

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, May 29, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, the Ombudsman-designate of the province. Seated in your gallery is Brian Sawyer. He served the RCMP with distinction in various postings across Canada, and for the past 12 years has brought his sensitivity and leadership to the challenging position of chief of police in Calgary. He will become Ombudsman on September 1 this year. I ask him to stand and be welcomed by the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 203****An Act to Amend the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 203, An Act to Amend the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

The purpose of Bill 203 is to set out the obligation to file with the Legislature Library, the Calgary city library, and the Edmonton library all pollution control data, which would be freely available, without charge, to the interested public.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Alberta Opportunity Company for the year ended March 31, 1984, as required by statute.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to table the response to Question 127 today.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to file five copies of the Interagency Co-ordination Handbook prepared primarily for use in rural communities. The handbook was prepared by the Northern Alberta Development Council.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, not to be outdone by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry: Monsieur le Président, il me fait grand plaisir de vous présenter, et par vous présenter aux membres de cette Assemblée, des étudiants de l'école J.H. Picard.

Mr. Speaker, in the members gallery are 62 students, and one nephew of the Member for Red Deer, who are studying grade 9 Social Studies at J.H. Picard, which is a French-lan-

guage school in the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona. They are accompanied by their teachers Messieurs Roland Genereux and Raymond Saint-Martin. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the members of the Assembly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you this afternoon, and through you to members of the Assembly, 27 grade 8 students from St. Mary's school, which is actually in the constituency of Edmonton Avonmore, whose MLA is out of the province on government business. The students are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Wayne Rissling and Mrs. Shykora. They are seated in the public gallery. On behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Avonmore, I would like ask that they rise to receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I hope I'm introducing students that are in the gallery. It says they're arriving between 2:30 and 3, and I've been trying to judge whether or not they're here; I didn't get an opportunity to meet them. Hopefully there are 38 grade 6 students from the Leo Nickerson school in the constituency of St. Albert. They are accompanied by teachers George Mentz and Mrs. Nancy Orlesky, parent Mrs. Gail Hay, and bus driver Doug Fischer. I ask them to rise and be welcomed by the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Fisheries Legislation Compliance**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question with respect to the Canada Fisheries Act to the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, and ask the minister if he is in a position to advise the House what follow-up action was taken on the recommendation of his officials in the Rocky Mountain House district that the Department of Transportation be prosecuted for alleged violation of the Fisheries Act in the matter of culvert extension and subsequent fish kills in the Cold Water Creek.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to but this certain case hasn't been brought to my attention. I'll take that question as notice, ask for the information, and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, given the documentation, I'm surprised it hasn't. However, could I ask the minister what is the policy of this government and the department of Public Lands and Wildlife, particularly the fish and wildlife division, as it relates to departments complying with federal law, the Fisheries Act in this particular case?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, our policy has been followed fairly closely with all our officers in the field. They do take action and live up to the Act. As we've discussed earlier, though, the discretion is left to the officer in the field and, in major cases, references are definitely checked with the Attorney General's department before charges are made.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, could I just supplement the answer given by my hon. colleague, specifically with reference to the Department of Transportation, which the hon. member was getting at. In all instances that I'm aware of — and I'm aware of an awful lot of them over the years — the Department of Transportation is extremely careful when crossing streams, rivers, or any area where there might be fish or other wildlife

present, to ensure that we carry out our operations in terms of culvert or bridge installation in a way that will not only protect the species that are in the water but, hopefully, enhance that. Oftentimes we get involved in fish ladders and all kinds of things, to ensure that the streams of our province are not by way of our work of any lesser advantage to the sport fisherman in this province than they are. There are literally dozens of examples where we have held up work for several months or done additional work of a very costly magnitude, to ensure the protection of fish in our streams. We'll continue in that regard.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Transportation or the Minister of the Environment. Information I have here would seem to indicate that the Department of the Environment gave the okay to Transportation for this particular project, notwithstanding concerns by fish and wildlife people that there was in fact aviolation of the federal Fisheries Act.

My question to either hon. gentleman: is the government in a position to advise what exemption, under law, Environment gave the Department of Transportation with respect to the Cold Creek project?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously I don't have the specifics of the case before me, but the department would require a permit under the Water Resources Act, as would any developer with regard to work in a stream course.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife tell the House what procedures are in place for co-ordination between government departments so that federal laws such as the Fisheries Act are in fact complied with by provincial departments? What procedures does the minister's department have in place to ensure that co-ordination?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, as in all projects, the departments continuously co-operate and discuss projects and proposals that come forward, whether from the private sector or another government department. They meet in roundtable discussions in the local areas on every application, and then forward their recommendations to our office in Edmonton.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister be a little more specific about the procedures that are in place? The information I have would seem to indicate quite a few cracks through which the process has fallen. I'd like to know what directives the minister has given to ensure that there is proper co-ordination between Fish and Wildlife, Environment, and other departments of government, specifically as it applies to the federal Fisheries Act in this case.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I don't have with me a copy of the regulations or the policy that they follow. In the past they've had very little problem in dealing with other departments. You're referring to the department of highways. This is the first mention of any other government department that has had a problem with the Fisheries Act that I know of. As I mentioned earlier, I'll definitely find the relevant facts of this specific case and report back.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement the answer of my colleague. Under the Water Resources Act, such development requests or construction aspects with regard to a stream course are circulated amongst the various departments. The comments come back, and then a decision is made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, with those answers fresh in our minds, I'd like to direct my second question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Given the minister's answer to my last supplementary question, could I direct a new set of questions as it relates to the Beaverlodge weir. Could the minister advise the House why his officials did not consult with fish and wildlife officials before funding and approving construction of the Beaverlodge weir on the Beaverlodge River?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have firsthand knowledge of the application the hon. member is alluding to. I'd have to check into it and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. While the minister is checking, could he investigate the situation which occurred. According to the documentation I have, his department gave authorization, and Fish and Wildlife threatened to prosecute the town of Beaverlodge. Given the problems, in public relations at the very least, that this sort of two-headed policy ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's come directly to the question.

MR. NOTLEY: What specific policy of co-ordination is in place to check with Fish and Wildlife before Water Resources gives any approval to a project which may affect the fisheries?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the policy, the particular proposals are circulated, responses are given to the department, and a decision is made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. When examples arise where this does not take place — I've cited two already, but there may be others — could the minister advise what ministerial process is in place to review the co-ordination between the Department of the Environment on one hand and the department headed by the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife on the other?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is a policy in place which provides for interdepartmental review of these matters under the various Acts which the department administers, one being the Water Resources Act. I believe those policies are being followed. If the hon. member has some information he wishes to pass on to me, I'll look at it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is requesting information that he may wish to investigate in the last days of this session, could the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife advise the House what discussions he held and whether any policy was developed as a result of assertions by fish and wildlife officials that the channelization of Pigeon Creek was undertaken for political reasons and without a permit required by the Water Resources Act?

MR. SPARROW: I'll have to take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker. I have never heard of any channel in Pigeon Creek, any reference to it, or any permits thereof. But I will take that as notice and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: We certainly are going to be taking a lot of things as notice today, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps I could ask the Attorney General a question with respect to the federal Fisheries Act. As I recollect *Hansard* of March 19, 1984, I believe, the Attorney General indicated that

section 71 of the Fisheries Act binds the Crown in right of any province when, as the minister put it, "the Crown is in the business" of doing something which may be harmful to fish. What is the overall policy of this department with respect to compliance by all departments of government with federal environmental regulatory legislation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the provincial departments comply with both federal and provincial legislation which is there to regulate the conduct of others and of governments as well. I'm not sure the hon. leader's question is precise enough for me to respond in specifics. I would point out a few things. For example, one is that as far as a federal statute binding the provincial Crown is concerned — and I'm now giving a legal opinion — that occurs in basically two circumstances. One is where it specifically declares in the statute that it is to bind the Crown, and it's made clear that the federal statute doesn't refer merely to the federal Crown. The other situation is that where the province would be in business in a commercial sense — not in business in the sense of building culverts as a transportation department but in the sense of a Crown corporation or the like — then it would be bound in those circumstances as well.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can do any better than to say to the hon. leader that in all those circumstances, obviously employees of the government do their very best not to break regulations and to comply with requirements that are binding upon them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Now that the field officers are going to have to report to the Attorney General's department, could the minister advise whether any general policy directive has been issued to field offices to scrutinize carefully any breaches of not only provincial Acts but federal legislation, notwithstanding the fact that there may be a loophole which would not bind the department even though it might bind a private individual or a company doing business?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any memorandum or policy directive to that effect. Given the fact that policy directives often emanate at the official level, though, I think I should check that and get back to the hon. member at a subsequent date.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could just supplement the line of questioning the hon. Leader of the Opposition is pursuing, I'd like to say that with regard to work in a stream course, depending on the nature of the project, there's obviously going to be some disturbance to the water course and the water resource, and there'll be some impact on fishery. To what extent those impacts will be is a matter of opinion. In most cases these projects are deemed to be necessary to the public interest of Alberta and must proceed. We recognize that there will be some disturbance in putting a culvert in a stream; obviously you're going to disturb the streambed. With regard to these projects, though, we look at the timing and scheduling of flows in order to approve projects in the time period in which they are undergoing construction, to minimize that disturbance.

Youth Emergency Shelter — Edmonton

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is a follow-up to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health with regard to the Youth Emergency Shelter in Edmonton. The minister indicated that support for that centre was forthcoming. I wonder if the minister has reviewed those comments of Friday, May 25, and could bring the House up to date as to the agreement that has been struck with that centre.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I reviewed the comments of last Friday and, in my review, didn't see that there was any further information to come. If the hon. member wants details, I certainly can get them and provide them for him tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In my discussion with the director of the emergency shelter, there was indication that the present agreement is about two years old and that a new agreement has not been struck. Is that information correct as of today?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, my information was that we had agreed to a new agreement, but again I'll double-check to make sure that's correct.

Calgary Remand Centre Disturbance

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Solicitor General. Can the minister confirm reports that the government's report on the April 8, 1984, riot at the Calgary Remand Centre has now been completed and forwarded to his department? If so, has the minister had a chance to read the report and make an assessment of the incident?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the report is complete. I have not seen it yet, but I understand it will be coming to me this week.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Will the minister be making this review public? Specifically, would he table the document in the House?

DR. REID: No, Mr. Speaker. It's not the habit to make these reports public, as they involve security within the corrections service. They have not been made public in the past, and I doubt if this one will be either.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question in view of the answer, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the public is concerned about what happened at the Calgary Remand Centre and, I suppose more importantly, what is going to be done to prevent it happening in the future, what information is the minister prepared to share with the Assembly and the public about the incident?

DR. REID: One of the reasons for not making the report public, of course, is that it may well contain information which would be useful to people who intend to create disturbances in the future. It is for that reason and for security reasons that these reports are not made public.

What may be made public is the total cost of all repairs once they are effected. Other than that, it's unlikely that any further information will be made public.

MR. MARTIN: Just following up on that, Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider releasing an analysis of the internal review which, while respecting certain privileges of information, particularly individuals' names, might still provide public information as to the probable costs — and the minister alluded to that — but, more importantly, to the causes and solutions?

DR. REID: Not having seen the document yet, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to make that commitment.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. The public has already been given part of the information through

its access to view criminal proceedings, which I believe are against 10 individuals. Can the minister advise whether required procedures were followed and whether any disciplinary action was recommended because of possible actions prior to or during the riot?

DR. REID: The possibility of disciplinary actions will depend on what's in the document. As I said, I have not seen it yet. If they are justified, disciplinary actions will of course occur. When I see the document, I will consider whether or not there's anything of a general nature that can be made public. But I'm not prepared to make a commitment until I've seen the document.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister has not made a commitment to provide anything to the House. There are a lot of nervous people out there. In view of the secrecy of this review, what assurance can the minister give this Assembly that this type of disturbance will not happen at the Calgary Remand Centre again? If we had the public document, we might have some faith. But we don't have anything.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is asking for a guarantee. In view of the people who are in remand centres, it's impossible to give a guarantee that there will not be future attempts to create disturbances or indeed damage property. The very nature of remand and correctional centres is that those people who are there have broken the law, and some of them may not be averse to breaking the law in the future.

MR. MARTIN: One supplementary following from that. Perhaps the minister hasn't reviewed it, but there's some literature by correctional administrators that says that one of the best ways to prevent riots of this type is to be open to the public. It's here, and I'll be glad to share it with the minister. Has the minister assessed this type of literature before making these comments?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of behavior of people who are incarcerated is an interesting subject and has been looked at, at some length, by many people: criminologists, sociologists, and psychologists. Opinions vary quite markedly as to the best way of handling these individuals. To take one particular attitude that involves making all the information public may in actual fact run counter to the advice of some other experts.

Teacher Qualifications

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Education has to do with the qualifications of teachers and upgrading those qualifications. Did the minister set out any guidelines as to when the upgrading of teachers will take place in Education of Teachers in Alberta: A Model for the Future? Are there any parameters as to when that will happen?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it isn't even established yet that there will be an upgrading of teacher training. The document the hon. member referred to is a discussion paper. It was not developed within the department, although it was certainly developed with the participation of one individual in the department, the deputy minister of Education. It is principally the

creation of the deans of the four faculties of education. Until such time as we've had the benefit of public discussion and have had an opportunity to analyze the contributions of the public discussion, we won't make any decision.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In the discussions that have been taking place in this area, has any consideration been given to having the teaching profession self-governing, the same as medicine, dentistry, and law? Then you must take a certain number of continuing education courses within, say, a five-year period. Has there been any discussion at that level?

MR. KING: There certainly has been, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member may recall that I answered a question in the Assembly earlier this year and, in the course of answering, indicated that we have been having discussions with the Alberta Teachers' Association that are directed toward a new piece of professional legislation for teachers in the province. Such a piece of new legislation would undoubtedly conform to the government's policy on professions and occupations and would have the effect of making the teaching profession in the province self-governing.

Election Contributions

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is a follow-up to a question on March 27, when I directed to the Premier a question that he put on notice. It was with regard to the fact that, under the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, Crown corporations are entitled to donate funds to political parties in Alberta. I wonder if the Premier has had time to review that matter, as to whether that is supported by the government at this time.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we have had the matter under review and have considered it from a number of aspects, one of them being the legal aspects involved. We haven't completed the legal review as yet.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in terms of that legal review. Is the Premier considering bringing forward an amendment, maybe not in the spring session but possibly in the fall session of the Legislature?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's a possibility that is being considered. But we haven't completed the review, so we haven't been able to come to a conclusion yet.

Container Port Facility

MR. MARTIN: My question to the Minister of Economic Development is in regard to his announcement yesterday about the container port. It is my understanding that no location has been decided upon at this point. My question to the minister is, what considerations will determine where the container port is located if it is located in Alberta?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the issue is really whether or not we're going to get the same kind of rates for shipping containers from Calgary or Edmonton to tidewater as are available from Montreal to Halifax. If there can be savings accrued from the innovative proposal we have made, the first railroad on that main line that passes those along to the shippers will be the recipient of the container port.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. What negotiations have occurred with the railways at this point,

and what has the response been to this point? Has it been generally positive or not?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, my experience over time has been that responses from the railroad are generally not positive. The negotiations will begin in earnest today and, over time, I hope to report back on the results of those negotiations.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the estimated cost to the provincial government of this project?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to be precise about that. Up to four facilities will be required to make the whole proposition workable. We hope the Alberta government doesn't have to be involved in jurisdictions outside this province. Until that's clear, I can't answer the question on capital cost, nor can I respond in terms of operating costs.

It will be a substantial sum of money, because involved will be railroad cars, containers, the first few years' losses, the cost of equalizing on either Calgary or Edmonton, should that be necessary, and the cost of operating the company that will administer the ports.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the project went ahead, I expect it would have some major impact on the elevator system. Has the minister held discussions with the major elevator companies about this proposal?

MR. PLANCHE: No we haven't, Mr. Speaker. I don't see any relationship between this and the elevator system. Actually, containers generally respond to the need for value-added products to get to tidewater, and I don't see a commodity-shipping system being greatly affected. What this does is afford Alberta people who want to upgrade commodities an opportunity to compete more favourably with those at tidewater.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have an assessment or ballpark figure of how many construction jobs this project might bring to either city if it goes ahead, and the permanent jobs eventually resulting from this?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the port in itself is not going to be a great employer of people, nor is the construction of the port. There will be maybe a dozen or two dozen operating people in the facility. The key to this is the activity that will grow around it, because it will now have competitive access to market. That number will be substantial.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Attorney General wishes to reply to a question which he previously accepted as notice.

MR. CRAWFORD: Not as far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. I got my Neils mixed up.

Unemployment Action Centre — Edmonton

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept the "young Neil" connotation that has been referred to.

Yesterday the hon. Member for Little Bow asked a question concerning departmental referrals to the unemployment action centre. I want to respond today by saying that there are infrequent referrals to that agency. Those who are referred there are referred primarily to access child care services that are offered.

We do co-operate in a number of ways with a variety of voluntary organizations; the Boyle Street Co-op would be an example. However, in the case of work with unemployed employables, as I mentioned yesterday, the vast majority of the district offices refer the social allowance recipients to our successful employment opportunities program.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 33 interested and enthusiastic grade 6 students from the Olds elementary school located in the Olds-Didsbury constituency. The students are accompanied by teachers Mr. Greig Connolly and Miss Pat Moran, and by parents David Bell, Lorne Coonfer, and Doreen Regier. I understand they're seated in the members gallery, and I'd like them to rise now and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege as the member for the Grande Prairie constituency, the home constituency of Willie deWit. I wish to remind the House of the contribution this young man has made to the sport of boxing locally, nationally, and internationally. He holds many titles: three-time Canadian amateur heavyweight boxing champion, defending Commonwealth amateur heavyweight boxing champion, North American amateur heavyweight champion, and world amateur heavyweight champion. He has brought considerable attention to our province. He is an excellent ambassador for all Albertans, and indeed all Canadians. Willie is a true gentleman. If he were not, I would not be standing here today talking about him. All who know him give him their respect and support.

For these reasons, I suggest we give him our unanimous support and our best wishes as we send him to the Olympics in California this summer, where he will be in quest of the first-ever gold medal in heavyweight boxing for this province, and indeed for our nation. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we also send our best wishes with all our Alberta and Canadian athletes as they go to Los Angeles this summer. [applause]

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the unanimous enthusiasm of the House, a message will be sent on behalf of the House, as the hon. member has suggested.

With regard to his point of privilege, I assume what he's referring to is the privilege of representing the constituency from which this young man comes.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and members of the Assembly 48 grade 5 students from the Spruce View school in the Innisfail constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Edna Lewis and Marguerite Baker, parents Merna Cernak, Gayle Willson, Delia Branson, Bonnie Jean Brown, and bus driver George Vanderham. They

are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise to receive a warm welcome from the House.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 179, 180, and 181 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

176. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:
With regard to private schools in Alberta and the Ghitter paper on tolerance and understanding:
- (1) the names of all Category 4 private schools inspected by the Department of Education since January 1, 1983;
 - (2) the date of each inspection; and
 - (3) in each case where the school was found to be unsatisfactory in any significant aspect, the action proposed to be taken by the Department of Education.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I move Question No. 176.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the government will have to vote against the motion for a return. Unfortunately the document referred to is not in the possession of the government. I have reread my transcript of my remarks to the annual representative [assembly] of the Alberta Teachers' Association. I certainly didn't suggest that the document was in the possession of the government. It is therefore impossible for us to return it. In any event, I note as well that when I was speaking to the annual representative assembly, the reference was not to opinion in Alberta but to the community's opinion. The survey that I was alluding to was, if my recollection serves me correctly . . .

MR. HORSMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; my colleague is dealing with the next motion for a return. I think this has arisen as a result of the fact that my colleague the Member for Clover Bar moved a question. Perhaps we could revert to Question 176, and I can advise the Assembly that my colleague is prepared to accept the question and will answer it in due course. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, notwithstanding the attempt, to move it, Question 176 is still firmly in place. Has it been agreed to by the government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. SPEAKER: Now we're at Motion for a Return No. 177. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Education would like to complete his observations in regard to that motion.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have to move it first.

177. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the survey the Minister of Education referred to on March 29, 1984, in Calgary, at the annual representative assembly, on the subject of Albertans' attitude to education in the province, that indicates 88 percent of the community wants change in education.

MR. KING: Does that mean I have to start over?

I have reviewed my remarks to the annual representative assembly, and I found that the survey alluded to was not a survey of Albertans' attitudes. If my recollection serves me correctly, it was a survey of attitudes in western Canada. At any rate, my reference was to the community's attitudes toward education.

In summary, the document referred to is not in the possession of the government and did not refer to the attitudes of Albertans towards education. However, for the information of the hon. member and so that he might get it from another source if that's available to him, the survey was done by the Decima Corporation in the fall of 1983.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, does the hon. member wish to have the question put?

DR. BUCK: Sure.

[Motion lost]

178. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) the names and official position designations of all government of Alberta employees working in offices outside of Canada, listed by location of office, as of March 31, 1984;
 - (2) the travel each employee has taken in their capacity as an employee of the government of Alberta working in offices outside of Canada and the cost of the trips, itemizing travel, lodgings, and meals;
 - (3) the purpose of the trips by the employees in (1) and a list of the persons or groups with whom the employees in (1) met;
 - (4) the names of all other persons, including family, friends, secretarial staff, or any other person or persons accompanying any person in (1) on a trip;
 - (5) the total cost to the government of Alberta to operate each office outside of Canada for the fiscal year 1983-84.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I propose an amendment to the motion, a copy of which has been supplied to the mover. The amendment would add the words "for the period November 1, 1983, to March 31, 1984" to paragraph (2), delete the words "and a list of the persons or groups with whom the employees in (1) met" in paragraph (3), delete the words "including family, friends, secretarial staff or any other person or persons" in paragraph (4), and add the words "at public expense" to paragraph (4). These amendments are for the purpose of making the motion exactly the same in intent and purpose as the motion for a return that was passed by the Assembly on November 24, 1983, for the period up to and including November 1, 1983.

Speaking to the amendment, I have supplied a copy to the hon. member who moved it. I think it would be entirely consistent with the previous order for a return, and I can advise the members of the Assembly that that particular motion for a return will be filed before very long. It did require a great deal of research as to the various people in the foreign offices and all their travels and so on, so it has taken a great deal of time to prepare. In effect, we shall now add to it the period from November 1 of last year until the end of the fiscal year 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Independents, on the amendment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, I hope and at this point in time take for granted that the deletion of "family, friends, secretarial staff or any other person" is done, first of all, to be consistent. I can understand that proposal as well. But I also conclude that there is no information as such, in terms of the public expense that has been incurred. That being so, the amendment would be acceptable. [interjection]

[Motion as amended carried]

head: **GOVERNMENT DESIGNATED BUSINESS**

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

Bill 49 **Appropriation (Alberta Heritage** **Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects** **Division) Act, 1984-85 (No. 2)**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 49.

[Motion carried; Bill 49 read a second time]

Bill 207 **Remembrance Day Act**

[Adjourned debate April 5: Mr. Kowalski]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's been several weeks since we last had debate on Bill 207. I'm delighted that since that time, Thursday, April 5, when a number of members in this Assembly put forward comments with respect to Bill 207, the Remembrance Day Act, which was introduced by the Member for Lethbridge West, the Bill has moved onto the government list.

In providing my remarks, I indicated that I had a great debt to pay to those of my forefathers in this country who participated in a number of escalations throughout the world, whether it was the Boer War, World War I, World War II, or the Korean War, and to those men and women who stood proudly and largely in defence of this country by wearing its uniform and who provided peace and an involvement to bring about peace for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 207 is an important first step in the recognition of our warriors of the past. While I intend to vote in support of it this afternoon, I would like to let all hon. members know that from my perspective, it does not go far enough. When we recognize that in fighting for the democracy and the freedoms that we hold in this country, well over 100,000 men and women gave their lives, gave their blood, and gave part of themselves, not only to us at a particular time but they forsook their family members who continued to live after their deaths, I am dismayed that we can continue to live — and probably will live in 1984 and have Remembrance Day recognized — and still see Remembrance Day maintained as a day of commercial activity in our province.

In my view, Bill 207's importance is as a necessary first step. It will not go far enough until I believe in my mind that we prohibit all commercial activity on Remembrance Day. It's an area I intend to provide greater thought to as 1984 wears on. Hopefully I will be in a position to provide greater com-

ments on that particular subject in the fall of 1984. Of all the days we have that are currently designated as statutory holidays in our nation — and November 11 is one of those days — it would seem to me that the enforcement of noncommercial activity on November 11 would rank of equal importance to us as December 25 and Easter, as a holiday to be maintained commerce-free in our nation.

As well, Mr. Speaker, as an individual who was not born until September 1945 and who lives today with freedom because of the contribution of others, as history has gone on and we've moved from 1945 into 1984, a great deal of time has gone by. In fact well more than a whole generation of people has been born, and we're now into the second generation of people who live in our society. For the most part, those individuals have not had a great opportunity to learn much about the history of this country, by the very nature of the types of social studies curricula we've afforded our various schools in this nation. It was only in the last several years that we as a political party and a government even moved in the direction of ensuring a greater realization of Canadian and Alberta history in our schools. It would seem to me that our young people, who now have the benefit of learning the new Alberta and Canadian content in our schools, will have a much greater opportunity than those who came before them to know the contribution that these well over 100,000 men and women made to our freedom and our society.

Mr. Speaker, in voicing my concerns for the maintenance of a day of remembrance and a day of thank you, I think we as a province have to take a number of steps in 1984 so that part of this history is not forgotten. When you take a look at the number of people who attend the cenotaph ceremony on November 11 and look at the crowds, unfortunately you do not see masses of people. You see the veterans, some of their relatives, some of their friends; you see a sprinkling of people who might be in the decade of the 30s or the 20s. But you really look around and see how many young people are there. We have lost something by not encouraging more and more people to participate at the cenotaph and to be there.

I think it's important that we take steps and provide some funding for the volunteers who will associate themselves with the various Legion groups we have in our province to in fact see if the Legions in all the towns, villages, and cities in the province of Alberta believe there is greater need to provide more important cenotaphs that would be a focal point for citizens to arrive at on November 11. It's a subject matter that we can in fact address and look at through a variety of the lottery fundings we have. I think it's important — and I know that it happens — that all hon. members in this Assembly who are able do in fact participate at Remembrance Day ceremonies in a number of communities in their constituencies. Certainly in the area that I represent, I have an opportunity on that day to attend at least five or six cenotaph ceremonies. You can only physically attend one. But as each year goes by, I make it a practice to try to attend the ceremony or an event or function of the Legion on different occasions. It's an area that I think has to be of primary importance.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Alberta books of war dead are located in various locales in the province. Certainly in this building we're standing in today, there are inscriptions of the men and women who gave their lives in our defence. They are listed in the main room in this Assembly. But in fact many communities in our province may not have, in a place where as many people as possible can see them, the names of those people who died. It would be my suggestion as well that we undertake some discussion with the various Legion groups in the province of Alberta to see whether or not there is some

need to have located in the various libraries — the public libraries or, if there is no public library in a particular community, a school library — an Alberta book of war dead that would have the names of all the local people who did participate, a book that would be open, under glass and available for all people for eternity's sake. We have a great debt to pay.

I want to pay special contribution and recognition to Mr. Gogo for spending a great deal of time on Bill 207. I want to congratulate him very much for coming as far as he has with respect to this.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this Bill. I am proud that we have moved it from one list to a government list. However, I think much more can be done in this area. All hon. members in this Assembly have a responsibility in this area. We are fortunate today to be able to live and breathe in the democracy we have. That thanks must be remembered, not only in 1984 but in each year our society continues to go forward.

Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to participate briefly in this debate and to make three points with respect to the subject of Remembrance Day.

Many people have taken the attitude — wrongly, I suggest — that in some way the celebration of Remembrance Day is in effect glorying in war or wartime activities. Quite the contrary is true, Mr. Speaker. It is in fact an opportunity to glory in the fact that those who fought and died for our country did so to preserve peace. As Canadians, they did not go out into the world in a belligerent way in World War I, World War II, or the Korean War for the purpose of territorial acquisition, which is sometimes the cause of war, but to protect the peace that we now enjoy as Canadians. It is in that context that I think all of us should celebrate on November 11 those people's lives and what they did for all of us.

With respect to the comments just made by the hon. Member for Barrhead relative to whether or not Albertans wish to preserve and remember holidays for the purpose for which they were intended, I concur entirely in his remarks. I find myself continually distressed, on November 11, to find commercial activities taking place.

I have just completed a very extensive survey of my constituency. One of the questions I asked was whether the constituents of Medicine Hat wanted to see maintenance of the situation as it now exists with respect to commercial activities on Sundays and holidays — and I included holidays specifically in the questionnaire — or whether they wished to see commercial activities increased or in fact decreased. The results of several hundred returns so far show that almost half wish to see a maintenance of the existing situation, 34 percent wish to see commercial activities decreased on Sundays and holidays, and only 18 percent wish to see an increase in commercial activities on Sundays and holidays. I think the fact that I included holidays in the survey was significant, because many of the people who responded to the questionnaire in the space available made specific reference to wanting to see no commercial activities taking place on November 11, Remembrance Day. I wanted to make that the second point in my comments today.

Finally, I want to add my words of congratulations to those people who have supported this private member's public Bill. That includes the many Royal Canadian Legions throughout the province and, I'm certain, the Royal Canadian Legion situated in Medicine Hat, a voluntary organization which does an immense amount of work on behalf of all the citizens of my community. The Remembrance Day ceremonies in Medicine

Hat, obviously unlike other places in Alberta, have in fact been very well attended over recent years. In fact from my observation, having been present to lay the wreath on behalf of the province of Alberta on every occasion since I was elected to this Assembly, I suggest that if anything the crowds have increased in recent years, as there seems to be an increasing awareness of the importance of maintaining peace in the world. It was said by the great American patriot Patrick Henry that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. Of course that means maintaining the peace through being prepared. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those Legions and organizations which have supported this private member's public Bill have done a great service to all Albertans.

In conclusion, as a member of the government, may I add my words of congratulation to our colleague from Lethbridge West, who is unable to be with us today on this significant occasion on which the Bill has been debated in second reading. I know he has asked his colleague and ours, the Member for Cardston, to conclude the debate on his behalf. As a member of the government, I want to express my gratitude and that of the members of Executive Council to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West for his contribution to Alberta's legislative package. Some Bills are perhaps of little consequence in terms of the way they affect the lives of Albertans. I suggest that our colleague the Member for Lethbridge West has made a very significant contribution to the legislative life of the province of Alberta with the introduction of Bill 207. On behalf of the government, I'm very pleased indeed that we have made the decision to include it as a government Bill. Our congratulations and thanks should go to our colleague, even though he is not present today.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to indicate that my colleague and I will be supporting Bill 207. I think it is important to recognize the very significant contribution of people who served overseas in the major conflicts that have involved our country. I want to also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Canadian Legion. I say that because I think that too often, especially in the last few years, we have seen the balkanization of our country, and we have not seen agencies in place that bring Canadians together. It's a terrifying and horrible situation that to bring people together you have to have your country in conflict. But it is a fact that the people who served overseas, whether they come from Quebec, P.E.I., British Columbia, Alberta, or wherever the case may be, have a common bond that permits the organization they belong to, to play a role in providing a little more glue to this fragile political alignment known as Canada. I think any agency, any organization, any group that contributes to Canadian national unity is worthy of note.

Not only should we take the five minutes to honour the sacrifice; perhaps during that time we should respect the theme we notice at Legion functions on November 11: think Canadian. Mr. Speaker, I think we need greater respect and homage to those organizations which contribute to Canadians, wherever they live, recognizing that proud though we may be of the provinces in which we reside, our loyalty to this country comes first.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate and perhaps important that the Minister of Education should rise to speak for just a moment on this Bill. I appreciate the contributions that have been made by a number of my hon. colleagues in this Assembly, and I particularly appreciate the initiative taken by my colleague the hon. Member for Lethbridge West in the introduction of this Bill and predecessor Bills of a similar nature in this House.

I think it is fair to say that there is a reawakening sense in the community that the school system, as a great public institution, must be prepared to affirm values the community holds to be important. The school system has to be prepared to endorse the great moments in our past, the great opportunities of our present, as well as the great challenges of our future. It is important that the school system should endorse the positive values that are associated with loyalty, self-sacrifice, and dedication to the ideals of a democratic community. It is important that the school system should remind youngsters, many of whom have never had to face difficult circumstances in their lives, that the community we enjoy today is the result of the sacrifice even to death of many people who lived before us in this community and other communities around the world.

I had the opportunity as a young man to visit the United Nations in New York. I am reminded of a monument in one of the gardens adjacent to the United Nations. The inscription beneath it is from the Old Testament. They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall no more make war against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

The best prevention against the likelihood of repeating history is to be aware of what we have done, each of us to the other, in the course of our history. I hope this Bill will in some small measure accomplish that for all of the children in our system.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my colleagues in making a few comments with regard to Bill No. 207. The Minister of Education has just spoken on the matter for all schools. From my past experience, having been directly involved with the school operation, I would just like to point out that many schools do in fact have observances on the day prior to Remembrance Day, because schools in the Edmonton area have an official holiday on November 11. I suggest that the observances that do take place usually are a half to three-quarters of an hour in duration, well planned, and well attended. Young people today are becoming ever mindful of the ravages of war. The intent is not to extol or seek any glory with regard to war but rather to remember the sacrifices made and to remember that we do not repeat our history in that regard.

There is one concern I have with the Bill; that is, it prescribes a minimum. I hope that does not become the standard throughout the province, that greater effort and care is made with regard to how we develop a meaningful Remembrance Day program. I know some schools have not participated in it, and I think the Bill will at least induce some uniformity throughout the province so every school does in fact remember the sacrifices made by the people in World War I and World War II.

I congratulate the hon. Member for Lethbridge West in bringing forth the Bill, and I applaud the comments that have been made by my colleagues.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take part in the debate on Bill 207. I didn't have a chance to speak on it during the initial introduction, but I have spoken on other occasions when the Member for Lethbridge West brought this Bill forward. I don't know on how many occasions he's brought it forward, but he persisted and got it moved to a government Bill.

We've heard many colleagues today talk about Remembrance Day. I agree very much with the comments by the Member for Barrhead when he said we should earnestly think about this as a first step to achieving a Remembrance Day when commerce does indeed stop — maybe not commerce totally, not those essential things in commerce that need to be carried on, but the nonessential aspects of commerce that could stop. As many

have said, Remembrance Day would be a day to remember not the acts of war but those who have given their lives and the thoughts of peace that exist that day.

I can remember going to Remembrance Day services for many, many years. I guess it's because my mother and father were both deeply involved in the Legion and what the Legion stood for. I can remember going as a very young child to these Remembrance Day services, what they meant, and what they were all about. I can remember going to Runnymede on a trip to England in about 1976. I think that's the name of the very large memorial where you walk among the columns. On those huge granite columns are the names of many who gave their lives for the war. I can remember looking for the name of a person from Bow Island, taking a picture of that name inscribed in the stone, and having this picture developed and given to that person's mother. Mr. Speaker, the memories she had — just a picture of that small part of that memorial was like a gift of many thousands of dollars. It was something she very much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to support this motion and remind them, as I said at the start, that maybe this should be the first step. I ask them to think about that and support the motion.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, like the Member for Cypress, I also feel that this should be a first step. Most of the children in Alberta do receive a holiday on November 11 and I recognize that the schools do a fine job in commemorating the spirit of November 11 on the appropriate day before the actual November 11.

However, I think it's important that we be diligent in our society and remind all members of our society of the benefits that accrue to us because of what was sacrificed for us. Many commercial activities take place on November 11. There are many people who as schoolchildren observed a ceremony but as adults do not participate in any ceremony. In the city of St. Albert, where I have been privileged to place a wreath each year, there has been a large turnout, but it is still a small percentage of the total population. Obviously everyone in this Assembly would be supportive of any way that we can recognize the tremendous sacrifices made by others for us.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Royal Canadian Legion for their very worthwhile efforts, not just in remembering those that gave us the freedoms we enjoy but also in the tremendous ongoing work of raising the recognition of members of our society. I know their volunteers go into the schools and communities and talk to groups about the work of the Legion, the work of their members, and the sacrifice that was made by our fellowmen.

The freedom that we enjoy is not enjoyed by the majority of people throughout the world. We have a precious gift in this country and we have a responsibility, to use a quote, to hold the torch high. It's a great responsibility, and we have a great example to set.

I would like to conclude by commending the Member for Lethbridge West for bringing forward this important step in remembering Remembrance Day and all the very important things it stands for.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I as well would like to speak in favour of Bill 207, the Remembrance Day Act, and give my congratulations to the Member for Lethbridge West for being persistent with regard to this concept and this amendment that will affect many communities across the province of Alberta. I'm sure every one of us in this Legislature has participated in

Remembrance Day activities and had a number of experiences that brought to mind the acts of bravery, the acts of involvement in those years of not only the Second World War but the First World War as well, when many returned but many did not.

From those experiences there are many lessons for young people in our schools. From my early days, as a young person involved in remembrance activities, I can even recall the impact of some of the speeches and some of the experiences that were related to the group by people actually involved in this world conflict at that time — thinking how terrible were the things confronted by real people.

So often today we forget our history. I believe this ceremony, carried on through the various schools of our province, will remind us of things that have happened and hopefully prepare us better for things that may happen in the future. Out of respect for many of those people that lost their lives, this period of time is very deserving. I certainly support the fact that this amendment will make operational many of the acts that are already taking part in our schools. On that basis, I certainly give it my wholehearted support.

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to rise briefly, Mr. Speaker, and also commend the Member for Lethbridge West for bringing this motion to us. I think it is an important one. Listening to the remarks of the Member for Medicine Hat, I was very interested in the survey he talked about, because I perceive that in Edmonton we're moving to commercialism even on this day, a day that's supposed to be one of remembrance. I think this is a very important point to remember. I was encouraged — I hope it's true throughout all of the province — that by his survey, people in his riding were against this commercialism, especially on Remembrance Day.

I think we all want to remember in our own way Remembrance Day and what it means to us. As a collective group, as a country, it's perhaps, as somebody mentioned, one of the most important days. But in the collective remembrance, we all have specific remembrances. I know some of us served. I know Ron Moore did. Coming from my hometown, I know he would have very different memories than those of us who were younger and didn't go over. But I might point out a personal experience of mine. I was born in 1941 — if we're trading dates, I'm a little older than the Member for Barrhead — and I did not see my father until I was four years old. So even people who were born after will have those personal remembrance moments, if you like.

I think it is an important Act. We have to take time to remember as we rush along in this world of ours. I think the point is that by remembering the terrible conflict that happened in World Wars I and II, we're remembering the people who sacrificed. Secondly, by remembering, hopefully we won't forget the horror of war and the world we leave for our children and grandchildren will be a better place to live.

In conclusion, I again compliment the Member for Lethbridge West. While it may not seem important to some people, I think it's one of the most significant Bills we'll be passing in this session or any other session for that matter.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words regarding this Bill, because I think it's another unique occasion in our Assembly when a private member's Bill comes before us and becomes a government Bill. I really commend the Member for Lethbridge West for bringing it before us, creating the interest he has, and thereby having it become a government Bill.

We look at the conflicts that have gone before for many, many ages, going back to the time when Hannibal crossed the

Alps to make his great pilgrimage in the matter of war, then of course the Crusades and those sorts of things. It seems to me that attached to those kinds of occurrences in those days was the fact that war is something that glorifies people. If somebody was successful, he achieved great glory. Also, if he didn't survive, he was still glorified in some ways.

I had a comment made to me one time, and I thought it was significant too. At that time I was attached to bomber command in the RCAF at a place called Dalton in Yorkshire, England. It was nighttime, and my roommate and I were in our billets, which were about 10 feet wide and 16 feet long. Mail had come from Canada that day. He was lying on his bunk in the far corner, and I was in my bunk in this corner, when a Jerry Messerschmitt came over and shot up the whole station. All of a sudden, we could see splinters coming up in the floor, going down the length of our billet between his bed and mine. Afterwards we were quite silent for a few moments. Then he said to me, Frank, you almost got glorified. I said, I'd just as soon have it the way it is.

I think another significant comment was made to me by a young schoolchild one Remembrance Day. She said, Mr. Appleby, why do we wear a poppy? Of course it's been mentioned here this afternoon by a number of members that we do it to commemorate the lives of those who sacrificed themselves so we might have peace. Then we have to underline that word "peace", because what are we doing today?

It's really not justifiable in any way to see the things that are happening in the world, especially in the Middle East and Central America. We're not really achieving what we want in our world as far as peace is concerned. If we are really going to make it meaningful as far as Remembrance Day is concerned, as we bring this Act into effect, we have to make it plain and clear to those children who will be making that gesture of remembrance on Remembrance Day that what we really want to do is start right at home, on a one-to-one basis with our family and friends in our own community and then spreading out to the whole nation and among nations. We have to learn that that's where it all begins.

We're not going to succeed in achieving what we're trying to do by having demonstrations, because demonstrations themselves, Mr. Speaker, are actually where conflicts begin. We see a great many of them these days, trying to persuade people that we have to have nuclear disarmament, which is a good thing. But we're not going to achieve it by that sort of purpose and that sort of procedure. We have to do it right in our homes and in our own lives.

In commending the member for bringing this Bill forward, I hope that all of us in this Assembly, as we go out on Remembrance Day in the years to come, will make mention of the fact that if we spread that word, that is how we will bring peace not only to our own lives but to our nation as well.

Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Lethbridge West, may I conclude debate?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure that that kind of proxy arrangement fits under the *Standing Orders*, but with the unanimous consent of the House, no problem.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Member for Lethbridge West regrets very much that he's not here today. It is seldom that we pass a private member's Bill in the Legislature, and I know he really felt this Bill was

important. It is at least the second time he has brought it forward as a private member's Bill, so I am sure he really would like to be here with us today. On his behalf, I would like to thank all the people on both sides of the House who have supported the Bill. I think it shows that on occasion, all of us can get on the same wavelength.

In my generation at least, Mr. Speaker, in the small country schools, we always had school on those days. It was quite a solemn occasion when you were in grade 3 or 4 to have the teacher looking at her watch, counting down to 11 o'clock, and then sitting there in silence. It seemed like two minutes was an awfully long time, but we still did it. I suppose any of the people who have gone through that have never forgotten it.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard people here today talk about the sacrifice people made, and that's part of Remembrance Day. But I honestly think there is a certain mount of thanksgiving, that we should be thankful we are not at war as often as some people in this world. I think we should count our blessings in some ways, because we live in a country that is comparatively at peace. We have our squabbles in a political way, but basically we don't take those ultimate decisions.

At the same time, I would like to compliment the government for sending wreaths to all local communities on Remembrance Day. Every one of us at one time or another has been to our communities and participated in these events. In my constituency at least, I know it's a big day. In Cardston, Magrath, and Raymond — I've been in every one of those communities, and we do commemorate Remembrance Day on our own, Bill or no Bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support this Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 207 read a second time]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Bill 53
Rural Electrification Statutes
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make just a couple of observations about Bill 53. I point out to members of the committee that as a member of an REA which is now in the process of negotiating sale — not that I'm very happy about that, but democratic decisions are made by members — I don't think I should vote on this Bill and so will exempt myself when we get to the vote.

There are a couple of points I'd like to raise. I certainly think the legislation is a step in the right direction. Obviously there's been a good deal of work done in concert with the Union of Rural Electrification Associations as well as several other groups. I'm most familiar with the district 6 action committee, which has met with members in the Peace River country

and expressed some concerns, Mr. Chairman. I think the points I raise and ask the minister to respond to flow from discussions I've had primarily with the action 6 people, although I have attended REA conventions from time to time.

I'm pleased to see the change with respect to the number of people voting before a sale can take place — 66 and two-thirds percent who are entitled to vote and are present at the meeting. That's certainly an improvement over the 50 percent plus one situation we have at the moment.

Mr. Minister, I have two specific complaints from members of the district 6 action committee that I'd like you to respond to. First of all, as I recollect your comments on second reading — I was not here at the time — you dealt with the increase in what I might call the threshold amount for the part 1 loan, from \$2,500 to \$5,000. I'd like to know from the minister on what basis the government decided to go that route. If the action 6 people I've talked to are correct, you certainly haven't gotten that recommendation from them. I read over the information sent to MLAs by the president of the Union of Rural Electrification Associations in the province. It seems to me, and one has to be totally fair about this, that while we're dealing with a very low-interest loan, 3.5 percent interest — no question that that is a pretty good loan to get these days — the fact of the matter is that we are increasing the threshold from \$2,500 to \$5,000, so the level of indebtedness under this part 1 loan for a farmer who is acquiring power will be, or could be, higher.

Mr. Minister, I raise that because in normal situations one might say: we haven't made any modification for a long time; perhaps it's an occasion to make that adjustment. But given the problems in agriculture at the moment, problems which have led a number of people to call for a debt moratorium and a group of farmers from central Alberta to come here several weeks ago expressing their concern, I wonder what the rationale is for the threshold amount being doubled. In the representations I've received from farmers, at least in the Peace, this is a matter of some concern.

The other issue, Mr. Chairman, really deals with the membership question. I think we have a good process with respect to our local gas co-ops, where everybody is included. If we took the co-op definition and applied it to REAs in terms of membership, I think we'd be in a much better position to ensure the survival of the REAs.

The final point — and I realize what the government is getting at. The government is basically saying that programs in place for REAs should be there for an individual who has to obtain his power as a company customer, for example, where an REA is sold out or whatever the case may be — in other words, to try to find some sort of equity between REA and non-REA members. I can understand that rationale. But it seems to me that there is a difference between a program which provides fairly significant cushioning in order that farmers in a rural electrification association own their line as opposed to the same kind of cushioning which allows farmers to obtain electricity but in fact not own the line because the line will then be owned by the power company. Since this has been specifically brought to my attention by people in the action 6 group, I'd like the minister to respond.

Mr. Chairman, I'll leave those observations with the minister, basically in the form of questions, and await his response.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, in responding to the three questions raised by the hon. member, I would not want to leave the impression that the decisions taken by government after what I consider to be lengthy consultation — by MLAs, members of the two caucus committees that have been directly involved, as well as all members of the House who have been

involved with their particular constituents or with REAs or other interested parties within their areas — and announced two weeks ago yesterday are an all-inclusive package intended to solve the problems of REAs in one fell swoop. On the contrary, they were seen as one of a series of steps taken by this administration, since coming to office in 1971, to improve the service of rural electrification to Albertans.

Specifically with regard to the move from \$2,500 to \$5,000 under the part 1 portion of the loan, I think it's important that we go back and review where we're coming from historically. If we look to 1973, we note that the part 1 portion of the loan was set at \$2,500. That was to bear an interest of 3.5 percent. It's also important to note that in 1973 the average cost of installing electricity was \$2,500 for one line of service, including the transformer. The part 2 portions of the loan were interest free and were intended to be there to provide a service; future customers would in turn be picking up those costs. In 1979 some refinements to that program were made. Relative to the cost of \$2,500 in 1973, it's important to recognize that today the average cost of installing power is \$5,000.

When looking at this matter, it's important that we recognize that in addition to moving the figure from \$2,500 to \$5,000 under part 1, effectively doubling the amount available, we have moved the interest-free portion of the loan from \$2,500 to \$5,000 as well, which means the farmer installing electricity has the ability to obtain \$10,000. He is paying 3.5 percent interest on the first \$5,000; the second \$5,000 is interest free. Under the part 2 portion of the loan, the remaining \$15,000 would be shared equally between the amount the farmer would pay interest on and the interest-free portion.

It's important to recognize that the upper limit of the loan has been increased from \$20,000 to \$25,000. As well, we've increased the type of service that a farmer may borrow for. The restriction before was a 25 KVA. We're now including all single-phase — in other words, the large single-phase — as well as three-phase farmers who, prior to this decision, could not borrow money for their needs under the program.

We've retained the 3.5 percent interest rate, I think that's a significant step and it should not go by lightly. I think a lot of credit goes to those rural members who argued strongly on behalf of their rural constituents that while the 3.5 percent interest was an anomaly in today's services and programs offered by both the private sector and government, there was a precedent set some years ago in the rural electrification program, and there was good reason to continue providing loans at that rate. As well, through the long term financing Act, we have retained the criteria for the financing: the part 1 portion of the loan at 10 years and the part 2 at 25 years. The changes affect new farm services only. Mr. Chairman, those are some of the reasons why the limit was increased from \$2,500 to \$5,000. One must not look at that in isolation from all the other increases and enriched benefits which are provided through the program.

The question of membership was raised by the hon. member. It certainly would have been much easier to address the question of membership similar to the way the government addressed membership in rural gas co-ops if we were now providing electricity for the first time to rural Alberta, but we're not. We're talking about customers who are presently being served by another utility company. It's quite a different matter for government to arbitrarily decide that it will direct that those customers who were initially served by the utility companies — and some of them have been served for a good number of years — will now automatically be transferred to the REAs. It was our conclusion that it was more important to define that all farmers should be eligible for membership in REAs if an

REA exists in their area, and that there should be some significant changes to the master agreements — changes which are not contained in the legislation, because it is not necessary to do that, but which do require the consent and approval of both the REAs and the utility companies themselves.

The final question raised by the hon. member referred to ownership. I believe he worked the question of rates into it. If I did not fully catch the import of the hon. member's question, I'd ask him to stand and ask a further question on the matter. In the changes we are proposing in terms of our policy, it is fundamentally important that REAs be treated like electric utility companies, that REAs have the ability to purchase power at a wholesale rate, and that the rate they're purchasing their electricity at should be compatible across the province. That was one of the original components of the Electric Energy Marketing Agency in recognizing that there should be a commonality, if you will, between classes of customers, whether the customer is in rural or urban Alberta, in the north or the south, and that that commonality would represent about 80 percent of the electric bill, the last 20 percent being the cost of distribution. The distribution costs in the areas that are more sparsely populated, where there are fewer customers, will not have the same economics of scale that larger centres will.

Clearly it was not an attempt to provide everyone with the same priced power across the board but to identify more clearly rates based on classes of customers. REAs needed to be treated as wholesalers, if you will, so there would be some room for an REA to use its charge of distribution to its customers in terms of building its own revolving fund. But generally speaking, that cost would be the same whether the REA was located in the TransAlta franchise area or the Alberta Power franchise area.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bill No. 53.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

213. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to propose measures to alleviate the increasing levels of unemployment among graduates of high schools, technical institutions, colleges, and universities.

[Adjourned debate April 5: Mr. Szwender]

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Member for Little Bow for bringing in Motion 213. It shows

that one of our members of the opposition has some genuine concern for some of the unemployed in this province. Mind you, it's a shame that the member wasn't in the House when the Minister of Manpower explained our approach to alleviating the problem of unemployment among graduates of our learning institutions. In fact it's a shame he's not in the House right now, but I'm sure he will read *Hansard* later. If he had been here when our Minister of Manpower explained the problems and our approach to the solutions, I think he would understand better. So I recommend that he read the previous *Hansard*.

In my 14 years of political life, I've seen many programs come in to create temporary employment. I've seen NIP, the neighbourhood improvement program; RRAP; OFY, the opportunities for youth; and the Company of Young Canadians — I always remember the young Canadians. They're all good programs, but still only temporary. The jobs came and went. Our beloved Minister of Manpower has introduced some excellent programs: PEP, STEP, NEED. These are perhaps a little better thought out than some of our federal programs in years gone by.

I'll give PEP as an example. It's a temporary program. Take one little company down in Calgary. At this point they are hiring 45 people. Under PEP they're taking on 23 more jobs. They're going to hire a lot of people. Some of these will be students; some will be graduates. But out of these, they are going to become permanent jobs. They will stay on the jobs later, when the program ends. This company is expanding. It's creating a market in Quebec. Traditionally, ever since we've been here, we have imported our furniture from Quebec and some from California and the states. But little J.D. Furniture in Calgary is exporting, competing, and selling Alberta-made products in areas which before had always produced and shipped to us. We were only the producers of raw materials. So it's good.

As for these programs, a job is a job is a job. If you create jobs anywhere, anyhow, there is a spin-off. It will trickle down and alleviate the problem for those unemployed, whether they're students, graduates, or whatever. They will all filter out and take some people off the unemployment roll. They'll create a job somewhere. We've got examples. I ran into an engineer who's driving a cab in Calgary. I thought, my goodness, the guy's a cabdriver. But he knows it's temporary. He is doing a job there, but he is looking forward. He doesn't want to drive a cab for long. He's an engineer, and he wants to do engineering. Band-aids are not going to cure a heart problem, and temporary programs are not going to solve the unemployment problems either. I think the thing that is going to bring about solutions in the long term is — take our Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, John Zaozirny. He negotiated with Jean Chretien and created a new oil sands plant. There will be hundreds of jobs. That engineer who's driving the cab is probably going to end up there building another oil sands plant. That's a permanent thing.

When you get something like that going, you get your gravel trucks rolling. Old Canfarge down in Calgary will be cranking up some concrete beams. The electricians are all going to be heading up there wiring. You're going to get carpenters building the concrete forms, the concrete placers pouring the concrete, excavations, the whole works. That is a permanent solution. That is something that has benefit, and that's what is going to make this province carry on. The rest of the country, if they carry on under the Liberal government with temporary programs, is never going to get ahead. We in Alberta can compete. Hopefully, the rest of this country will catch up with us.

The other type of thing which this province, perhaps more in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary than anywhere else in

the province, is bringing in — Shell Oil brought their head office in. There are going to be secretaries. Some of the young students that are graduating from computer programs at the University of Calgary or the University of Alberta are going to work in these jobs. There are hundreds of jobs there. These jobs will be ongoing, not a temporary thing.

As for us and our make-work programs, it seems that everything we have done has received some criticism. But we've got to understand that we cannot go out and build homes now. This province can't pour money out of the heritage trust fund or anywhere into homes. There's no demand for homes now; there's a surplus of them. We don't build shopping centres; they have a lot of empty stalls through all the cities and towns in this province. We have a good surplus of those. We don't build warehousing. We don't build office buildings, because we've got millions of square feet of that sitting empty. So what do we do? We will build the things that the government needs and that are going to create jobs.

It seems that we get criticism on everything we touch. We hear our opposition members say, do something. So we are. We're building two new hospitals. Goodness, we've all read the news media about that — criticism, criticism. We're building airports to service the rural areas. What do we do? We get criticism on our airports. We build a park. If you have any questions about the value of our Kananaskis park, it created jobs. It will carry on creating jobs and employment in years to come. Some of these students can go there and work. What nicer place to work than a place like Kananaskis park? This is going to bring people into this province. And yes, they're going to play golf there, and they're probably even going to be getting their balls into the white sand. But the hotels and motels and restaurants and industry in Calgary are going to be really happy to see these people coming through Calgary, going to Banff, going through Canmore, Cochrane, you name it. It will create employment; it will create wealth; it will help this province. The roads we're building will serve our people. There again, some of these guys will go into business. The trucking operations, good old Burnco, and the big gravel miners will be hiring accountants, computer people, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate our member's motion, but I really think that if he would look very carefully and read the last budget — it is something that will create some employment and bring this province around to alleviate the very problems he is concerned about. Perhaps he criticized this budget a little bit. Maybe he didn't understand it or whatever, but if he reads it very carefully and follows the strategy that's taking place, this province will eliminate this problem. I don't think we need to pursue the ever-onward temporary programs, the giveaway of money, the giveaway of funds. Make-work projects do not actually solve the problem.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm pleased to speak on this motion, because I believe youth employment is probably one of the most disheartening problems I find myself facing as a MLA. Some people may say it's challenging. But to me, it's disheartening.

Youth employment is one of the many symptoms of a slow economy. With total overall unemployment at an unusually high level, today's youth find themselves with a higher-than-average proportion of that unhappy figure. I believe the reasons are obvious. The marketplace is extremely competitive, and where an employer has a choice, he's liable to hire experienced personnel. This presents a double problem for students, in that they cannot get a job because they're inexperienced and they cannot get experience because the job opportunities aren't available.

Years ago there were numbers of general labour jobs which provided employment for the unskilled worker. As our society has become more mechanized, computerized, and automated, these jobs have disappeared. Years ago, Mr. Speaker, almost everybody had an uncle, a grandparent, or a brother on the farm, and they were able to go out to the farm and work during the summer. But today's agriculture sector is also mechanized. The machines are so expensive and, in some cases, so complicated that farmers hesitate to put an inexperienced man on a machine, and you can well understand their hesitation. They can't afford to take a chance on having a mistake made which will cost them time and repair expense. If the time and inclement weather occur at the same time, they may not even get their crop off. There is simply too much at stake to risk inexperienced help.

How then can a young man gain the valuable experience he so badly needs? Last fall I met with representatives of the University of Alberta Students' Union. We discussed at length, among other things, the problems of student unemployment. My major concern is the ultimate hopelessness that students must feel when they are unable to get a bite, let alone a job. Students grow up looking forward to the time when they can go to work and become independent. They are eager, willing, able, and enthusiastic. It has to be devastating to find that nobody wants them. Suddenly they're idle; they feel useless and unnecessary. Their whole life — their objectives, their values, and their view of society and their role in it — is all of a sudden in question. I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, because unemployment may become a way of life as those young people lose hope. As work is fulfilling, unemployment is degrading, especially when the person who is unemployed feels that somehow it may be their fault, not the fault of the marketplace.

The students' union representatives suggested that it might be better for government to consider increased funding in student employment programs, as job creation might be a more judicious expenditure than student aid, inasmuch as the money spent nets higher gains in terms of productivity. It's the government helping the students to help themselves. I'm certainly pleased that the Minister of Manpower has been able to expand the student temporary employment program so vastly this year.

Mr. Speaker, at one of my public meetings this winter some time was spent discussing the hire-a-student program. Some senior citizens said they would like to hire a student, but they were afraid to do so because the students weren't covered by compensation. If they were going to do a temporary job, it was almost impossible to temporarily cover a student for compensation. A suggestion was made by one of the gentlemen that they should be covered by compensation. Quite frankly, I think this is an excellent idea, one which would cost the government very little money but would offer more opportunities for students to find work during the summer season. I believe the cost of covering a registered student with compensation would probably prove to be the most cost-effective job creation assistance the Alberta government could give.

The senior citizens at the meeting were especially apprehensive about hiring someone without compensation coverage. It appeared that this, more than any other reason, held them back from hiring. The jobs they wanted done, such as painting and washing ceilings, required a certain amount of agility and, in many cases, working at heights where accidents could happen. I urged the people at my meeting to take a conscientious look at the jobs they've been putting off, to see if they can do it now. I've also urged the Minister of Manpower to take a look at possibly covering the students on hire-a-student with compensation, as we do in the summer temporary employment program.

Mr. Speaker, today's youth are underutilized. I believe we have a vast potential that could and should be tapped. But lest I sound too negative on this whole topic, I want to emphasize some benefits of today's situation. There are more tools than ever before to help a student find a job. I remember back in the '50s — I'm dating myself — when I was looking for jobs. I think they were probably as scarce as they are today, but I don't believe we had the kind of assistance and the kinds of opportunities for help in finding employment that we have today. If we didn't find employment, the welfare benefits certainly weren't as lenient, as accessible, or as — I won't use that word. They didn't fulfill the needs as well as they do today.

I believe students must be aggressive. Maybe they need to take one of the wage subsidy forms in their hip pocket and approach farmers and small-business men for a job, pointing out that the \$2.50 the government pays would substantially assist the farmer or the small-business man in paying them \$5 an hour. If he were willing to also cover the cost of room and board, or accommodation, the student would make good money and the farmer would certainly get good benefit for his \$2.50 an hour, aside from the fact that I just said the machinery was fairly expensive and sometimes a farmer hesitates to hire a student for that reason. The student would probably have a job before he tried 10 farmers or 10 small-business men. I would like to see some students take that approach and aggressively hunt for a job with an Alberta wage subsidy form in their hip pocket.

I remember talking to students who phoned me about employment last summer, and I suggested they advertise. One of the students was from Breton, another was from Warburg. I said, put a sign on the bulletin board. Both of them that I talked to particularly said it worked; they got a job almost immediately. I know of other students who have set up their own handyman programs. In fact some very successful businesses have been set up by students during the summer and are still flourishing.

Today's job market has another benefit, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's a very important benefit; that is, the understanding that one should give an hour's work for an hour's pay. It's about time the employer and the employee both benefitted from an hour's pay. I think that's probably one of the most beneficial aspects of today's marketplace.

I'm positive that every young person wants work. I know this government will try to provide a stable environment where the private sector can flourish and create the much-needed jobs. It's important that today's young people have that opportunity. It's important that they can look toward the future not only with enthusiasm but with confidence. I'm glad the member raised this particular issue so that we have an opportunity to take a real look at the concern of today's young people and to really assess where we're going and what we can and should do to assist them in having that opportunity and in fulfilling their life's dream.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and participate in the debate this afternoon as well. I appreciate the intent of the resolution and of the hon. member. There is a problem; I think we all accept that. Young people have an unemployment rate that is much higher than the general population, and there are some obvious reasons. Generally the lack of skills and experience in the work force contribute to the tougher job they have searching for a job.

I'm not sure, though, how we'd go about solving the problem. As the hon. Member for Drayton Valley said, youth unemployment is largely a symptom of a much larger problem, and

that is a general economic slowdown. Whereas young people before would have had a lot of opportunities to get work on graduation from high school, university, or college, those opportunities aren't the same today.

Mr. Speaker, I know that a lot of young people are returning to university now because they skipped going on to advanced education, to college or technical school or university, five or six years ago because they had immediate job opportunities or prospects. They left high school and went to work in the oil patch and made a very sizable income each year. They skipped the opportunity most people would have used at their age in going on to a technical school or university on graduation from high school. They're now returning to the advanced education system to upgrade their skills. That is one of the main reasons the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary have imposed quotas on first-year admissions. We're picking up the graduates for this year and the graduates who are picking up their education after a delay of five or six years.

There is no doubt that there is a youth unemployment problem. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how we'd go about trying to meet the problem. The federal and provincial governments have tried to provide some short-term, temporary assistance. I think we have to congratulate our Minister of Manpower, the Hon. Ernie Isley, for working very hard in this regard. There's a long list of programs that are available to young people: the hire-a-student program, which operates just immediately north of the Legislature on 109th Street, STEP, the NEED program, the wage subsidy program, assistance to farmers. The list goes on.

I know the minister and people in his department are providing a very much needed service to the community. I also might refer to a constituent of mine who's very active in the minister's department, Larry Duckworth. I know his part of the department from speaking to him, and there are a lot of people in that department who are hustling, trying to provide opportunities for people; not just young people but people in all walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the real solutions for student unemployment are short-term or band-aid programs though. I think it's a basic structural problem, and we need to try to revitalize our whole economy. I know that the Premier and the economic affairs committee of cabinet and caucus are working on a position paper that should be released later this spring or early in the summer. That strategy paper should outline some ways for Alberta to improve our economic performance over the next decade. In that strategy paper, I think we need to be emphasizing our long-term strengths that will allow young people in the future to seek gainful employment.

I had a meeting in my constituency, probably about a year ago, with the Minister of Manpower and a policy committee of the constituency association. As part of that group, we invited the president of one of the students' unions in my constituency, and we asked him to share with us some of his ideas. Frankly it was his feeling and the feeling of the group that night that we should not be trying to put in money to provide short-term solutions. We could be using those same dollars to have a long-term advantage for the economy. I think even some of our younger people appreciate that if you use those same limited resources to create make-work projects, then you're not using those same dollars to build in some long-term strengths for the economy. Mr. Speaker, I think it's those long-term strengths that are going to be the source of future employment.

If you look at the Orders of the Day — I'll just borrow a copy from my benchmate. I think a lot of government members — the Member for Calgary Egmont, for example — have

produced ideas on the Order Paper that suggest ways for us to be trying to build those long-term strengths. The idea of bringing in new technologies — I guess the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont's motion was passed, so it's not on the Order Paper right now. But it was passed by the Assembly last week, Mr. Speaker, because we appreciate that we need to be bringing in micro-electronics and robotics in some of our new industries. There's a good reason for it. If we cannot afford to pay high wage rates or if we are competing in labour-intensive industries with low-wage countries, we're not going to be in a competitive position in the Pacific Rim for the provision of ball bearings for oil rigs or engineering services. We need to become more efficient.

An example of that was brought home to me a little while ago when I visited an architectural firm that does work all over the world, the Chandler Kennedy consulting group, which has an office here in Edmonton. They have a computer on staff now that does a lot of the drafting, and they can send plans over the telephone worldwide. The point Gerry Kennedy was making to me in my tour of his office was that that's the only way he can get jobs outside Edmonton, outside Alberta. He is able to hustle and compete on the world marketplace by being more efficient.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably best for the government to try to solve youth unemployment problems by trying to solve general economic problems and that the youth of the province will be employed in exciting and creative ways but in meaningful ways. I had a couple of letters in the last little while. One was from a student who has a STEP job, and it was in two parts. It was, thank you very much for the opportunity to get involved in a summer job. He appreciated that, although he felt he wasn't really doing anything very useful. I'm not going to give his name, because I don't want the Minister of Manpower going in and wiping out that position. The only point he was making to me was that he appreciates the \$5.50 an hour — that will help him get through the summer and into university again for his second year — but he's not really sure he's doing anything very functional. And he's not in my constituency office, Mr. Speaker. But the point is that that's not necessarily a very productive way, although a lot of STEP positions are useful, a lot of them are ways to try to help some young people over a difficult period of time. I think we should recognize it as just that. It's important.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are some ways for us to get young people involved in the economy though. A while ago, Dr. Homer talked about his vision of opening up the north and farming hundreds of thousands of acres of land that are presently not developed. I know my colleague to the right from Grande Prairie is acting on the Northern Alberta Development Council. He has counselled me a lot on the potential in agriculture in northern Alberta. If we're going to be trying to provide employment opportunities, I think we should then be trying to bring in some of the lands that are potentially available for agriculture and making them available to young farmers who want a chance to make it on their own. The hon. Member for Cardston is shaking his head and looking at me with a pained expression. However, I still think there are some opportunities there. The Member for Bonnyville in northern Alberta, the Minister of Manpower, thinks it's a good idea. So I'll be in the middle, simply saying, here's an idea. I don't know. I'm not a farm boy, Mr. Speaker, although I claim to be part of the rural caucus, because I have a quarter section in my constituency that hasn't been developed yet. But I think it's worth exploring.

There are other areas we should be looking at. In biotechnology in agriculture, there are ways to make our present farm

operations more efficient. There is biotechnological work being done in Calgary where bovine fetuses are being frozen, stored for future transplant into other cows, and born at different times. You can take a superior quality animal and fertilize a number of her eggs. By doing that you have a number of calves from that same cow and produce a genetically superior product a number of times. Interesting technology is now being used not just in Alberta but worldwide, and Alberta is leading the industry in that. I picked that idea up from my colleague's *Agrologist* magazine that he shared with me yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I guess what I'm trying to say is this. In agriculture, for example, we can create new opportunities. We can create new farmlands, or we can create a better or more efficient economy within existing farmlands. I think we can do the same sorts of things in forestry and energy. We're seeing an example of that in the Judy Creek operation in the hon. Member for Barrhead's constituency. Work being done by AOSTRA led, in the research stage, to a \$125 million investment by Imperial Oil for enhanced recovery in the Judy Creek field. That announcement was made a little while ago. That recovery operation will employ a number of people in the construction phase and also in operating the program. Those engineering and construction jobs will hopefully affect the youth unemployment level. Investing money in research and providing opportunities is a more significant way to go than just band-aid solutions that I sense are being offered in the hon. Member for Little Bow's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I'm looking forward to the position paper brought down by the Premier this summer. I think it will point to some new directions for the province, directions which should be underpinned with support so they provide real jobs and opportunities for young people.

MRS. CRIPPS: Glad to hear you're back on the topic.

MR. COOK: We have a deputy Speaker over on the other side, Mr. Speaker. I'm simply trying to argue that youth unemployment is not well solved or served by providing band-aid solutions, but rather by providing economic growth in real terms.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude my remarks by simply saying I'm not sure how we go about meeting the intent of Resolution 213. I think the member has been sincere in bringing it before the House. He's addressed a problem, and none of us in this Legislature discount it. But I guess the problem I have is in the way you solve it. I support the temporary hire-a-student type programs: STEP, the NEED program, and the wage subsidy program brought in by the Minister of Manpower. Those things are all very valuable in a short-term way. I find it difficult to think of ways you could hire a law student on a permanent basis if there were not the need for an extra person in a law firm — or an engineering graduate. I'm a graduate of the arts faculty, and I'm just not sure what the government could do to go and create jobs for arts graduates.

DR. ELLIOTT: Elections.

MR. COOK: The hon. Member for Grande Prairie suggests elections. There'll be a federal election and hopefully a change of administration this summer.

Mr. Speaker, I don't support Motion 213. I don't think it is anything more than a band-aid resolution. It is sincere as far as it goes, but it isn't suggestive of anything that would help us as a government or the people of the province solve the problem. That's what I think the function of the opposition is in our parliamentary system: to propose alternatives. As the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont is pointing out, they're not

even in the House. We appreciate that there's a problem. But rather than doing this sort of thing, I think the opposition would serve themselves more in the long run at election time if they were to bring in alternatives to government policy, and I don't see any. There isn't one resolution that I see on the Order Paper sponsored by the opposition that would create meaningful employment on a long-term basis. I don't see any Bills on the Order Paper that really bear on economic policy and youth unemployment. I guess I'm disappointed that we're not seeing some alternative policies or ideas. But we have had a lot from members on the government side. I think we're going to be well served if we try to build the general economic health of the province and not just try to provide band-aid solutions to a problem, recognizing that it is a problem.

I can't support Resolution 213, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the House not to support this resolution.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to enter into the debate on Motion 213, dealing with youth and their unemployment situation in Alberta and throughout Canada.

First of all, let us all be realistic about Alberta's and Canada's economy. I believe it is nonsensical to discuss in 1984 the situation of the late '70s with respect to employment or unemployment. We were very fortunate in the late '70s, perhaps too fortunate. We're paying the price now, and we're paying the price heavily. We overbuilt, providing jobs, jobs, and more jobs. We had a population that could work in any area, whether they were skilled or unskilled. We had population growth, and jobs were indeed plentiful for all people. But we don't have these plentiful jobs now. Due to our overbuilding and our overheated economy, we are now experiencing a downturn with little growth and not as many opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, our Ottawa government sure didn't help us at all. One doesn't have to expound on their inadequate and disastrous policies that have resulted in a serious unemployment problem in this province and indeed throughout all provinces in Canada. The problems are further compounded by a shift away from the industrial age. I've made reference before in this House to Alvin Toffler's two books, *Future Shock* and *The Third Wave*. A new era is upon us that will greatly impact on our work force and our workplace. Society is going to be more high technological and indeed much less industrially based.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that our government is involved in more future studies. I've become aware of a number in the Department of Economic Development that I'm sure will impact on our province and ultimately on employment. I'm pleased that we've incorporated programs to help students and youth find employment, and there are many. I'm pleased with the manpower policies and direction that have given assistance to our particular youth.

But, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, I am troubled by the innuendo from the Member for Little Bow that we as government must create jobs for graduates of our postsecondary institutions, such as lawyers, doctors, and other professionals. Surely the Member for Little Bow accepts the fact that the economy of Alberta is driven by the private sector, with assistance from government when needed. However, I sincerely do not believe that our government should be getting any more involved than we presently are. I'm troubled as well that the Member for Little Bow, who raised this resolution and who believes it is so important, is not present in this House to hear hon. members discuss this extremely important issue.

As a career educator, highly involved in the career development of our youth, I have to stress that all members of society have a major role to play in the career development of our population. Parents must plant the seed of optimism in our

children. They have to teach their children that one goal in society is not enough. Job searching and career awareness does not occur in a vacuum. It must be taught, and it must be learned.

How much [time] do parents spend with their children talking about work — its positive impacts, its negative impacts, salary and job expectations. I don't believe very much, Mr. Speaker. I can give you examples of talking to a high school class when I was career counselling — and I'm still doing this on a part-time basis. I asked a group of 30 students in a grade 11 class to list on the blackboard their particular job expectations and then to give me what they believed was an average salary in these particular jobs. The average salary was \$92,000 a year. These jobs dealt with such things as truck driving, light truck delivery, working as an accountant, working as a skilled labourer, cooking, et cetera. Where they get this information, I don't know, but I'm sure parents could do a better job in this particular area.

How many parents talk with their students about short- and long-term planning? Again, Mr. Speaker, when we are in the age we are in today, it is so critical to talk to children, to explain to them that things are not going to be the way they were when I was younger; they are not going to be the way they were five or 10 years ago and, in my estimation, this is what the future looks like; but if I'm not sure, son or daughter, I'm going to go out with you; I'm going to do some searching, and I'm going to ask questions. How many parents take their children to work for an hour, or for a day, to let them explore this tremendous area of the world of work?

Mr. Speaker, youth themselves must become more involved in career development. Career development doesn't begin in the spring of grade 12; it begins in the early childhood years. Students must set a higher priority for the 40-plus years they will be spending in the work force. They have to demand more answers from employers, government, and postsecondary institutions about the world of work now and into the future. They have to become more concerned about job trends, and I don't think they are that concerned about job trends at this time.

They have to request figures from universities on how many graduates got jobs in their chosen field last year, for example. What are the predictors, Mr. University Professor or Mr. Dean, when I graduate four or five years from now? School systems have an obligation to offer career education programs to all children. As well, postsecondary institutions — and I stress this — must offer these types of programs.

Mr. Speaker, in the situation that is occurring in 1984, it's very sad that there was a drastic cutback in one of the Edmonton school systems of a senior individual who was responsible for career education and development. I say "shame" to that particular cutback. Teachers and professors have to show more leadership in offering students guidance in connecting their course content to the real world. Ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, too often I have heard from professors and academic teachers that that is not my job; my job is to impart facts in a particular subject area. To that I say, how tragic. It's simply not good enough to state to me or to a student: we have a Canada Manpower Centre on our campus, and they have the statistics and the data; if you're interested in the world of work, go ahead and see them.

I have always been pleased with the publication that comes from the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, Mr. Speaker. It's an annual publication, and it lists each technology taught, how many people graduated, how many found jobs in their related field, how many found jobs in a nonrelated field, how many were unsuccessful in finding employment, and the names of organizations and businesses that hired that particular

year. Surely to goodness every postsecondary institution in this province should have a document like that.

Governments at the civic, provincial, and federal levels play a role as well. In 1980 the federal government published a book called *Work for Tomorrow — Employment Opportunities for the 80s*. Mr. Speaker, in this book are 186 recommendations dealing with employment, youth unemployment, females in the work force, and dealing with what we should do as a province and as a country to make things better for our population. I'm embarrassed to bring this up when how many of these things have ended up coming to fruition. But as far as I'm concerned, it's typical of a lot of words and very little action by the Ottawa government, that plays a major role in this particular area.

From the standpoint of the federal government as well, Mr. Speaker, one can look at the Canada employment centres. They have to do more counselling with clients who come and visit their offices. They have to spend more time with people looking for work, leading and initiating this particular counselling time. When times are tough, we have to create a positive attitude, not add to the fuel of sadness and despair.

An example of what I'm referring to is job searching. When times are good in this province or anywhere else, youth unemployment is usually three or four times higher than adult unemployment. When times are not so good, the figures of course can be compounded. As a career counsellor I know that, on average, a young person may have to apply for 30 positions before being offered a job. In 1984 a person will have to make perhaps 100 contacts. That is a reality. If we know this to be true, surely we can change the attitude of the person who goes out and applies for 10 jobs and is rejected for those 10 positions. If indeed we know this to be a fact, if we know that when times are tough you have to pound the pavement a little more, surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, we can turn that attitude around. Again, I sincerely believe that Canada manpower centres must spend more time enunciating these types of things with the clients who visit them.

Another fact deals with looking for employment itself. Mr. Speaker, only 5 to 15 percent of all jobs that are available at any one time in this province are in newspapers. The other 85 percent are there for the taking. I think it's necessary that people go door-to-door more. They have to use their friends and relatives, and there's nothing wrong with that. They have to use the phone and the yellow pages. They have to go to districts that don't have bus service available. They have to hoof it into industrial areas and go door-to-door, and go door-to-door again. They may even have to leave Edmonton, Alberta, and go to a rural area or to another city or town if the opportunities are there.

The jobs, although not as plentiful as in the late '70s, are still out there. The provincial government has done an extensive amount to help youth seek and gain employment. The programs such as STEP and the wage subsidy program may be swept under the rug by the opposition, but they are working. They've worked for a number of students and young people in my constituency. I have given them the form, the brochure, and said: go door-to-door and advise your employers that there are these programs where \$2.50 an hour would be reimbursed to them if they hire you.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta Education has recently released new initiatives in counselling, especially career counselling. There is a kindergarten to grade 6 career development program in the schools. Computer career counselling programs have been approved in principle by this Legislature and, who knows, one of these days there may even be funding in this area from the Minister of Education. I'm sure the secondary review committee will receive excellent feedback from Albertans, stressing

the need for intense career planning initiatives in all our schools. In addition to the JOBS Alberta program, for years Alberta Manpower has produced excellent materials in the form of audiovisual and written material for young people planning careers. The key is having schools and postsecondary institutions use this type of information.

Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough to use this information with 30 selected students who have an interest. I believe it is imperative that postsecondary institutions and secondary school students all receive some type of career planning information in an in-depth way. After all, if 95 percent of our school students are going to be in the work force at some time in their lives, surely we should be spending more than half an hour or 15 minutes in a particular grade talking about career planning, the world of work, the positives and the negatives.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend hours talking about the types of materials that are available through Alberta Manpower. The Job Seekers Handbook is an example. It talks about getting ready for work, identifying and researching employers, putting your qualifications on paper, et cetera. There are all kinds of materials like the career profiles that are in every school in our school district, that talk about salaries, expectations, qualifications needed, et cetera.

The hon. Member for Little Bow might be very interested and I highly recommend to him a conference that is being held Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of this week, sponsored by Alberta Manpower and The Society for the Promotion and Advancement of Career Education — first provincial consultation for career development practitioners. They have invited such people as Edwin Herr, who is the president of the American Association of Counselling Practitioners. His topic will be some perspectives on the changing world of employment, implications for career education and for counselling. Mr. Speaker, other topics — vocational education is for learning and living, career transitions, becoming an entrepreneur, job dissatisfaction, peer counselling, women in science, attitudes on self-management, et cetera. Alberta Manpower is indeed involved in assisting people in employment.

Mr. Speaker, some members have alluded to the role of hire-a-student. Hire-a-student is not only sponsored financially by Alberta Manpower — sure, it assists the particular facility and pays some salaries — but it has produced tremendous documents such as Job Search Information Service, which talks about all kinds of things I've been referring to with respect to tips for young people in finding employment. Extensive work went into that to train the counsellors and part-time and full-time help working in hire-a-student offices throughout this province, and I stress "throughout this province". Hire-a-student is a tremendous program; hire-a-student has tremendous individuals who will visit a school and talk to students about tips for finding employment, about the world of work, and what to keep away from and perhaps what to enter. But it saddens me when I hear stories that when they entered a particular school with 1,500 students, 50 students showed up for a session. I know schools where the entire population of the school attended these sessions and learned a lot. I have to put a question mark on the interest of those particular young students and their parents in the world of work when only 50 people show up.

Mr. Speaker, I started my comments about the need to realize and accept the role of industry and business in creating employment. They must play their part in helping youth and new graduates, and indeed they are. I was fortunate to work with the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce some years ago to develop a directory of resource personnel in business and industry who would gladly talk to any students about the future of a particular occupation, et cetera. I wonder about the use of

that document. They too are opening their doors to young people as best they can, and they will continue to do so as the economy turns.

I cannot accept the theory from the Member for Little Bow that we as a government must create jobs. Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned that is the socialist way, that governments can do better. I just can't accept the fact that private industry can't do better than government. I won't accept that governments have to produce jobs for graduate lawyers and professionals. I cannot and will not accept that premise. I'm sorry for those struggling to obtain work in their chosen field. They will get to their goal but, as for all of us, direct goal attainment is not always achievable and never will be. I truly have faith that as a society working together — and I reiterate and summarize, parents, youth, business, industry, labour, government, and educators — we will work out of this particular downturn and aspire and attain our goals so we may be happy earning our daily bread.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in this debate on the motion presented by the hon. Member for Little Bow. I would like to say that I support his motion because the implication it has, has been a preoccupation of mine for quite some time now. I'm sure those concerns are shared by all members of this Assembly.

I've listened with some considerable interest to the hon. member's remarks and to the remarks made by other hon. members in speaking to the motion, including those of my colleague the Minister of Manpower. I believe a number of important points have been raised, and I take no real issue with what has already been said. I believe all of us are well aware of the current situation of our economy, provincially and nationally and indeed from a worldwide perspective. We all know that economies at all levels are still struggling to make a comeback from a very pronounced and prolonged recession. Under these circumstances, I simply recognize the severe limitations placed on all sectors of employment opportunities, not just on those opportunities which affect people who are graduating from our various learning institutions and are now entering the job marketplace for the first time.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any short-term solution to our present unemployment situation. When I say that, I am acutely aware of the dramatic effect this will have on our young people. I'm sure that for many of them it has already become a very depressing and devastating experience. When we speak of new job opportunities for the youth of our province, I think it is important that, on balance, we consider the fact that security of job tenure for our employed labour force has also been a matter of some concern and still remains so, although to a lessening degree as our economy begins to turn around.

When we speak about the lack of jobs for our young people, Mr. Speaker, my main concern is that long-term unemployment sets in motion a process of erosion that dramatically affects the attitudes of what is already a disillusioned sector of our society. Particularly with young people, I find this is more amplified and the negative effects are much longer lasting. We have already seen the effects of this process on our adult population, and I think we recognize all the social consequences that go with it. Rightly or wrongly, I believe the greatest challenge to governments in the future will be not so much the economy as to restore the confidence of our next adult generation with and in government.

The hon. Member for Little Bow suggests that government propose measures to alleviate the increasing levels of unem-

ployment among graduates of high schools, tech institutions, colleges, and universities. In that statement I think he's telling me two things. Firstly, by their very nature, such measures would be more of an intermediate- and long-term nature, because I think he recognizes that the present programs, such as STEP and PEP, are programs that fill an immediate need only. Secondly, I believe his choice of words in phrasing the motion tells me that he recognizes that you cannot totally eliminate unemployment. At the same time, I believe all hon. members recognize the urgency of the motion, given the immediate circumstances concerning our youth employment situation today.

The motion also prompts me to ask the question: is it government's place to step into the marketplace to create jobs? I suppose debate on that issue could come full circle a number of times without reaching an answer or a solution. I personally do not believe that is government's role, and I say that for a number of reasons. First of all, it would be artificial. If you look at government programs such as STEP and PEP and their intent, you know that by their very nature they are temporary and terminal. In the traditional sense, I see some value in such programs but, at the same time, I believe it is time we moved from the traditional to more innovative programs. I believe we have both the opportunity and the reason to do it now; I also believe we have the ability to do it. If it is within this context that the hon. Member for Little Bow proposes his motion, then certainly I find I must support him all the more.

When I look at the major reorientations reflected in current statements made by all levels of government today, perhaps the recession may turn out to be a blessing in disguise. Mr. Speaker, I've spent some time examining economic and industrial changes in a number of nations, and I've been struck by the fact that major changes in economic and industrial objectives have occurred as a result of major disruptions or catastrophes of varying kinds, or even wars. There is also another concurrent fact and a very significant one; that is, the only nations that succeeded were the ones that recognized the need for change and seized the opportunity. As a province and as a nation, we find ourselves in that position now. We need to look positively on our current situation as a breathing spell and make a commitment to regeneration based on new goals, new objectives, and new frameworks.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we as a government can play a significant role in terms of leadership and innovation. In this way, I believe we can secure those economic and social benefits for our citizens and certainly address the question of job security for our people. As a starter, let's look at some of our more traditional programs, our provincial and federal versions of STEP, PEP, winter works, job creation, NEED, and what have you. The money that has been pumped into such programs over past years amounts to billions. During difficult times, governments have also had to increase budgets in the traditional way, by enlarging their capital programs in the hope of sustaining employment, not to create new employment. There is not too much wrong with that, if you accept the traditional ways. Again, such government programs remind us of two important facts. Firstly, such programs are only temporary. Secondly, there are really no permanent jobs created.

I listened with some considerable interest to the remarks of the hon. Member for Little Bow and the response of the Minister of Labour with respect to economic strategies, job training, and the role of education in securing employment opportunities. I'm also reminded of the statement concerning the new future role of our province and our country as a major exporting nation of stature in an international community, of our future role in

the area of science and technology, research and development, economic diversification, manufacturing, and the high tech service industry. All of this translates into jobs for the future.

But I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: why are we targeting specific elements of our unemployed society? Why are we targeting our traditional workplaces if our future lies in new areas of industrialization and new world directions? I suggest that the billions we have spent would have produced greater and more lasting results if we had targeted those dollars to the industries of the future, whether those dollars took the form of subsidies or low-interest loans with partial or no write-offs where permanent jobs were created, for skills training, retraining, or on-the-job training programs, or for industrial expansion or economic diversification. It is really of little consequence, because we have accomplished two very important things. Firstly, we have put the onus back on private-sector enterprise to create permanent jobs, and that's where that function appropriately lies. Secondly, it enables those future industries to come into being and, in so doing, ensures our province's place, and that of our nation, within the international community in terms of those goods and services that will make up the bulk of worldwide commerce of the future.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other major areas I would like to speak to, but in view of the time that is left to me and to the Assembly, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening at 8 o'clock it is proposed that we deal in Committee of the Whole with a number of Bills on the Order Paper, commencing with study of Bill 44, the Appropriation Act, then proceeding in numerical order, perhaps to the conclusion of study those Bills, and then proceeding with second reading of Bill 45, the Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act. Following that, if there is time, it will be the intention to move to second reading of private Bills on the Order Paper.

In view of that proposed course of action, I move that when members return this evening at 8 o'clock, they do so in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of consideration of Bills, as I have indicated, and that we now call it 5:30 p.m.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

[The Committee of the Whole met at 8 p.m.]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Committee of the Whole)
(continued)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee please come to order. We have a number of Bills to consider this evening.

Bill 44
Appropriation Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 44 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 13
Planning Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my hon. colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I move that the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 19
Fuel Oil Administration
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. WEISS: On behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for St. Paul, I move that Bill No. 19, the Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 20
Universities Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my hon. colleague the Minister of Advanced Education, I move that Bill No. 20, the Universities Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 24
Employment Standards Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment, which has been circulated to all hon. members. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have the amended Bill. Are there any further questions or comments?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 24, the Employment Standards Amendment Act, 1984, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Bill 25, which also has an amendment.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I made an arrangement with members of the opposition, who won't be here until 8:30, that that Bill wouldn't be dealt with until after 8:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will hold that one for now.

Bill 26
Veterinary Profession Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. STILES: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Ponoka, I move that Bill 26 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 29, the Exemptions Amendment Act, 1984.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, that Bill is not to be called tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll hold that one.

Bill 34
Corporation Statutes Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this Act, and the amendment has been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have the amended Bill. Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of the amended Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 34, the Corporation Statutes Amendment Act, 1984, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 37
Oil Sands Technology and
Research Authority Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Lloydminster, I move that Bill No. 37, the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 41
Alberta Mortgage and
Housing Corporation Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the amended Bill now. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amended Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 41, the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 46
Engineering, Geological and Geophysical
Professions Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 51
Small Business Equity Corporations Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have an amendment. Are there any questions regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have the amended Bill. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amended Bill?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Certainly such an important Bill should have some items of discussion. In terms of the general business community, will there be some kind of brochure or information package that will be going out to the general public? That's number one. Number two, what kind of time line does the minister foresee, in terms of the accumulation of some of that capital that can be invested in various areas? Has the minister some indication of how quickly the community will respond?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, in response to the first question, we're working on a simple information kit that should be available by the first part of July. We anticipate that there will be a number of corporations established in the balance of this fiscal year. I'm not sure of the number. We anticipate that it could be six to eight, somewhere in that range.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 51, the Small Business Equity Corporations Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 52
Real Estate Agents' Licensing
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 52, the Real Estate Agents' Licensing Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration and reports Bills 44, 13, 19, 20, 26, 37, 46, and 52, and also reports with some amendments Bills 24, 34, 41, and 51.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**
(Second Reading)

Bill Pr. 4
Dino Alberto Knott
Adoption Termination Act

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, Bill Pr. 4, the Dino Alberto Knott Adoption Termination Act, is necessary because at present this adult child is seeking to become reunited with his present family, which he has found. The family who adopted Dino Knott has had very little recent contact with him, and he also consents to the cancellation of this adoption. The adoption order was dated 1972. Since the adoption was not terminated within the permitted period of time, legislation is necessary to terminate it. You will note that there is an amendment introduced to this Bill in order that Dino may take his family name, Argento.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 4 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 7
Newman Theological College
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 7. Newman Theological College Amendment Act, 1984.

As stated on introduction, the purpose of this Bill is to change the titles of the two officers of the college, namely the principal and vice-principal, to president and vice-president.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 7 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 8
George Harold Sibbeston Adoption Act

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 8, the George Harold Sibbeston Adoption Act.

[Motion carried: Bill Pr. 8 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 6
Concordia Lutheran Seminary Act

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 6, the Concordia Lutheran Seminary Act.

[Motion carried: Bill Pr. 6 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 10
Edmonton Research and Development
Park Authority Amendment Act, 1984

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 10, the Edmonton Research and Development Park Authority Amendment Act, 1984.

This Bill is to amend the representation of electors on the board of the authority so that one of the representatives shall be a tenant of the Research and Development Park.

[Motion carried: Bill Pr. 10 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 11
Edmonton Convention Centre Authority
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 11, the Edmonton Convention Centre Authority Amendment Act, 1984.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to extend the power of the authority to conclude leases from one year to five years.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 11 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 12
Alberta Association of Municipal Districts
and Counties Amendment Act, 1984

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties Amendment Act, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. member for second reading of Bill Pr. 12, would the members in favour of the motion please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Someone seems to be under some misgiving as to whether we're proceeding correctly. Is there such a misgiving? ... I misread a signal.

[Motion carried: Bill Pr. 12 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my understanding with the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that although Bill 45 will be presented for second reading tonight, it will not be called until 8:30.

Therefore, I move that the Assembly adjourn for 10 minutes.

[The House adjourned at 8:20 p.m. and reconvened at 8:30 p.m.]

MR. SPEAKER: Would the members kindly come to order again.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Second Reading) (continued)

Bill 45
Medical Care Statutes
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 45, the Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to make changes in the administration of the Alberta health care insurance plan and the premium system thereunder, so that it complies with the new Canada Health Act and thereby avoids the province having penalties imposed upon it, as called for by the Canada Health Act.

Just by way of a bit of history, ever since medicare came in, in 1969, this province has supported approximately one-third of the cost of its medical services programs by way of collecting health care premiums from its citizens. Many of those premiums are collected by way of employer group arrangements, and many bargaining units have achieved partial payment — sometimes a majority portion — of those premiums by the employer, as a benefit of employment. So the system of premiums, the philosophy of insurance, is long established in Alberta as an important element of our health care plan. In recent years the premiums have been worth roughly \$230 million in revenues to the Provincial Treasurer.

During the late '70s a very dramatic phenomenon started to occur. With the very rapid population growth and the high element of construction and transient workers, the rate of premium arrears started to increase very dramatically. A couple of years ago it had accelerated so rapidly that accumulated arrears were approaching the \$48 million mark. Most of that had been accumulated in the two- or three-year period just previous to that. So our government decided that that wasn't fair to the people who were paying premiums and brought in legislation that simply said that if you don't pay your premium, you're responsible for paying your own bill if you go and get some kind of medical service. That program went into effect last October. The new health care cards were mailed to all Alberta citizens, and I think people very quickly got used to having a dated card and making sure their premiums were paid. In the few months since last October, we've collected more than \$15 million in premium arrears.

I think equally important, though, we've identified a number of persons who had never registered with the plan, who were in the lower income groups and were entitled to premium assistance or, in many instances, premium waivers. Those groups were able to be identified and have been receiving assistance or the premium waiver program ever since then. So I say quite modestly that I think the program was a terrific success. If it could have been left in place, I think it would have achieved even more success.

Mr. Speaker, we must now turn to the Canada Health Act for reference to what happened there and why we're here tonight. The Canada Health Act, under section 15, imposes penalties. It simply says in the bottom line of that section:

An order made under [this] subsection ... shall not come into force earlier than thirty days after a copy of the

order has been sent to the government of the province concerned under [this] subsection . . .

The earlier subsection simply deals with establishment of the penalties. The penalty in this case could be the value of the whole federal transfer, and in the case of Alberta that's in the neighbourhood of in excess of \$400 million. So it's a substantial penalty.

The Canada Health Act establishes penalties by going back and talking about the five principles of medicare. They are public administration, comprehensiveness, universality, portability, and accessibility. If a provincial government doesn't meet the federally legislated requirements of those five principles, it is subject to the penalty of the amount and in the manner that I just outlined.

This Bill deals with the aspect of universality. We're not concerned about meeting the other requirements, because certainly we're well within the federal law with respect to all of those. But there is some question about universality. The universality section had one important change made in it. The old health Act that was in force prior to the passage of the new one said that 95 percent of the citizens of a province had to be covered, and this one says 100 percent of the citizens of a province must be covered. So while we were okay before under our old program, because we were dealing with probably around 1.5 or 2 percent of the population who were in arrears, we could not meet the 100 percent requirement called for by the new Canada Health Act.

I'm now going to refer back to three sections of the Canada Health Act, because it gets to the very essence of the provincial Bill that is in front of us. Under the section describing universality, the Canada Health Act says that a province must entitle 100 percent of the insured persons of the province. That leads you to go to the definitions section and find out what an insured person is, because we have to cover 100 per cent of insured persons. The federal Act says insured persons means, in relation to a province, residents of the province other than — and then it mentions the exemptions, which are RCMP officers, members of the Canadian Forces, people in penitentiaries, et cetera, the usual kinds of exclusions.

So in the federal Act, an insured person refers directly to a resident of the province. Then you have to read further in the definitions section to find out what a resident is.

"Resident" means, in relation to a province, a person lawfully entitled to be or to remain in Canada who makes his home and is ordinarily present in the province, but does not include a tourist, a transient or a visitor to the province.

If you can tie those elements together and work backward from the basic premise of why the penalty is imposed — because you don't meet universality — what universality means; it means all the insured persons; an insured person is a resident; and what a resident is.

So we now come to our Bill, Mr. Speaker, and it's necessary. It's an omnibus Bill; it amends three Acts. The Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act deals with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act, which deals with the administration of the insurance plan and how benefits are paid; it deals with the Health Insurance Premiums Act, which deals with the levying and collection of premiums; and it deals with the Alberta Hospitals Act, which is self-explanatory. What it does is simply link registration to residency and says that any resident of Alberta is covered. A resident of Alberta is a person who meets the requirements I outlined under the Canada Health Act, and in fact in our definition section I believe you will find that the definitions are identical, word for word.

We have a reason for doing this. If you're a resident, we want to know where you live. And we want to know where you live for one of two reasons. If you owe us money, we want to know where to go to get it. And if you're entitled to financial assistance, we want to know where that assistance should go.

There are sections of the Bill that deal with persons who have not registered or who have not been heard from and turn up at a doctor's office or a hospital. The onus then is on that doctor's office or that hospital to register that person and deem him to be a resident. Then the coverage kicks in. There are standard regulation-making sections, which are necessary under any Act. But under the conditions I have outlined, imposed upon the provinces by the passage of the Canada Health Act, I think this is a good Bill. We will meet the requirements of the Canada Health Act. We'll avoid the possibility of the penalties being imposed upon us. We will still have the requirement under an insurance plan for individual citizens to show some slight element of personal responsibility and come forward and register. If they're delinquent and they come forward and register at that time, we're going to try to get an agreement from them to make arrangements to pay their arrears. If they refuse to do that, we'll still have to register them, but we'll have to revert to the system that was in effect prior to last October, the usual system that is used with all bad debts, and simply go through that onerous procedure.

There it is. It's very simple. It's not a Bill that I would have thought was necessary at this time in Alberta, but it's been made necessary by the actions of the Parliament in Ottawa. I recommend the adoption of it to all members of the Assembly.

MR. MARTIN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I apologize and I do appreciate the minister and the government waiting until I could be here at 8:30. You will be pleasantly surprised that I won't be long. So that will make it worth while.

I now appreciate the definition. There's been a lot of confusion, from leaked memos and this and that, about what a resident is. I'm sure the hon. minister is well aware of that. For clarification, as I understand it, the definition of "resident" is exactly the same as that in the Canada Health Act.

I have a couple of other areas. Basically, as I understand it, so we're all clear in this House, and it makes our job simpler: as long as people go to the doctor and give an address, they will be covered. What happens after, in terms of trying to recover back premiums, if I'm correct about that, the government goes to the courts or wherever it has to go to collect the back payments. So as I understand it, it means that basically 100 percent of the people will be covered.

The only question I have — and perhaps in concluding debate the hon. minister could follow up on that; I think that would clarify it. I refer to the waiting period in subsection 4(3)(d). I don't believe it's in the Act. The minister can correct me if I'm wrong. How long will the waiting period be for people to become residents?

If the definition, as I understand it, is straightforward — it's the Canada Health Act — and if people give an address and they're covered, period, and whatever money they owe is another procedure, then that clears up my understanding of the Bill.

In conclusion, I ask if I could have the minister — because as the minister talks, it's a wide-ranging Bill. But I think that's the area that seemed to have a lot of confusion in it. As I say, a lot of it had to do with press and media reports about memos and that, so there was some confusion. So I ask the minister, in conclusion of debate, to clarify my understanding of it.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the waiting period referred to is that which has been in effect for the last 15 years, I believe, in all provinces. It's three months for a new resident or someone who has, under the portability section, moved from another province.

[Motion carried; Bill 45 read a second time]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Committee of the Whole)
(continued)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee please come to order.

Bill 25
Public Health Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have Bill 25, Public Health Act, with an amendment. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

MR. MARTIN: If I recall correctly, I believe that the hon. member was going to come back with some explanations in Committee of the Whole, and I would want to give the hon. member a chance to do that.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to explain some of these amendments. In second reading there were several questions asked by hon. members, and I would like to perhaps pursue some of the responses.

First of all, I think many of the amendments were brought to our attention by a thorough discussion with people such as the Health Unit Association. As I go through the amendments, I will draw to hon. members' attention those which came from the Health Unit Association.

One hon. member asked whether or not we had studied Ontario's legislation. Indeed we reviewed Ontario legislation and that of many other jurisdictions. We also spent a great deal of time reviewing our own legislation and procedures, and our approach particularly to recalcitrant patients. Experts in Alberta in the field of communicable disease control, private practitioners, and practitioners of community medicine were consulted. I feel we have indeed studied a lot about the different systems of public health care across Canada.

I believe I stated something in error in discussion on second reading yesterday. It was brought to my attention by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe, that Ontario does have a shortlist of virulent diseases, defined under the Act, that are similar to the communicable diseases which would be outlined under regulation in Alberta's legislation. Because of the changing list, it was felt that it would be more appropriate to define virulent diseases under regulation rather than in the actual legislation. At this point in time, we don't even know about some of the diseases that are presently on the shortlist of deadly diseases, so it would be changing constantly. Therefore, rather than a lengthy process through House amendment, it was felt

that it would be more appropriate, because of the significance of these diseases, to have them under regulation.

A second point brought to our attention by members was regarding the definition of "community health nurse". Consideration was given to expanding the definition of community health nurse as proposed, but it was concluded that it would be far more appropriate to regulate specialty requirements of the nursing profession under legislation governing that profession. Therefore, that was dismissed as unnecessary. As well, it was felt that it would be inappropriate for the government to regulate the professional qualifications of professionals employed by the local board, and therefore the definition of "public health inspectors" was left to the local board as part of their jurisdiction.

The Crown being bound by our Act was also asked about. It is very unusual for the Crown to be bound by its own legislation, because the Crown endeavours to ensure that it meets the same standards that are imposed on members of the public by its legislation and regulations, and often voluntarily submits to inspection to ensure that the standards are being maintained. Where those standards are not met, it's considered more appropriate that the matter be resolved by the same body responsible for the legislation — that is, the legislators themselves — rather than by the court through prosecution of the Crown at the expense of the public.

I think one more factor was brought up. If passage of this Bill were to be delayed, it would necessitate delaying proclamation of the Bill beyond the targeted date of July 1. It would be inappropriate to develop regulations under an Act which has not received the approval of this Legislature. The July 1985 deadline has been set to allow a thorough review — revision of all regulations under this Act, including all six of the Acts under the proposed Public Health Act.

Much consultation was evident in the preparation of this Bill, and in following through with that, there will be an increasing amount of consultation in the preparation of these regulations. That time line is extremely necessary.

I believe the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake asked about the exclusion from school of children who were susceptible to measles. The current regulations authorize that when measles occur in a school, susceptible children at risk of exposure shall be excluded until immunized or until 14 days after the last case of measles has occurred. It is contemplated that a similar provision would be retained under regulation under the proposed Act. There is a drive in North America to eliminate measles as a disease, much as smallpox has been eliminated. This is part of it. As you know, there are many different kinds of measles, and this would apply to the most serious type of measles. A susceptible child would be deemed at risk if they do not have proof of immunization or documented evidence of having had the disease.

It's a really dangerous disease. I know we accept it, but the rationale of excluding a susceptible child is to control a potential outbreak and thereby reduce risk to others. It's not at all the government's intent to force immunization on the public but merely to prevent the spread of measles by preventing susceptible children from contracting the disease and being a source of infection for others.

If you will note under section K in the amendments, the term "health promotional" is added to the definition of the services to be provided by the local board. I believe hon. members will recognize that this clearly is evidence that we wholeheartedly support their efforts in looking after — I believe the hon. member called it preventative health, but I think preventative medicine is perhaps the term that is referred to more.

In conclusion a definition was asked for about schools. Again, schools are defined under the School Act. We discussed the dairy provisions, the transfer of administration from the Public Health Act to the Dairy Industry Act. All regulations about the dairy industry will be carried out under that Act. So the local board has an opportunity to influence municipalities to pass such bylaws as necessary. This is not a change in present procedures by virtue of the transfer of the Act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all hon. members to carefully consider this Act and approve it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Certainly the hon. member has done a good job in terms of the Act and has worked very hard. For that I certainly commend the member. I haven't the document here before me, but I understand that in the last day or two the Health Unit Association made another request to have the Bill held over the summer. Has the minister had a meeting with the Health Unit Association since second reading of the Bill to discuss some of those reasons, or discussed some of those reasons by telephone? Have most of the concerns been clarified at this time? I guess the Bill could proceed if they are.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable consultation since the Bill was presented in April. The minister has met with the Health Unit Association at their annual conference. We've reviewed the Bill very carefully with them; the department has, as well as the minister. There's been frequent consultation. I have had the opportunity to meet with the minister and the association to review some of their concerns. It appears that they are limited to two particulars. I have mentioned both of them this evening. The others are concerns your government feels can be resolved through regulations and are really under the jurisdiction of the local board.

The idea that changing the pasteurization of milk to the Dairy Industry Act will be hazardous is, I believe, perhaps undue concern. I am not trying to say it is not an important issue, but under the regulations we are going to ensure that there will be no change in the kind of care with which milk is handled at this point. I think that's very important.

Another issue that was brought to our attention was the definition of "chief executive officer". In some local boards it is deemed essential that the medical officer of health be the

chief executive officer. That is left up to local boards to determine, it is within their authority to determine whether or not it must be the chief medical officer of health or can be the executive officer.

I have already discussed the other point we feel very strongly on, that the Crown should not be bound by this.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on the amended Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 25 be reported.

MR. CRAWFORD: As amended.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration and reports Bill No. 25 with some amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Bills that will be read a second time would be the private Bills available for second reading that were not read a second time tonight. Other than that, the Assembly will give consideration in committee to the Bills that were read a second time today and will proceed with third readings.

[At 9:04 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

