After a while we start acting as if it's our department. You know, don't hurt what we're doing — a sort of rallying around the flag type of thing. But we must remember our responsibility. Our responsibility is to protect the little fellow, the aggrieved person. Basically we're saying it is our responsibility to protect the entire environment, to protect the water and the air.

In the southern part of the province, because the rivers are smaller — my colleagues from the south have brought to the attention of the Minister of Environment the problems that some of the people in our province have with their drinking water, with their potable water, because they are downstream from a major metropolitan centre and the wastes that are dumped into these rivers and streams cause problems downstream. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that we are causing problems. We are causing injury to the environment.

We are in a province where the pesticide 2,4,5-T ... The dioxin contained in that chemical was one of the active agents in agent orange, which was used as a defoliant. We now see some of the results of the use of that agent. So I'm saying to the hon. minister and members of this Assembly: let us be leaders in the fight to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to digress a bit and give my opinion of some of the things I'm proud of in this Legislature and some of the things I'm not so proud of when it comes to protection of the environment. I have said at many public forums that one of the pieces of legislation I was most proud of was the forming of the

Environment Conservation Authority, one of the best pieces of legislation that's ever been before this Assembly: a flagship piece of legislation. Other members of the world community came to Alberta to look at that legislation. The most important aspect of that legislation was that the government didn't control it.

We are all proud of our Ombudsman in this province. We are proud of the role that Ombudsman plays in addressing grievances. That's why that agency was established. It was not established to be a plaything of the government or of the minister.

I think it's only right that we refresh the memory of the government backbenchers, especially the ones who think that everything the government does is so great. They don't seem to question some of the decisions their front bench makes. When that agency was emasculated by changing "may" to "shall" — the minister "shall" indicate what the agency can investigate — for all intents and purposes we destroyed that authority.

To add insult to injury, we came back with an agency which was supposed to do the same thing, and the government had the audacity to use the same initials. Now I would never accuse the government of trying to mislead the people of this province. I would never attempt to do that because we know this government would never do that. But many people in this province still think the ECA is what the ECA used to be. Now we see that there is not as great a protection of the environment as there was under that original legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look at what we are doing in the protection of the environment. We have The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act. We have The Hazardous Chemicals Act, Department of Environment legislation, and the Environment Council legislation. So the government has made a lot of noise about environmental commitments, but very little commitment is shown in the implementation of the legislation. That is what basically concerns me. So let's just have a look at the record of some of these concerns.

The Hazardous Chemicals Act was given Royal Assent on May 16, 1978. But it has taken the minister two and one-half years to compile a list of chemicals to which the Act applies. Mr. Speaker, that was not my idea of what "now" meant. "Now" is so far in the past that the government has forgotten about "now". Maybe I should remind them that they talked about "thrust". That was the in word in the last two or three years. So I'd like to say to the minister and the government that if we've forgotten about "now" let's remember "thrust".

It concerns me that the minister ... And I like the minister. I like him outside the House, but in the House we have a little difference of opinion. But that's the way it's supposed to be. I don't get paid to be nice to the minister in the House; that's not my role. After the House is out, that's a different story. We're not on company time, as the expression goes. But in the House we have a responsibility, and I'm saying the minister has not fulfilled that responsibility, taking two and a half years to compile a list of chemicals that The Hazardous Chemicals Act applies to. [interjection]

Just one and a half. Well, the minister's department then, I guess. I apologize if the minister has only been a year and a half ... I forget they play musical chairs every four years. They throw the names in a hat, then pull out some and say, this fellow will stay for four more years, that'll double his pension. Then the next one goes in, that'll double his pension. I do apologize to the minister if he's only had a year and a half, but the department has

had two and a half years to compile this list.

Now the responsibility in the Department of Environment for the monitoring and enforcing of environmental standards is divided between the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the Department of Environment, in some cases. Albertans must depend on the Energy Resources Conservation Board to promote the exploration and development of energy resources, while at the same time controlling the environmental impact of these activities. So there's a real natural conflict of interest. The first loser will be the environment. But most importantly, future generations of Albertans will be the losers.

Mr. Speaker, one way this government could show it's serious about environmental protection would be to have the Department of Environment very clearly assume responsibility for all environmental monitoring and enforcement, while the ERCB deals with the oil industry on non-environmental issues. I think the members of the Assembly must be very clear on that point. There should be this division, and I feel the agencies would be happy to have that kind of division. A public works department should conduct major construction projects, in short. The Environment Department should be protecting the environment, not building dams. That's the clear division we should have. The Department of Environment shouldn't be building dams in the province. I don't think the department is responsible for that.

Mr. Speaker, I briefly touched on the Environment Conservation Authority. I'm sure the people who have replaced the Environment Conservation Authority, the ECA, must feel very, very frustrated in many instances because they make recommendations — and I will go along with the minister when he tells us they are nothing but an advisory body; the elected people are responsible for the implementation of policies. I accept that. But when we really just go through the charade of having public hearings, when the ECA makes recommendations and nothing is done, then I am sure the people in that authority feel they are just spinning their wheels. So my recommendation to the minister is that we get back to the concept of the environment authority having some teeth, and reconstitute it so it is listened to. People can make impartial suggestions to it, make impartial recommendations. That authority would have the right, on its own, to investigate and consider environmental protection. Then really the government is saying the environment doesn't matter that much.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister and I made a few flippant remarks about

Jack, Jack, the ducks don't quack,
The water's too polluted.

But I know the minister is concerned about protection of the environment because, having a rural background, there's really nobody in this province more understanding of the environment and knowing of the interaction of the different ecosystems that make up mother nature. I don't think anyone understands that better than people in the agricultural sector. I'm sure the hon. minister wonders, as I do, what we are doing to the environment when we use herbicides and pesticides. As a person who does a little bit of farming, I know that I have hesitated using herbicides because I feel uncomfortable using them. But we know that members of the agricultural sector have to use herbicides; they have to use sprays. All you have to do is get hailed out like I did, and then the wild oats are three feet higher than the barley. You've got the greatest crop of wild oats you've ever seen, but the barley isn't so great. So there is a use, but I'm sure that we as citizens are all

concerned about some of the long-term effects of our actions.

Another area that concerns me is that we who are in the forefront of a massive petrochemical industry in this province will be turning out more and more chemicals. Our neighbors to the south, because they have progressed further than us, turn out thousands of them. If you remember your organic chemistry, all you do is kick around a few molecules in the benzene ring and you can make variations, permutations, and combinations of chemicals by just changing the molecular formula. I'm sure the regulatory and testing agencies have no human way possible to know some of the long-term effects of these chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to indicate to the members of the Assembly and the people of this province that I am concerned. I come from a constituency that I guess has the greatest concentration of petrochemical plants in the province. I know the industries in my community are concerned. I know the industries in my community do everything they can to try to keep the air and water clean. They are concerned about the effects of some of the products they produce. And they do have public hearings; they invite public input; they invite the people in our area to bring any matter to their attention. I would like to say that we should all be concerned about protection of the environment. With those few brief remarks, I welcome hon. members of the Assembly to contribute to the debate on protection of the environment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had the opportunity to review carefully the resolution placed before the Assembly by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. While I think I could take issue with certain aspects of it in terms of the wording and the specifics of the resolution itself, I don't intend to do so, because I think that what's important is the intention of the resolution and its underlying principle, which is the concern we must all have for the quality of life in this province and, more specifically, for the environmental heritage we have. Bearing that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I say unequivocally that I support the intent of this resolution.

While we are all aware of the fact that one can't be right all the time, I suppose what the placement of this resolution on the Order Paper by the Member for Clover Bar shows is that one can't be wrong all the time either. I think in this instance the member has brought before us a very important, very relevant topic for discussion.

DR. BUCK: At least I have the freedom, John.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: So do I, and I intend to exercise it.

I think one has to take a very close look at the progress that has been made in a very short period of time on the question of the environment in this province. The hon. member was fair in mentioning that early in the 1970s this province brought forward good, strong legislation by way of The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act — legislation that in fact has been viewed as among the toughest in the country.

I think it's important, while we discuss the concerns we have with respect to environmental issues, that we do not lose sight of the progress that has been made. The fact is that in this province we are faced with tremendous growth. That growth is bringing certain difficulties along with all its benefits. The environmental hazards posed by

dramatic growth are certainly among them.

As well, in speaking on the positive side of the ledger, I'd like to congratulate the Minister of Environment on his position in respect of the Bow River and the clean-up of the serious phosphorous problem that has developed over the last number of years. I am pleased he has requested, in very strong terms, that the city of Calgary take all necessary steps within the next few years to ensure that we have a proper treatment facility there to remove the phosphorous, which is choking off the aquatic life in the Bow River and affecting the quality of water being used by those Albertans living downstream from the city of Calgary.

None the less, we have to acknowledge that there are problems to be dealt with and faced. Those problems will continue to emerge in the next number of years because of our growth. I would like to speak briefly about three specific areas where I feel we have to apply a lot of attention and take action.

I suppose the first general area would be the adequacy of our present legislation. I'd like to cite just a couple of examples, one being The Clean Water Act. The fact is that under that legislation there are no specific standards with respect to what constitutes pollution; to rephrase it, what amount of pollution, if you will, can be tolerated without materially affecting the quality of water. I think we've got to take a pretty close look at those pieces of legislation to ensure we have covered all the gaps.

With respect to The Clean Water Act, I would mention as well that it doesn't address itself adequately to questions of bacteria content in water. A series of questions have been raised in this Assembly with respect to bacteriological contamination of the water in the Bow River downstream from Calgary. We have had delegations come to this Assembly with a petition from residents in southern Alberta, expressing concern about the quality of water — not only because of the phosphorous problems, but because of the bacteriological problems. I would urge the minister not to feel, because we are addressing the phosphorous question, that we have dealt with the problems of the Bow, because in my judgment we have not done so. Some very serious questions still have to be dealt with. There is a strong belief among persons far more knowledgeable in this area than I that the real answer to clean water in the province is tertiary treatment in our sewage facilities, to ensure that we will have clean water in the years to come.

I would also like to say a few words about the adequacy of our legislation in respect of hazardous wastes. At this juncture — and I intend to deal with it at length in a few moments — I would simply refer, by way of example, to The Public Health Act. Under that legislation, at the present time, in order to dump wastes in a sanitary landfill site in this province, one need only obtain a mere permit. The permit entitles one to dump all types of waste. In my judgment there has to be a close look at that particular statute, because with the growth in the volume of hazardous wastes that are going to be by-products of our rapid growth in this province, it surely has to be a matter of great concern.

The second area I'd like to deal with briefly is the question of enforcement. In my judgment, under the existing legislation — even though it does have some shortcomings — there are opportunities, as a matter of fact there is a responsibility, to strictly enforce that legislation. I think the resolution deals specifically with that point when it speaks of a rigorous and consistent application of the law. Mention has already been made of the fact that

we have only now put in place an actual schedule under The Hazardous Chemicals Act. I want to be fair in my remarks and make it clear that I don't think the problems we're faced with are the minister's fault. In fact, I think they arise from the rapid growth taking place. But having said that, we have an obligation and responsibility to deal with them rapidly. If we don't, they're going to get out of control, and we're going to be unable to deal with them as effectively down the road.

The third area I wish to speak on, and spend more time on, is this whole question of hazardous wastes and hazardous chemicals, and within that context, specifically the question of waste disposal. I'd like to acknowledge to the House a very particular concern, because the constituency I have the privilege of representing in this Assembly happens to have the sole disposal location for hazardous wastes in the city of Calgary located within its boundary. I and many residents in that constituency are very concerned about that state of affairs. I have some real concern about the appropriateness of having waste disposal facilities located within an essentially residential area. I don't think that's satisfactory. I think we have to move away from that set of circumstances as quickly as we possibly can.

Earlier this year it was revealed that some 37 tons of polychlorinated biphenyls, which are regarded as a most hazardous waste and have been linked in some way with cancer, were dumped in the Forest Lawn landfill site. At the same time it was revealed that some 6,000 tons of hazardous wastes are deposited in that landfill site every year. One of the officials of the city of Calgary spoke of the present waste disposal techniques in these words: we're in the horse and buggy days. Sadly, I think there is some real validity in that statement.

The province has been taking some initiatives in this area, for which they are to be commended. They have on hand now a report by the Reid, Crowther group, which provides us with a summary of inventory and present disposal practices in this province. What's very frightening is some of the revelations that have come out of that report. The consultants identified some 1,300 industries in this province that are producing waste which is considered a potential threat to the environment. A majority of these industries are centred in Calgary, but I should point out for the information of members of the Assembly that they produce only 12 per cent of the total waste generated. In fact 68 per cent is being generated from industry in the city of Edmonton. In total, these some 1,300 industries are generating an estimated 92,000 tons of liquid waste annually, about three-quarters of which can be categorized as high-priority waste. The Reid, Crowther study has come to the conclusion that present procedures for disposing of industrial waste are, for the most part, unsafe both to the personnel handling the waste and to our environment. I think those statistics are frightening: 90,000 tons of liquid waste annually.

I'd like to move from that brief historical description of where we're at to a more specific discussion of the present situation in Calgary at the Forest Lawn landfill site, which as I mentioned is the only location in that city for the disposal of hazardous wastes. I think one has to commend the city of Calgary because they have, of their own initiative, attempted to deal in some way with this very serious matter of disposal of hazardous wastes and chemicals. In the last two years they have set up some form of crude monitoring — I don't use that adjective in a disparaging way, but I think they would be the first to acknowledge that it's not a very comprehensive approach

— where they are at least trying to separate hazardous wastes from those that are non-hazardous. That has been undertaken in the last two years. But the fact of the matter is that in the preceding 10 years, there was absolutely no monitoring whatsoever. God only knows what's buried at the Forest Lawn landfill site.

I think members of this Assembly should be aware that the intention is that over a period of years that site will ultimately be converted into a recreational area for the residents in that part of the city. While I certainly don't have the technical expertise to speak of the real possibilities of danger to public health, one doesn't require a large degree of scientific knowledge to be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that while we have made some positive moves in this area, we're going to have to accelerate dramatically our activities in terms of our environment. I think some steps can be taken very quickly. The first among those, I would submit, is a move towards far more comprehensive legislation in terms of waste management than is presently on the books in the Legislature of this province. The legislation should be in a form that could be described as cradle to grave legislation, that ensures that from the time of the creation of those wastes to their ultimate disposal, Albertans are on top of the treatment, handling, and disposal of those wastes.

The Reid, Crowther report, and other sources, have suggested that at least five ingredients should be included in that kind of comprehensive waste management legislation. I'll refer to them very briefly. Firstly, licensing of haulers: at present, some initiatives are being taken on both the federal and provincial scene, but the present circumstances under which hazardous wastes can be hauled are far too loose and leave too much opportunity for improper handling and ultimate disposal of those wastes. Secondly, I think we have to take a very close look at the licensing and monitoring of landfills, which is the present means by which we deal with those wastes. I think the licensing provisions have to be tightened up very dramatically. Earlier I mentioned that under The Public Health Act all one requires is a mere permit for disposal of waste generally. That entitles one to deal with both hazardous and non-hazardous wastes.

As a third measure, I think we have to look at the recycling of solid wastes where possible. Fourthly, we should be looking at a manifest system for tracking the transportation of these hazardous wastes. Fifthly, we need some very strong and substantial penalties for abuse and contravention of this new legislation, as well as the existing legislation. We've just got to get a whole lot tougher, Mr. Speaker.

I would also submit to this Assembly that there may be considerable merit in having as much of this responsibility for waste management under the jurisdiction of one department of government. I make that suggestion simply in the belief that it's more likely we're going to be able to take the type of swift action we require if we can co-ordinate efforts through one department of government. I say that with the caveat to the extent it is possible, because it may not be entirely appropriate to have all aspects within one government department. At present at least three departments come to mind — the Department of Environment, the Department of Social Services and Community Health, as well as the Department of Transportation — that are involved. To the extent we can bring all the legislation under one umbrella, I think that would be desirable. In a submission by the city of Calgary, they have taken the same position with respect to this compre-

hensive legislation and its administration and enforcement.

I'd also like to address briefly the question of ultimate disposal of hazardous wastes. At present studies are being conducted with respect to the feasibility of a central disposal facility. I think there is no question that that's ultimately going to be required for this province. I think we have to face the very real fact that while it would be preferable if some other jurisdiction would be so kind as to construct one we could haul all our wastes to, that's a rather unlikely event. So we have to come to grips with the fact that we're going to have to have that type of facility somewhere in the province. Again, while I don't profess to have the technical or scientific skills to suggest exactly what type of location is most appropriate, I would suggest it certainly should be a site well away from population. Studies have been conducted with respect to an appropriate location.

In that regard, I'd like to mention the Bavarian experience. They had a history very similar to Alberta in terms of the rapid industrialization and growth of their jurisdiction. They set up a co-operative venture which involved municipalities, industry, and government. Their system includes collection points for initial testing and storage of hazardous wastes. These wastes are then shipped via a waybill system to a treatment plant. At this very advanced treatment plant there are some six different processes by which different types of wastes are treated according to their chemical composition. It's my understanding that the facility is clean, attractive, and environmentally sound in terms of meeting air and water environmental standards. While I'm not suggesting that that is necessarily what is required here in Alberta, I bring it to the attention of the members of this Assembly simply to point out that this is being done elsewhere in the world. I think we've got to look to those kinds of examples.

Mr. Speaker, I'd simply like to conclude by saying that we speak a lot about our heritage in this province. Surely one of the most vital aspects of our heritage is our environmental heritage. The fact is that it's a gift we have been granted. It's a gift we will never be able to recover if we lose it.

So I hope this government moves in a swift and dramatic way to ensure that many years from now we can look back with pride on the environmental heritage that is here for the enjoyment and the quality of life we want for our children and their children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was on his feet first.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in the debate this afternoon, I can't help but share the view we heard from the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn as he concluded his debate; that is, one of the most important heritages we can leave is sound environmental management. In addressing this subject this afternoon, I'd like to take just a moment or two to review some of the environmental history over the last 10 years. Then I'd like to deal in a little more detailed way with the implications of Motion 223 on the question of rigorous and consistent application of the law as it applies to air and water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, there really was quite a strong public

demand for tougher environmental legislation during the late '60s. The hon. Member for Clover Bar cited the decision of this Legislative Assembly to establish the Environment Conservation Authority. I agree with the hon. member when he says the ECA legislation was in fact flagship legislation of very considerable importance. It was important in terms of setting out the opportunity of the public to express concerns about environmental matters. It was important because it was structured in such a way that it was independent from government. It was an authority which had the opportunity to not only bring capable people in terms of its staffing but outstanding Albertans who sat on the Environment Conservation Authority during its initial years of operation in this province.

A number of its recommendations, a number of its reports, Mr. Speaker, I think clearly identify environmental concerns which, had the government followed them, would [leave] us in a much stronger position today to say that in fact we are going to have a heritage to leave our children in environmental matters that the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn pointed out. Yes, the ECA legislation was flagship legislation. Also, The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act was legislation that any Assembly could be proud of.

Between 1969 and 1971, I recall that Mr. Yurko — the hon. gentleman who is now the Member of Parliament for Edmonton East and at that time the Member for Strathcona East — in that particular Legislative Assembly was one of the more ardent advocates for the environment in the Legislature and would frequently talk about the need for "polluter pay" policies. As a matter of fact, as I look back at some of the observations Mr. Yurko made when he was in opposition, if anything he felt that The Clean Air Act, The Clean Water Act, and The Environment Conservation Authority Act didn't go far enough — we needed tougher legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to note that in my view no member has been more consistent in his support for environmental concerns — and I've always agreed with him — than the Member for Strathcona East between 1969 and 1971. The Tory caucus between '69 and '71 was obviously committed to the environment and to strong environmental legislation. But between '67 and '71 we had one other very important factor; that is, environmental issues were extremely fashionable. Now issues come and go, and most of us involved with politics know perfectly well that issues may be very, very strong for a period of time and then the public interest shifts. Then five or 10 years down the road, the issue arises again.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, what concerns me is that this government's commitment to the environment strikes me as being rather more consistent to the public interest in the issue than in any deep political commitment by the government. Because after 1971 we began to see a shift. As a matter of fact, not much of a shift for the first three or four years. When the hon. Member for Strathcona East became the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar and was Minister of Environment, a number of excellent things were done between 1971 and 1974. Nevertheless there was a subtle erosion, if you like, of environmental protection in this province. From 1974 on it was almost a roller-coaster change.

We had the legislation the Member for Clover Bar cited, the first change in terms of the authority of the Environment Conservation Authority. We had the debate on the Red Deer dam that occurred in this House in 1977. We had the changes in the structure of the Envi-

ronment Council of Alberta that were made as a result. Now we have the public statements of the chief administrative officer of the Environment Council of Alberta who, quite frankly, casts some real doubt on whether he, as the man who's been in charge of the Environment Council of Alberta, feels there is much point in carrying on.

The hon. Minister of Environment points out that of all the recommendations, X number have been accepted, and that's very interesting. Except when one looks over the recommendations of the ECA, Mr. Speaker, they range from being relatively insignificant and technical in nature to being profoundly important. The point that isn't made and needs to be made is that the important fundamental recommendations of the ECA have not been acted upon by this government, have been discarded or set aside.

It's fine to say we've got a batting record of X per cent. But when the important ones are the ones we haven't acted upon and the technical ones are the ones we have, I submit that I have no other conclusion but to share the concern expressed publicly by the chief executive officer of the Environment Council of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the reason it's important to underline this matter is that surely we don't want to get into the situation 10 years down the road that we see in other parts of North America. Surely we don't want to have the environmental wasteland in Alberta that we find in northern Ontario, where there has been a very casual approach to environmental issues, or parts of the northeastern United States. The thing that's disturbing is that in the late '60s, long before we had this tremendous thrust to industrialization with all the potential environmental implications of massive industrialization, when this was a much slower moving economy between '67 and '71, we seemed to have from the government and the opposition at that time a far stronger commitment to tough environmental legislation. Now when it's more important than ever before, now when we are going to be laying the groundwork for the heritage the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn talks about, all of a sudden we see a change. No, not throwing out the legislation, but modifications, subtle changes in the way in which we administer it, less of a solid commitment. Mr. Speaker, nowhere is this matter more clear, in my assertion, than in the way we've dealt with SO₂ emissions with respect to the oil sands area in general and the Suncor operation, but even more important, the Syncrude plant.

Mr. Speaker, let's take just a few moments and review the history of the controversy to date. When the hon. Member for Strathcona East was in opposition the position of the Conservative Party was very clear. It was "polluter pay", the very best environmental standards possible. I think that was a fair assessment of this government's position for several years. But when Syncrude began to encounter trouble — financial trouble, that is — all of a sudden we began to see the government backing off environmental issues, making the choice, if you like, between financial success in the short term of the operation and strong environmental standards over the long haul.

Mr. Speaker, I know it's easy to make that judgment sometimes and say, well, we won't worry about it; we'll let things slide by because this great project is in the interests of the country, and perhaps we won't insist on the best possible technology. But while those arguments can be made in the short term, over the long haul one has to ask: at what environmental price do we make those

decisions? Mr. Speaker, we must ask those questions specifically when we address the matter of the clean air and clean water Acts and the regulations thereunder, and the licence to operate and commitments made in the licence to operate.

I want to quote from a document prepared for the now Speaker of the federal House, Mme. Sauve. This was back in 1974, and it's from an assistant. I'll table this in the House, Mr. Speaker, so that hon. members may peruse it. It deals with air waste management:

Syncrude's assessment of environmental effects from sulphur dioxide emissions was to predict ground level concentrations based on a single stack and ideal weather conditions. This is a simplistic approach because it does not consider total emissions of SO₂, adverse dispersion conditions nor the effect from other operating plants in the area. In addition the long-term potential problem of cumulative deposition of sulphur emissions in regional and transboundary sites was not reviewed by Syncrude. Effect of heavy metal emissions in the plant fuel combustion gases should also be assessed properly.

Mr. Speaker, the memo goes on:

With the release of large volumes of water vapour, we are concerned with the potential for formation and persistence of widespread fog in the area. This fog, along with sulphur dioxide, could produce a serious human health hazard.

Mr. Speaker, this was back in 1974. The appendices to the conservation and utilization report on meteorological conditions in the Athabasca oil sands make some similar observations. On page 24 of that document it says "Generally the climate poses severe problems for industrial pollution dispersion"; on page 31, "Elevated inversions . . . can trap pollutants in the valley and create a uniform mixture of high concentration"; on page 37, "The potential for serious problems due to fog formation in the Athabasca Tar Sands . . . is significant"; on page 37, "unacceptable frequency and duration of air and land vehicles due to fog"; and also on page 37, "unacceptable level of fog-borne pollution damage to humans, plants, fish, wildlife and equipment." On page 39 of that report, Mr. Speaker, "Sulphur Dioxide may react with water to produce sulphuric acid with subsequent fallout to the surface or collection by vegetation".

Now why is it important to read this into the record? It's important because after the breakdown, if you like, of the initial Syncrude agreement in the fall of 1974 — and then, as you may recall, it was necessary to convene a meeting in Winnipeg. Syncrude was then put on the track as a result of the Winnipeg agreement in 1975. We had some discussion in the Legislature at that time. One of the important issues that people concerned about the environment raised in 1975 was that the very best possible technology should be used before the plant was built.

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the federal-provincial task force report on Syncrude Canada Ltd., on page 14 the following observation is made:

Based on the technology applied and demonstrated by late 1975, the Committee concluded that best practicable technology for the Syncrude tar sands project was as outlined in the following table.

At the upper range of the estimated annual charges, these additional control costs would be equivalent to 0.7 cents per gallon or 23 cents per barrel based on . . . 125,000 barrels per day production rate of synthetic crude.

Mr. Speaker, this would have been the cost to reduce

the emission of long tons from 287 down to 58 to 78. I raise this because all this debate was part of the public domain in 1975. But the government said no, no, we don't think that's necessary; the engineering has already gone far enough, therefore it's not necessary to have the best practical technology.

But this very federal-provincial report suggests, Mr. Speaker, that it would be possible to employ technology that would substantially reduce the emission of sulphur dioxide, and that it would be done at a reasonable price. I think that's an important issue to raise. If the minister could demonstrate to me that had we insisted in 1975 that the best possible technology would be employed and would cost the equivalent of \$10 a barrel, no member would say go ahead. But that's not what it says, Mr. Speaker. It says 23 cents per barrel. That is a rather different figure. When one goes beyond that and we look at the Federal-Provincial Air/Atmospheric Committee report, the background information. . . Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how my office came upon this — perhaps a slip-up somewhere in the minister's department. Nevertheless it came with this federal-provincial report, and I found it particularly interesting. I'm going to table it as well. This document says:

Although Alberta Environment has firmly maintained that the 287 [long tons] sulphur dioxide emission requirements contained in the 1973 permit to construct reflects the best practicable control technology at the time the Syncrude engineering design was completed . . .

It goes on and makes this point:

. . . it is apparent that the decision was a political, rather than a purely technical one.

Mr. Speaker, that's something that concerns many of us. [interjections] Now the minister says, oh, somebody gets a little upset. Well the fact of the matter is that if the hon. member would just think back to the reason for the Environment Conservation Authority in the first place, one of the most important reasons for its widespread public support was that the ECA would not be beholden to the political level. But here we have a document, Mr. Speaker, that quite frankly says the decision was a political rather than a purely technical one.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, political issues rise and fall. Public concern about the environment in the late '70s was not as strong as it was in the late '60s, but I suspect that like all other issues that come and go, there will be a time when once again environmental concern is one of the most keenly felt public questions. But if we're going to have protection of the environment, we can't have protection on the basis of a political Gallup poll of a weather vane — if the wind is blowing in the direction of protecting the environment we're in favour of doing it, but if the wind is not blowing in that direction, we let things slide a bit.

Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what happened in northern Ontario. Because there wasn't a commitment to environmental protection when there should have been, we now find that large areas of a very beautiful part of this country in terms of fishing, the quality of the lakes — their water has been seriously jeopardized. Let's not allow that to happen in Alberta.

This background paper goes on to point out in paragraph six that the Deputy Minister of Alberta Environment has stated:

. . . that additional environmental impact assessment studies will not be referred to [this joint federal committee] for review and comment because of the

difficulties — both technical and political — experienced with the Syncrude review.

Then it says:

Alberta Environment will, however, ensure that federal statutory requirements are adhered to.

And the "but" is this: because of both the technical and the political experience with the Syncrude review.

Mr. Speaker, there are certainly going to be other political implications of it. Of course one is the possibility of acid rain not only in our part of Canada but next door in Saskatchewan. We have the recent study by the Saskatchewan Research Council, that has demonstrated that the long-term transfer of air pollutants from the oil sands development is already resulting in acid loading of ecosystems near La Loche, Saskatchewan, some 150 kilometres east of Fort McMurray. Though the levels of sulphur disposition were generally at or near background levels, there were several recorded instances of high pollution episodes which seem to be traceable to man-made sources.

Mr. Speaker, I realize — and the minister will point out — that a committee of the two provinces is now working on this matter. But I raise this issue because we should have insisted, when Syncrude was constructed, that the very best possible technology be employed. The minister stood in the House the other day and said, well, we're not going to do that because it would be unfair and costly. Of course it's going to be unfair and costly. But the question is: what about fairness to the people who have lived in the area? What about the health costs and environmental costs down the road? Certainly I believe the minister when he says we're going to insist that future plants have much tougher environmental regulations. But the issue is: what are we going to do about this particular question?

In the memo the minister sent me — and I appreciate the fact he sent it — we've had excessive emissions in violation of the regulations on 49 occasions. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that's only two days out of the last two years, so there's no major problem. Well if you go back to some of the concerns expressed in this federal-provincial task force report, they don't seem to think that's correct. They seem to think that because of the climate conditions and the ecosystems in the area, we have to be extra careful in this kind of statement that it's only 2.3 days, or whatever it was, out of the last two years. That's a little more serious than the minister would like to lead members of this Assembly to believe.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of consistent application of the law. We don't say we're not going to prosecute somebody because they've only broken the law two days in the last two years. If we have reasonable evidence to prosecute, we prosecute, because everybody should be equal before the law. That's our system, or it should be our system. In this particular instance we say, oh well, certainly it's against the regulations, on 49 occasions the regulations have been breached, but we're not going to prosecute.

Mr. Speaker, I say quite frankly to the minister that it's time we forced Syncrude to clean up its act. If we were talking about costing thousands of jobs in the area, perhaps it would be a different matter. But the information I've been given is that the best possible technology could be employed; that while one of the lines would be shut down, there are enough other types of work that there would not have to be any displacement of jobs as a consequence of employing the best possible technology. I'm sure the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest,

who's now sitting on the board of Syncrude, would welcome an opportunity to enter this debate to tell us what he's been doing on the board to insist that the best possible technology be employed.

Mr. Speaker, throughout these documents one thing comes through very clearly: unless we had been prepared in 1975 to insist that Syncrude employ this technology, there was never any chance of the company complying with the regulations, because of the conditions in the area. So here you have The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act, that we are quite properly proud of, and regulations thereunder that assure people we're protecting the environment. Yet there was never any question that the company could operate within those requirements, because we allowed them an escape hatch when they built the plant, which made it impossible not to breach the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I know the former Minister of Environment advised this House on a number of occasions that he preferred to work with the people who had breached the regulations — a sort of John Howard approach to corporations. That's very nice. But the fact of the matter is that we've now had this sort of gentle hand for five years, since Mr. Yurko left the department, and we still haven't got the technology changed. And when I raised this matter in the House, it was obvious to me in looking over the answers of the hon. Minister of Environment that the minister has not had an opportunity to sit down with this errant corporation to try to get them to mend their ways and work with them.

Mr. Speaker, that's why it's important, if we're really serious about protecting the environment, that a resolution like this be passed. It's one thing to talk incessantly about all the things we're doing to protect the environment. But when you look at the reality, you find it's a rather different story. When it comes to the Environment Conservation Authority, you find we have emasculated that authority. When it comes to legislation, you find that we put legislation in place but haven't forced major polluters to live up to the regulations contained under that legislation or even the licence they have to operate.

Mr. Speaker, that leads me to the inescapable conclusion that this government is not as serious about the environment as it should be; that we have to reassert the importance of protecting the environment, especially with the dreams many people have about economic development, expansion, and diversification, all of which have environmental implications of enormous consequence. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the Assembly, that at this particular juncture we are not doing enough. The government's record is not a strong one; it must be improved.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order for clarification, if I may. On the issue of consistency, the past speaker spoke in the House about the tremendous thrust to industrialization as it affects environment, whereas just outside the House he said we're in an economic swamp. I wonder if he could clarify that.

DR. BUCK: You don't know what he said outside the House, Hugh. You know the parliamentary rules.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, there isn't a point of order; there's a question.

MR. NOTLEY: I thought the hon. member said we were in an economic swamp.

AN HON. MEMBER: Slump.

MR. NOTLEY: No, I don't recall saying we were in an economic slump.

AN HON. MEMBER: Swamp.

MR. NOTLEY: We're in an economic swamp? I don't recall saying we're in an economic swamp, hon. member. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The time allotted for this designated motion expires at half past 4, of course.

MR. WOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You don't give me much choice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion proposed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I do so, firstly, on behalf of my constituents in Sherwood Park and, secondly, because of a deep personal commitment to the protection of the environment in which I live.

At first glance the motion would appear to be a model of simplicity, and thus unfortunately perhaps does not convey the total complexity of the tremendous task we face today in terms of environmental protection.

The hon. members who have spoken before me have in their own ways more than adequately made their points. But I'm not so sure we can realistically deal with environmental protection on a province by province basis. I say that in consideration of the fact that air pollution, acid rain, the transport of hazardous chemicals and waste materials, and nuclear fall-out have no appreciation for borders or boundaries. I'm convinced that the problems we face today are global. None the less the motion by the hon. Member for Clover Bar will serve as a focus for public concern and, I'm certain, a focus for debate in the Assembly today.

Perhaps it would be useful to review a few things we learned in school, although it may have been many years ago. The world in which we live contains life-support systems so ingenious that they are self-renewing. They are so massive that they can meet the needs of billions of people, animals, insects, plants, and creatures of the seas. For hundreds of years we have taken these life-support systems for granted. In fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'd suggest that we shouldn't stop the member in mid-sentence. Perhaps he could just . . .

MR. WOO: I was going to say . . . Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, in fact I'll sit down.

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

CLERK ASSISTANT: Bill 211, The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act. Mr. Notley.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf . . . I'm sorry.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to move that that Bill stand and retain its place on the Order Paper at the request of the hon. member. Perhaps that was what the acting Leader of the Opposition was proposing to do. Whatever procedure is appropriate.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we should hear what the wishes of the hon. member are, through the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Government House Leader.

On behalf of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the Assembly to have Bill No. 211 retain its place on the Order Paper in light of the fact that the hon. member had to be unavoidably absent.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Bill 201
An Act to Amend
The Individual's Rights Protection Act

[Adjourned debate March 27: Dr. Reid]

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think it's some seven months since I adjourned debate on Bill 201, a Bill to amend The Individual's Rights Protection Act that was introduced so eloquently by the hon. Member for Little Bow earlier this year.

At the time of second reading, the hon. member spoke of the concept of voluntary affirmative action and a mechanism for permitting this. In debating the motion, I remember discussing the primacy of The Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act, the two flagship pieces of legislation of this government, being Bills 1 and 2, following the election of the Premier and his first government.

It's interesting to note the primacy given to those pieces of legislation by this Legislature. And for all the eloquence and bombast of the federal government, the Ottawa government does not share that feeling of primacy for rights legislation. In their unfortunate and, I hope, unsuccessful proposals for constitutional change, they want to entrench certain rights in that constitution. But they are very, very careful not to give primacy to those rights, Mr. Speaker. It's a typical reaction of the Ottawa government. There is much more show than substance to their prattling.

This spring I reviewed briefly the different forms of discrimination and prejudice, direct and indirect, and the non-finite nature of the problem that all rights legislation has to address. The hon. member introduced and we debated a specific concept of voluntary affirmative action. Subsequent to the debate, the hon. Minister of Labour introduced The Individual's Rights Protection Amendment Act, 1980, which introduced several amendments to our Act. I'm going to limit my remarks this afternoon to the area of affirmative action as it's called, and the changes introduced at that time.

One of the great difficulties of affirmative action is to define what the term means and to avoid, in trying to correct the problems affirmative action is supposed to address, producing what is also a rather difficult term to define, "reverse discrimination". When we discuss these concepts and try to do something, we are saying that a particular social situation is serious enough that it justifies action which might be outside the range of equality of treatment of individuals that is the central concept of The Individual's Rights Protection Act. Things go astray if the corrective action is carried to the extent that it impinges upon the rights of another individual, while correcting the problems for the individual we are address-

ing. Reverse discrimination occurs when you get into contractual compliance regulations, when you apply quotas of employment of various minority groups and that type of situation. Speaking medically, we refer to it as the cure being worse than the disease. Other jurisdictions have found just how easy it is to prescribe a cure and produce worse diseases than the one that was to be corrected.

What we need is the capability to have programs that are varied and different enough to allow for the differences that exist between people as individuals and as groups, and that do not reach the stage of reverse discrimination. On the surface, it may seem easy to try to devise a set of rules, rights, and legislation that will cover the problems. But when one looks at the variation in the problems, it's almost impossible to write such legislation. For that reason you have to have enough flexibility within the Act as it's written to allow for such variation to occur. It's a very difficult balancing act to decide what is a specific program for an individual or a group, yet not go over the boundary to reverse discrimination. For that reason the responsibility for making such decisions and for prescribing such cures has to rest essentially with elected representatives of the people and not with the faceless bureaucrat.

To my mind the legislation introduced by the hon. Minister of Labour addressed the problem in a very satisfactory way. Being long-winded, I note I am now approaching my 20 minute limit. I will therefore leave other members to discuss the effects of the legislation as it was introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the time limit for the hon. member is 30 minutes.

DR. REID: I can continue a little longer.

MRS. FYFE: You've only spoken for nine.

DR. REID: I've spoken for nine.

The feeling I have, Mr. Speaker, is that legislation such as this, while it has been very successful in other countries, has been successful in those jurisdictions because of the flexibility built into the legislation. In a society such as Alberta has at this time, we have so many rapidly changing situations that to try to have rigid legislation, as I said, is impossible. It will produce worse diseases than it is supposedly correcting. I think the legislation, as introduced in May of this year and addressed so eloquently and capably by the minister at the time of introduction and recorded in *Hansard*, has fulfilled the requirements of the present society of Alberta. It has been proclaimed. Some action has been taken under it already. Under those circumstances, I feel that we do not need any further legislation such as that posed by the hon. Member for Little Bow. Therefore, I would like to listen to the opinions of other members of the Legislature on this particular subject.

Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the discussion on Bill 201. I share in the remarks of my colleague the Member for Edson, because the impact of the proposed Bill is no longer as significant as it was seven months ago, with the introduction and proclamation of the amendments to The Individual's Rights Protection Act on September 1, 1980, our 75th anniversary. We are now no longer debating whether or not we should

have affirmative action, but how we can have effective participation and equal opportunity, as in fact the legislation provided for in the first instance.

In presenting his Bill in March, the Member for Little Bow made reference to a newspaper statement that had been attributed to me in my capacity as Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. He referred to the fact that the newspaper quoted me as saying I wasn't sure whether our programs were legal. This gives me the first opportunity to indicate to members that that statement was inaccurate, and was perhaps the reporter's impression.

Effective participation is a program that provides opportunities for everyone to realize their potential. It's a program that all employers and all of us as individuals should follow to ensure that we remove the barriers that prevent achievement of potential.

I'd like to spend a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, on the problem of systemic barriers. I would indicate, too, that I did have some concerns that some of the efforts employers and individuals might wish to take in this area might in fact be challenged. So I was happy to be a participant in the House in the passage of our amendments this spring.

You might remember that earlier this year reference was made and a submission was made to the Alberta Human Rights Commission regarding an advertisement in *The Calgary Herald*. I'd like to take us back to that, because that kind of advertisement is part of our problem. It's the problem of attitude and perception. The ad simply said, "Is your husband a carpenter? And a good one." I think quite rightly it was brought up in the Legislative Assembly at the time, and an individual did submit an official complaint to the Alberta Human Rights Commission. Subsequently, in fact, the newspaper apologized. As I indicated to the Assembly at that time, I offered our apology, as did the minister, for the employer, because it is our policy to advertise all positions in the government of Alberta in such a format that anyone may apply. All candidates are given equal consideration. The reason I bring this up again — it has been dealt with — is that recently, as an individual, I read an advertisement by a private firm in one of our major newspapers, with this kind of attitude expressed in it:

[Now it's time to] jog along the jogging trail
Through the green parkland, past the racquet club,
and around your distinctive new offices. Hey, see the
girls in the secretarial pool waving as you run by!

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is that?

MR. STEVENS: It's attitude. I wrote to Commissioner Marlene Antonio of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, who is, on behalf of the commission, co-chairman of a committee to review attitudes and systemic barriers, and said, isn't it discouraging, for the writer of this advertisement to assume that it will be the men who are jogging the trail through the parkland past the racquet club and waving at the girls in the secretarial pool. Attitude is the real problem. Commissioner Antonio agreed, and phoned the manager of that company and discussed the implications and the attitudes that type of advertising expresses. He saw it that way too, and that ad has not reappeared. I don't think you can write into the legislation law that will prevent or change attitudes. We have to do that through example and encouragement.

I can share with you another recent one that came to my attention as a father. My son received an example of

an advertisement for a career as a policeman in the city of Calgary. This career brochure spent a page describing what the police man does, how 'he' must be this, how 'he' must have this qualification, and how 'he' must do that. I wrote to the former chairman of the Calgary public school board and pointed out my concern as a parent and a citizen, that that type of program, of advertisement, of appeal to our young people isn't acceptable anymore. I was surprised at the reaction. I believe the board is looking at all their recruitment portraits so they can make sure this type of discrimination or barrier is removed.

In the remarks the Member for Little Bow gave when he presented his Bill at first reading he said, "I don't agree with the concept of quotas, which foster the belief that a person has a job . . ." only because of their particular disadvantaged membership or participation in a group. I share that very much.

You may recall that I received the approval of the Legislature, on behalf of our Personnel Administration Office, to obtain funds to employ staff within our office to review current employment policies and extend recruitment areas so that we do not inhibit potential native employees in any way. I indicated at that time that it was our hope to provide equal employment opportunities. How do we do that? We have a number of positions established now, and we are recruiting for those positions. As a first step, it's our endeavor to ensure that we have recruitment and selection procedures for specific positions which may serve a predominantly native population or be located in a geographic area which has a predominantly native population, and which throughout Alberta ensure that there are no unnecessary requirements in the job description that may eliminate natives or any other person from applying for that position.

Now we're also evaluating how we will advertise beyond our regular advertising channels. We will advertise using the native people newspapers and other means: posting bulletins in the communities, or mailing job bulletins to individuals through Native Outreach and similar organizations. Through awareness programs, we're going to try to ensure that we don't screen out anyone and that anyone who meets the interview standards, or the recruitment standards, will be interviewed.

There are a number of other programs we are developing, and have developed, and I'd like to share some of those with you. Perhaps members are aware that for the past five years we've had a special placement program in the government of Alberta, which is aimed at employing handicapped individuals. As a matter of fact, we are one of the few provinces in Canada which have that kind of program, and the only level of government in this province which places handicapped persons within our service. We have a program that reaches out to employers and to individuals. We provide time, patience, encouragement and, hopefully, understanding. We have a number of newsletters. We've been very successful in our approaches.

Mr. Speaker, since 1977 we also have had a special unit in our personnel administration office called the personnel planning and career development unit. That unit was created to ensure that all groups of Albertans, all groups of individuals, have the same opportunities for employment or career advancement. We've got a program that is designed to advance women's awareness and access to career development opportunities in the Alberta public service. The program is also aimed at helping managers meet their responsibilities to develop and utilize human resources, and helps men and women to better under-

stand and adapt to the changing roles and the pressures demanded of all the Alberta public service.

I want to share with you a remark that was given to me when I met recently with a number of individuals who represented various organizations in Alberta. They were the Alberta Status of Women Action Committee, the Council of Women, Native Outreach, and a number of other organizations. One of the ladies present said: you don't consider voluntary work when you seek a candidate for a position; you don't look at my background and take into account what I may have done working as a volunteer. I said to her and the ladies present, and say to all members here today: yes, we do, but it's important that you identify how that volunteer effort, how that work you have given your community — or that support, your participation — relates to the job. So I said to them, whether you are a member of the chamber of commerce of Banff or a member of the ladies auxiliary hospital for Canmore, put down what you did, or are doing, when you were carrying out or are carrying out those duties. It's not just enough to identify the participation. What is the role, and how did you carry it out? We do in fact take that into consideration in the Alberta government.

We have a number of special training programs that try to get at barriers. There is a calendar out called Staff Development 1980-81, and there are a number of activities that we regularly carry out. For example, during the last year we had three programs which were tailored specifically to meet the needs of the career development of female employees. Over 1,000 women participated in this program between September 1979 and June 1980. This year two of those programs, career development for women and secretarial professionalism, have seen an increase in enrolment of over 100 per cent. I am very pleased that's happening in Alberta, and very grateful for the work of our staff. I am particularly pleased that our female employees are taking the opportunity to attend these programs.

We also have a series of special management awareness sessions. I go back again to attitude. How does biased thinking or discriminatory attitude affect a woman's career mobility? If we have a program that we are going to place in Banff, Lethbridge, or Jasper, will it in fact be available to those candidates who wish to utilize it? We may find that women are unable to attend, because women generally have been in a difficult position in the career world if they are also in the family world. Traditionally, men have been freer to attend those courses. So we are moving the courses around the province.

We have also developed a number of pamphlets and programs that assist our personnel officers. I don't know if members have seen one of them. It has been circulated. It's simply entitled Does it Matter What You Ask? And it does matter what you ask. The basic purpose of this pamphlet is not only to help our personnel officers but to help each supervisor, each recruiter who may be sitting on a panel and interviewing prospective candidates. The main point of this program is to ensure that the questions asked are asked of all candidates, are job-related questions, and are not related to value judgments about the person's sex, race, age, or marital status.

Commissioner Antonio, of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, recently wrote me a letter about the staff development program. In her letter she said: let us consider a recently divorced woman — we'll call her Alice — who has the responsibility of raising two children. She's employed in a small community as a clerk, or typist, but she now knows her present salary will never support that

family. Alice wants to improve herself, perhaps to obtain a supervisory rank, and she wonders what courses we have.

I wrote back to Commissioner Antonio that we have many programs designed to meet the needs of Alice, and Harry. And a number of these courses do not have prerequisites. In other words, you don't have to have a special background to take them; such courses, for example, as effective public speaking. Many candidates are not aware of how to present themselves at job interviews. They're not aware of how to present their histories. They're not familiar with that. So we have programs on how to present yourself at a job interview. We have programs that teach interpersonal skills, how to communicate. In the management development program, I can tell you that 86 per cent of the participants are women. I am very pleased at that statistic. For all our management development programs — and there are a number of them — 44 per cent are now women. In the very top advanced managerial program, the average attendance has now climbed to 30 per cent. So it is happening, and it's happening because we have effective participation programs, and throughout Alberta we want to encourage voluntary — the carrot approach rather than the quota approach.

We also have programs that say: you can't take the time to attend this during the work day; your services may be very specialized and you want to take a course in another program? We have programs that allow you to take advantage of university, college, or private institutional course training at your time, at the employee's time, and it may subsidize up to 100 per cent of the cost, depending on whether the course is related to the job. But in all cases we want to enhance the skill and the knowledge of the participant, so that that participant can achieve his or her career goals.

Promotion within our service is based on merit; that is, a combination of experience, education, training, and personal suitability for the job. However, through our awareness programs and our training of personnel officers and recruitment specialists, we have taken steps to ensure that candidates whose experience may not be satisfactory will still be considered on the basis of their other qualifications.

I would very much appreciate hearing from members if they are aware of any systemic barriers, or if systemic discrimination is brought to their attention by their constituents because, through the kinds of processes I've outlined, we are doing our very best in Alberta to eliminate that type of barrier. I believe we have made great strides in the last 10 years.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I follow the hon. minister. In listening very carefully to his remarks, I find he's obviously very sensitive and in tune with the things happening out in the other world, even outside the parameters of government employment, in terms of the systems, what has been formally described as systemic discrimination barriers that may have been in place and that we are now becoming conscious of. People in a position to be able to rectify that, when they are obviously as sensitive to it as the minister has shown — I think all of us can take heart in the changes that will come as a result of it.

Mr. Speaker, since the hon. Member for Little Bow introduced the Bill last March, many things have happened. Of course we know there has been a major change in legislation and that, as the hon. minister mentioned,

the legislation has been proclaimed. Besides that, something I have certainly been very interested in is that the Human Rights Commission has now developed regulations under the Act. We had not done this before. The ability was there. I think we were so busy scrambling to get on top of and cope with what we perceived to be many problems in the province in the fast-moving scene that we hadn't addressed ourselves to the ability of using regulations, and in fact possibly the overall enhancement it would give to the way the commission was operating. I suppose because there wasn't a certain prescribed procedure out there in the public, the public perception was that complaints weren't handled the same in each case. Depending on the officers involved, some people felt that, through our officers, we were acting improperly. I certainly hope people will avail themselves of the opportunity to view these regulations, because my cursory look at them makes me believe that they have indeed evolved an excellent document. With this comprehensive way of handling complaints each person, both complainant and respondent, will feel they've indeed been treated properly and fairly.

The commission is also undertaking something else very important; that is, the development of policy, criteria, and setting of standards, if you will, to be used in the procedures that will look at so-called affirmative action. I think this is most important. The commission are the people on the forefront. They're the first line out there in the public and should be in a position to be very well acquainted with the situation, with the kind of discrimination brought forward, and indeed with what they would perceive to be inequities, particularly in our employment situation in this province. I think most of us look at affirmative action from the point of view of employment. It's also very interesting in that one of the first things the commission has done is make sure that, in adding the protected category of the physically handicapped or disabled, we do have programs out there. I think there was some concern that those programs would be in some sort of danger because they now might be contrary to the Act. There has been a so-called 'grandfathering' of those programs, so that the physically disabled who were under special programs will continue to be under those programs.

The other interesting evolution I see in the whole human rights field is the way affirmative action, or all the other names it is given, is now being viewed. For instance, one of the so-called eminent people in the field in this country, Walter Tarnapolsky, before we changed our legislation said that in fact our legislation did permit affirmative action. But there was a lot of question about that, and it was very obvious from the nervousness of the people who wanted to assist in that regard and to evolve programs that we should indeed clarify that. I believe we certainly have through that legislation. Mr. Tarnapolsky has said that in most so-called affirmative action there needs to be no reflection in an Act of any kind of an ability to have that so-called affirmative action, because what's really happening is that you're remedying an existing situation. That's what human rights is all about. He has a very interesting way of looking at it, but for all those people involved, it was most important that we clarify that. As I said before, I think we've done that quite well. Hopefully that will be proven over the course of time.

Of course the federal government addresses the whole nature of the issue in a way that tends to categorize everybody in groups. I find that somewhat objectionable.

In looking at Bill 201, I think probably the hon. Member for Little Bow has fallen into the same sort of trap, in that we have discussed people in terms of groups instead of individuals. If we look at what's happened to the federal government, for instance, when they were looking at the major programs and projects going ahead in this province that would be under federal jurisdiction, they first issued some statements saying that, first of all, they would guarantee native employment. Then the women across the country, those people close to the project, said, but what about us? So the feds went a little bit further and said, we'd better make sure affirmative action programs in these major projects include women. Then the handicapped came forward and said, what about us?

I think it tells you that we're all individuals. There are individuals in this province who I think you would say are disadvantaged. I believe all of us in this Legislature would feel those disadvantaged people need, where it can be done, programs that would assist them, especially when there's a major employment opportunity in their area. I would hope the federal government would come to that realization and no longer fragment people in this society the way they have been, by putting them into so-called groups.

That leads you to ask, what kind of society do we want? What policies should be in place? Indeed, Bills 1 and 2 speak to that. But in light of the very, very fast evolution in the human rights field — and I guess you could say that's happened in a lot of other fields, particularly in this province — I believe we must be very, very careful in making any major changes to legislation. In looking at a situation that has always been so, there are many we could refer to today that I believe discrimination takes place in. But we haven't discussed it or, I suppose, looked at it in a firm way in terms of saying, well, first of all, do we believe there's discrimination; secondly, do we believe we can get away from that discrimination, and do we want to get away from that discrimination? If we believe in that major principle instead of saying, it has always been this way, we can't do anything about it — either business, industry, or programs that have been in place. Those same people in particular industries have said it's going to be very difficult, it's going to be very hard on us, we can't make changes. I think we have to scrutinize that very closely, because that same attitude was in place in 1973 when I was appointed to the Human Rights Commission as a charter member. I would remind hon. members that many, many things have happened since that time. The phone calls I get now are very rare compared to the ones that used to be — even on the farm.

I know that historically people have classified some jobs as purely physical, only done by men. That doesn't happen now. I am involved with a program, an international agricultural exchange, in which a great, great percentage of the participants are females. Seven or eight years ago farmers were saying it was absolutely impossible; a girl could never do that job. Unfortunately it wasn't because they wanted to; it was because they were faced with the situation that they couldn't get qualified help. These people came from other countries. Partially qualified, they came to learn from us. They came in different sizes, weights, colors, creeds, and everything else. To the amazement of the farmers, it didn't matter whether we were talking about a five foot two gal — in some cases guy. They knew how to do the job, and they wanted to do the job. If you're that size, you find a way to do the job. If you're living in a household where everybody else is

over 6 feet tall, I can assure you that you have to find a way to cope.

I guess I'm saying that the examples you can use, in terms of the thinking of about seven or eight years ago, in some cases are still out there today. There are those people who say it's impossible to make changes because our industry can't afford it. I'm hoping that hon. members here, when faced with those kinds of decisions, will look carefully at what kind of province they want, what kind of principles they adhere to, and try very hard to find a way to give weight to those principles. Because certainly I think we are to a situation now where we no longer look at groups. Hopefully we look at the systems that are in place and say, are they there because it's in the best interests of business? If there is a necessity for the best interests of business, I think we would all agree that sometimes there have to be exceptions. But let's examine our systems to make sure they don't discriminate, to make sure they're valid to the nature of the business, and make sure we look at all people as individuals and don't categorize them as groups.

MR. WOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been some months since this Bill came up for debate, and I've had a brief opportunity to review some of the remarks by members who spoke. It is clear in my mind that many conflicts exist in terms of some of the responses and statements made by hon. members in this House. In my view this reflects possibly the inability of legislators to come to a clear definition of what constitutes an affirmative action program.

I would also be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I let go unchallenged a number of statements with respect to affirmative action programs, the attitudes and the operations within this province and within the context of legislation we already have in place. I'm concerned in that there appears to be a cavalier attitude that reflects a casual non-comprehension of the concerns of people, industry, and government and, in particular, the aspirations of recipients of so-called affirmative action programs. It is very easy for us to sit here and to suggest, create, and establish programs. But before we can do that, I think there's a need to ask what we really mean when we talk of affirmative action programs. Can we develop such programs in legislation and in isolation without considering the elements of discrimination, prejudice, educational deprivation, economic disparities, and the lack of access to life's opportunities? It is very easy for us to speak of affirmative action programs, but at the same time I would ask: from what position do we view the objectives of such program content? Is it from the point of view of government, industry, or professionals, and indeed are we placing too much trust, confidence, and dependency on the constructure of these programs that we take for granted should know everything?

I have no difficulty with the intent of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I commend the hon. Member for Little Bow for bringing it forward. I might even agree to the extent that what he proposes can be construed as an extension of The Human Rights Act and The Individual's Rights Protection Act. But I say, let us not rush into it. From personal experience I know that we as minority and ethnic groups have made necessary adjustments in order to seek equal opportunities within this society. We have done this, Mr. Speaker, without benefit of Bills, human rights legislation and, in fact, legislation of any kind whatsoever. We have succeeded in doing it, and I'm proud of it. I'm prepared to see that that system will not

be destroyed only to be replaced by a program that is non-functional and in fact produces negative results and, worse yet, creates new and greater problems.

In our haste to provide something which we perceive to be good, let us not create something for the sake of creation itself. I am concerned that this process will become convoluted, that it will dilute the context of programs, and that it will diminish objectives by building too much into programs in an attempt to accommodate all the concerns that may arise.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should not be so naive to think that such a complex situation can be legislated in such a way that all our problems will simply disappear overnight. We are really talking about a number of preconditions, which must be addressed before or concurrently with program design in order that we assist people to reach their goals. There has to be determination of where the deficiencies exist in our society — those deficiencies which give rise to being disadvantaged, the deficiencies which create the prohibitions which prevent minority groups from achieving social status, the inhibitions which cause dislocation and loss of community by individuals. So-called affirmative action programs would appear to be directed toward singular objectives, with a view that all participants are cast from the same mould, are at equal stages in life.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: why start at this point? We are taking a number of things for granted. The problem itself evolved at different times and at different stages, and here we propose to develop a program that will address itself to and accommodate all these variances and differences.

I would like to give you a very simple example, Mr. Speaker. In effect, it is a form of discrimination being practised, and relates to a segment of society I have great interest in. That particular element is the youth of our country and our province. We have a situation where a young man approaches an employer with hopes of obtaining a job, and the first question he is asked is, have you any experience? The answer is no. That really says to me: no experience, no job; no job, no experience. I wonder about the principles that would be required to be incorporated in a Bill of this nature that will address itself to a problem like that. Is it in fact central to the problem we are talking about when we speak of affirmative action programs?

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations. I am not so sure in my own mind whether we as a society are attempting to right a wrong because of a guilt complex, or to right a legitimate wrong. How far do we go to carry a past debt into the future? Are we in fact creating another form of crutch mechanism that I, as a minority group, can fall upon in case I can't make it the way I expect everybody else to make it?

What is the reaction when I talk to people of minority groups about this subject? It is not so much, Mr. Speaker, what they perceive as being an affirmative action program as what we perceive it to be here in this Assembly. More often than not, they view programs of this nature from an economic, a social, and a political standpoint. These are programs perceived by minority groups as satisfying some very specific requirements.

I spoke in support of the amendments proposed by the hon. Minister of Labour with respect to the first and second amendments to The Individual's Rights Protec-

tion Act. I am proud of those particular amendments because they dealt with the handicapped, a segment of society that I think basically requires our general support. But at the same time, I wonder if we are only paying lip service to a number of issues that confront us, and ducking the greater issue.

If it is for this government to strike out where no other government has gone, then I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of this Assembly, let us leave a trail for better things to happen. Let us develop an atmosphere that will encourage better things to happen. Let us not produce legislation that will create results that require the added impact of enforcement to make them work. This doesn't help people in minority groups. All it basically does is create an adverse reaction and backlash on the part of the greater society of which we are part.

In speaking to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I recall a number of so-called affirmative action programs that I had opportunity to view in the United States of America. They included the Bedford/Stuyvesant restoration program, which is being conducted in the disadvantaged areas of the city of New York. They included examination of the developmental processes that were taking place in third world countries, where in the past a majority of the actual citizens of those countries were ruled by minority groups who came in as immigrants. We looked at the opportunities industrialization company concept in the city of Philadelphia, where those specific programs are directed to the Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and black Americans. We had an opportunity to examine the Thiokol chemical demonstration project conducted on the Navajo reservation in New Mexico. We had an opportunity to examine within these major programs new directions and new initiatives that looked at the question of minority education programs which assisted people basically to gain those skills and the knowledge to appreciate where they are at in terms of how they fit into society in such a way that provided them the opportunities to progress further and seek equal status within a larger society.

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether in this province we have the ability to move forward in terms of establishing such programs. I am not satisfied that we have had a consultative process with the people who will be directly involved or affected by such programs before we sit here and make a determination and say, this is the direction we will go. I would suggest that perhaps we should undertake that process.

In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the House sit this evening. By way of government business tomorrow, Motion 19 on the Order Paper by the hon. Provincial Treasurer will be dealt with as government business, as indicated by the Government House Leader yesterday afternoon.

[At 5:25 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]