

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Wednesday, November 5, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, His Excellency Ambassador Francesco Paolo Fulci and his wife. His Excellency is here on his first visit to Alberta since recently presenting his credentials as Italy's ambassador to Canada. He's accompanied by Consul General Gianfranco Verderame and Consul Peter Caffaro and Mrs. Caffaro.

*In nome del popolo della provincia dell'Alberta, nostro Presidente del Assemblea, Amerongen; nostro Primo Ministro della provincia, Peter Lougheed; e tutti gli onorevoli membri di questa Assemblea, vorrei dare un benvenuto a Sua Eccellenza Ambasciatore Francesco Paolo Fulci e L'Ambasciatrice, il Console Generale Gianfranco Verderame, ed il Console Onorario Peter Caffaro e Signora Caffaro a questa Assemblea. Spero che questa visita a della Sua Eccellenza confermerà a lui la grande contribuzione fatta dai nostri Italo-Canadesi allo sviluppo sia nella nostra provincia dell'Alberta, sia nel Canada, e sono sicuro che le sue osservazione e discorsi nella nostra provincia darà più incoraggiamento ai nostri sforzi corone sia nel campo culturale o nel campo commerciale. A Sua Eccellenza e L'Ambasciatrice i nostri più graditi saluti ed auguri migliori per loro soggiorno nel'Alberta e nel Canada.*

[as submitted]

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished guests are in your gallery. I would ask them to rise to receive the recognition of the Assembly.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY  
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table today the report of the Select Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. In doing so, I'd like to express my appreciation to the members of the committee from both sides of this House for their conscientious work and efforts during the deliberations of our committee and in the preparation of this report.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 239**  
**The Environment Protection**  
**Authority Act**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to

introduce Bill 239, The Environment Protection Authority Act.

Mr. Speaker, a clean healthy environment is the most important thing we can leave for future generations. The purpose of the Bill is to take advice on the consideration of environmental matters a step away from politics.

[Leave granted; Bill 239 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the Alberta Law Foundation annual report for the year ended March 31, 1980, as required by The Legal Profession Act.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table with the Assembly a copy of a report entitled Thinking About the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, commissioned by the office of the Official Opposition.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, two groups of students from my constituency of Edmonton Centre. The first group of 10 students is from the Edmonton Public School Board continuing education program. They are seated in the members gallery, accompanied by their group leader Mr. Scragg. Also, seated in the public gallery are 17 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre, along with their instructor Sally Thompson. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that these two groups of students rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure once again in introducing a number of students from the Alberta School for the Deaf, in the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. I'm always particularly pleased to see these students here and to have the opportunity of welcoming them to see the proceedings of the Legislature. I would ask that all hon. members give them the customary welcome if they rise now.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 25 young adults attending Memorial Composite high school in Stony Plain, located in the Stony Plain constituency. They're in the public gallery, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Martyn. I would ask the group to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 31 students from the Lousana Consolidated school in the beautiful constituency of Innisfail. They are accompanied by their teachers Elizabeth Leach and Elaine Ainge, and their bus driver Marilyn Greenwood.

Also visiting the Assembly today for the first time are Victor and Gloria Duffin from Lousana. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly,

Professor Belden Daniels and Mr. Michael Swack from the Counsel for Community Development in Cambridge, Massachusetts. They are the individuals who have done the research work that I tabled for members of the Assembly. They're seated in your gallery, sir, and I'd like them to rise and receive the recognition of members of the Assembly.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Interns' and Residents' Dispute

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It concerns the present tension among interns and residents at the hospitals in Alberta, primarily the University Hospital in Edmonton and the Foothills Hospital in Calgary. I'd like to ask the minister what the present state of discussions or negotiations is, having regard for the fact that concerns have been expressed by those individuals involved of the possibility that a work-to-rule campaign would be in effect this evening if steps are not taken.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the advice I had on that matter just prior to coming into the House was that discussions are still under way between the Alberta Hospital Association and the interns and residents association. They have been in a more accelerated way since Monday. They are still continuing.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. With discussions now going on in a speeded-up fashion, if I could use that terminology — I took that from the minister's comments — can the minister give some assurance to the Assembly that a work-to-rule campaign will not be started this evening either at the University Hospital or the Foothills in Calgary?

MR. RUSSELL: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the minister been involved in discussions directly with the Alberta Hospital Association and the group representing the interns and residents, or has this been done by officials of the department?

MR. RUSSELL: As a department or through my office, we have not been involved as yet, Mr. Speaker. I did receive by mail a request from the legal counsel representing the interns' association asking for a meeting, but that was replaced by a meeting between the association and the Alberta Hospital Association.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the minister or the minister's office been in contact with the united nurses' association? I ask the question in light of statements from that organization that it's their intention to co-operate, if I could use the term, with the work-to-rule campaign which has been set out very clearly as a possibility, starting this evening.

MR. RUSSELL: No we haven't, Mr. Speaker, and I'm surprised to hear that. So far, this discussion or dispute has been strictly between the employing hospitals and, more latterly, the Alberta Hospital Association and the interns' and residents' association.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Having regard for the fact that my colleague asked the questions yesterday with regard to the matter put before the government's Public Service Employee Relations Board, has the government been giving some consideration to either the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or the Attorney General, who reports to the Assembly for that board, becoming directly involved in the discussions now that we are near the twelfth hour?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker. I think there is a misunderstanding of the issue here. Incidentally, the doctors' future professional association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, did make an intervention in that hearing before the board. If the hon. member is reading the news coverage on this, I think he'll recognize that the same dispute is now under way in Ontario. It revolves around the issue as to whether the interns are students or an employee group. It was that matter that was addressed by my colleague the Attorney General yesterday. But insofar as a bargaining unit or rate of pay, that's strictly between the employer and the Alberta Hospital Association.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last question to the minister. In the course of discussions between the minister and the Hospital Association, has the minister indicated to the Hospital Association that from the standpoint of working out a reasonable settlement, if a reasonable settlement can be worked out, financial restraints will not be imposed by the government? I ask the question in light of what seems to me to be the real issue; that is, the denial of the right to bargain by this particular group, who are in this situation of not yet being doctors.

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker. I must be clear that we haven't intervened in a direct way, nor have we been requested to, other than the one letter I referred to in my earlier comments.

##### Meat Packing Study

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Economic Development. It flows from the minister's announcement this morning with regard to the appointment of Dr. Horner as a consultant to the government. I'll become more deeply involved in that part of the question in just a moment.

I would like to ask the minister if he could outline the general terms of reference for Dr. Horner's appointment, and what time frame is involved. Also, could the minister give us some indication of the broader study that is being undertaken? From the announcement, I take it that the work Dr. Horner is doing is a small portion of a far broader study looking at agricultural processing in the province. Could we have some handle on the broad study, the costs and the time frame, then Dr. Horner's involvement?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to do that. I'm sure the Member for Olds-Didsbury, coming from a constituency where not only cattle but the meat packing industry is so important, shares the enthusiasm the rest of my colleagues have at the announcement of contracting the services of Dr. Horner. The importance of the agricultural secondary industry for the future of this province has long been recognized, and there has also been a recognition of the uncertainty the meat packing industry

faces in the shorter term.

To respond to the question more precisely, we felt it was time to develop a study to determine whether it was the level of cattle available for the meat packing industry or the economics of the meat packing industry, or just what part the government might play in a catalytic role to assist the industry to develop its full potential. In my view, Mr. Speaker, we were indeed fortunate to find a man who has the capacity for work and the background in transportation and agriculture, in both the private and public sector, to identify those problems and in one year bring us a report that will give us a better sense of direction for the future.

Perhaps my colleague the Minister of Agriculture would like to supplement that response.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, all members recognize the potential of this *province* in the livestock industry, in both the beef and the pork industry and, indeed, in the new interest that's being shown in the sheep industry. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, Lambco is doing exceptionally well and will continue to do so, and is there to recognize that growth factor in the sheep industry and, indeed, in the processing of lambs.

But back to the original question, Mr. Speaker. In the production of livestock in this province, recognizing that potential and recognizing the problems and obligations that would go in an increase in any part of that industry, and the far-reaching effects it has on both the land-use question and the use of our basic commodity of coarse grain, we should look to the longer view as to where this province will be going in the meat industry, in the processing, the upgrading, and of course from the producer point of view, in the 1990s. It takes a complete review of both what exists and what exists in the potential, from the provincial point of view, to bring together some of the aspects that would give us the opportunity to make some decisions for the much longer term.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either gentleman. Perhaps I didn't make a portion of my initial question clear. Would it be possible to indicate to the Assembly what time frame we're looking at for the larger, overall agricultural processing study referred to in the news release from the minister's office, and the cost of that overall comprehensive study? I'm sure it was just by accident, but neither minister indicated the cost of Dr. Horner's involvement in this one-year stint.

MR. PLANCHE: I'd be happy to answer that, Mr. Speaker. We would expect some preliminary comment about February next year and a conclusion of Dr. Horner's comments in one year. The cost of the contract will become clear when I table it, as soon as it's available for the Assembly to read. It shouldn't be misunderstood either that the conclusions of Dr. Horner's study will necessarily be the direction we'll take. That will be another area of information to help us get a sense of direction in this very important issue.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development. It's with regard to the effect on producers' returns and consumers' costs relative to beef. I wonder if there would be a section in the study with regard to retail outlets such as some of our larger — Safeway, for example, has quite a monopoly on the retail of beef at the present time in Alberta. Is that part of the study Dr. Horner will do?

MR. PLANCHE: I don't believe the parameters of the study will take him into the retail trade, although the Lucerne boxed-beef aspect of it will certainly be within that purview.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister in a position to advise when the contract with Dr. Horner will be tabled and why it wasn't tabled today, in view of the announcement, so Albertans would have some idea of the cost of the contract over the next year.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the contract took effect November 1, and it was necessary to make the announcement to clarify Dr. Horner's position. The contract should be available in two, three, or four days.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister in a position then to advise the Assembly what other elements of this major study the government plans to announce, and when?

MR. PLANCHE: The discussion about Dr. Horner revolves around his submitting a study. He will be free to access information available to him as he sees fit in order to give us an arm's length appraisal of where the industry should go. Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, it has been difficult to get that kind of information because most of the sources have a vested interest, depending on what sector of the beef and packing industry they're in. We wanted to have that clarified from an arm's length viewpoint.

MR. NOTLEY: My supplementary question for clarification really relates to the second paragraph of the minister's announcement, dealing with "a major program to evaluate the overall agricultural processing sector in Alberta". Could the minister be more specific about the evaluation and specifically what role Dr. Horner's work will have vis-a-vis the Foster committee?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, we have an ongoing assessment of the meat packing industry. Dr. Horner's study will be input to that particular study. The question always seems to be whether there is economics in the meat packing industry, and is it caused by the anomalies of transportation or by the herd levels? As I said before, those issues need to be addressed at arm's length.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture, relating to his announcement on the research facility in Leduc. I wonder if he could advise the House if the packers in this province have indicated they would wish to participate in that program, to be on stream in a while and, secondly, if Dr. Horner's study into the packing industry will somehow relate to that.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it was with the consultation of the industry that tied with the direction we as a government felt one should go in the processing industry, that the planning and announcement of the meat processing lab was made. The interest that will be shown by the meat packing industry allows those companies, and indeed some of the smaller companies involved through the Alberta abattoirs, the opportunity to upgrade the basic product they now may be providing to the consumer, or to bring forth some new products not now available. So the opportunity for the industry to make use of the meat

processing lab of course provides us with the benefits that would accrue directly to consumers in the province and for Alberta products that will be exported.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Minister of Agriculture indicate if the Foster report has been completed and presented to him?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's not complete. It will be finished and submitted to my office before the end of November.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Economic Development indicated that the two areas Dr. Horner will be concentrating on will be herd sizes and freight rate anomalies. In view of the concern expressed over the question of competition in the market place, particularly in northern Alberta, as a result of some of the mergers and closures occurring, will the mandate of Dr. Horner's study also include competition in the market place for producers in northern Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the differential in transportation existing in northern Alberta — and I believe the hon. member is discussing mainly the current one, the differential in the hog industry and getting the basic product to market — if that problem still exists or continues in another form, it would then become part of Dr. Horner's responsibility and part of the study. At present we feel that shortly we should have that opportunity to bring together the problems of getting the product to market and the differential in the actual price for the northern part of the province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either the Minister of Economic Development or the Minister of Agriculture to clarify the second paragraph of the minister's announcement today, if I could just quote a very short phrase: "Mr. Planche said that the study is to be part of a major program to evaluate the overall agricultural processing sector in Alberta."

My question to either hon. gentleman: is Dr. Horner's area of study the first part of a new overall look at this whole area, and should we expect additional announcements dealing with other sectors of agriculture, or in fact is the announcement about Dr. Horner today really to fill a supposed gap in an assessment that's been going on in either department for some time?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer that question. Basically, Dr. Horner's study will pick up those areas which, in a broader study, we haven't had the opportunity to either spend the time or get the input. The total evaluation of the livestock industry in this province has been done basically on two major planes: one, within the two departments that deal directly with the physical aspect of the market itself and where we go from here, and the other has been tied to marketing in the broader aspect of export.

We have also had the input on a very broad scale on the individual Foster report, that covers not only those items involved in marketing with the hog industry; the interest in the presentations covered the hog industry from all aspects. Of course that information will also be available. So Dr. Horner will have the responsibility of pulling together those items that either tie directly to, or that we have not had the opportunity to touch in a much

broader way, and to fit them into the ongoing policies with regard to marketing both domestically and for export, and to the areas of upgrading, which we have done to the present, and to tie together the discussions we've had and will continue to have with the industry and with the department itself.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last question to the Minister of Agriculture. What kind of instructions have been given to Dr. Horner with regard to co-operation with the federal combines investigation people who are looking at the whole meat packing industry in Alberta today? Has Dr. Horner been instructed to co-operate fully with the federal combines investigation people or to back off completely? What kind of instructions has the government given Dr. Horner in that area?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the instructions and the direction of the total review of the livestock and packing industry in this province and Dr. Horner's direction is not in the form of a total investigation of the industry. It's an opportunity to work with the industry and gather the information available, and also work with the availability and direction of producers and government to tie together a recommendation which we have an opportunity to review and come up with a livestock program for the future.

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

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I take it from that answer that there has been absolutely no discussion between either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Economic Development about what position Dr. Horner should take in the combines investigation presently going on in the meat packing industry in Alberta, having regard to the fact that apparently Dr. Horner is going to be looking at that whole area.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on that. In that context the combines investigation isn't relevant to the problem we're trying to solve. It's clear to everyone that if you're raising cattle and feed here, surely an indigenous meat packing industry is part of our future. We want to assess why there has been a deterioration in that business, and what can be done to reverse it in the medium term.

#### Utility Line — Fish Creek Park

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is directed to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Could the minister advise the Assembly if officials of his department participated in the recent decision to construct an overhead electrical transmission line across Fish Creek Park just south of the Deer Run area?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Utilities and Telephones was not involved in any way in the line brought to the attention of members of the Assembly by the Member for Calgary Fish Creek. The line is a 13 kilovolt line, and the Energy Resources Conservation Board does not have jurisdiction over lines of less than 69 kilovolts. I believe, though, that some discussions have been held between the city of Calgary and the Department of Recreation and Parks. The Minister of Recreation and Parks may wish to comment.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the city of Calgary and the Fish Creek Park management committee did meet on a number of occasions. They discussed it in detail and concluded that the most economical route was to go across the park. But they also agreed that it should follow a utility corridor, which it did. My understanding is that that has been concluded, and construction is under way.

MR. PAYNE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks advise the House what opportunities were afforded the residents of the Deer Run area to make input to that decision-making process?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any input from the citizens at large. My understanding is that they brought it before the Fish Creek Provincial Park management committee, along with the city. They discussed it and concluded that that was the route.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, if I could be permitted a final supplementary. In view of the potential aesthetic damage to such a beautiful urban recreational resource, would the minister himself, who is in fact responsible for urban parks, take steps to assure the Assembly that this installation, as opposed to a subterranean installation, was warranted?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the construction and the cost of construction were taken into account. The cost of underground construction would be around eight times as high as overhead. They concluded that would be the most economical way to go. But to assure the Member for Calgary Fish Creek, I will take a look at it and see if I can get more information back to him and respond to his question.

#### **Highway Construction and Safety**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. In light of the fact that we have Dr. Horner looked after, I want to know how we're doing with the highways.

My question has to do with the minister's recently announced plan to look at a 10-year plan to twin Highway 16, and also Highway 1 coming into Calgary from the east. Can the minister indicate more specifically if there is a plan in place at this time, or if the minister is just thinking about a plan?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I guess that would lend itself to some interpretation. The plan exists in my mind; it exists on some paper that I have; it still hasn't been approved in the normal way. So the existence of it lends itself to that kind of interpretation.

MR. R. CLARK: The answer is no.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, that's really planning.

MR. NOTLEY: It's wishful thinking on the part of the minister.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister seems to be indicating that the Department of Transportation will be looking at twinning in areas where, using the minister's words, we have hot spots. Can

the minister indicate what criteria are being used to indicate which parts of the road will go ahead and which will not?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, in developing an approach to this, we had a lot of background material. We chart the flow of traffic in volume and kind in all parts of the province on the major thoroughways, and it's relatively easy to identify what those flows are. That isn't the only criterion, however. While the 10-year program, as we're developing it, does have time lines on it, divided into different time frames, we're allowing some flexibility so there will be some input. But broadly speaking, we're interested in getting this on track in a formalized way.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Alberta construction industry and the Alberta Roadbuilders have been pressing for this 10-year program, can the minister indicate what discussions the minister or his department has had with the Alberta Roadbuilders as to a 10-year plan for highway construction?

MR. KROEGER: During 1980, Mr. Speaker, I have been meeting with that association about once a month. So they do have input, and we have a pretty clear view of their thoughts.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister also indicate to the Assembly if the minister or the department have any long-range plans for rehabilitation of the present highway system in the province?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we also plot the condition of both the primary and secondary roads right across the whole system, and we do know from past history the age, the traffic counts, and the traffic loadings. We have a pretty good record of the present state and what the future demands are going to be, so we can maintain this program.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the minister. And I'd like to compliment him: he can say no very skilfully now; he's getting very polished.

Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if the present RCMP patrol program on Highway 16 west is going to be accelerated in light of the fact that we 17 people have died on that stretch of highway? Can the minister indicate if that program is going to be stepped up?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I guess I would invite the Solicitor General to comment on that specifically. We do have ongoing conversation with both the Solicitor General and the RCMP. In discussion we have tried to establish how effective their patrolling has been. They're very cautious and conservative in their estimates and in the response they give us, but the indicators are that it is working. Perhaps the Solicitor General, who is responsible for that area, might like to comment.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can't add too much more to what the hon. minister has just stated. There has been a stepped-up program for that stretch of highway. It will be assessed. Whether there's a need for further work in that area by the RCMP will have to be assessed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just one short supplementary. In light of the fact that we're bringing liberalized liquor legislation to the Assembly fairly soon, is the minister in a

position to indicate, or does he know, how many of the deaths on Highway 16 west were liquor related?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, although that's a very important topic, perhaps it should be dealt with through the Order Paper.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I asked him if he knew and if he had the information. Maybe he does.

MR. SPEAKER: Even so, the question period isn't intended to elicit or give detail.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister in a position to indicate if a major number of the deaths on Highway 16 were related to alcohol?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better if that question were put on the Order Paper, and I can find out from the RCMP. Certainly whatever information the RCMP has would have to be obtained by contacting them. Whether that question is suitable for the Order Paper is a matter for this House to determine, I suppose.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. In view of the fact that we have an expanded and stepped-up construction program in the province right now, would the program that the minister is anticipating for the twinning of 16 and the Trans-Canada be over and above the excellent system that is now in place?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I can't prejudge that because I haven't presented it for consideration yet. We could aim for that kind of thing. We'd like to establish a positive program, over a period of time, that would be proceeded with on a long-term basis. Just how that will be approached on a budgetary basis, I can't guess.

#### Oil Sands Development

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It concerns the comment on page 7 of the hon. Premier's speech with regard to oil sands: "We have decided to hold that matter in abeyance and re-examine our royalty arrangements." Well, questions have been asked before, Mr. Speaker. Specifically to either hon. gentleman, will it be the intention of the government during the fall session of the Legislature, either in the form of a ministerial statement or in some other way, to explain in some detail the government's position with respect to "in abeyance and re-examine . . . royalty arrangements"?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, probably not.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. During the debate on Monday the hon. minister indicated that a price of \$38 a barrel, according to his figures, would not be adequate, if I remember him correctly. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government would be prepared to table whatever data or figures the minister has with respect to the assertion he made on Monday?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we've had a number of assessments or estimates prepared, but they're not in the form or of the nature that one would normally table. They come by way of departmental advice to me and are not normally the type of documents we would table or make public.

The hon. member is not quite quoting me accurately, because the price was \$38 as of January 1, 1981, plus increases in accordance with the consumer price index. While speaking to Motion No. 21, I said that from that information I had concluded that anyone developing such a major project as either Alsands or Esso's Cold Lake project would not find that price economic in the sense that it wouldn't return the rate of return developers of that kind of risky project require before they would proceed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What review has been given by the department to the May 1980 ERCB assessment that a price of \$32 a barrel would return to developers the operating costs plus a rate of return of 15 per cent? Has there been any specific assessment of that statement? If so, could the minister give it to the House?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member could be more specific regarding the Energy Resources Conservation Board document. Is it the one referring to dealing with the application by Alsands or Esso?

MR. NOTLEY: With respect to Esso.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, those comments by the Energy Resources Conservation Board were of course made in light of cost estimates with respect to both the capital cost required to build the project and the operating costs of the project after it was completed. They have changed dramatically, because the capital or construction cost has risen substantially since that time. I couldn't be so definitive on the question of operating costs, but certainly the capital costs have increased. To that extent, Mr. Speaker, our assessments would be that those numbers are no longer valid.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. During the course of the department's review of what price would be necessary to bring on investment, what rate of return is used, in view of the fact that the ERCB had talked about a 15 per cent guaranteed rate of return? Is it the view of the government that that is adequate, or is it necessary to have a higher rate of return to make these projects viable in the government's judgment?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't use a precise number to determine when the project might be viable. Obviously that number will vary from project developer to project developer, but we would run estimates on the basis of a range.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. With respect to the question of re-examining royalty arrangements, what assessment is now being made of the Suncor royalty on their expansion, which I believe is at present 8 per cent. I'm not talking about the original production, but production as a consequence of the

expansion, that amount. Is there going to be any reassessment of that royalty schedule?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would want to refresh my memory, but I think it's inaccurate to refer to the royalty on the expanded production as being an 8 per cent royalty. My recollection is that we were treating the expanded production as if it were separate from the original plant, and would apply to the expanded production the royalty arrangements that were applicable to the original facility. At present I haven't had reason, or the opportunity, to consider what we might do with respect to the royalty arrangements applicable to the expanded portion in light of the proposed change in pricing for the production from the existing facility, which was contained in the energy program in the budget of October 28.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. The Premier indicated that there wouldn't be a definitive statement on this issue during the fall session, yet in the summer a suggestion had been made that lower royalties would be contemplated. In reviewing and re-examining the royalty structure, is it still the intention of the government to follow through on the basic principle outlined in the summer, or are we looking at a totally different situation as a consequence of the federal budget?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the answer is: a totally different situation.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The minister indicated that \$38 wasn't a high enough price to earn the companies an acceptable rate of return. Could the minister indicate to the Legislative Assembly what rate of return the \$38 would provide for the oil companies?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I think that question is essentially the same one asked by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I said that when we looked at these matters we were working with a range, and I wouldn't be in a position to say what particular rate of return would be necessary for any particular project developer. That decision will vary from project developer to project developer. Certainly I wouldn't be using a precise number as to what rate of return would lead a project to go forward.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has indicated that a number of assessments or estimates were prepared by the department in regard to various projects. In regard to the Alsands and Esso projects, what would be the rate of return in a particular range for those two projects, given a price of \$38 per barrel?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that would depend on the royalty arrangements applicable to the project at the time of proceeding.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In regard to the estimates and considerations you've given to the approval or non-approval of these plants, what range of rates of return have you considered appropriate as criteria for your decision-making?

MR. NOTLEY: Subject to current royalty arrangements.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as I say, the question of what rate of return is necessary before a project developer proceeds is not our decision. It's one that is made by the project developer. We review the question of royalty levels and negotiate the terms on which the projects would proceed, then the project developer makes the decision whether those arrangements and the price will lead to a sufficient return — in its opinion, not in our opinion — to justify the project going ahead.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary please, Mr. Speaker. In regard to the assessments or estimates prepared by your department, could you indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please use the ordinary parliamentary form.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, and I apologize to the minister. Could the minister indicate to the Legislative Assembly where the data base for those assessments or estimates came from. Were they developed primarily by your department, or was input provided by the petroleum firms?

MR. LEITCH: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the course of preparing those kinds of estimates or opinions we would use both information available within the department and information we would get from the project developers.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, early in the exchange the hon. minister indicated, in reference to the remarks the minister made in the House last Monday, that \$38 per barrel as of January 1 next year, with the inflation factor built in, was not adequate. Would the minister indicate to the Assembly the range of amount per barrel the government feels would be adequate for these plants to go ahead?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't put it in a range. Our position has been, and I think I can summarize it this way, that if these projects were part of the energy package we've been discussing in the Assembly on a number of occasions, we were prepared to change the royalty arrangements with respect to Alsands and Esso's Cold Lake project in such a fashion that there would be a smaller return to the province of Alberta than is the case with the Syncrude project, given the same profitability for the projects. That would have enabled the federal government to have increased taxation room with respect to the Alsands and Cold Lake projects.

So we were discussing a lower royalty insofar as the provincial government was concerned, and then said that that royalty, while it's lower than the Syncrude royalty, in our judgment would still provide a fair return to the people of Alberta for the sale of this resource. In those circumstances, if the projects would attract world prices for the oil produced by the plants, it would be up to the developers to make the decision whether they were prepared to go ahead on those conditions; i.e., the royalty proposals we had made to them and the condition which would be given by the federal government that they would attract world prices.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the projects could have proceeded. I believe the project developers would have proceeded on those conditions: the royalty arrangements

we had proposed plus a commitment by the federal government to have access to world prices.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, if I may. From time to time the government has indicated that it would be willing to provide equity for tar sands development. Could the minister please indicate to the Legislative Assembly what the government would consider a fair return to the people of Alberta for their resources?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the question of equity participation now seems rather academic. It was part of our proposal of July 25. It was never defined in a precise way as to what we would include. It was a \$7 billion undertaking, through the resource revenues of this province, to the next two or three oil sands plants on the basis of committing these resource revenues to improving energy self-sufficiency in Canada. Obviously the July 25 proposal was made on the basis of flexibility for detailed negotiations as to the precision of apportionment that would be equity and apportionment that would be debt. But that obviously has now expired as a result of the events that have occurred.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. member. We have exceeded the time for the question period. I apologize to the three members whose questions were not reached, but we did have an extraordinary number of supplementaries on two of the topics that were covered.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods wishes to make a statement with regard to some information previously supplied to the Assembly.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, in my address to the Assembly on November 3, 1980, I erroneously indicated to the House that the gold production of the Yukon Territory was \$1 million when it should have been 1 million ounces. Having enjoyed the golden hospitality of the people of the Yukon Territory this summer, I wouldn't want to do them such an injustice.\*

Thank you.

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

20. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the messages of His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the 1981-82 Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates (A) 1980-81, and all matters connected therewith, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, this a routine motion so I don't believe any elaboration is required.

[Motion carried]

### head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

#### Bill 75 The Liquor Control Act, 1980

[Adjourned debate October 29: Mr. Harle]

MR. HARLE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. When I adjourned debate, I took the opportunity of going over the notes I'd made in order to debate the Bill, and found that I've covered most matters I wanted to mention. I would like to see and listen to the debate of other members of this House. I would ask that members support the Bill. I would also like to state that due to some commitments this afternoon, I won't be able to sit and hear them. But we have the benefit of *Hansard*, and I will certainly be very interested in following the debate on this Bill.

I would like to close by asking for support for second reading of the Bill.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments relative to Bill 75 to my colleagues in the Assembly. Surely it's only by accident that the Bill's number is indicative of the year we're celebrating. I don't think there's any particular significance to Bill 75 in terms of its number.

In dealing with Bill 75, I think it might be fair to have perhaps a short look at the history of alcohol or liquor in the province of Alberta. I would add that during the debate members will perhaps think that the way the country is going at the moment may well encourage or drive people to drink. I hope the Bill doesn't do that, and I think the hon. minister has indicated more than once that that's not the intent.

Mr. Speaker, we're in what most people deem to be an oil and gas era — one of every three Albertans involved in petrochemicals or hydrocarbons. It's interesting when we look back to our birth as a province that indeed alcohol or booze or whiskey was a very significant factor, not only in the birth of our province but in the very coming of the North West Mounted Police. The area I'm from — and the members for Cardston and for Macleod well know the history of Fort Whoop-up and the fact that between Fort Whoop-up, which was really just south of Lethbridge, to Calgary on the Whoop-Up Trail, there were about 25 to 30 trading posts whose chief commodity was American liquor. I think all members are probably aware — if they're not, they probably will be before the day is over — of the great job the North West Mounted Police did in controlling that traffic.

Historians tell us that in the early years of the province about 90 per cent of all the arrests and convictions were related in one way or another to alcohol or alcohol abuse. It's interesting to look at some of the regulations. For example, at one time liquor licences were granted to hotels in this province on the basis of a population of 500. If there were 500 people, one licence was allowed in the community. It's interesting when we compare that with today. You had to have 1,000 to get a second licence.

Obviously in some people's minds it got out of hand, because on that great day of July 1, 1916, the province of Alberta, which has always had a preference for plebiscites on touchy items, had a plebiscite. The province went dry. It stayed dry for a fair length of time, about eight years. According to the records, the Hotel Association mounted

\*See page 1344, right column, paragraph 3



a rather well-informed and substantive lobby, and the province went wet again in 1924. That's the year the Liquor Control Board and The Liquor Control Act, the very Act we're dealing with today, were born in this province. So whatever 24 from 80 is, it's a long time ago.

And here we are today proposing changes to The Liquor Control Act, which essentially do a couple of things. One, it encompasses in one Act — which is certainly a break for people who have to read statutes — The Liquor Licensing Act and The Liquor Control Act. Then, Mr. Speaker, what well could become to many people a further liberalization in terms of drinking regulations in Alberta — does it or doesn't it? Well, we'll probably know by the end of the debate. It's interesting to quote the Solicitor General just the other day. He said, I don't think there is any doubt that if the object was to increase the availability of alcohol or increase consumption, I would be against the change. I have no difficulty supporting in principle, if indeed the Solicitor General is accurate. I just happen to quarrel with some of the gist of that statement. I have difficulty understanding how you can increase the outlets within an area to any significant degree without increasing consumption. That's the point I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker.

There was really very little change in the liquor laws of Alberta until 1958. For example, from 1928 to 1958 women had to be served separately; they couldn't sit together. In 1958 they were allowed to sit with the male gender. In looking back, for those who read the history of the west, it's also interesting that if there was ever a moderating factor on the drinking habits of the male population, obviously it came when women were allowed to drink in the same establishment. They had a very positive effect in terms of the conduct, the social behavior, of gentlemen in drinking establishments. So obviously the six members of this Assembly, or their forefathers or foremothers, had a very strong influence on whatever moderate drinking habits exist in the province today.

Mr. Speaker, in 1966, under the famous Bill of Rights, I believe, of Mr. Diefenbaker, Indians were allowed to drink. Until then they couldn't be served nor could they buy. Many of us today often wonder when we see the abuse that goes on. Also in 1966, we made it legal in this province to make, consume, and possess homemade beer and wine. In 1967 the ladies truly came of age, in that they could go into lounges on their own. That was 100 years after we began as a province. In 1969 we had what some people seemed to think was the breakthrough of self-service, which is French for no service. Our first liquor store had self-service in 1969. In '71 the former government of the province of Alberta allowed the drinking age to fall to 18, a decision which has affected many of us and certainly has caused a great deal of debate.

Shortly after that, Mr. Speaker, with the new government, I believe in '72-'73 the former Member for Calgary Buffalo was involved in looking at the drinking habits of Albertans. As you all know, we had the publication of the Ghitter report. It's interesting to point out that, for example, in 1976, as a direct result of an action by the government toward better social behavior and an attempt to reduce the incidence of violence in the establishments, we saw that dancing, to either live or recorded music, was allowed in beverage rooms, dining rooms, and cocktail lounges. Until then that had been prohibited.

In 1976 was perhaps the most progressive change I've seen, limiting the size of taverns. As members may recall, we had them as high as 800 seats here in Edmonton and, I think, about 720 in Calgary. They were limited to 250

seats where dancing was permitted or encouraged, and 200 seats without. Also in 1976 there was the recognition that Albertans as a group were spending a great deal of time outside their homes in terms of eating in establishments. I understand they now eat one in three meals outside the home. So Sunday drinking was allowed.

That's been a very, very short version of our history, Mr. Speaker. Now we're about to make changes in Bill 75, changes which quite frankly I would hope would last us certainly for the rest of my time. One asks oneself, what about the positive and the negative aspects? First of all, the things I am pleased to see are not in there, and many Albertans out there would like to have seen them. For example, unlike British Columbia, we're not going to have the neighborhood bars. We're not going to have those bars you find on the main streets of Great Falls and Shelby, Montana, and frankly I think that is encouraging. Many people have felt we should have the so-called neighborhood pub, the kind of pub you find in London, England — which is decreasing very, very rapidly, for a variety of reasons. I submit you cannot have those in Alberta because no one wants them in their neighborhood. So they end up in shopping centres, and the very thing we're attempting to accomplish is to have people walk. But as you know, Mr. Speaker, by their very design shopping centres are built for automobiles and people with plastic money.

Secondly, I'm also pleased to see that we did not fall prey to what some members throughout the province would like to have, similar to Ontario. We're not selling fortified wines or wines of any kind in kiosks, like we sell and flog lottery tickets in this province. In Ontario, as many members know — I submit it's because of the poor quality of wine, and they don't like the competition — they've somehow put things in place where Ontario wines are sold virtually at random in kiosks through shopping centres. I am pleased we haven't done that.

Thirdly, although I don't for one moment question the motives of the province of Quebec, we have not agreed to sell beer and wine in corner grocery stores. I think that is a wise move.

Mr. Speaker, where are we now? I want really to get to what I believe is a problem, and offer some solutions. Very quickly, in terms of consumption, all hon. members receive the annual reports: over 33 million gallons of beer. If you don't think that's a lot of intake, just think of the great difficulty we have with our rural sewerage program. We're drinking almost 4 million gallons of wine in this province, and over 5.2 million gallons of whisky, spirits, and liqueurs. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we've now hit over 23 gallons for every man, woman, and child in this province. We have half a million kids in school and 170,000 senior citizens. If just half of each of those drinks — and in southern Alberta we have quite a belt where they don't drink too much at all. So I suggest a lot of people are consuming 100 gallons a year. Is that good or bad? I don't want to make the judgment. But as a taxpayer, frankly I'm picking up part of that billion dollar cost in our hospital system that's paying for it. I want to make some comments about that.

In terms of health costs, Mr. Speaker, I suggest in all fairness that if we're going to put on the legislative books of this province a statute that some people will interpret as a privilege and others as a right, it's important that we who pass it be aware of the financial cost and implication of what we're doing. For example, it's very difficult to determine how many people in our hospital system are there because of alcohol or drug abuse problems.

There are some definitive studies, not in this province. Manitoba completed one, and from 6 to 16 per cent of all beds are occupied by alcoholic problems. In Ontario — I was there recently — they've completed a study. I'm not a statistician; I accept the word of the people who do these studies: one in every five beds. Here in Alberta, we're the second highest consumer in Canada, next to the Territories. Estimates, or 'guesstimates', run from four in 10 hospital beds in the capital city — that's 40 per cent — to somewhat down to two and a half. I don't care how you shake it, Mr. Speaker. If you just take an average of two

... Last year Albertans, 2 million strong, spent a day and a half in hospital per person, not counting over a million we have in terms of auxiliary hospital day-beds, or two and a half million nursing home beds for the year. But if only 20 per cent — and I've had people tell me that one in five physicians has a problem. If that's true, how many in every five lawyers has a problem? How many in every ... and on and on and on.

Now accepting for a moment those figures are true — and if anybody can afford to drink, Albertans can because we've got the cheapest booze in Canada — look at the cost. Twenty per cent are in our hospitals because of alcohol problems. If they are — and I submit it's not too far out — and we have 12,000 hospital beds in this province. According to the latest figures available the cost ranges from \$500 and something in our children's hospital in Calgary to about \$62 somewhere else, but it's about \$150 per day. Then in our \$1 billion hospital budget that many of us get excited about, the hospital costs alone for alcoholic problems is about \$240 million.

Now as we all know, there's only one way of getting into a hospital. There's no such thing as self-admission. Chiropractors can't put you there; doctors have to. So of the \$213 million medicare bill, just imagine for a moment the size of the medical care bill of the people who want to see the physician. Now, that's on the health side.

Then we have in this province the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, with a budget of about \$12 million. About 60 to 75 per cent of its budget now is in terms of treatment. Last year AADAC treated 11,500 people, a pretty substantial number.

The social costs: the Solicitor General was asked a question today. We have about 1,000 people in our jails, if you read the annual report of the Solicitor General. About half — slightly higher with native people — are there because of liquor offences. At \$50 a day, with a 1,000 inmate population, half for liquor offences and probably another 20 per cent who cannot pay the fine because of a liquor offence, the cost must be millions; never mind the cost of the police enforcement side.

The tragedy of traffic deaths that was raised in the question period: last year 25,000 drivers were suspended for impaired driving. The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission runs a program called impaired drivers program, and they're being snowed under. They can't cope, because the statutes say we must have those drivers attend an impaired drivers program before they are relicenced. It's difficult coping.

Social services in terms of divorce, family break-up, social assistance costs, the traumatic experience young families are going through where alcohol is involved; the number of single parents we have, alcohol is involved. I'm not trying to give a scare story, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to put out some facts.

For example, economic costs in Alberta, I'm told — dated October 21, fairly recent: \$1 billion for Alberta

business in terms of alcoholic costs. Each alcoholic in industry — these are employers saying this, not me — is costing his employer 25 per cent of his annual salary. Why? Because most of it is cover-up. That's another \$1 billion. In the U.S., Mr. Speaker, the latest figures tell us that it cost \$27 billion.

It's interesting at this point to reflect to those proponents of more liberal liquor legislation, that if you start them early enough, and young enough, and on the right kinds of wines, you won't have a problem. It seems to me you tend to associate this with France; it's not unreasonable to associate it with France. Well what about France? French, who drink more than anyone in the world, are paying the consequences. For example, alcohol figures in a third of the country's auto accidents, 25 per cent of its suicides, and a majority of its violent crimes. It has 2 million alcoholics. One out of four French citizens is considered a problem drinker. One third of France's social security budget goes toward treating sickness brought on by the record consumption of 16 litres of pure booze every year. Last year there were 40,000 alcoholic deaths in France.

Now I'm not saying we can't learn from that. We are a young province. I suggest we can take steps to avoid this 130 per cent increase in hard liquor alone that France has experienced in the last 15 years. When the French government decided to do something about — here's a question of attitude. The Prime Minister Mendes France said there would be a school milk program put in place, and the response from one Paris doctor was: we'll start drinking milk as soon as our cows start eating grapes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not my intent or my job to give things other than facts. The question is: is there any hope for the future? Well, frankly, I think there is. I think there is hope for the future, but there again I bet on Mr. Carter yesterday. I'm the sort of man who back in Roman times bet on the Christians against the lions. So although I think there's hope, I'm not too hopeful.

Many of us think — and I'm speaking now as an Albertan — that the future lies in controls. I think the experience of the past and elsewhere it has shown us that controls don't work. If we want to solve crime in this province, we should start with burning down jails, not filling them. Those who've been in this Assembly for five years and read the reports realize the majority of inmates in jail are not there for what we know as crime. They're known as offences, because if it's 30 dollars or 30 days for some minor offence and you don't have 30 dollars, you're in jail. I think the control measures are really not the answer. I think there are other measures.

I suggest one of them, Mr. Speaker, is the price of alcohol. At this point in time we have amongst the lowest income tax in the country, no sales tax, and on and on and on — and the lowest price of alcohol. Twenty years ago it cost you about \$5 or \$6 for a bottle of whiskey; today it costs you about \$8, unless you have discriminating taste that runs to very expensive liquor.

In High Level, Alberta, it's 90 cents for a bottle of beer and a dollar for a glass of milk. I think it should make us wonder. The price of alcohol in this province has gone down 45 per cent in the last 10 years relative to income. I don't know what else has gone down in this province, but liquor has, relative to income. Is there not some justification for re-examining the price of alcohol? I suggest there's a case to be made that we should reconsider that price.

But that's only a small part, Mr. Speaker. To me the major factor lies in what can be done, not for the fellow

who has the alcoholic problem today, because that's a treatment problem, and that problem is growing at such a rapid rate. It's like our hospitals. Unless we legislate against illness, I don't see any solution in the health area. I don't really see any solution, whether it's AADAC or the hospital system, in trying to have bigger and fancier treatment programs. I think we have to target in the area of prevention.

This can be done very easily. I am told there is a great deal of covering up in industry for people who have alcoholic problems. Alcoholics will allow their wife to be gone, their money to be gone — the one thing that stops them is when their job is at risk. We've got to catch these people while they're at risk, and that's done by early intervention in the work place. When a man's work habits are wrong and alcohol can be identified, that's the time to get him. There's just not enough of that being done.

Secondly, in terms of a target audience, studies in Edmonton have shown about 65 per cent of grade 7 children in our schools drink. They start at home. Well, if television can do anything, it sure can elect people across the world to elective office. If it can do that — and the one thing that Albertans and all Canadians do is watch television — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we could use that type of medium to influence. I'm proud that the organization I am part of is in the process of planning a campaign now, directed at the target audience — not at the hardened drinker, but those who have not yet begun to drink. I'm convinced, just as sure as I stand here, that the future of the drinking habits of Albertans lies in influencing their attitudes.

But I'm not naive, Mr. Speaker. One in every five Canadians now moves every year. Three or four years ago the government of Canada started a program called dialogue on drinking, to influence Canadians. It was part of a 10-year program, and it got cut off at the knees after one year. They spent \$600,000 while the industry spent \$52 million. So why question whether you can win if you're going to compete? I think you've got to win co-operation, and use statutory control in some areas. The ALCB in Alberta, unlike many other jurisdictions, is very strong in terms of advertising content.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, on this note. I'm not an expert, but I view the problem of alcoholism in this province and in this country as the number one health problem we have. I'm not saying we don't have a lot of other problems. If we could somehow get people involved in terms of attitude, to care a little bit about their fellow man, to get some of that Terry Fox spirit towards making this a better country and province to live in, and get a sense of dedication into people to do something about it today, I do indeed hold hope for the future.

Thanks very much.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate briefly in Bill 75 this afternoon, I must say at the outset that some of the comments made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West are, in my judgment, very valid. There is little question that one of our major health problems in Canada today is abuse of alcohol. One of the concerns we have to have in this province, with the stress in a province that is rapidly growing, is the implications of alcoholism somewhat above the national average.

This noon, members of the heritage trust fund committee had an opportunity to meet with the consultants hired by the official opposition. Members will be interested in that particular report. It draws the attention of Albertans to the fact that where you have booms — whether in

Alaska, the North Sea, or wherever there have been major booms — one of the inevitable implications is stress, which leads to much additional use of alcoholic beverages.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we look at a Bill like Bill 75, it is not only important to view it in the framework of general societal concerns — obviously we have to do that — but as well it seems to me that we have to address it from the peculiar perspective of a province that is going to be subject to a good deal more in the way of social stress over the next few years, social stress that could exacerbate the problem of alcoholism in this province.

The hon. member from Lethbridge raised certain things that, quite frankly, I agree with. I think we should be charging more for liquor in this province. I don't think we can be proud that we have the lowest liquor prices in the country. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to charging prices, if we talk about the price of energy going up being an element of conservation — the higher the price, the more conservation — one can make the argument with some degree of validity that liquor prices in Alberta in 1980 are just simply too low.

But as I look over Bill 75, Mr. Speaker, I would express a number of concerns. It seems to me that rather than moving towards more civilized drinking, what this Bill seems to do is just make it easier to drink. Again, against the background of the pressures in this province, I think we really have to look at that.

I look over the provisions of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and we find that as a result of municipal ordinances or votes, we are now going to make it possible to have liquor in sporting stadiums. We have longer hours for night clubs. We have senior citizens' residences with service. We're going to be able to provide service in live theatres. Changes in illegal possession — perhaps one of the changes here may even be a good thing. The idea of the conveyance of liquor if it's capped: it may very well be, ironically, that that will lead to less danger on the road, rather than people thinking they have to drink that bottle. That may be a plus.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, as I go through the other elements of the Bill: the liquor/food split, changed from 50:50 to 60:40; Sunday opening at 12 o'clock instead of 1 o'clock in the afternoon. What I see is just one example after another of it being easier, as a consequence of Bill 75, to drink in Alberta than it was before.

Now that raises the issue of the neighborhood pub question. I listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West on the issue of neighborhood pubs because, in my judgment, if we can move to more civilized drinking in Alberta, then we have to honestly examine whatever options there are and ask ourselves, is this a move to more civilized drinking or not? I have to confess, when arguments are presented, that it may be difficult to have neighborhood pubs in communities, and as a result we're going to get them into shopping centres. That's a concern I have.

But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, one of the better, not legislative committees, but task force committees undertaken by members of the Legislature was the Ghitter report. In 1972, the committee recommended the concept of neighborhood pubs. I just want to quote briefly from some of the observations made by the Ghitter report in 1972, and then I would be interested in the views of other members during the debate this afternoon on that issue.

The committee ... adopts the viewpoint that the [presence] of large, depersonalized drinking estab-

lishments in the Province is more likely to result in a higher incidence of drunkenness than is the approach recommended by the Committee to encourage smaller, more personalized licensed premises within communities.

While it's true we have cut down the size of new hotel operations, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there is still a substantial difference in the number of people in major hotels and the neighborhood concept outlined by the Ghitter committee in 1972.

It goes on to say,

It is not enough that licensees should merely provide establishments for "just drinking". Licensed premises should be encouraged to provide food, as is presently the case, and basically to encourage a reduction of beverage alcohol consumption on premise. Recreational activities such as dancing, singing, darts, checkers, and shuffleboard in all licensed establishments should become part of the normal repertoire of these outlets.

Mr. Speaker, it's fair to say that in the last few years we have made some changes and improvements. But I think there is still some distance to go.

The committee rejects the view that "an expansion or liberalization of license categories would result in increased consumption", and then outlines the concept of the neighborhood pub — maximum 125 seats, et cetera. I'm sorry I wasn't here for the minister's remarks, but I did read over the speech. I gather the government is arguing that because of problems in British Columbia and Great Britain, the government has decided not to proceed with the concept of neighborhood pubs. I think we have to carefully examine that proposition, not from the standpoint of more access but whether that sort of setting would allow people to meet as friends and not get into the situation where you have the substantial drinking that is encouraged by the larger bars or outlets.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there. In an issue like this I think most of us are mixtures of both wanting to move in a slightly liberal direction and wanting to restrain ourselves. We have a tradition here, as the Member for Lethbridge West rightly pointed out as he traced the history of drinking in this province, from a wide open western environment at the turn of the century to the prohibition of 1916. The view of many Albertans that we need fairly rigid legislation to protect temperance is still widely felt.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer two specific observations on Bill 75. It seems to me that one of the changes made after this government came to office has encouraged the use of additional alcohol, not only in Alberta but right across the country; that is, the advertising of alcoholic beverages. Distilleries and breweries are not going to spend \$52 million a year unless they get a pay-off. We really have to be a little naive to think that the advertising of liquor has no relationship to the consumption of liquor. You don't have advertising unless you develop a market. That's the purpose of advertising. The distilleries and breweries are not philanthropic organizations set up to help newspapers and magazines meet their bills every week or month. They are there to develop a market.

What do we have when we look at these advertisements? We have the most unscrupulous kind of life-style advertising by the distilleries and breweries in Canada. One looks at a copy of *Maclean's* magazine, or any of the major publications, and you don't see the unhappy consequences of the abuse of alcohol. You see either a very capable professional woman or a blonde by a swimming

pool. You don't see the mother who's left her children out in the car while she's drinking in the beer parlor. You see the successful businessman with a drink in his hand, or a skier going down the slope all ready to get his Canadian Club. You don't see the poor fellow on 97th Street who has a bottle of wine under the arm, literally wasting his life away. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West talks about the impact of that kind advertising on children and young people. When you equate the advertising of alcohol with everything from business success to sexual prowess, good heavens, Mr. Speaker, don't be surprised if people drink. That's what is happening.

I say very frankly that we have to take a look at this question of life-style advertising. I realize that one province can't do it. But if we're really serious about the abuse of alcohol in Canada, one of the things we might do, federally and provincially, is to talk about the kinds of controls that could be put on liquor advertising right across the country. I recognize that it's a little difficult for one province to do it, because you have magazines, newspapers, and what have you, coming from other parts of the country. This is the problem they've run into in Saskatchewan. While it may be difficult to do that as a province, and while you can't even close the border as a nation, nevertheless it does seem to me we could move some distance to dealing effectively with this question of advertising were we to work together with other provinces.

This is more a technical question, Mr. Speaker, a form of question for government members. It seems to me that in what appears at first to be a simple amalgamation of two Acts, with minor changes, there is one aspect which troubles me; that is, there will be a delegation of statutory power to regulation. For example, on the question of licensing; one licence with various categories. Instead of having the categories set out in The Liquor Licensing Act, categories are going to be set out in the regulations. Hopefully these will be available by committee stage. In my view that makes it a good deal easier for people who want to get licences to lobby, again behind closed doors, the regulatory process as opposed to the decisions being set out in the Act by the Legislature.

I think we have to be pretty candid about it. As a province we do very well from the sale of liquor. Last year the net income of the Alberta Liquor Control Board was \$158 million. By contrast, \$1.5 million was spent by AADAC. That's a little less than 1 per cent of the net income from the sale of liquor in this province. So Alberta as a province is doing very well out of it, and will do very well as a consequence of Bill 75, because more liquor will be sold and consumed. Our profits as a province will go up in the short run.

But, in the long run, it seems to me that we are encouraging greater drinking without asking ourselves whether it is possible to achieve more civilized drinking. No one is saying we can go back to the 1916 days of the temperance league and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and close off the taps and board up the hotel bar-rooms. No one is suggesting that. But as I look through Bill 75, it does seem to me that the government, in trying to make the compromises that I suppose any caucus does in something like this, really didn't get down to the crucial question of that issue: how can we drink in a more civilized way? Instead, we have just fallen into an easier access to alcohol, backed up as it is now by a massive advertising campaign by the breweries and distilleries in this country. Inevitably, the net result in this province is going to be more alcoholism and, as the

Member for Lethbridge West pointed out, more broken homes, more accidents on the highway, more people killed, more children left as wards of the province. While those kinds of tragedies can't be prevented — and no one is suggesting that Bill 75 is in any premeditated way by this Legislature going to cause those results — the issue is: are we, by passing a Bill like this, leading to more abuse of alcohol?

Mr. Speaker, I would have to say quite frankly that it seems to me we are. Lots of people are going to make lots of money with Bill 75. It's a great day for the distilleries and breweries; no question about that. It will be a good day for the Treasury of Alberta in the short run. But with the pressures of substantial growth that this province has to look squarely in the face, I really question whether this Bill at this time is appropriate or in the public interest.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to enter this debate briefly this afternoon. As I listened to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview I could not help reflecting on the story that I received the other day of a politician in Oklahoma, which, as many members will recollect, is a dry state. When he was asked at a political rally how he felt about whiskey, he replied: you have asked me how I feel about whiskey. Here is how I stand on this question. If when you say whiskey you mean the devil's brew, the poison scourge, the bloody monster that defiles innocence, dethrones reason, destroys the home, creates misery and poverty — yes, literally takes the bread from the mouths of little children; if you mean the evil drink that sends Christian men and women from the paths of righteous, gracious living into the bottomless pit of degradation, despair, helplessness, and hopelessness, then certainly I am against it with all my power. But if when you say whiskey you mean the oil of conversation, the philosophic side, the side that is consumed when good fellows get together, that puts a song in their hearts and laughter on their lips and the warm glow of contentment in their eyes, that can change a casual acquaintance into a life-long friendship; if you mean that drink, the sale of which pours untold millions of dollars into our treasuries, which are used to provide tender care for our little crippled children, our blind, our deaf, our dumb, our pitiful aged, and to build highways, hospitals and schools, then certainly I am all in favor of it. This is my stand, and I will not compromise. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, that is a good paraphrase of what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has put before us today, on one hand and on the other.

MR. NOTLEY: And now we hear from Jim Horsman.

MR. HORSMAN: In dealing with the matter, I will refer to some specific concerns I have had with respect to the subject of alcohol consumption and how the legislation deals with those. In the first place, I have received from my constituency, and other interested Albertans, a good deal of correspondence on this subject. There is no question whatsoever that it is a matter that touches the lives of many people and brings forward a great deal of concern.

The number one concern expressed to me has been the subject of the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors; that is, people under the age of 18, as now defined in The Age of Majority Act.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that in the definition section of this Bill, " 'adult' means an adult within the meaning of The Age of Majority Act". I think it is

important to emphasize the fact that when the previous government changed The Age of Majority Act, it had wide-ranging consequences, not the least of which was that it permitted people between the ages of 18 and 21 to consume alcohol. I have had a number of representations that there should be a change in that respect. But it cannot be done without substantially amending The Age of Majority Act and thereby depriving people who are adults in every other sense of the word of one of the rights they now enjoy under legislation.

In order to deal with the question effectively it is our decision as a government — and I strongly support it — that we must move dramatically in the field of enforcement of the law as it now exists. That means to ensure that those people who either consume alcohol as minors or those who supply or serve alcohol to minors recognize that they are guilty of an offence under this Act and, secondly, that they are prosecuted when they breach the Act.

It is very important — and I wish to draw this particularly to the attention of members of the Assembly — that a new offence has been created in Bill 75. The offence is to be found in Section 85(b), which provides that, "No person shall . . . permit any person to supply liquor in licensed premises or premises described in a permit to a minor who is in those premises". This is a new provision and, I suggest, a very important provision of this legislation, because it will remove the protection now extended to owners of licensed premises who permit service on those premises of alcoholic beverages to minors.

Now it's true that there is a very draconian measure which can be applied against those owners today, in that licences can be either suspended or lifted completely if it is proved that they have in fact been guilty of carrying on that particular course of conduct over a period of time. But this permits individual charges to be laid against owners, and I think it is going to be a very great tool to prevent the illegal sale of alcohol to minors. It's true that before, the servitor could be prosecuted. But it was not possible prior to this Act — if it is passed in this form — to bring charges against the owner or management of the establishment. I think that is very important.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that in today's society there are young people still in secondary schools at the age of 18, and I believe there is a problem. I believe we must crack down hard. That's permitted, and that's part of liquor control. Granted, it may not make people more civilized in their drinking, but it will certainly, if effectively done, prohibit the sale and consumption of alcohol on licensed premises by those persons who own and operate such premises. I think that's a very important section, and I want to stress it today.

With respect to three other matters on which I've received representation, one related to the establishment of so-called neighborhood pubs. As has been expressed by the minister in his remarks and by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, I share in saying that indeed these would not have worked in our society. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that many people have an idealized vision of what is in effect in the United Kingdom; the corner, the neighborhood pub. The experience in Canada has not indicated that that would be the result of introduction of that particular type of facility. It is more likely that we would follow the example of our American brethren. I'm sure any of us who have travelled widely, or even in a peripheral way into the neighboring states, would not want to see the same type of corner bars arising in Alberta which are the American — if I can use that

expression — answer to the question. I don't want to see that in Alberta. I think the decision not to proceed with the establishment of neighborhood pubs is a wise one indeed.

The third item was reference to not extending the sale of alcohol to grocery stores. Mr. Speaker, there is ample opportunity for those who wish to obtain alcohol to take to their homes or cottages to drink, or wherever it may be lawfully consumed, to do so at the present time. I see no reason to extend it and create the situation where we are placing the operators of small corner grocery stores in considerable jeopardy as to their property, because it has been the experience elsewhere that this has resulted in an increase in crime and robberies of the small corner grocer. That attraction will not be extended to those who wish to plunder our corner grocers.

The other question on which I've received a good deal of representation has been the sale at sporting events. This matter has been carefully considered in the preparation of this legislation. I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker and the House, to Section 58(1)(a), which defines sporting stadium, and then to the further definition with regard to sporting events and what the regulations may contain. It is not simply that any sporting event or any stadium which houses a sporting event will be entitled to be licensed; far from that. It is only in relation to professional sports events. That's a very important distinction over the many amateur athletic events attended by many thousands of Albertans in smaller communities.

Furthermore, it restricts the sale to beer or cider provided there is approval by a by-law of the municipality in which the sports stadium is located. That makes it quite proper for the municipal governments to decide whether they wish to permit the sale of beer or cider in those stadia. Furthermore, that

in the opinion of the Board a substantial number of the professional athletes who will be participating in that event or a substantial number of the members of the audience who will be witnessing that event, are adults.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is to cover adult sporting events, in larger communities I would suggest, and then only if it is a decision of the local municipal council.

Mr. Speaker, I think the decisions that have been made are well balanced between the views of those who wish to see a much more liberal application of the law relating to liquor and those who wish to see a tightening-up or restriction on the sale. The balance we are seeking as a moderate government is reflected in Bill 75. It is true that there is some extension of hours, but it is done in such a way that is reasonable and will not necessarily lead to increased consumption. There is further provision for live entertainment, dancing, and participation in other activities in licensed premises, so that the person is not absolutely restricted to sitting at one table where all that can be done is either converse or drink. That's one of the problems with the old Liquor Control Act. It tied the individual to his seat, where he had no choice but to drink. As well, there are other aspects of the legislation which will moderate excessive consumption and, hopefully, will have a civilizing effect upon the patrons of licensed establishments.

I would like to add one word before I conclude, and that relates to the subject of permits for postsecondary institutions. Those permits will be granted only to boards of governors, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest is an appropriate control and method of dealing with that matter. I

realize that it has been a matter of some controversy in some parts of the province.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

In making my remarks, I've covered all the individual points I wanted to. Finally, I want to say that there's no question that the members of caucus and the Solicitor General have spent hours in discussing the various aspects of this legislation, and the representations that have been received from many people in the province have been carefully weighed with due attention. We are cognizant of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West in his capacity as chairman of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. We are hopeful that through a process of education and clearer understanding of the impact of alcohol upon the lives of our citizenry, we will indeed bring about — I don't know whether it's a proper term, but it seems to be in usage today — a more civilized consumption of alcohol. That is the aim and object of this legislation and the establishment of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission.

In balance, Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is appropriate for Alberta in the 1980s.

MR. COOK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I promise to be brief. I want to stand and support Bill 75 as presented by the hon. Solicitor General. First of all, I'd like to compliment him on his work shepherding this legislation through caucus. As the hon. Member for Medicine Hat has pointed out, he succeeded in building a balanced approach. There are a lot of concepts that some members of caucus would have liked us to endorse: neighborhood pubs being one, drinking in pubs on Sunday outside for another, the availability of wine or beer in corner stores. The compromise that was worked I think is a fair one, and we have made some remarkable progress. It's interesting to note that the last major change in liquor legislation in this province occurred in 1958. I think the province has changed a good deal since then.

I think we have some positive features in this program. I would whole-heartedly endorse the concept of beer and cider being available in stadiums where professional sporting events take place. I would note that the local municipalities governing professional sporting events in their area have the option to approve such sale or not. I think that gives the flexibility to this feature that we need, given the different values and traditions in the province.

I'm pleased to see new features in there. For example, licensing will now be available for theatres and night clubs; we're going to allow extended hours of operation for night clubs. I think that's encouraging. I think we have to recognize that we are trying to develop a tourist industry in the province, and this feature should go a long way to making this province a little more saleable for the convention industry and for tourism. That's an important industry.

I also think it will go a long way to developing an entertainment industry in the province. We're seeing that across western Canada, Alberta lags in a good number of ways in development of musical or night club acts. We don't have the same diversity you find in British Columbia or Manitoba, for example. It's there, but not to the degree it might be. So here's an opportunity to develop that kind of industry.

I think it's fair to say too, Mr. Speaker, that our senior citizens who are in senior citizens' lodges have not till now had the opportunity to have alcoholic beverages

provided in a social setting. They had to consume their whisky furtively in their rooms, and sneak a few sips when the matron wasn't looking. Now we can treat them as they are: reasonable, intelligent adults who are quite capable of enjoying a glass of wine or beer with their neighbor and friend.

I'd like to make one final point. I'm pleased to see that in Section 53 we have a new feature in the legislation; that is, the Liquor Licensing Review Council. I think this is going to be an important addition to the legislation. I'm somewhat concerned that in effect we almost have a series of franchised McDonald's, A & W's, and Dairy Queen's in our pubs. They all look the same. They have the same wall coverings, the same rugs, the same arborite tables, the same plastic chairs and, with minor exceptions, they bear the same resemblance to the hamburger industry, the difference being that you can get a little different furnishing in a Dairy Queen or an A & W or a McDonald's, but by and large it's all plastic and boring. I think we have to be trying to ...

AN HON. MEMBER: McDonald's is boring?

MR. COOK: Well, if you have not eaten at McDonald's ... On my salary, Mr. Speaker, I eat at McDonald's fairly often. Some hon. members might not. [interjections]

I simply want to make the point that I think we need more flexibility, and I think the board should be discouraged from being the final arbiter of what is in good taste in licensing establishments. I think we need to encourage innovation, not a heavy-handed approach to picking out wall coverings, rugs, chairs, and arborite tables. For precisely that reason, I hope the board would become a little more reasonable, a little more flexible in its licensing regulations of restaurants, pubs, and night clubs, and that the review council might provide some sober second thought, if you like, for that kind of licensing procedure. I'm looking forward to seeing the licensing council act as an appeal body or review body when operators have difficulty convincing members of the board who have rather traditional views on these things, to reconsider the approaches they've adopted over the last few years.

With that final comment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage all hon. members to support Bill 75. I think it makes remarkable progress, and that the minister should be commended. He's done a lot of work shepherding it through caucus. He has sought the balance that I think we all recognize we need. We've made some changes and some progress, but we haven't gone so far that we're going to alienate a lot of people in the province, and the minister should be commended.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in favor of this Bill, I'd first like to assure this Assembly that I support to a great degree the remarks that were made earlier by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West and other hon. members with respect to the concerns I think we all have regarding the degree of alcoholism in this province, and the difficulties encountered by families and individuals with respect to that.

Having said that, I would like to take exception to some of the remarks by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and to indicate that I do not believe the provisions of this Bill will in fact increase the abuse of alcohol in our province. Indeed, if one looks at the legislation we have had, which frankly has been some of the

most restrictive in the country, and compares our problem rate and our consumption rate, that does not apply. In fact the expanded hours question leaves me a great deal to wonder. Does someone who drinks at 10 o'clock in the evening abuse alcohol less than someone who would want a drink at 1 o'clock in the morning? Because we have allowed for a different hour, where another individual who has a different schedule to work on can come and have a drink, does that mean there's going to be an increased problem to our society? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to this date the evidence does not show that.

I'd say the same thing with respect to the sections of the Act which relate to expanding the privileges of liquor licences to different categories. Because we allow for a different kind of venue or environment to be set aside as a drinking establishment, does that mean there will be more problems? I suggest in fact that the opposite could be true in some cases. Different environments will detract from drinking and encourage other kinds of activity.

I believe the moves that were made today are indeed a recognition of the changes taking place in our communities and the life style Albertans are part of; the fact that people work and live and operate at different times and at different places, and therefore require different opportunities or ways of dealing with their recreation or leisure time.

I would like to deal briefly, though, with the matter of neighborhood pubs. I'm afraid that in that matter, as this House knows, I disagree with the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and the Member for Lethbridge West, and find myself in the unusual position of endorsing some of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

I recognize that neighborhood pubs immediately conjure up the vision of drinking establishments on every street corner in Alberta society, that people see the possibility of inebriated individuals strolling down their street and across their lawns. I understand as well that there are concerns from individuals who see the increased number of outlets as meaning increased problems. I think all those difficulties, and they have been faced in some instances — and I underline some instances, where neighborhood pubs have been instituted — are aspects that can be taken into account when designing legislation that would allow those people who want that kind of facility in their community to choose that. I emphasize again: allow.

The Bill I introduced in this House last year would have ensured that in fact the communities decided whether they wanted that, and that indeed the pubs that may have established, or may not have, given the community, would have been forced to provide activities that, hopefully, would have detracted from the drinking end and have encouraged the activity end.

It's my belief, and quite a firm belief, that alcohol abuse, if not consumption, would be reduced by a neighborhood pub concept which recognized a community association or volunteer organization and its membership, in terms of allowing them a restricted liquor licence. Indeed, that's taking place in many of our communities now. I take exception to the remark that everybody wants one until they talk about having it on their street corner, because my Bill was introduced at the suggestion of a meeting of community presidents in my constituency, Calgary Currie.

I believe such a Bill would not see a proliferation of those pubs immediately; it would be a slow and progres-

sive kind of situation. But ultimately we might be able to encourage, at least in the Calgary and Edmonton areas, a more cohesive community, where people didn't have to drive across the city to have a drink and play a game of shuffleboard but could walk down to their community hall, into the basement, where they could meet with friends and could indeed engage in the kind of activity I think many would like to now but don't have the opportunity to.

Having said that, I believe this piece of legislation, in allowing for some flexibility in the food/liquor split, in the hours of operation, and with respect to the licensing categories that are now available to individuals who want to participate, will allow for some expansion of the kinds of establishments that may lead to a community pub when this society desires that.

I hope this Assembly will take a look at what happens with the legislation today and assess that over the years. I believe the assessment will have to be only that it will not cause great horrendous problems, but will be a recognition of the changing mood of Alberta, and that we'll again take a look at the neighborhood pub concept sometime in the future.

Hoping the Assembly will do that, with those words I would very much support second reading of the Bill before us and, with the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, congratulate the hon. minister on the very hard work and long hours that were spent with respect to this Bill.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to make a few comments this afternoon regarding Bill 75. I too would like to commend the minister most sincerely for bringing forth this legislation. I realize that there are a lot of strong feelings by many individuals in regard to some of the issues before us in this Bill. However, I feel very, very strongly that, hopefully, it will not do anything more to create any further concerns with alcohol in our society, and that we can treat that issue from a separate point of view.

I guess one of the points I want to make very strongly — and I was pleased to note that the minister said he would read our comments and be willing to answer any questions. I would like to ask him on what information he and the Member for Lethbridge West based their comments on the pub concept in B.C. and England. Having travelled extensively in B.C., every year for the past 20, and having recently, in June of this year, been on an extensive tour of London, southwest England, a complete tour of Wales, Aberdeen, and the rural countryside of Scotland, I cannot see why they say that the pubs are on the decline. Wherever we travelled — and it was generally for lunch that we stopped and ate in the pubs — we found that they were very congenial places. They were well supported by large numbers of people. You could see that there were many additions to some of the areas. To the original pub, they've added areas with glass roofs so people can sit in a more gardenlike atmosphere. Then of course they've added tables and chairs outside when the weather is nice.

So I really challenge them on the point of view that that concept is dying. I see that it meets a very specific need quite different from the other aspects we are dealing with in this legislation. So I too must support the comments that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the Member for Calgary Currie made. I think we have the same point of view, and obviously we are representing the people in both our areas, because this concern has come

to me from people in my communities.

I think it is certainly true that you can't just take the concept as it is in Britain and transform it to any community in a city or rural setting. But surely that doesn't mean there isn't some value in that type of setting where people can relax. I guess it is debatable. It's probably not proven whether they actually drink more or less in that setting. But having been in them in England I certainly can vouch that it is a very relaxing and enjoyable place to sit when you're trying to talk or meet with a few people, instead of having to end up in a relatively large room with music pounding in your ears and flashing lights. It's a different type of set-up that I think would be very nice to have in communities — if they so wanted it. I think there is that restriction to it.

However, I'm certainly willing to consider this issue further and to receive more input from people in my community. In fact, every so often on a Friday night one of my community associations actually set up a publike atmosphere in the community association hall. So I think there will be an opportunity to assess this, to see how popular it is in the community and if it does create any havoc with driving, parking, or any other type of rowdiness. Hopefully it will be able to continue even under the present [legislation].

So I really would beg that all members of the Legislature support second reading of this Bill.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure whether that was age before beauty or beauty before the beast. I first have to say that I believe most of the comments I would have wanted to make have already been made. But it's also very important for me to reflect the views of my constituents at this point. I think they would want to associate themselves with comments made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

I notice that a couple of hon. members have introduced their feelings about the neighborhood pub. Certainly the hon. Member for Medicine Hat, in his introductory remarks on the one hand and on the other, I guess really did bring to the forefront the two different ways alcohol is viewed in this province. Depending on what part of the province you're from, the density of population, and so on, there's great diversity as to how those two different views are reflected.

But on behalf of the great numbers of people in the Three Hills constituency who have written and called me concerning their views on alcohol, the liquor laws, and so on, I have to say that for the most part I agree with my constituents. I would be very concerned with the ramifications of the neighborhood pub, although I realize that with the introduction we have in the legislation of the municipalities and neighborhoods being able to make up their own minds as to what type of facility they want, if that concept were introduced in conjunction with a neighborhood pub, I suppose it would make it a lot more palatable.

My constituents also expressed concern about grocery stores and other outlets being expanded to be able to sell alcohol. That's a direction that we certainly chose not to go.

I believe the hon. Member for Medicine Hat also pointed out a very important aspect of the legislation when he spoke about the tougher consequences of serving minors. That leads me to a concern voiced by my constituents in great numbers. Probably I have something like 75 to 100 letters on file in my office relating to the drinking age. Unfortunately, I guess we have to then



discuss the age of majority, because I for one wouldn't want to see the drinking age raised and not the entire age of majority. Maybe that's a discussion we'll once again have to have in this Legislature. I note from reading *Hansard* that it's a discussion that's been held here before, and with as many new members as there are, it's possibly a discussion we should have again.

But I would reiterate my support for Bill 75. I think there are some details in the Act I would like to speak to when we get to the committee stage. But, generally, my comments on behalf of my constituents — I hope I can say on their behalf they'd generally be in favour of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments. I support Bill 75, but on the other hand I think we've gone about as far as we can go with regard to liquor in this province. I think we've made it accessible and available. We've certainly promoted the advertising. I think it's time now that we start to try to turn the clock back, if you will, or let's be taking a more positive attitude in addressing ourselves to the problems that liquor is causing. We can make all these fine speeches, as did the hon. minister from Medicine Hat. I think the little joke he introduced was a very good summation. But I think we've got to face the fact that alcoholism is a very serious disease in our community, and it's time we started to try to do something about it.

I'd just like to make a couple of comments with regard to the pub. The hon. Member for Calgary North West travelled extensively in England this year, and I was over there last year. I thought it was interesting — you couldn't get in the pubs in London at noon hour, because everybody was dashing there for lunch. People were standing out in the streets, drinking and eating their lunch, and I was one of them. Yet when we were in north Yorkshire, you certainly could get into the pub. I thought it was hilarious. We were in a pub at 6 o'clock at night. You couldn't get anything to eat. It was run by a Greek who spoke English in Yorkshire, and on the jukebox he was playing *Rhinestone Cowboy*, sung by Dean Martin. Sitting in a crummy pub where the furniture was falling apart, I thought to myself: this is British culture? This is what they want to bring to Canada? I couldn't believe it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's atmosphere.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Yes. I was glad my father decided to leave that village, because I just thought I probably would have been one of the inhabitants of that pub at that hour if he hadn't.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of the B.C. pub concept. I have to part company with my honoured colleagues here, because it has caused a lot of divisions within communities, particularly when the matter has been put to a vote. I visited some of them in the Okanagan Valley this year and in Victoria, and I don't think they're that great that we would want to bring them here.

In conclusion, I think we should be taking some positive steps. In my opinion, this would be a reduction of advertising — it's obvious. I know it's difficult; I know national magazines and national television bring in some of these ads. But on the other hand, other advertisements are developed locally that we would have control over. Obviously the brewing industry is doing it because it increases consumption and helps their profits. I think we should be taking positive steps against it. I think we

should be putting more money into research to try to offset some of the problems arising from alcohol. And, as the hon. Member for Three Hills said, the age of majority has to be considered. I frankly think it should be raised, because alcoholism is at the lower levels in our school system and it's time we did something about it rather than just talk about it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to enter the debate and say a word or two, express some of my concerns, express some of the positives and still look at some of the negatives.

I'd just like to remind the government members of the Legislature that when they show their concern about some of the problems we have with increased consumption, problems of rehabilitation of alcoholics, and so on, it was this government that, without any debate in this Legislature, gave the opportunity for the large liquor concerns in this province to carry on their extensive program of advertising. I just want the record straight, so we don't come back and say it's somebody else's fault. I'm not laying blame. I'm just laying the facts on the table so that the balloons flying overhead and the people lying by the side of the pool telling us how great it is — well, it's not so great when you walk or drive down 96th Street and 97th Street.

I would support the Bill in its entirety if we could get a commitment from this government to spend even one-third of the approximately \$150 million, or whatever we bring in from revenue, on preventative and rehabilitative programs.

I would also like to make a comment or two on the neighborhood pub. For many years, my family ran a small country hotel. We have had neighborhood pubs in this province for 50 years. That's what the small country hotel is. It is the neighborhood pub. It is a social centre. I find people saying we have to have the neighborhood pub in Edmonton or Calgary quite amusing. First of all, the neighborhood pub has to be a viable economic entity. It's fine to see the little old English pubs — and I'm like the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. I thought they were the grubbiest little joints I'd ever seen in my life. Somebody said, you haven't gone to the right ones. Well, I sure tried a lot of them, and I didn't come up with any winners. Maybe we're living under the false illusion that the great little old English and Scottish pubs are something we've been missing, because I don't think I've missed anything worth seeing.

MRS. EMBURY: You took the wrong road.

DR. BUCK: Maybe somebody took the high road and I took the low road, or something. But it was one of the very few disillusionments I had in the old country. I enjoyed everything else about it immensely.

So the neighborhood concept has been in effect in this province through the small hotels in the country. It is a social centre in the smaller towns and communities. It does have that positive aspect.

Number one, the advertising thing does bother me very much. As we increase the advertising and the outlets, we increase the consumption. It's fine to talk about having to learn to drink intelligently. But with increased consumption go increased problems.

But on a positive note, Mr. Speaker, I think that — well, I guess I'll tell you this personal story, because I think it gives me some insight into where the responsibili-

ty really lies. My wife has finally got me convinced that we legislators are really completely all wet when it comes to restrictive legislation. She says the ultimate responsibility lies with the family, with the mother and the dad, and with the individual. So maybe we shouldn't have as much restriction as we have now. Maybe through our preventative programs and through the family unit is the only way we can attack so-called intelligent use of the product. Maybe the forbidden fruit we've had — I just say maybe — if the children in our homes were to accompany their parents, maybe some of the things that go on in our bistros would not go on. I don't know. I just throw that out for your consideration.

But in this day and age we say, legislate this, legislate that. Maybe let's put more emphasis on rehabilitative and preventative programs in our schools, because this problem of the alcoholic and increased alcoholism is with us, and it's going to increase. The more turbulent your society is, as we have in Alberta, a society that has an influx of many different peoples from many different countries and provinces, it seems that the problem becomes more acute. We have to look at these rehabilitative and preventative programs.

Mr. Speaker, because I'm concerned that our programs for rehabilitation and prevention are not adequate, we as legislators had better look at this. When the minister of social development says to his cabinet colleagues and to members of his caucus, I need more funding — we've got the \$150-odd million that we take in revenue every year. If we have to earmark, if we have to use a percentage of that income — say, 5 per cent, 10 per cent, whatever we need — let's make sure that those funds are available for the hon. minister and the Member for Lethbridge West.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I would like to say that we get much criticism in this province about how antiquated our liquor laws are. But I know that when you go to other jurisdictions, and the so-called "liberalized" United States, the further south you go, you'd better not get down there in a heat wave, because it's really difficult to slake one's thirst in many of those southern states. Our laws are not quite that antiquated in this province. Thank you.

I just throw those few remarks out, Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of hon. members.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, it wasn't my intention to get into this debate this afternoon, but after the hon. members for Clover Bar and for Calgary McKnight got into it, I thought I'd better say a few things.

The Member for Calgary McKnight suggested that we do more research into drinking. Having been a touch in the grape for quite a few years, I don't think research is going to help me or an awful lot of other people. As far as bringing it into the schools, I think it's probably pretty well acquainted there with the children, as the Member for Lethbridge West explained. What we need is a price for liquor, cigarettes, and all kinds of other dope.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I was acquainted very, very early in my life with homebrew, and it made me so sick that I don't think I took another drink for six or seven years. Maybe we need a few more of those cruel old lessons. Cigarettes were a different matter.

Two things will change drinking: the attitude to drinking and smoking, and the economic realities. I know a lot of hotel owners are going to scold me if they even hear

about this little talk this afternoon, but most people who are in the hotel aren't listening to what goes on in here anyway.

The price of liquor when I was a young man was pretty much a full day's work. A full day's pay went into a bottle of liquor, of whiskey. I think we should adhere to that same rule today. The same with cigarettes. Under the new federal budget, we're taxing people to heat their homes, to drive their cars, and to do all sorts of other things — on energy, things that we can't do without. But, booze? I don't know what it was, but a slight increase in the price of booze, a slight increase in the price of liquor.

I know that Alberta as a province can't suddenly raise the price of liquor to where it should be. People who have contacted me since this new legislation was introduced have been normally church people or people dealing out of social conscience. I would suggest that these churches and social groups start putting the heat on the complete North American continent to come together and come to grips with this entire situation. The liquor changes we have here, with the pressure that's been put on us from a host of people, and certainly not from the hotel people that I know of, but people in general, have forced us into this. We've got to keep up with other provinces and other parts of the land. I certainly think it's regressive that our laws in North America are creating a situation that down the road, in 15 or 20 years, I don't know how we'll ever back away from.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CHICHAK: It certainly gives me some — I'm not sure whether to say pleasure, but I am pleased to have the opportunity to make some remarks with respect to this Bill. The description of pleasure perhaps will reflect itself in the remarks that I might make.

A number of points have been made this afternoon with respect to this legislation, I guess very valid ones. I would like to make some comment with respect to a few of those matters which I think really will not serve or achieve the desired result.

Several members have mentioned that if the price was right it would help solve the problem. I look at the matter of price as it might be applicable to spirits, of whatever nature, in liquid form. In fact I would see a substantial increase in price penalizing the poor and really doing nothing for the rich. I can't see that that will really help us, and I think that the rich are as vulnerable to the results of over-consumption of alcohol as are the poor.

So I think the problem is far different from one of price. I don't think legislation, or curtailment or expansion of availability, will necessarily change the attitudes of today's society. A percentage of society perhaps indulges in a subdued manner in the availability of alcoholic beverages. As the hon. Minister for Advanced Education and Manpower and Member for Medicine Hat has indicated, moderation is fine. It brings a glow to the hearts of many and a relaxation to help release some of the stresses and strains of today's demands, and perhaps there is no problem in that. It's the excesses that really cause the problems. I don't think we can expect that society suddenly will turn a page and say, well, this is a real problem so we are just going to have to not indulge. That's just not going to happen.

I think the realistic, long-term goal needs to be to make the kind of awareness and recognition of the real problems at a very early age. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, to know that the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse

Commission has embarked on a very strenuous educational program to be taken into the schools, to start the learning process, I suppose, where it belongs — as a second step.

The first step of the role of the learning program, of course, has to be in the home. You can attempt to educate in the schools a great deal, but if you don't have the environment in the home of a proper attitude, the proper utilization or non-utilization, which may be more important, you will succeed not quite to the extent that we would hope in the educational system, although there would be some measure of success in any event. So in the passing of this legislation, one can say it has gone too far or not far enough. It is not going to change the realities of today's life with respect to the use of alcoholic beverages.

The other point raised was with respect to the extension of advertising alcoholic beverages. I have had the same concern over a long period, and still do, with respect to the effect advertising has on one's attitude, activity, and participation or desire to socialize to an extent that perhaps might not be embarked upon. I suppose we really can't be an island unto ourselves. Because of today's technology with regard to television, the cable programming brought in, I think it is extremely difficult to say that we can legislate to control that kind of message. One can achieve a certain degree of control, but if we are realistic I don't think we will find we can keep out that which is all around us in the rest of the country. If it were curtailed in the country as a whole, we could have a measure of success. But that is not about to happen. I think we are fooling ourselves if we say, well, by a stroke of legislation we will simply curtail that aspect of advertising.

I have already raised the matter of the pricing of liquor. I think that is not an answer. Insofar as attaching a percentage of the revenues collected by Treasury from liquor sales, I would hate to think that any program of a preventive nature, or in fact a program that then needs to be implemented as a cure for effects that have come about in our society, will be determined by the amount of revenues being collected from liquor sales. I would think it would be a totally wrong step. On one hand, we would be saying to the people, you're drinking too much, you should curtail this; so we're going to raise the price so you can't afford to buy it. That's going to hit the pocketbook of the one on an average, or less than average, income and not really have an effect on one who is fortunate enough, for many reasons, to have an income where that is not going to have any effect in any event. Or on the other hand say, well now, if you drink a little bit more we can have more in our Treasury; we can take that percentage and try to cope with programs that need to be in place either to deal with diseases and illnesses that result from the overconsumption of alcohol or programs of a preventive nature we need in our schools. So I really don't see that as an answer.

I think it's important, as has been pointed out, that the family unit be brought in as a central cog for this whole area, in addition to the educational process of our younger people. So that for them, it no longer means that a status of manhood, womanhood, or a level in society might be reached by being able to consume a certain amount of alcoholic beverage. I think it is important that our society, families within our communities and many organizations — rather than trying to say, thou shalt not drink, because we know that's not going to happen, educate them earlier in the results of that and try to train

them that if we are going to involve ourselves in that kind of activity, let us do it in a manner that's going to be minimal in damage, illness or domestic problems.

Those are the kinds of things we need to direct ourselves to, more than how we are going to spend the revenues coming in, or how we are going to keep people from drinking by increasing the costs and making in fact two classes of citizens: those who can afford to buy the alcoholic beverages and those who no longer can. Mr. Speaker, insofar as this legislation, it is necessary to have some guidelines, regulations, and meet some standards. But hopefully, the real impact and direction of our society today might be in how we can wrestle with the problem, not in asking the government to constantly legislate more to prevent people from doing something that should really be done in a different way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker: he who drinks and drinks with grace is always welcome every place, but he who drinks more than his share is never welcome anywhere. I recall attending a party one evening. The glasses served to the guests had a ring around them about two inches from the bottom. At the bottom there were pictures of people. Above the ring there were pictures of pigs. I think the message of how much a person should pour in his glass was passed very quickly.

I really had no intention of participating in this Bill, even though there have been many changes. Those were minor changes and probably could have been changed by regulations. However, as I listen to hon. members, there are some areas I cannot agree with. Even though the hon. Member for Clover Bar has just left, I can well appreciate his concern that the government makes \$150 million from the sale of booze, and maybe they should spend one-third of it for prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can honestly say that the government of this province makes anything from the sale of booze. Maybe there is \$150 million revenue. But when we look at the other end of it, when we see that the Minister of Social Services and Community Health has a budget of nearly \$1 billion, when we see how many homes are broken because of the results of alcohol and how many murders are created throughout the country because of alcohol — and many times there are acquittals because the person was under the influence of liquor. What about the property damage to vehicles and other? How many hundred million dollars every year does insurance pay out for this? What about the people who get hurt? Many of them become handicapped for the balance of their lives and need to be provided with social assistance. I can never accept that the government is making money from the sale of liquor.

Insofar as the pubs are concerned, I had always opposed that concept, and I strongly oppose it at present. When we see that in many years past, you had to provide the rooms, cafeteria service, and everything else to get a hotel licence. Now many of these put a lot of money and borrowed money to put up their establishments. Today are we going to give somebody permission to put up a few sheets of plywood and sell booze? What is going to happen to the hotels throughout this province? We must appreciate that tourism is the second biggest industry in this province. It was said many times that it may be the number one industry in a short while. Much of this credit can be given to the Hotel Association for providing accommodation, food services, and that that goes along with it. I'm sure pubs would not provide any of this. I

have seen a few pubs in our neighboring province, and it's unfortunate. They exist away from all businesses, are four walls, and all they are are drinking places.

Another area I hear about very often: the lowering of the age from 21 to 18. This was done in the spring of 1971. I know it was done for a reason. Maybe it was hoped the young people under 21 and above 18 would provide support for a political party, but it didn't work that way. But in no way would I honestly be able to say we should go back and raise the age of majority. Throughout my constituency I do not think the minors are giving us much of a problem. It may be so in the bigger cities but not in the rural areas. I think that sometimes even some adults have a chance to see a good example from our young people.

Many times I have hoped there would be some way to be provided with statistics of changes since 1971, after the age was reduced. However, I cannot see very much need to be so concerned about that. I think that as human beings we have to make our judgments when and how much we drink, and the costs of liquor are not going to change it. We know very well that many constant alcohol users are those on lower incomes or maybe with no income at all. Raising the price of liquor by two or three times is not going to hurt those who can afford to pay. Those with smaller incomes are going to deprive their families of the livelihood which is a necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I'm going to support this Bill. I don't see anything in it that would be detrimental.

Thank you.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I realize from my short occupancy in your position this afternoon how difficult it is to see this part of the Assembly.

Following in the tradition of former speakers this afternoon, especially in the latter part of the debate, I'd like to make a few brief comments. The feedback I got from people in my constituency seemed to be a great deal of concern a few months ago about grocery stores. I have some cause to wonder about the type of teaching going on among social studies teachers in some classrooms of the province, when I got a concentrated, organized group of letters from a number of grade 3 students. They read something like this:

Dear Mr. Appleby,

We want you to vote against the Bill that is going to allow liquor to be sold in grocery stores that is before the Legislature at the present time.

I wrote back to all these people and informed them that at that time no such Bill was before the Legislature, but I had to wonder about where that type of rumor or propaganda arose.

When we look at changes in any legislation we always have to wonder — and it's been expressed this afternoon by numerous speakers — whether it's for better or worse. And, of course, we have to have some concerns about that. I'm sure we also have to have concerns about the fact that once it has been passed and is in place, difficulties will arise if we want to make those changes in that type of legislation.

I think we face that same sort of issue — I'm sure many of us have received comments from constituents — regarding the age of majority, probably in connection with liquor legislation as well, but saying that it should never have been dropped from 21 or it should have been dropped to 19 when it was dropped, and so on. There's a great deal of difficulty in trying to make any changes in that type of legislation once it's in place.

I have my concerns as well about the matter of advertising. We saw announcements in the sporting pages of the *Edmonton Journal* and *The Edmonton Sun* a short time ago that Peter Pocklington had bought the Triple A baseball team from Ogden, Utah, and they wondered if it was going to be a success in Edmonton because of the type of attendance they might expect. Then the announcement came out that there would probably be changes in the liquor legislation and they'd be able to sell beer and cider in the stand at sporting events — they said, hurray, we've got it made; our sporting franchise is going to be a success. I think it's unfortunate if sporting events have to depend of the sale of liquor in order to be successful.

A few years ago Macdonald tobacco company sponsored the Consuls, the Canadian briar playdowns, and then they had to give up that sponsorship. It was immediately picked up by one of the liquor organizations. No problem there getting a sponsor. But, again, I think it is unfortunate if these types of things have to be supported by liquor concerns and if, at the same time, broadcasts for our football and hockey games have to be sponsored by people who advertise the sale particularly of beer during those events.

However, I would just like to note a couple of concerns I have regarding specific items in the legislation. One has to be the matter of the sale of beer and cider at sporting stadiums. I note that some restrictions were indicated by the minister when he made his comments on Bill 75 in the Legislature, suggesting that the sale of beer and cider would be restricted to the concourse level, would be in plastic or paper cups, that there would be certain food requirements, and that coffee and pop would also be sold. Those things probably are necessary as a sort of subduing atmosphere to what might happen. But there is an indication there to me that maybe this is not exactly what should be done, if these things have to be put in effect as a sort of restricting influence on the sale of that liquor.

I also have a concern with the matter that says that this Bill does not permit the sale of beer and cider where either the majority of performers are minors or where the expected crowd consists of substantial numbers of minors. I think we have a pretty gray area there. Who is going to make that decision as to when we have substantial minors or not? When we get to discussion of this Bill at committee stage, I hope the minister will answer that question and we'll be given some assurance as to the manner in which that is to be handled. That is Section 58.

The other section I have some concerns with is Section 71 dealing with the conveyance of liquor in a vehicle from one residence to another. It would provide that it's possible to convey it from one to another and then on to some other location as well. I have no quarrel with that. But I don't know if there is anything in the regulations or in the legislation that would specify that that liquor is to remain sealed or whether there can be open liquor in those vehicles during that time of conveyance and, if so, how is it going to be judged if that's being consumed during the time it's being conveyed.

Actually, though, when we look at the legislation in general and think of the fact that the Solicitor General, and the previous one, spent a great deal of time, put in a great deal of effort, and listened to a great number of representations, there was a great deal of consideration given to this legislation in bringing it before us. What has been done has been a good effort, and I would support it. I would just hope that we are in actual fact making some improvement in our liquor laws.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion carried; Bill 75 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in respect to tomorrow's business I would just indicate that it is not proposed that the House sit tomorrow evening. Although the specifics of business for Friday will certainly be given

tomorrow afternoon, I might indicate that the present intention is to be in Committee of Supply in respect of the estimates of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:29 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

