

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, November 1, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in February this year the Winter Olympics Games were held at Sarajevo, Yugoslavia. That event is of particular significance to Albertans since Calgary and Alberta and Canada will be hosting the next Winter Olympics in 1988. Our Premier, accompanied by many other Albertans and Canadians, was the recipient of extremely warm hospitality and a very fine welcome from the people of Sarajevo and of Yugoslavia.

Today we as Members of this Legislative Assembly have an opportunity to show our appreciation for that hospitality and for the co-operation which has existed, particularly in the field of Olympic development. I might add that we will be continuing our spirit of co-operation since Yugoslavia will host the next World Student Games, which were just hosted in Edmonton.

We have this opportunity now to welcome to our Assembly two distinguished visitors seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. They are His Excellency Krsto Bulajic, the ambassador to Canada from Yugoslavia, who is accompanied today by the consul general with responsibilities for Alberta, Mr. Nick Jelincic, who is located in Vancouver, British Columbia. I ask that they both rise and receive the warm welcome of members of the Assembly.

head: **READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the petition of Thomas Payne, Melvin P. Leinweber, and Ralph Garrett for the Central Western Railway Corporation Act be now read and received.

[Motion carried]

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

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act relating to the 1983-84 annual report of the Provincial Treasurer on the fund. I am also pleased to report that the committee has made every attempt to fulfill its duties as required by the Act and as expected by the Legislative Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 84
Wildlife Act**

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 84, the Wildlife Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This particular Bill proposes a new Wildlife Act for Alberta. Considerable public consultation and input has been received since the development of the Fish and Wildlife advisory policy

issued in 1982. A discussion paper which outlined the major principles of this revision was tabled in the fall session of '83, and further public input was received. Everyone who participated in this extensive process is to be commended for their input.

Highlights of the Bill include: a redefinition of the term "wildlife", clarification of "captive wildlife", placement of the licence provisions within the regulations, restructuring the penalty sections to more adequately deal with the seriousness of the violations, and a capacity to transfer ownership of some wildlife through a formal mechanism. The matter of access to private and public lands for hunting or other purposes will remain as it appears in the existing Act.

It is important to emphasize that the development of regulations is required to make this legislation operational, and there will be further opportunity for public input on specific issues. Now that this legislation has reached the Bill stage, I would like to thank members, especially of the Wildlife Advisory Council, for their useful input.

With the introduction of the Wildlife Act, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to table with the Assembly the discussion paper on game ranching and the proposed schedules for the definition of "wildlife". It is the government's intention to thoroughly review these matters with the public before finalizing our positions on these issues. Copies of the Bill, the game ranching policy, and schedules will be made widely available to the public, including all fish and game clubs and member organizations of the fish and wildlife advisory council.

Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 84 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1983-84 annual report of the Department of Agriculture and, contained in that report, the annual report of the Wheat Board Money Trust Account for the year ended March 31, 1984.

In addition, I beg leave to table the 1985 Farm Safety Calendar. In the spirit of volunteerism between the farm safety program, Alberta Agriculture, and several farm organizations, this is the fifth year the Farm Equipment Dealers' Association of Alberta-British Columbia has diligently undertaken such a valuable and worthwhile project. The calendar, which is appropriately entitled Lessons from our Children, was made possible through a grant from the farm safety program of Alberta Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud. Through their pictures, our future farmers are saying that good farm management goes hand in hand with safe practices, which leads to increased productivity.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the Special Areas Trust Account financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1983.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the fourth annual report of the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, five dedicated people representing Alberta's 2,800 foster families. November 4 to 10 is the second annual Foster Parent Week in Alberta, a time when we should all recognize the contributions made to Alberta's children by foster families across the province.

To begin this recognition for Foster Parent Week, I ask them to rise as I read their names: Wally and Mary McDonald, last year's foster parents of the year and recipients of the Alberta Achievement Award; Harold and Frieda Cressman, who have continuously been active in the Edmonton Foster Parents Association for a number of years; and Mrs. Hannah Loos, one of those special foster parents who, for 10 years now, has taken on the added responsibility of caring for mentally handicapped children. I ask the Assembly to give them a warm welcome to this House.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 61 grade 6 students from the Lorelei school in Edmonton Calder. Accompanied by their teachers Mr. Luard and Miss Barfett, they are seated in the members' gallery. I ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 62 grade 6 students from Drayton Valley elementary day school. They are accompanied by their teachers Paul Vickers and Roger Smeland and by parents Joan Wetaski, Faye Wood, Vivian Bredin, Vicki Johnston, and Gail Biedler. They've braved the cold to come up here and see the Assembly in action. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, 27 energetic, enthusiastic, and courageous grade 6 students from the G.H. Dawe community school in the constituency of Red Deer. I say "courageous" because, after the comments from the Member for Drayton Valley about braving the cold, I can tell hon. members that these boys and girls had a bus breakdown on their way from Red Deer and overcame those tribulations and got here to the Legislative Assembly in any event.

Mr. Speaker, our students are accompanied today by teacher Jenny Baird and by parents Mrs. B. Maruk, Mrs. Caton, and Mrs. Luciani. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the recognition of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

DR. BUCK: Just before I ask my first question, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the indulgence of the Assembly to relay congratulations to a pioneer broadcasting company in this province. The hon. Premier has indicated that the government has sent a letter of congratulations, but on behalf of my opposition colleagues, I would personally like to offer congratulations to Dr. Rice and the members of CFRN for 50 years of service to this community and to this province. I think we'd all like to. [applause]

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't always try to break the rules; I just try to bend them a little once in a while.

Rental Security Deposits

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and has to do with the questions I asked on November 23 of '83 and May 3 of '84 on security deposits for renters. The minister has announced that some legislation to try to protect the security deposits of tenants will be brought forward in the spring session of the Legislature. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly what the problem has been that it is going to take up to 18 months for some type of legislation to come before this Assembly?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the precise date the hon. member is referring to with respect to a commitment to bring forth legislation, but certainly my department and I have undertaken a thorough review of the legislation. That has meant studying the process across Canada to some degree. As I indicated in answers to the hon. Member for Red Deer's questions in the House just the other day, we certainly have undertaken that review. With respect to the trust deposit area, for instance, it's quite clear that for those jurisdictions that already have a bureaucracy in place — they have some sort of rent control or rent review board — the situation is entirely different from that of a jurisdiction like our own or like Ontario that doesn't have that type of bureaucracy.

I can't recall if the hon. member was in the House but, for his edification, I did respond with the fact that we expect a judicial decision in mid-November. With that in mind, it would be inappropriate for me to make some comment that may be adduced to have some effect on that decision.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that other jurisdictions have had policy and legislation in place, can the minister indicate — we don't have to worry about the court decision — what problems she saw before this was taken to court, to put some type of protection for tenants into legislation? Other jurisdictions did have it, Ms Minister.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member described it as "problems". The legislation varies to a great degree right across the country. If the hon. member is referring to the trust provisions that some jurisdictions have, that is not universal across the country and very much depends on what other compatible legislation is with it.

As I indicated in the House the other day, we certainly are looking at a number of recommendations that have come forward as a result of that review, but it very much depends on the decision in terms of the clarification of our own legislation.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, what studies has the minister done or what studies is she doing in the situation where a tenant dies and the security deposit is taken away because the person didn't give proper notice, as has happened recently? It's quite difficult to give notice if you get killed. So what studies is the department doing to make sure this doesn't happen?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that doesn't require studying. That is not permissible under the legislation. The security deposit is in no way affected by whether or not notice was given.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what the department is doing to help tenants in situations such as this? If the minister says the provisions are already in the Landlord and Tenant Act, what offer of help is the department giving

the estates of these people who have had that circumstance happen to them?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, all that would be required is for the families who are affected by a tragedy of that nature to come forward to the department. If it were found that a landlord in fact had transgressed the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act, the department would take the appropriate action. The hon. member may be aware that the department has taken a number of landlords to court, and the appropriate sanctions have been applied against those landlords.

Pork Producers' Insurance

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Agriculture and has to do with the pork producers' marketing insurance plan. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly the status of that plan in light of the fact that the government did put some \$10 million into that fund?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I've received a letter from the Alberta Pork Producers' Marketing Board, stating that their insurance plan was in some financial difficulty. Members will recall that in July 1981 some \$10 million was put in to establish the fund. At that time the Pork Producers' Marketing Board felt they could run their plan with that \$10 million in seed money. To make sure the plan could stay viable, however, they requested that a \$10 million guarantee be put in place, and they could call on it if needed. They called on that guarantee last February, and we put it into place in March. It is my understanding that since that time, that money has also been used. So at this time I'm reviewing the entire plan to assess what, if anything, should be done in the future. I'm doing that assessment internally and also through discussions with the industry.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly if the program that was put into place had any effect on helping the pork producers in this province? Was it of any effect?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that would of course be part of the assessment we would do on it, but certainly the plan gave some support to the industry within the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the fund doesn't have any money and the producers are still putting in their share, can the minister indicate what the status of the producers' portion will be?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, when the plan was put into place in July 1981, it was to run until March 31, 1985. During that period of time, a 4 percent checkoff from the producers was to go into the plan. Since the plan is now in some financial difficulty, an assessment of the entire plan will have to be done, including the 4 percent deduction from the producers. Until some final decision is made, the 4 percent checkoff will have to continue.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Motions for Returns standing on the Order Paper today remain there.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

209. Moved by Mr. Musgreave:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to consider establishing an Alberta advisory council on the status of women to advise the government on matters relating to women and to bring before the public and government, matters of interest and concern to women.

[Adjourned debate April 17: Mr. Cook]

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to speak to this motion this afternoon. Thanks to the MLA for Calgary McKnight, members of the Legislature had the opportunity this spring, and again now this fall, to look at the issues concerning women in this province and to debate this motion. I made a rather lengthy speech in 1983, when the Member for Calgary McKnight proposed a slightly different motion to the Assembly, and it covered most of the areas I want to address. As I realize that quite a few members wish to speak to this motion this afternoon, I'll try to keep my remarks relatively brief.

In the last speech I made regarding this issue, I looked at the role of the Women's Bureau, I looked at the role of women in other countries, and I also gave a substantial outline of what the departments of the government are doing in regard to specific issues that affect women. I don't want to repeat those statements. But when we're debating a motion such as this, one thing I do believe is that there are many questions we should consider in this total debate. I encourage many of my colleagues to speak on this issue, as I did last time, because I think it's important that we have representation from women who live in the large cities, women who live in the country, women who are homemakers, and women who are in the work force.

Another point I mentioned when I discussed what the government departments are doing in regard to women's issues was that when this issue is discussed in public, I always have the feeling that our communication system is probably quite sad. We haven't been able to use all the vehicles of communication to inform the public of all the action programs in place for women. Of course, new and ongoing issues always occur, but I do think it's fair to say that the government responds quite quickly to emerging issues. One such example, which has been well discussed in this Assembly, is women's shelters. Thanks to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, we have many examples across the province of women's emergency shelters that have been funded primarily by our government.

The motion before us today asks primarily for an advisory council to be established. Again, one of the issues that I really do not hear discussed very much in the public but which is very important in our time of restraint today is the issue of finances. How much money would it take to maintain the ongoing staff or the objectives this council has to carry out? I also realize that they're very interested in either carrying out or seeing that research into certain issues affecting women is carried out. This is another area that would be quite expensive.

I'm sure members of the Assembly are well aware of the number of research dollars this government spends in many areas. One example that is certainly commendable and I think speaks quite directly to the value this government places on the contribution of women is the five-year, \$1 million research grant established by the government for the nursing association for nursing research. This is the first that has been established by a government in any country. As you know, nursing is still

primarily made up of the female sex, although we're always encouraging and hoping there will be more men in the profession. So I think this is one outstanding example of research that is given to a group.

DR. BUCK: Tokenism.

MRS. EMBURY: I hear the opposition can hardly wait to get in and make a few comments, so possibly I should keep my comments short.

DR. BUCK: Tokenism.

MRS. EMBURY: He keeps stating that this is just one example of tokenism. I'm sure most people have heard many fine comments from nurses regarding that nursing research fund, indicating that when they're starting into this field of research . . . It has taken a couple of years to get the foundation established, and now they have called for proposals for a couple of years. As nursing research develops in this province, I recall very vividly that when the hon. minister of the day set up this nursing research program, he definitely stated to them that the door would be open for further funding if it could be used. So I really don't consider that a form of tokenism. I was very proud that our government responded to the request of the nursing profession in this province.

I would like to speak very briefly about what has actually happened in the last couple of years in regard to the activities in the provincial government. I think there is a misconception out there that the government is doing nothing. This obviously flows through the organized representative groups. The council that represents many women's associations across this province has made a direct appeal to the government for an advisory council on the status of women. This is a natural progression, because there is a council in the federal government and in all but two of the provinces in Canada. When you study the other provinces and some of the things the councils have done, it's only natural that women would look to this vehicle to be the one that would best meet their needs in Alberta. But as I've said before, I think we need to spend a little more time in communicating exactly what we are doing.

One of the major steps that was a change was a direct response to the request of the women in Alberta. At one time there was a rotation among the cabinet ministers to look after women's affairs. I see this as rather innovative. As far as I recall, it seemed to work quite well. This gave a broad perspective to looking at women's issues. When women asked if one minister could be permanently appointed, this did happen following the election in 1982. As most people are aware, the Hon. Dick Johnston, Minister of Advanced Education, is that designated minister.

After due consideration and consultation with women in Alberta and across the country, the minister set up what is known as the Alberta Women's Secretariat. Because a cabinet committee deals specifically with women's issues, a further step has been to set up an interdepartmental committee on women's issues. This is in the process of being established, and hopefully they will soon start to meet and look at their mandate.

So there is quite a process now in place. We have an interdepartmental committee, the Women's Secretariat, a cabinet committee, and a minister responsible. As they define all their job functions and roles, hopefully they will be communicated so that the women and men of Alberta who want to speak on women's issues will have an opportunity for input into our system.

There is ample opportunity this afternoon for a wide variety of debate and, as I said, I would like to hear from other members. I have stressed on several occasions that I think it's important to know how women in our constituencies feel regarding this issue. As the pressure to establish this council increases from the representatives of the organized groups, I think we should be very aware of the objectives they have put forth, how they see this functioning, and who would finance this council. Would it be expected that only government dollars would fund this council? Or because the council as it is presently constituted is made up of representatives of many — I think 65 to 75 — women's groups in the province, would it be natural to think that each of those women's groups would support the council financially? With those questions put before the Assembly, I would like to hear the other comments on this topic.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity of participating in the discussion on Motion 209, presented by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. Having known the hon. member for some 10 years as a colleague in this House, I've grown to admire and respect his views. He's a member who doesn't put forward suggestions lightly.

At least a dozen people have spoken on this topic to date. The whole question is that

the Assembly urge the government to . . . establishing an Alberta advisory council on the status of women to advise the government on matters relating to women and to bring before the public and government . . . Mr. Speaker, I have somewhat mixed views on the motion, for reasons I'd like to explain. I've long believed that we should consider our fellow citizen as an equal. I get nervous when we attempt in any way to divide people. Others are obviously of a different view — that to support one does not necessarily mean to reduce the other — but I'm not of that view. I think the problem is much larger, and I'd like to give some arguments as to why I think that government and this Assembly should think in a different direction.

As I said, a dozen members have spoken. I think they've been very eloquent. The Member for Calgary North West just indicated areas the government now functions in. One has only to look at the estimates we passed in this House last April, areas that touch on those — and I believe I'm correct in saying that the Progressive Conservative Party has long accepted the view that the role of government is to help those who cannot help themselves. As a result, I see in the estimates that we spend some \$436 million in social assistance, of which almost \$200 million is to single parents. We know that some 88 to 92 percent of those single parents are women. Child welfare commands \$140 million. The handicapped receive \$114 million; day care, \$17 million; widows' pensions for those who, for whatever reason — not divorced, not spinsters — have somehow had the misfortune of losing a loved one and are compensated to the tune of some \$12 million directly through the widows' pension program; plus heaven knows how many dollars through ancillary programs such as the senior citizens' home improvement program, ADL benefits, and so on. Mr. Speaker, I think that's ample evidence that this government in large measure supports those who are in need. It just happens that the majority of those in need are women.

I think we should take a moment and look at what I believe is the problem. I look on the one hand at people who it seems to me are highly respected; anyone we know who makes a profit is highly respected. Lee Iacocca, the chairman of Chry-

ler, spelled that out very clearly. Governments are naive if they think they can increase social benefits without increasing the very thing that creates the size of the pie from which you can take the benefits. As you know, he is a very blunt gentleman, not in terms of profit statements but in terms of his comments. He said very clearly that our concern should be, and the most serious question is, our kids and their future. It has to relate to the topic we're talking about. He's saying that in large measure economic matters are really the key to the future. When we mortgage our children's futures, can we consider and should we be considering other areas?

I suggest to you and to members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that when you talk about children, in large measure you automatically have to talk about mothers, or women. It seems to me that if we in this Assembly were to reflect the views of most Albertans, we would have to say that most Albertans don't necessarily want their children to be rich or poor. I'm sure I'm quoting most Albertans: they want their children to grow up, be educated, marry, have families, have a means of living a happy life, and be able to enjoy and participate within their communities. They view that in the context of the so-called normal family.

What do we have? We have a society that is developing at an ever-increasing rate. I don't want to talk about alcohol, although members are well aware of the problems with the amount of alcohol consumed in this province. Just stop for a moment and consider that our society has become on one hand a society that demands things instantly, and we're now putting that onto our children. We look at things such as that 4 percent of all Canadians used tranquilizers in the last 48 hours. We look at the study done in Edmonton: one out of every two households has Valium sitting in the closet. I'm saying that we in our society seem to have forgotten our traditional values and standards and are turning to those things that we think tend to help us through a very difficult period: mind-altering drugs.

I think we've become slaves to technology in many ways. Many of us can very quickly say no to our wives or our children. The one thing we can't say no to is a very simple instrument called the telephone. For example, we've become addicted to putting off even talking to a loved one to answer that incessant, ringing telephone. It's interesting to see that it's reached the point where they now have telephone addicts. They have a questionnaire. It says: "Can you spend an entire day without making a telephone call? Can you unload the dishwasher or groceries without talking on the telephone? Are you more likely to phone when you're alone?" By the way, these are characteristics of a subject I'm fairly well acquainted with. One that I think is very crucial for men and women to answer today is the true test of sexual compatibility. The question is: "Do you believe in practising telephonus interruptus?"

It's interesting to note that because of technology, last week they installed pay telephones on the intercontinental flights — the L-1011s and strato-cruisers. There are people — and I can't think of better people than my colleagues here — who choose to get away from that incessant ringing of a telephone. If they purchase a trip to a faraway land, they are likely to discover a pay telephone on those intercontinental flights. As a result, one of the airlines is coming out shortly with a nonphoners' section to counter the smoking section.

I guess what I'm getting at is that, on one hand, we tend to go back to the '20s in this province and apply today's standards to problems that existed then. We go back to the time when women didn't even have the vote. I think the 12 members who have participated have been excellent in pointing out the number of things that have been done over the years. The point I take issue with is that we continue to attempt to adopt policies,

not to resolve needs but to divide us as a people between male and female or men and women. If we believe in principle that the role of governments is to help those who cannot help themselves, then let us stick to that principle and deal with those who cannot help themselves; that is, those who are in need on the one hand and, on the other, those who are children or infants in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Edmonton Whitemud made a very interesting observation. I think it was in response to Motion 12, which the Premier was addressing. It was about the homemaker in our society. For good or bad — and I don't think it's for good — we in our society have long accepted the principle that your value is in direct proportion to what people pay you. If you're not paid very much, you're not very valuable. By the way, I urge members of the Assembly to think of their indemnities and bear that in mind. It seems to me that if you're not earning a lot of money — and it's become particularly obvious in the past two weeks in Crown corporations, where people are obviously most important to the Canadian economy by the salaries they receive, even though some of those organizations have never realized a profit.

When we come to the housewife or homemaker, Mr. Speaker, that's a group of people, male or female — primarily female — who have long failed to be recognized by any government, outside of the so-called family allowance cheque. As a grandfather, I can talk with some authority. I see what my children do with their children. You take a young 23- or 24-year-old mother in Alberta. She's nursing a baby. Another baby is on the floor or carpet with dirty pants, the washing machine is running over or plugged up, and the telephone is ringing. She answers the phone; it's her mother. The doorbell rings. She hangs up the phone; she doesn't get a chance to go to the door. Her husband rings, and she answers the phone. He says, "Have you got nothing to do again today?"

That sort of thing is going on today. We don't seem to take time to recognize the value of the homemaker. And what are the effects? Never mind the \$17 million in day care. Never mind the \$250 million in the Solicitor General's department that tends to have people go back to jail six times. Never mind places like the Youth Emergency Shelter in Edmonton, which is in serious difficulty. Never mind the almost \$200 million we pay out for single parents who look after children and whose husbands, for whatever reason, are gone. It seems to me that we as a government continue to shell out over \$1 billion through the social services area alone, not in prevention but primarily to solve problems as a result of people perhaps not recognizing the traditional values of our society and the role of the mother in our society.

That's what the Member for Edmonton Whitemud said the other day about those who came to the forums on the white paper. Some of those groups were attempting to point out that it seemed that we as a government continued to respond to certain selected vested-interest groups — for example, women in the workplace — but have never considered recognizing the backbone of today's society: the mother and the homemaker. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we don't in any substantial way.

We say that if you're not in a single-family dwelling with an \$80,000 mortgage, you're not with it. Of course today you're in trouble; we say you shouldn't have done it. If auto sales are down, we say: do your share and don't save your money; go and buy another car and get into debt. What's the net effect? We all know the net effect, Mr. Speaker. Probably eight out of 10 married women are in the workplace today, not because they want to be but because there's no option. By the time they pay for day care, transportation, and clothing, and the husband pays the additional income tax ...

MRS. FYFE: The husband is unemployed.

MR. GOGO: As my colleague said, the husband may be unemployed — there's really not very much left. I question whether we as a society are benefitting in any way from the latchkey children on one hand and the heavy turnover on the other, if teachers could find a job. Let's face it, Mr. Speaker, in a 30-student classroom, with three kids who can't stay awake because they haven't had enough to eat or weren't properly looked after, the teachers are burning out because they're finding most of their time is going to the problem children. It manifests itself in so many ways.

I want to make a suggestion that I think is meaningful and should be considered. If we as members of this Assembly are sincere about doing something for women, for mothers of future Albertans, then we should seriously consider recognizing them publicly. I'm not saying we should have an Alberta mothers' day; it wouldn't hurt. But can't we recognize them in another way? If it could be proven to this government that the almost a half a billion dollars in social assistance, the \$200 million for single parents — add up those programs. I don't know what they total — perhaps \$800 million. Shouldn't we consider the following option? Recognizing that tens of thousands of Albertans have yet to find their first jobs and there are no jobs for them, and that there are married women who would rather be in the home but, for the reasons I've given, there's no option — they can't be in the home. They've got to make that money to make ends meet. But when the smoke clears, they end up with \$200 or \$300; that's all. But it's a magical figure to them because it keeps the wolf from the door. If there were an option whereby some of those people in this building working for members of this Assembly could, because of their desire to return home to look after their one, two, or three children, be replaced by that huge lineup out there of young Albertans trying to find their first jobs, many of them female — if they could get their first jobs by replacing those married women who wished to be home and the net cost to this government were zero if you compare it to the existing programs ... I'm talking now of \$200 or \$300 a month.

Then we expand upon that: recognizing that a substantial amount of our health budget pays for senior citizen nursing homes and lodges, if you want to keep your parents at home the way it used to be done but need an addition to your house, the government could see its way for a low-interest loan to put an addition on your house or perhaps \$100 or \$200 a month to assist you in food for keeping your parents at home. That tends to be revolutionary thinking, Mr. Speaker. But it seems to me that in our great anxiety to progress and to continue to show the rest of the world how good we are, we have all these shattered pieces of human lives by the wayside.

I don't oppose the intent of the motion at all; I simply think it's only a small part of the total program. It seems to me that if we as a government were to firmly believe that the family was truly the basis of society ... Two years ago the Member for Calgary Currie introduced a Bill in this House. It got pretty short shrift, because it wasn't the time for that. Today I suggest it's different. If we as members of this Assembly were sincere about the future of Alberta in terms of our young people, our men and our women, we would seriously consider putting emphasis on the family, the value of the mother who stays home to look after those children.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I too want to very briefly take part in the debate this afternoon. I would like to remind members that I believe the original motion — it's been so long ago, Mr.

Speaker — was to set up a separate department of women's affairs. I'd like to say to the hon. gentleman who just spoke that if we had a full-time minister of women's affairs, maybe some of these problems would be looked at and resolved.

Just to indicate tokenism, I say to the hon. member who spoke two speakers previously, the minister responsible just showed up to listen to the debate. That hon. gentleman is the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat. That shows you how indifferent this government is to women's affairs. If we had a full-time minister responsible for women's affairs, maybe we would have someplace for battered wives to go to, other than standing in the street or having to go to police stations. If it were taken out of social affairs and put into a department of women's affairs, maybe we would have someone.

Mr. Speaker, this government's record of equal pay for equal work and executives at the upper level is not that great. We have asked many, many times in this Legislature what it's doing to improve this situation of women at the top executive levels. The government gives us a little tokenism, pats them on the head a little, and tells them things will get better. I just don't think that's good enough.

I know some of the right-wingers in this government party keep complaining about the greedy people on welfare. That's been recycled so many times in this province. Certainly we know there are people beating the system, but we also know of many women who are trying to send teenagers to university, women who are staying home on very, very small incomes. There are people who are greedy, but there are also people who are needy.

This afternoon in this Assembly we paid tribute to the people who are foster parents. I have spoken with those people. I know many of them hardly even get an opportunity to take a weekend off, because they're looking after foster children. Maybe some of the girls who are in this situation — the department of women's affairs would look more intimately at some of the problems that we are having.

I am saying that there are women who are the sole supporters, women who supposedly have had court orders against their former husbands, saying: you must pay this woman and this child so much support. What happens? We all know what happens. If the woman is lucky, one or two cheques come, and that's the end of it. So there are greedy people ripping off the system, but there are also women who need more help than we are giving them. If we had a ministry of women's affairs, maybe then we would look at the question more realistically.

The more complicated government becomes, the more everybody has to fit into the system. We have X number of dollars, and we say: look what great legislators we are; we've increased the department of social development by 7 percent in this area, 12 percent in that area; we've thrown money at it, so everything must be great. But what has to happen is that we have to break down different sections. If there were a problem in women's affairs, then that minister responsible would bring it back to his colleagues and say: look, caucus, this just doesn't do the job for us; there are other situations that need some help — the battered wives, women who are trying to support families on small incomes and welfare incomes. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that this government took a realistic look at and a reassessment of what is going on in other jurisdictions and looked seriously at a department of women's affairs.

There are problems with alcoholism. Does the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, who spoke just previously and who is in charge of AADAC, know how many female alcoholics at home are silent drinkers or, as they use the term, "closet" drinkers? If we had a ministry of women's affairs, maybe somebody

would find out. Maybe we would have some counselling services to try to seek these people out and offer them counselling. But when it's thrown in as an afterthought with the Minister of Advanced Education's department, then all it is is tokenism.

We talk about women in the workplace. My wife used to have a pat answer. Somebody would say, "Do you work?" She'd say, "You bet your life I work, but I work at home". As if because you're home, you don't work.

Mr. Speaker, there are great areas and opportunities. If we had a separate and concerned ministry, then we would get some of these answers. With those few short words, I would like to say that it's not good enough for this government to just have tokenism when we talk about women in this province being treated equally. I don't think they are.

The amendment that has been brought by the government side to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood's original motion, if I remember it correctly, is really a watered-down thing. Of course, this is a parliamentary procedure you use if you don't really want to vote on the motion as it was originally written. Fair game. They just dilute it to an amendment that really doesn't say anything. It directs the government to look at establishing something or other . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: The Member for Clover Bar doesn't say anything.

DR. BUCK: Well, at least the Member for Clover Bar is concerned. If I were the minister responsible, you can be sure I'd at least have my little butt planted in my seat here and listen to what the hon. members have to say about the minister's department.

MR. JOHNSTON: Your remarks are known worldwide, Walt. They're short to read and worth very little.

DR. BUCK: Okay, that's fine. But at least you get paid \$70,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but perhaps there's a bit of a misunderstanding about the nature of what was referred to as an amendment. What actually happened here was that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood moved the previous question, which is a rather unusual procedure in this House. The purpose of that is to prevent amendment of the motion, to ensure that the motion itself will be debated without amendment; then of course it could not be amended unless the motion for the previous question were first disposed of.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I thought it had been amended.

Regardless, I would like to say to the hon. minister responsible that he and the government should get serious about some of the problems that affect women of this province — genuinely serious enough to set up a ministry of women's affairs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given to me to speak on this interesting motion. Since various hon. members have already spoken very ably on the very significant achievements of our government and of the citizens of this province in fulfilling the goals of women's groups in this province, I will touch on the broader implications to our society that emanate from the agitation that has been conducted by these groups with such persistence and vigour over so many years.

The late Professor H.A. Innis, an eminent Canadian economic historian, once remarked that one of the best criteria of the quality of a civilization is its attitude toward and its treatment of its women. The more it afforded equal treatment, respect, and care of its women, the higher was the quality of that civilization. I heartily subscribe to that statement. In fact this attitude is crucial to the success, well-being, and harmony of our society. Therefore the goals of various feminists are very much in the best interests of not just women but all members of our community. I do not see how it could be otherwise since we cannot live without each other, even though some of us try very hard with varying degrees of success.

I have no quarrel with the goals of feminist groups; it is the methods used by them to try to achieve these goals that raise concern in my mind. First of all, they greatly oversimplify the complex roles women play in our society, that equal the complex roles played by men. In fact the vast majority of women today play a dual role. They are career women for 40 hours a week; the rest of the time they join the next largest group who are the homemakers. These women play a very essential role in our society and focus their concern on not only their success but also the success of their children and their husbands. Of the small minority of women who are single and strictly career-oriented with no children, the vast majority are still very actively and positively involved in the economic and social well-being of the community and are basically sharing the same objectives as their male counterparts. Women are just as much a part of our macroeconomic situation as men. The interrelationship is very intimate, very complex, and all-encompassing.

Women's issues are really our issues. Almost every man living has a very dear mother, sister, wife, or daughter; I have all four. I would give anything for any one of them. While I strongly support the objectives of our feminist groups, I find the position of confrontation that these groups have imposed on our society questionable. We do not need any more confrontation. We need to pull together rather than apart. There has been too much of this in our society in this century, particularly in the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot legislate attitudes, changes of heart, and improvement in human conduct. This has to come from within the person himself. This conversion to do better and conduct himself better comes from the person's heart. Countless mistakes have been made in our approach to human relations. All we need to do is look at forced bilingualism, forced metrication, and the vast confrontation in labour/management relations currently practised in the western world. They're but a few examples of the calamity that we experience in our society. Confrontation encourages reaction. It kills the desire to co-operate and leads in the opposite direction.

Another fallacy these women's groups are running on is that every time somebody has a problem they quickly run to government. The Member for Clover Bar is gone now; he should be listening to this. This attitude assumes that government can somehow fix everything. Don't ask me how, but they assume that government will do things better than a group of its citizens. As the Member for Lethbridge West so ably pointed out, government is already spending enormous amounts of money on various massive programs. Like the Member for Lethbridge West suggests, I suggest that the very worthwhile and numerous objectives of women's groups can be pursued by their own organizations, with emphasis on gaining support through consensus and co-operation, not just from women but from everybody — from men as well. There's much to be achieved by working together not just to improve the quality of treatment of women and remove discrimination based on sex but to make our streets and homes safer for them by

working together to remove the blight of rape, wife-beating, incest, and all these social calamities that plague our society today. These ills will not be overcome by governments merely passing laws and hiring bureaucrats to enforce them. These ills will be overcome by working through the hearts of people to change their attitudes for the better and treat all women with respect, fairness, and consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The amendment you alluded to earlier was to ensure specifically that the motion keep its absolute context. Could you tell me if that allows previous speakers to speak or if it precludes them from speaking again?

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding is that when the previous question is moved, debate continues as before. In other words, it's as if there were no amendment. The only effect of it is to prevent amendments until the motion has been voted on.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just for clarification then, would the members who had spoken before be precluded from speaking because the motion is not changed?

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to checking, that's my understanding.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to join in the debate this afternoon to make a few comments. I was particularly inspired by the Member for Calgary Mountain View, who gave us his words of wisdom.

In a country such as Canada, which was settled by many cultures and religions, the majority of settlers were influenced very deeply by Christian values. As a result, the role of the woman, as taught through 200 years of Christian teaching, had a very deep impact on the people in our country and in other countries that were primarily peoples of a Christian religion. This teaching has influenced the attitudes toward mothers and certainly the respect for women as a whole. If we contrast this attitude, the way women are treated and act in their role in our society, with those countries that have a different religious tradition, we'll see very marked differences.

I know there have been jokes. Most men like to be treated as little boys and be pampered and looked after. Sometimes this becomes a joke within our society, that that's the kind of woman they're looking for. But within the context of the views put forward by the Member for Calgary Mountain View, many women in this day and age don't find those jokes very funny. Although women have made tremendous progress in the struggle to be treated fairly as equal human beings, those jokes that may have been laughable in previous years are no longer funny.

To comment on the views of the Member for Calgary Mountain View and his concern about the extreme views of feminists, I would like to suggest that although I'm not going to agree with the views of many feminists, I respect the fact that feminists who have taken some extreme positions also deserve credit because of what they bring forward in the thought process. They make many people, both men and women, think about themselves and about their relationships with each other. In the process of extreme views, a dramatic change often comes about in the moderate views and, as a result, changes in our society as a whole. As a consequence, attitudes have changed. Since women received the vote, which as we are aware was just in very recent years, within our own century, not only have attitudes of men toward women changed but attitudes of

women toward themselves and of men toward themselves have changed.

Just within recent years I was involved as a volunteer in a mothers' day out program. This was in the mid-60s, not long ago, and yet there were still young mothers who felt guilty about the fact that they were leaving their child, that in leaving their child with someone else, there was something incapable in them. Either they were criticized by someone who said, "what's wrong with these young mothers; they can't look after their own children", or there was a guilt feeling within them that they couldn't adequately cope with the stresses of being a mother in the home. In 20 years I have seen a dramatic change in women's attitudes towards themselves, and certainly no longer the condescending comments that were prevalent those short years ago.

The change in attitude toward day care is partly a result of economic need. If we took all the working women out of our economy, our economy would absolutely turn over. I was listening to a commentary on the radio last week. A male was commenting on a woman who had said that if we want to resolve our unemployment problems, let's just take the women out of the workplace. This commentator went on to justify the important role that women play. Often the work done by women is demeaning, not satisfying, and most often it is at the lowest end of the economic pay scale. As a consequence, he concluded through the dissertation that the original comment was total bunk and that taking women out of the workplace would not solve our employment difficulties.

On the other hand, I would say that the attitudes within Alberta are certainly very civilized compared to most of the rest of the world, although I'm not concluding that there isn't room for more improvement. For example, the attitude of the government caucus toward day care made us a leader in the provision of day care in this country. Because there was a desire to improve the standards of day care and to ensure that there were spaces available for all children requiring day-care spaces, we no longer have the criticism that we had in previous years. I haven't had a call on day care in quite a long time, and previously that was a serious concern of many parents. It was a dramatic move that improved the lot of many families and was certainly a responsible position taken by this government.

The attitude toward family violence is one that we had an excellent debate on when a motion was brought forward in this House last year by the Member for Edmonton Belmont. The attitudes expressed by many members of this Legislature were ones of very deep concern about family violence and what has happened to women and children, the members of the family who have the least ability to protect themselves.

The motion that's brought forward this afternoon asks for support for an Alberta advisory council. I think this motion is certainly worthy of support. The Member for Calgary McKnight has spent an awful lot of time talking to women's groups and listening to representations. It's admirable that not just women are taking a leadership role on this question; there are male members of this Assembly who also realize the concern that many women have. It's not a case of women wanting more than their share; it's a situation where women want to be recognized. If a small move such as an advisory council will assist government to recognize areas where we could make further improvements, then I think support for this motion is desirable.

I just want to make one last comment relating to the manpower question. As I said previously, women play a very essential part in our economy as a whole. Last evening some members of my constituency were meeting on the question of

manpower training. One of the concerns related to sectors of our economy, such as the construction industry, that have been very severely impacted by economic conditions. What do we as a responsible society do to assist those who are affected? We tossed around a number of ideas regarding retraining. How do you transfer skills from one work sector to another? The classic example is now going on in Great Britain with the coal miners' strike, where there are an enormous number of workers in an industry that is now almost redundant. There is not the requirement for coal that there was in previous years. What does that society do with such a large number of people? How do they retrain them to make their lives useful and meaningful? It's not a question of wanting work for the sake of work, at a task that has no meaning, but to have meaningful work.

I think the same principles can apply to women who have played a role in their home, or women who have chosen to go into the work force and make alternate arrangements if they have children. Many women lack the confidence to make that adjustment. It's no different than the male worker having to make that adjustment. I think the motion today for the advisory council could go a long way to assisting us as government, to provide us with direction in these matters dealing with a segment of our society that comprises more than 50 percent of our people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to join the debate on the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. In fact about two weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending a one-day seminar sponsored by the Provincial Committee for an Alberta Council on Women's Affairs. I must say that as I listened to the debate I had to be very impressed with the calibre of the ladies in attendance and the points that were brought up. They were extremely well informed, extremely able to communicate, and I think they have a message for us.

But I also have here in my hands a pictorial history book of agriculture in Alberta put out by the Alberta Women's Institutes. It's called *Yesterday*. As you look through it, you see how women in Alberta have been part of the building of our whole province. I don't think you could ever overlook their role in our development. We've always played an important role. It seems odd therefore that we have to debate a motion like this, that asks the government to look at and bring forward matters of interest relating to women. In 1915 Roberta McAdams was the first woman to be elected to the Alberta Legislature, was in fact the first woman in the British Commonwealth to introduce a Bill, and also the first woman to be elected by the soldiers' vote overseas. You also remember of course that four of the Famous Five were Albertans: Louise McKinney, the first woman elected to the Legislature in Canada and in the British Empire; Irene Parlby, the second woman to be appointed cabinet minister; Nellie McClung, who served from 1921 to '26; and Emily Murphy, who in 1916 became the first female magistrate in Alberta and in the British Empire.

I feel that women in Alberta have played a very important role, not only in the development of our province but in the political process. In fact 54 years ago women's status in Canadian society was altogether different. Women were persons in matters of pain and penalty but not in matters of rights and privileges. Until then, women were denied holding any jobs with power, any chance to become a lawyer or judge, a public official, or to vote. Those women were brave.

What's happened since then that we are still fighting for rights for women? We still have to take a very vocal part in attaining rights that seem to be ours. Mr. Speaker, I think there's been a real change because of the entrance into the

consumer society in 1930. Women became mentors of social mobility at that time. Women seemed to be the key. Through their purchases we could buy our way to a better life. I think that since then women have been continually portrayed in consumer roles that are almost sexist and very poorly portrayed in their working roles. I think that kind of attitude pervades everything we resent in the status of women at this point.

In addition to attitudes, I think we have to look at two phenomena, megatrends almost, in Canada. One is the return of women to the work force. In 1975 in Alberta only 46 percent of the public service were women. By 1984, 52.3 percent of public service employees are women. When you think of what the hon. Member for Lethbridge West said about women's worth being judged by their payment, women presently average 67.7 percent of the salary that male persons receive in the public service. So you can see why there is some concern over these inequities.

In terms of women in management, gains are being made, but perhaps they're not fast enough. In 1975, 5.7 percent of women were in management; by 1984 this had increased to 11.9 percent. So steady gains are being made. When you think of next year as the 10th anniversary of International Women's Year, I think we have made constant gains. But I know the concern of women, the impatience, and the frustration in trying to get to the point we are at today. I think women are still clustered in occupations that are characterized by low wages, less security of employment, lower skill levels, reduced opportunities for training, and sometimes limited chances for advancement. When you look at the kinds of jobs held by women in Alberta, about 64.5 percent of the jobs fall largely into three low-pay, low-status occupations: clerical, sales, and service. When you consider that 52 percent of our work force is women, there must be talent out there that is not being used adequately.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the women in the provincial committee that we should be doing more as a government. We should be promoting more ideas so that women can in fact achieve their true potential. But I look at some of the things we are doing. For instance, the Department of Advanced Education sponsors further education councils that offer adult and continuing education courses. They're readily available throughout Alberta. A women's studies program is offered by the University of Alberta, and it provides a great deal of information on stress management, career choice, and re-entry into the labour force.

The Department of Education has a screening committee that monitors school books and other learning resources and tries to eliminate sexual stereotypes that appear in our educational resources. In our secondary schools, vocational programs are offered to provide training for students. The Human Rights Commission sponsors ongoing education programs with public- and private-sector employers to assist in the elimination of employment barriers. They also provide an ongoing review of recommendations for fair employment practices. They provide public awareness programs and supply materials that give information on the Individual's Rights Protection Act. They investigate matters.

There are community resources in the Department of Manpower to provide assistance to associations in terms of management and consulting skills, self-sufficiency, and preparation of work proposals. The Alberta vocational training program provides funding and allowances for up to 52 weeks to those who desire academic upgrading. The Career Centre provides counselling assistance to people on work force re-entry. Career information services are available for people or agencies that want occupational information.

In our own Personnel Administration office courses are specially designed for professional- and technical-level employees who wish to advance into supervisory and managerial roles. In the personnel planning and career development unit, there are training programs designed to provide women with skills and development that would enable them to advance to their potential if they choose. There are briefing opportunities for supervisors, managers, and executives on the implicit and explicit forms of discrimination that women can face. Newsletters are published. There is support and assistance of all kinds to the departments in implementing their programs, to assist women to attain managerial levels. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a lot of things are happening. There is a lot of encouragement being given to women. There are a lot of strides being made in this area of awareness, but we still aren't there.

Very often we look at this problem and think that an advisory council may help. When I look at the proposal for an Alberta council on women's affairs, the proposal would be that members would be appointed and would have regular meetings with the minister responsible, but their mandate would be the following: to identify current concerns and issues related to women for which the government of Alberta has responsibility, by setting up a regular exchange with the women of Alberta. The Provincial Committee for an Alberta Council on Women's Affairs presently represents about 55,000 of the over 1 million women in Alberta. This council would also bring matters of interest to Alberta women before the government and the public. They would also try to determine directions for research and data collection on matters relevant to women. They would publish reports, studies, and recommendations. They would monitor the effect on women of current government policies and programs, and assist in establishing goals and objectives against which proposed policies and programs could be measured. They would act as a liaison between government authorities and bodies concerned with women's issues across Canada. They would also regularly consult and exchange information with Alberta women's groups and organizations.

When you look at this mandate, Mr. Speaker, I think a concern is bound to be expressed by hon. members. I feel every one of us here should be identifying concerns and issues related to women. I believe we should all be looking for matters of interest to Alberta women. We should be looking at the research that is generated in the government and making sure of the effect on women of the policies that we introduce on a daily basis. My only concern with an advisory council is that we would forget our responsibility to recognize these problems in our work here on a daily basis. I am concerned that an advisory council might assume all the responsibility that we as individual members should have for looking at all the issues that are before us on a day-to-day basis for any discrimination or any lack of advantage given to the female sex.

An advisory council could become a substitute for having more women represented in senior public and political positions. I think women should be encouraged to run for political office; women should be encouraged to move into management positions. Every one in this House has a duty in that regard. I hope we don't ignore it or figure that the appointment of a council of any kind would subsume that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I do think, however, that there is room for an advisory council representative of women's groups in Alberta that would help the Women's Secretariat to assume their role in our government. When the secretariat was formed this spring, there were great hopes for what might happen. I think the major priorities of the secretariat during the first months of operation have been the gathering of information and statistics so that we can move into action. The secretariat

has tried to establish networks within government of Alberta departments and indeed throughout organizations in Alberta. I think the secretariat has worked hard consulting with women's groups. They have taken speaking engagements throughout the province. They've spoken to the local council of women and women in science and technology. They've spoken to the university groups all over Alberta trying to bring forth the efforts that are being made, so we have a base from which to start.

Mr. Speaker, I think those consultations have added valuable input to the exchange of information, not only among women's groups but with the government. I think they are learning more about what is available in the government as well. I think the secretariat has also consulted with other jurisdictions across Canada and established some very valuable links there. I know they have been deeply involved with a seminar on the Divorce Act, and I know they are working in the area of day care.

The secretariat has presently developed position and research papers on the following issues: education and training of girls and women; legislation protection for pregnant women; positive measures and affirmative action; the analysis of the distribution in earnings, by sex, of government of Alberta employees; child care in Alberta; family planning services available in Alberta; and male/female representation on government appointed boards and agencies. They've worked hard in the area of wife battering and family violence. I think they're also working on research projects and moving into areas intimated by the motion before us today.

Next year is the year to end the United Nations Decade for Women. The Women's Secretariat could play an important role in what will be happening next year. I feel that our secretariat should be given a chance to move ahead, to act, and to try to meet the mandate that has been suggested in this motion, using the valuable resources of the women in Alberta that are there.

Mr. Speaker, women used to have to make choices — either/or. I think we're getting past the stage of the either/or option. As John Naisbitt said, we're entering the time of the parentheses, the time between eras. It's almost as though we have bracketed off the present from both the past and the future. I look back at the book I started with, *Yesterday*, and think that we in Alberta have such strong links with the old world, the economically self-contained world, the industrialized world. We're looking forward; we're trying so hard in our legislation and the work we do here to look into the future. We're looking at high tech, but as we go toward high tech, I think we must be very careful not to look at short-term solutions. We haven't let go of the past, but we haven't embraced the future either.

Mr. Speaker, I would like us to get away from the Archie Bunker kind of mentality, the stereotype that says, when they talk about women: why should anybody pay you for the work God gave you to do? I would like to be able to move away from that, but I don't think we can do it alone. I think women and men have to work together. We're clinging to a past, and I think we have a fear for the future. I think we are caught in the middle. As women, we have a new role to play. In doing so, we need help and support, but that has to come from all of us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to rise and spend a couple of minutes giving a few views relevant to the issue we're discussing this afternoon. Much of the discussion has of course centred around the area of advisory councils and various other programs that have been suggested by women, programs that are either in place or some others that are possibly desirous of being put in place. In discussing issues of this nature

in the constituency — in the manner of women seeking equal rights, if that's the best term to use — I often ask myself: what do we really want?

For a man who is out there trying to give his best effort and put his best foot forward with many groups in the community, the issues of women do of course come up, but maybe not as often as they could or should. Some of the women that are interested in the constituency and want to have first-hand dealings with an MLA could possibly set up some of their committees within a community to assist us in dealing with some of these issues that are there. I'm certain that I, and many of my other colleagues who are interested, get tied up with many of the other day-to-day issues that come forward and that may seem important to particular individuals or groups, yet the same amount of effort is maybe not put forward from women's groups to each individual MLA.

I did a little checking on some different things, Mr. Speaker, in briefly preparing for the discussion this afternoon, and it really opened my eyes. There are a lot of different programs in place specifically to assist women, in both the private and public sectors and so on. I'd like to identify some of these, as far as the area in the provincial government, for example. They're operated by the Alberta Personnel Administration office and have been since 1977. It's interesting to note that since 1977, women in management in the provincial service have increased from 5.7 percent of the work force to 12 percent. I suggest that that is a fair amount of progress, maybe not the progress that some people think it could or should have been but at least I think it's in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other programs within the Personnel Administration office that assist in the development and training of women and help approximately 2,000 women a year within the service. These programs include Women Entering a Supervisory Role, Women Entering a Management Role, Preparing for the Job Interview, Dealing with the Public, The Supervisor in the Automating Office, Human Resources Management. It's interesting to note that I know a number of ladies in management or supervision, especially in the private sector, who have a considerable role with regard to human resources. That may be because they have a little more sensitivity to an individual than some of the fellows do. Others are Career Development for Women, The Career Planning Process, and Administrative Skills and the Senior Secretary.

In dealing with this issue, I guess I look back to my younger days, when my mother brought me up. [interjections] It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the snide remarks always come from the guys and not the women, so that tells you something right off the bat. It shows that they're somewhat interested in how I was brought up.

AN HON. MEMBER: It shows that we're listening.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, my mother was a single parent who brought up a young family, generally speaking — and some might argue this — not too badly. She really had to work hard to do that. When you look at the area of single parents, generally speaking they are women who are trying to make ends meet in a low-paying job — maybe a job equal to a man's but with less pay — and also trying to run a home, bring up children, and what have you. Not only is it a tough job but they have to give an extraordinary effort, maybe more than we as men have to give when we just go out to work and come home, put our feet up on a chair, and watch the hockey game while our dinner is being prepared. However, those of us who participate in the community don't have those opportunities that some do. I'm sure there are also men having to bring up

children as a single parent that have the same difficulties as women, so I don't think we should forget about them either.

Mr. Speaker, over the last number of years, the thinking toward opportunities for women has changed and is continuing to change. When I lived in Australia — and I guess the relationship between Australia and Canada is about as wide as you can get. If you really want to see chauvinism, Australia is where you want to go. In most cases women are not treated very nicely by men; they are treated very poorly. When I came back to Canada and lived in Alberta, if I can use a comparison as an example, I think we treat our women very, very well. Possibly some people might not agree with that, but in general terms I would suggest that that is fairly close to the case. Opportunities for women today are quite good compared to years ago. For example, years ago a single woman or a divorced lady with a child or two couldn't even get a loan. They couldn't get a Visa card. They couldn't get a mortgage on a home. They had the same opportunities and income as a man, yet the man could get a mortgage. Nowadays that has reversed itself. As long as a woman can show economic opportunities similar to what a man is obtaining, they are given that opportunity to obtain mortgages, loans, plastic money, and so on.

As with many groups that represent a number of people, I guess you often ask the question: how representative of the community of all women are the views of some of the groups that come forward and make statements? I guess you could ask that question of many other groups and activities that may take place in our community. You have to try to delineate the information that is given to determine the correctness and sincerity of it. I wouldn't for one moment suggest that women try to present their views and improve their life-style and the situation some of them are in with information that is incorrect or not given with sincerity. I'm sure it is.

It's also interesting to note that during the last couple of years, this government has discussed this issue — the present motion, the motion on spouse battering, the Women's Secretariat that is now coming before us again, and the fact that we did encourage and develop a Widows' Pension Act, which assists widows in their difficulty when they've lost a loved one.

Mr. Speaker, one of the areas that I think I have become reasonably well-versed in is the area of battered women. As a participant on the police commission in Calgary for four years, we discussed this item many a time. There were frustrations. When a woman got beaten up and had to go to a women's shelter, if it was full she had to find her own way. A lady came into my store one night at about 11 o'clock, and I happened to be there. She had just been beaten up by her husband. I had to try to find a spot for her at the shelter, at a friend's house, or somewhere else, so she could be comforted for the evening. It's not a pretty sight.

Some of the difficulties that happen of course — I know that this changed in Calgary while I was on the police commission. When there was a severe beating of a lady, we instructed the police to automatically charge the spouse who did the task. We talk about the battering of women, but on the other hand we should remember that many times women will not lay a charge against the spouse. I guess we could stand here and be critical of that, but that may be unfair because many women feel insecure. They lose their livelihood and the security for their children. That is a real difficulty in our society, and it's an unfair one. Because some jerk beats up on his wife, that lady has to feel insecure. She wants to either charge him or leave him, and she may have to stay there and get beaten up again. I think society has to examine this particular area very closely to ensure that if that's happening, that woman is going to be looked after should she decide to remove herself, at least temporarily, from the joint living place.

I know there are a lot of other members who wish to speak on this issue today. I guess there's a lot more I could get into. There are so many different pieces of material relevant to women's issues. There are so many good points that have been made here today. I guess I'd just like to leave the Legislature with a couple of words.

First of all, I think women deserve to have the same rights as any other individual, as children do. I sometimes ask if, when young people are brought up, it starts at an early age with a little girl being very intimidated by her father. Maybe that is the start of the intimidation process. If we make an effort to assist women, in both the workplace and the home environment, and ensure that their rights as persons are given the same high regard that men expect — have the same sympathies and the same emotional qualities — I think we'll all have a better world to live in. I think we're generally pretty good people. We also have to recognize that women and children are persons, as we are as men.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak on this. I hope we continue to address this issue in a positive fashion so that we will create an environment of equal opportunity for all.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I want to take an opportunity to add very briefly to some very valuable contributions which have been made by my colleagues. Talking to the co-ordinator of the speaking team, I understand that roughly 18 members have already participated in this very important debate. Moreover, as I understand it, a fairly substantial number are still anxious to get involved and express their views with respect to this important issue.

You can tell it's important when even the Member for Clover Bar comes back. It's the first time we've seen him in the House for the past little while.

DR. BUCK: I just wanted to hear his words of wisdom.

MR. JOHNSTON: It's always nice to hear from you, Walt, trivial as it may be.

DR. BUCK: At least I don't get \$70,000 a year for doing nothing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad at any time to match hours for hours in terms of contributions to this province with many of the members in this Assembly and the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Nonetheless it's good to hear the Member for Clover Bar, and we'll look forward to your support on this issue. After you had spoken, I wasn't too clear just where in fact you were, whether you were in favour or not.

Let me talk very briefly, Mr. Speaker, about what I consider to be an important mechanism. Let me make it clear from the beginning that I am supportive of the council on the status of women. As the resolution already suggests, the government and the members of this Legislative Assembly should consider moving toward that mechanism. As I've said before, even if this resolution does not manage to be dealt with in this Assembly while the House is still in session this fall, the fact that the resolution is here and that so many members have participated in this very important debate certainly means that we are in fact considering this question. I know that in the near term, as a result of this discussion and the interest which has been generated by all my colleagues — certainly on the government side — we will be considering ways in which we can apply the arguments and recommendations which have flowed from

this discussion to see if it is possible to put together some form of recommendation to form a council on the status of women.

Let me deal with two or three elements. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the fact that a council has been recommended suggests that there must be a couple of weaknesses in the system. If we look at the constitutional basis under which equality is established in Canada, there's no doubt that the new amendments to the Constitution, going back almost to the day in 1981, reflect two very significant sections which ensure equality for men and women. As the supreme law of Canada, that of course applies in the province of Alberta as well. As you well know, section 15 in particular will come into force on April 17, 1985. That's the three-year waiting period referred to in the Constitution to ensure that, under those equality sections, men and women do have equality. Section 28 states more specifically that there is equality between men and women.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that even though those equality sections are in the Constitution and even though many of us have recognized equality for some time, perhaps equality in essence isn't being recognized in many of the institutions and systems in which we operate on a day-to-day basis. Therefore it leads you to the other side of the issue; that is, whether or not women are being reflected in the decision-making process in Alberta and Canada in some legitimate and reasonable way. If the status of women council is being recommended, we can only conclude that legitimate recognition in these systems in the decision-making process is in fact not effective, is not adequate, or has not yet reached the point when we can say we have achieved equality in terms of input, decision-making, and really effectively controlling the power systems of the country.

In those two questions, I suppose the latter one has always been available; that is to say, women have had the opportunity to participate in the political process. We've heard from the members of this Assembly who are women, who have gone through the process and can speak both to the difficulty all of us share in terms of getting a nomination and election and moreover to the opportunities which exist for women in politics. If we were to find the quickest solution to any of these problems, it would certainly be to have some equal distribution of women and men in political offices. I think all of my colleagues here would certainly encourage that. We know there are some difficulties; nonetheless I think that equality has existed.

In the interim, however, we can only conclude that if this recommendation holds that the current political process does not allow women to effectively participate as candidates in the electoral process, we have to find some adjustment to assure that women have some voice in the political decision-making process in this province. I'm sure some of my female colleagues might take that as a touch of a slight, in that it suggests they are not making effective contributions. That is not the case, and I want that to be clearly understood.

The Member for — where was he from? — Clover Bar has left again, of course.

When we deal with status of women councils across the provinces in Canada, we find that a variety of mechanisms are in place, and those mechanisms include such things as ...

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but I must draw the attention of the House to it being half past four. According to the *Standing Orders*, we must now move to another item of business.

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

**Bill 213
An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act**

MR. LEE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to begin second reading on Bill 213, An Act to Amend the Liquor [Control] Act.

Mr. Speaker, I approach this Bill with a degree of anticipation, after having advocated the Bill for two years — in fact I was elected on November 2 with my colleagues — two years less one day. During that election I really made only one commitment. Other than to do my very personal best as a member of the Legislature, my one commitment was to introduce this Bill in the House. So it's with a sense of relief that I finally have an opportunity to speak to it.

DR. BUCK: That's a heavy platform, Brian.

MR. LEE: Welcome back.

Mr. Speaker, the first question is, does one approach this issue with logic or with emotion? It is not really an issue that is debated logically. It is one we debate with the best of our emotions. Isn't it true though that we base all our decisions in life, whether we're buying a product or choosing to like or dislike someone, on emotions; then we defend them logically.

Mr. Speaker, I've made an emotional decision: let us trust the people we represent. Let us trust their common sense, goodwill, and ability to make judgments best for themselves. I intend to do that by identifying three reasons why I believe this Bill ought to be supported: public support, economic opportunity, and social opportunity.

Before I do that, I want to clarify, first of all, the Bill's content and, secondly, a brief history. What will the Bill do and what won't it do? Mr. Speaker, the Bill proposes to accept applicants from food retailers throughout the province. It would do so based on the following restrictions: that not more than 10 percent of the shelf space could be used to sell beer and wine; that the store in question must service the local community that customarily patronizes that store; that there should be no Sunday sales; that there be tough fines if any sales are made to minors; that there be a local civic option for any municipality that does not wish to see this legislation brought about; that there be strict security measures so as not to provide a difficulty for local law enforcement; that there be no sales before or after the full hours of operation of a competing liquor store — in other words, sales could not take place before 10 o'clock in the morning or 11 o'clock at night; and the liquor must be sold by adults. As well, while it's not in the Bill, I would favour an emphasis on the sale of domestic wine to assist Alberta wineries.

Mr. Speaker, what the Bill would not do: it would not alter the role of the Alberta Liquor Control Board as a referee or regulator; it would not diminish local control over closing hours — in fact it would strengthen it; as I indicated, it would not permit Sunday sales; it would not alter the restrictions regarding age that already exist in this province; and finally, it would not impact local land use or zoning provisions.

I mentioned that I have been looking forward to this Bill with anticipation, and I really have. Ever since moving to Alberta 24 years ago, I've always been intrigued by the liquor laws. I recall that my twin brother and I would wait in our parents' truck as they went for a drink in the local bar, and my

mother would have to go in one door and my father in the other. Many people wonder if I'm quite that old, but I can remember back that far. We've seen a tremendous evolution take place since then.

As I mentioned in my debate on Tuesday, shortly after I was elected for the first occasion in Calgary in 1977, I had an opportunity, as a director of the McMahon Stadium Society, to propose a resolution that the average football fan have the opportunity to purchase light beer in paper cups. That was eventually passed after two and a half years of lobbying. I was elected November 2; as I mentioned, this was the only promise. In November 1983 I introduced this Bill in the closing days of the fall session and reintroduced it on March 27 of this year's spring session.

Just to recap, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I spoke in favour of Motion 207, proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. I did so for the philosophical reasons I believe support the practical implementation of this Bill, for the six freedoms I believe it will bring about: freedom for businesses to compete more effectively; freedom to choose as a consumer; freedom from excessive size of government; freedom to be personally accountable and responsible; freedom to trust and be trusted; and the freedom to grow, to succeed, and to fail, but above all for the individual to have the freedom to experience that in their own way.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are many good reasons for public support of this Bill. Of course one of the reasons I introduced the Bill in the dying days of one session was to stimulate public response, and we have had public response during the past year. To begin with, there was an immediate response from many of the business industry associations throughout Alberta: the Alberta Wine Distillers Association, the American Wine Association, the Calgary Korean-Canadian grocers' association, and the Edmonton Korean Businessmen's Association.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted while I'm on my feet, without reverting to a former part of the program, I would like to acknowledge the attendance here today of representatives of the Edmonton Korean Businessmen's Association. They represent some 200 members and over 100 retail stores. I ask them to stand and members of the House to welcome them to this Assembly. I think they've been standing all day, so they're quite comfortable seated right now.

Mr. Speaker, I mention that on their behalf I served notice on May 15 of a petition of some 5,300 Albertans that had been collected by their members through their stores. That petition has been filed with the Legislature Library.

There are other associations, Mr. Speaker. I note that the Canadian Federation of Independent Grocers took a survey which indicated that a substantial percentage of Calgarians — 72 percent — would view the option as a convenience, and 59 percent said they wanted that service provided in Calgary. I will refer to a survey just a few minutes from now.

Business organizations throughout the province have indicated their support by way of the chambers of commerce that represent them. To name a few: the Ashmont Board of Trade, Berwyn and District Chamber of Commerce, Bow Valley and Canmore Chamber of Commerce, Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, Morinville Board of Trade, Red Deer Chamber of Commerce, Stettler Chamber of Commerce, Stony Plain and District Chamber of Commerce, St. Paul and District Chamber of Commerce, Swan Hills Chamber of Commerce. There are others I do not have listed in my remarks today. But I thought perhaps one of the most representative comments came from the president of the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, who said in his letter to me on February 15, 1984:

The Edmonton Chamber supports in principle, the intent of [this] Bill . . . on the basis that the reduction and eventual elimination of the Government's monopoly on beer, wine and liquor importation, distribution and retailing is a desirable objective and should be encouraged.

But who really speaks for the public on this issue? Many spokesmen have gotten up and said: my constituency, my group, my organization, and so on, favour or do not favour this proposal. There is a group called the Alberta Alcohol-Drug Education Association; they've purported to speak for the majority of Albertans. I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to qualify who that group is. First of all, they are not the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission — I know they are frequently mistaken for them — but rather they are an organization that was formerly one of the Alberta Christian temperance associations. While they are a registered society in the province, they do not have a membership; they have a mailing list. They do not have a board of directors. So I'm not certain who they speak for, although their right to express a point of view is certainly valid and accepted.

Mr. Speaker, a Gallup poll was conducted in May 1984. Just before this Legislature began, I had the opportunity to release the results, which indicated that of 1,053 respondents throughout the province of Alberta, 54 percent of Albertans favoured this proposal, 43 percent did not, and 3 percent were not sure. In the city of Edmonton, 58 percent were in favour and 37 percent against. In Calgary, which rather surprised me, some 68 percent of the public favoured the proposal, 30 percent were against, and 2 percent were not sure. Sixty-eight percent is two-thirds. We can amend constitutions with two-thirds support, so it seems to me that there is considerable support for this proposal.

Why is there public support? Certainly the economic opportunity and some of the social implications. But there are some very practical reasons. First of all, there's the opportunity of walking to your corner store rather than having to drive to a distant liquor store. I have a letter from the Stettler Chamber of Commerce. It says:

There was mixed reaction, but mostly a positive response to the proposal.

This is written by the president, and he said:

My personal feelings are that enactment of the bill would be good for small rural stores and the residents of smaller communities that are not now serviced by a government store.

A major convenience for rural Alberta.

I have a letter here from the secretary of the village of Alliance, Alberta. It says:

Village Council heartily endorses this proposal. The current method is completely unsatisfactory. As examples we must drive to the nearest A.L.C.B. outlet for a simple bottle of table wine (in our case a round trip of 40 miles). If we desire to buy beer we have the choice of purchasing at the local licensed outlet (hotel) at a healthy mark-up or driving the 40 miles. And let us be realistic, not everyone feels comfortable in a hotel tavern.

Mr. Speaker, I think another reason that relates to that issue is the subject of hours of operation. While I do not feel that beer and wine ought to be sold in food stores every hour of the day, I certainly don't feel it's realistic to say: you be at our doorstep by 6 p.m. or you have to wait till the next day or two or three days from today. I think the public is a bit concerned over the restricted hours of operation of the Alberta Liquor Control Board.

Mr. Speaker, I'll throw in one other practical idea. Frankly, you can't buy a bottle of chilled wine in this province. I think

it would be nice to walk to my neighbourhood store and be able to pick up a bottle of chilled wine if I had forgotten, and I believe many people would. In fact I've heard that from many individuals.

Finally, there's the level of service. I'm not going to criticize the Alberta Liquor Control Board employees. But with as limited a number of stores as there are, oftentimes it's very busy. The neighbourhood Liquor Control Board outlet in my area does a volume of — excuse me, it's not even a volume; it has a profit of \$5 million a year. It is a busy store. I had a letter from a constituent in that area that said:

As you probably have concluded I'm a regular patron at the A.L.C.B.'s outlets . . . Standing in line with my bottle of plonk I am hearing people complain of the A.L.C.B.'s inefficiencies, overheads, and poor service. I think people would welcome local retail, perhaps using the B.C. example as a guide.

Mr. Speaker, there are some practical reasons, but let's look at the issue of economic opportunity — the economic issues involved in this Bill. First of all, I think there's the question of free enterprise. Thomas Jefferson said:

That government is best which governs the least, because its people discipline themselves.

This quote contains an underlying belief that precisely represents the intent of this Bill. The intent is that people are inherently trustworthy and responsible. We may try to protect against that irresponsibility of the few, but in doing so we should not take away from the freedom of responsibility of the majority. To take away those freedoms from the majority to prevent the excesses of the minority is nothing if not totalitarianism.

I have a letter from the Stony Plain and District Chamber of Commerce, and they support that. They simply said that their chamber

supports [this] Bill . . . and hopes you are successful in passing this piece of legislation.

The Chamber's mandate is to promote the free enterprise system and this type of legislation will support that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this Bill clearly falls within the purview of the principles of free enterprise.

Then there's the concern about any monopoly that exists, whether it's a direct government monopoly or a monopoly at arm's length. We become very aware of that monopoly in this province when there is a strike and we can't purchase spirits anywhere except in very limited quantities at certain locations. There have been many letters of concern and letters to the editor in that regard, and I'm very sympathetic.

But more than anything, Mr. Speaker, my concern is for the food retailing industry. We just had the annual report tabled in the Legislature yesterday. In 1983 the Alberta Liquor Control Board made a profit of \$292 million. I have before me a summary of the profits store by store. At the Westbrook store in Calgary, I see a net income of \$4.859 million. I have great difficulty explaining how that is. Within a walking distance of six blocks from that very store, there are a half dozen independent food merchants barely getting by, barely earning the minimum wage for their employees, and we're saying: there's profit there, and we're going to do it all; you do your best; and by the way, we don't pay taxes and you do. I have great difficulty understanding the fairness of that.

While it's true that this Bill technically allows large food stores to have the option, I believe there is a need to take a look at the space content provision of the Bill. But more than anything at this point, I'm empathetic with the concern of the small independent food retailer who is being squeezed from all angles, competition from majors and from chains.

There is the issue of job creation, Mr. Speaker. It is understood that in most states and provinces where this is permitted, anywhere between 18 and 25 percent of the gross sales of a food retailer are attributed to the sale of beer and wine.

Then there's the issue of tourism. I have a letter from the Ashmont Board of Trade. They said:

If this legislation is passed, I am sure it would benefit our village immensely in that it would satisfy our tourist trade and keep them coming to our area.

Another letter from the Banff Chamber of Commerce:

As the operator of a tourist business in Banff I am strongly in favour of . . . [this] Private Member's Bill which would allow the sale of beer and wine in grocery stores. Almost every day I hear comments from visitors to Banff on the ridiculousness of Alberta's antiquated liquor laws. No doubt this tarnishes the reputation of Banff as a progressive resort and prevents the Town from competing on an equal basis with American resort areas such as Lake Tahoe, Aspen, Vail, [et cetera].

Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this issue, I of course have heard from the Alberta hotel industry, and I am sympathetic to their concerns. They have a tough time of it. Business is down, and they have large mortgages. But I don't believe the association speaks for all members, because members have frequently come up to me in the past several months and said: I know our association has said we're against this change, but I want you to know that I personally favour the principle because it is a principle of free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say that if this Bill is introduced — the majority of off-sales at hotels take place past 11:30 at night. I believe we ought to respect that. The hotel industry is depending on it. We ought to restrict the sale at food stores to 11 or 11:30, so at least there is not that head-on competition.

Mr. Speaker, in the time remaining this afternoon, I'd like to address the social opportunities as I see them if this Bill is passed. I think there are many social opportunities. The question is: is it a problem, or is it an opportunity? When we look at the issue of alcohol and alcohol abuse, we should recognize that it is a major problem. Each year in this province, about 2,500 people are killed related to impaired driving. There are 50,000 alcoholics in the province. The average Albertan consumes \$360 of alcohol a year. So naturally it's a concern. We ought to take a careful look at the impact this Bill will have, because I believe it's advantageous.

A federal report released on May 4 said consumption in Alberta has been higher than anywhere else in Canada, despite the fact that we have restricted availability. If I refer to my remarks in this House on Tuesday, there is no empirical evidence that availability is a factor or related whatsoever. I have been unable to find anywhere in this province that there is a relationship between alcohol abuse and availability.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the issue of moderation, maybe it's time we made alcohol, other than hard liquor, more available. If we look at the trend, the consumption of beer sales in Alberta has declined by 40 percent since 1950. Hard liquor has increased from 25 to 48 percent of the consumption since 1950. Despite the economic downturn, there is an alarming rate of liquor with high alcoholic content.

Mr. Speaker, one of the benefits of this Bill is that it would avert the stock-up syndrome. I can say this quite clearly. I probably go to my liquor store three times a year, so it's not surprising that I walk out with a case or two of beverages. Of course everybody knows me, and people begin to wonder what happens. But as long as it's sitting there in my home, there's the likelihood that it's going to be used. It doesn't make any

sense. Would we go to the local store and buy three cases of milk? Not likely. There is that stock-up syndrome.

I know there was a quotation in the local press that said that when they allowed the sale of wine in the local food stores in Montana, consumption of wine went up 245 percent — absolutely true. Everybody wanted to walk down to the local store and try it. It was filling the pipeline. What the writer of the article in the paper forgot to mention was that it went back to normal a couple of months later. In fact there have been no changes in the rate of alcoholism in that state since then.

A letter from the Winfield Board of Trade:

The members of the Winfield Board of Trade support the sale of Beer and Wine in Alberta Food Stores — we believe it will increase the trade and sale of foodstuffs here.

I know the local member is paying attention to this.

We also agree it will cut back the consumption of hard liquor to a certain extent.

Isn't it interesting that the people can sometimes recognize what their politicians cannot?

Mr. Speaker, there is the issue of drinking and driving. I would like to quote from *The Edmonton Journal* editorial of March 30.

. . . [this] Bill makes sense. It is in keeping with the Tory pledge of privatization . . .

And it would be so much more practical and convenient. Most Albertans drink beer and wine. A nearby vendor could reduce the number of drunks driving and it might also convert lazy seasoned hard liquor drinkers into beer and wine buffs.

Mr. Speaker, we have another source of wisdom, the owner of *The Camrose Canadian*. I wish the local representative was present, because I want to quote from that newspaper. The editor says:

I believe you're on the right track, and wish you all kinds of success. If workers can stop at the neighbourhood grocery or on the way home to pick up a bottle of wine for supper, two things, three, may happen. They may not spend as much time or as much money in a downtown bistro after work soaking up one or more to relieve the day's tensions. There may not be so many partially impaired drivers on the road. And they might even see more of their kids.

Well said.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the benefits of this Bill is destigmatizing the availability of liquor. Because it's in limited supply, it is a forbidden fruit. I note that the U.S. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism said alcohol beverage control laws generally don't seem to have much effect on drinking behaviour. The trouble is that this provincial government has a conflict of interest at present. On the one hand, we want the revenue that comes from the sale of beer and wine; on the other hand, we want to deal with the issue of alcohol abuse. As long as there is that conflict of interest, I don't believe we can ever have a concerted, clear policy dealing with alcohol abuse.

The same thing applies to the smoking issue, Mr. Speaker. We regulate smoking. We get taxes from the sale of cigarettes, but we don't sell cigarettes. Everybody sells cigarettes. Isn't it interesting that despite the fact that you can buy them at every corner store, there are machines in every restaurant, and you can get them anywhere you go, smoking is on the decline? It's because it's no big deal; it's readily there. But what is happening is that people are beginning to focus on the price they pay for poor habits with respect to cigarette smoking.

Mr. Speaker, I'm short of time. I could go on. But I want to quote from one other report. Dr. Morris Chafetz, the former director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, said:

The time has come for a redirection and reemphasis toward prevention of alcohol abuse and the development of healthy drinking patterns based on:

- (1) alcohol as a social instrument is available and is used by many large populations ... and efforts to remove it have failed.
- (2) In many cultures that experience minimal alcohol problems, alcohol is used early and often.
- (3) Studies of other cultures have shown that there are ways of drinking that do not result in alcohol problems.
- (4) The social acceptance of intoxication, implicitly or explicitly as part of drinking behaviour, usually contributes to a high incidence of alcoholism.

On the basis of these assumptions, I believe that a practised drinker with healthy attitudes towards alcohol will have a lower incidence of undesirable effects from alcohol than the unpractised drinker with guilt and conflict about drinking. Perhaps we ought to face some facts. The use of alcohol in our society is here to stay ... By integrating drinking experience with family use, immunization against unhealthy, irresponsible drinking behaviour can be provided as a bulwark against alcoholism.

What all these people have said is that as long as it is a forbidden fruit, as long as we place some value on it far in excess of its true meaning, people are going to misuse and abuse it.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides and recognizes that not all Albertans feel the same. I recognize that in certain regions of this province there is no case to be made for this change. That is precisely why the Bill says, let the local municipality decide. Trust the local municipality, because there is a significant difference between the constituency of Cardston and the constituency of Banff. We trust our constituencies in areas of local autonomy; we trust our municipalities to regulate business hours of opening and closing; we trust them to regulate planning and density issues; we trust them to deal with the shape and sizes of the city; we trust them to set priorities for transportation; we trust them to decide, for example, whether or not they want to sell beer in paper cups at their professional sporting events. Why in heaven's name can't we trust them to trust their people to make the decisions that are in their best interests? Clearly, if we're going to address this issue of alcohol abuse, it is not going to be dealt with by the question of availability. It's going to be dealt with by the issues of education, positive life-style examples, destigmatization, an emphasis on moderation, and a focus on physical health.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, I've talked about this Bill's content. I've talked about the historical overview of how it came to be. I've listed three reasons why I think the public, generally speaking, favours this; the six economic opportunities; and the seven social opportunities. In closing, I want to quote René Descartes, who said: a state is better governed which has but few laws, and those laws strictly observed. We do not need huge control boards for the sale of beer and wine. I believe that what we need are provisions such as this, which establish succinctly what is and is not permissible. Once that is achieved, we should observe and enforce regulations and trust in the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members for their support.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Clover Bar caught my eye first.

DR. BUCK: In rising to take part in the debate this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to start with I'm not sure if the hon. member is serious. I guess he is, because if you're a one-issue politician you must be serious about that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I finally found out why three of my children smoke. My wife and I don't smoke, so I guess they are smoking the forbidden fruit. That's the only reason I can see, but I hope they will have enough brains and use their common sense to quit smoking. I am not a person who tries to inflict my religious beliefs or my morality on other people, because I think that we as individuals all have that responsibility. But as a legislator, I do feel that I have a responsibility to try to be my brother's keeper.

It is very, very simple: the more outlets you have, the more consumption you have. We have to look at the social problems. We have to look at the broken homes, at the violence, at the battered wives and the battered children. It does not have to be an emotional issue. I think we can look at the balancing of the pros and cons.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the hon. member who has proposed the Bill — who is now rushing off to have his picture taken on television — that it was his government that allowed advertising of booze on television and in local newspapers. There was not even the opportunity to debate that issue in this Legislature. I would like to know how he can justify that.

The hon. member says there would be no Sunday sales. I would like to know from the hon. member — this government has done nothing about trying to keep the small-business man in business by keeping the large retailers out of open Sundays and allowing the small corner confectionary to remain viable. I also know that once we allow alcohol, beer and wine, in the small convenience stores it will spread to all of them, so the members will lose their advantage. Safeway will be selling beer and wine within a short period of time. 'Low-value food' will be selling beer and wine within a very, very short time, because if you allow it in the small stores you will have to allow it in the large stores. Under our Canadian Bill of Rights, you can't discriminate. You can't tell one person that he can do it and the next one that he can't.

The hon. member is dragging a red herring across the floor, trying to convince the small-business man that this is going to be to his economic advantage. He would have been better off complaining about the 13 percent income tax or looking at some type of small-business incentive program to keep the small-business man alive, rather than this tokenism of saying: you can sell beer and wine in the small stores, and that's going to keep you viable. That is nothing more than a red herring.

I'm glad to see that the hon. member checked with the Alberta Hotel Association, because I know some of their members are having great difficulty trying to keep their businesses viable. I'd also like to say that if my learned friend the Member for Calgary Buffalo says our liquor laws are so antiquated, he's never been to the southern parts of the United States. I have not been to those states, but I have friends that have been down there on business. They said Alberta is practically wide open when you compare it to some of the southern states.

I am not trying to impose my views upon what other people think their rights are. I'm trying to look at it with a common-sense approach, because I think most laws are made with the commonsense approach. I have to commend the government. I think they've got a good balance in this province. You can have a drink if you wish, or you can abstain.

Without any hesitation, we all know that the more outlets you have, the more alcoholism you have. It's that plain and simple. We talk about social acceptability in the great nation

of France; if your children learn to watch you drink a little bit of wine, they will not be alcoholics. What they really are, are hard-core alcoholics who can handle it. Hon. member from Lethbridge, I believe they have the highest percentage of alcoholics in the world.

I challenge the members of this Assembly who have the odd nip once in a while. Try a little experiment. Go one week without a drop of alcohol and then, on that seventh or eighth day, have just one drink and see how the alcohol tolerance goes down. You'd get really swacked on one drink, an ounce and a half. But if you drink one or two drinks every night of those seven days, your alcohol tolerance goes so high that you really need that fourth one to get any kick out of the stuff. So the more alcohol consumption we have, the more immune we become to the effects of alcohol.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment on booze in sport stadia. It is very interesting to see why we have to look at the scoreboard in Commonwealth Stadium. They get that really funny commercial, which I thought was skillfully done: beware of the two-fisted slobber. They never come back with one drink. It blows my mind that when it's about 10 below zero with a windchill factor of about 25 below, people could be drinking suds on a day like that. They never seem to buy one; they buy two because they're limited to two. So you buy two, then your buddy buys two, and then you go back for two more. They say these two-fisted slobbers are pouring it over their neighbours and making quite a nuisance of themselves.

We've allowed that; we're living with it. Why is it that in Calgary they are now restricting it, I believe, to the downstairs portion? Because the fan who doesn't like having booze spilled all over his back and head has said: "Hey, I'm not going to go and watch those Stampede. First of all, they're a lousy football team and, secondly, I don't like people pouring booze all over me." So they've restricted it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say that some of the smaller cities that have had NFL Monday night football are looking very seriously at trying to eliminate booze from their stadia, because some of the melees that took place after the drunken fans got out of the stadium on a Monday night were almost riot situations. Many of those owners are looking very, very seriously at eliminating booze or else eliminating Monday night football. So it's not the great panacea the hon. member is telling us it is.

To the illustration of Alliance that the member used — the member mentioned that it has a small hotel. Is it that they don't have a liquor store because of choice? I don't know. I'm sure that if they wanted to, they probably could have one.

I want to get back to one more illustration about booze and sports. My wife's cousin, who was in Glasgow, said the Glasgow Rangers were playing. I said, "I want to go and watch the soccer", because they pack the stadia in those countries that have soccer. My friend said, "No, I won't take you." I said, "Why?" He said, "You cannot believe the mob scene at those stadia. They sell 10,000 standing-room tickets, and all those guys are so beered up that you don't want to wear your trench coat because they'll urinate in your pocket." You can't get 10,000 drunken, standing-room-only fans to go to the bathroom, because it takes an hour to get in and an hour to get back out. They do it right there or down your pant leg. He said, "If you go to the soccer matches, you need a hard hat because you may get killed from the flying bottles and the melee that goes on." Mr. Speaker, the hon. member hasn't convinced me of the great thing it's going to do for our sporting events.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to weigh the economic issue and this false bit of trying to drag the free-enterprise herring

in by looking at, number one, the consumption and, number two, if we turn it entirely over to the private sector, is the private sector going to pick up the tab to pick up the broken pieces from the broken lives? A friend of mine is now a member of AA. He did that because he thought he had a problem. He said he did that because his business has improved, his family life is better, everything is better. He said that if we spent dollar for dollar, if we took in \$290 million from liquor profits and spent \$290 million on picking up the pieces, then maybe at least we would have a balance. Or, he said, if every time we went and bought a bottle at the liquor store, we put the equivalent amount in the collection plate the next Sunday, the churches would have so much money they wouldn't know what to do with it all.

Mr. Speaker, we have to keep some of these things in perspective. I believe there is a moral issue. I believe we as legislators have a moral responsibility to have a good balance between making it available for those who want it and not pushing the product. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West, the chairman of AADAC, knows that in pushing the product, the price is too high. I would like to say publicly, and I am not trying to impose any morality on this issue, that I have a right to decide if I want to have a nip or not. But the issue here is: will we make it so available that the kids will pick up their six-pack wherever it's convenient and then run down the road, run into me, and kill me? Or they run down the road and kill my child.

I think there is a moral issue there. I think I would have a lot of difficulty being a policeman when I stopped someone, smelled liquor on his breath, asked him to stand up and do some little tests, and then let him back into that car. I am sure that officer must agonize every time he does that, wondering: should I take him down and have him blow, or is he going to be capable of driving that automobile? I am sure those officers anguish every time they make that decision.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the issue as to, number one, whether there will be an economic benefit. I find that very difficult to believe. Number two, will increased consumption cause more social problems? I think it will. I think we have to stand in our places and make the decision. The decision I have made is that I will not vote for the Bill.

Thank you.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, he who drinks and drinks with grace is always welcome everywhere, but he who drinks more than his share is never welcome anywhere. If Bill 213 is legislated, I believe the only thing it will do is encourage and provide an incentive to drink more.

Had a Bill like this been brought before the Legislature 10 or 12 years ago, I may have looked at it with a different view. Shortly after my election, I had delegations from time to time with inquiries about discrepancies by the Liquor Control Board and other functions. But for the last few years, I've had none. Maybe some things have changed already, and maybe the liquor board has worked much more co-operatively with the communities and so forth. Maybe even the chairman of the Liquor Control Board, who is a good businessman and politician who lived with the people, saw their needs, likes, and dislikes, and maybe that is why it seems to run very smoothly. As the old saying goes: if it isn't broken, don't fix it.

Right now there is no other province in Canada that has a lower age for allowing people to drink. There are some provinces that have the age of 18. Already school administrators are concerned that students come to school after consuming alcohol. If alcohol, beer and wine, is going to be available in these corner stores, I'm sure not just one student will have a

chance on his way to school to pick up a bag of potato chips and a glass of wine.

It has been said that the corner stores need some help, and we are concerned. They're finding it difficult; I know this. But it's not very much different with the hotels. They have their problems too. Who would select the corner stores that would qualify for the sale of beer and wine? Would somebody who is prejudiced be given that opportunity? Would these corner stores be able to provide the service that the present outlets do? Would they have parking, or would you have to park three, four, five blocks away? How many little corner stores have any parking for their customers? I wonder if there would ever be any accommodation like there is at present. I wouldn't be at all surprised if bootlegging were encouraged because the corner stores had liquor for sale.

The hotels have been providing a splendid service for many years. You look at the number of hotels going into receivership; they have financial difficulties. For a good number of years, tourism was the third largest industry in this province. One of the reasons was the service they received with the accommodation. Even now, when any hotel is built, there are regulations. You must have your rooms above it, and you must provide food. The difficulties are much greater when you go into the rural areas. I am sure those hotels sell very little accommodation. However, those are the regulations. Maybe somebody in the corner store could have four sheets of plywood or something and be able to sell that. The hotels at present work on stringent regulations, and I think they follow them quite well. When we look at the Alberta Liquor Control Board annual report, there are a few throughout the year who contravene the Act. But when you find eight, nine, or 10, that is very few.

We have to look at the cost of liquor. The costs of beer, wine, and other liquors have been going up continuously. If the small corner stores are going to handle them, I expect that is going to happen for several reasons. They will have to keep small quantities. If they keep large quantities, the value of what's in the beer — and I think at present it's only good for 90 days — would deteriorate. There is that possibility. If the losses are going to be great, somebody has to pick up the extra costs.

It's also the same with transportation. In the rural areas, when a truck brings a load of beer he will dump two-thirds of it into the liquor store and the other one-third into the hotel. If these small grocery stores are going to handle it, they're going to take such small amounts that it is going to be considerably more costly.

I mentioned bootlegging. I was in Hawaii one time, where there was the ABC store. Half a block from that store, there was another ABC store; they have them right across. Yet when you look, the prices of liquor are not identical. A bottle in one store may cost X number of dollars. Half a block away, in the same store by the same operation, there is a difference in price. If they can do that, I wonder what happens when you come before them after hours and so forth. So I cannot see that there would be equity in that.

When we talk about convenience, if there aren't enough outlets today, I wonder whether there ever will be. I can recall the first time I was old enough to buy liquor. There was one liquor store in Edmonton, on 104th Street. Today the liquor stores are within walking distance of each other. Do we need yet more outlets?

We talk about the revenues. True enough, your annual report shows there is a third of a billion dollars profit from this. But is it a profit? When we consider that the Minister of Social Services and Community Health has a budget of over \$1 billion, when we consider how many homes are broken and how many

crippled people there are, nobody is going to tell me there is money in selling liquor. On the whole, it's a real handicap to the people. On one hand, how much money do we put into AADAC to try to encourage people to consume less alcohol? On the other hand, we're asking to make it so much more available.

The Alcohol-Drug Education Association was mentioned by the member. Even though it may be chartered as a society, he wondered who it represents. Regardless of who it represents, it says that in 1980 there were 25,741 impaired driving convictions. There were 10,000 Albertans who were admitted to hospital for alcohol-related medical problems. That same year, one out of every 10 deaths was alcohol related, and they are predicting that by 1985 there will be 82,000 alcoholics in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how we can consider the economics of this with what we have.

I feel that there has been good service by the outlets there are at present. The hotels have done a reasonably — or I could even say a very — good job of providing service over the years. Maybe we should leave it to the experts, those who know and have worked with it. Mr. Speaker, I must ask all hon. members to defeat this once and for all once the vote comes.

Thank you.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on Bill 213. I've waited about 25 years to get up and express my views on this, and I'm glad to get the opportunity at last. When I first came to Canada about 30 years ago, I went to work for Canadian Freightways. Every day when it got near quitting time, everybody was really chomping at the bit to get out of there. They wanted to get out and make tracks, and they would always invite me to go to the bar. They had those funny bars in those days. It wasn't the custom or style I was used to, and I didn't particularly like the bars. I still don't particularly like the bars they have. But I began to realize we have a different system here.

With a little bit of research, I realized that we drink more booze per person in this province than they do in Louisiana, than they do in New Orleans, the great old fun city where you always see the Mardi Gras and that type of thing. Our consumption is so much higher, yet in the city of New Orleans you can buy beer, wine, whiskey, or grain alcohol at pretty well every drug store, grocery store, or even service stations. And guess what? They don't have trouble with the children going in there and stealing the liquor. They have a different attitude, and I think the attitude is the important thing here.

When I worked for the city of Calgary, when I was going to university, some of the guys would get very upset if they didn't get to leave at exactly 4:30. They were in a desperate hurry, and where did they go? They went straight to the bar. Well, the tradition in New Orleans, on a hot summer day, was that you would often stop at the grocery store, pick up a box of beer, and take it home. I know it was the weak old American beer. It didn't have that high an alcohol content. You didn't get zapped on it, drunk, or whatever. But on the hot summer days, you would drink a beer at home.

When I compare that with our system here — we really have it good here now; we've got the happy hour. Let's take the guy that leaves the office. He goes in for the happy hour. You don't get one drink; you get two for the price of one. You really get the consumption up. I know our existing outlets for liquor — hotels, bars, you name it — like the existing system. The sales are up, there's good profit, and so on. But it is destructive to Albertans. Our existing liquor policy is destructive. It encourages excessive alcohol consumption. It encourages the public to drink in a public place and then get in that

automobile and drive home, maybe killing somebody on the way. As for saying that if you had it in the little neighbourhood store the guy would drive there, don't you realize that every guy who goes into the bar or pub, whether it's downtown or at the hotel over there on the highway, must still go home? He must go back to the residential area.

In this province we do control our liquor — the hours, permits, all kinds of regulations, inspectors, and supervisors. But I really wonder. Compare the system of a fellow who sits at home watching the hockey game or whatever and he drinks a little beer. He's not going to get drunk at home. It's not likely he's going to get drunk and drive to the grocery store. If he's got the influence of a family, he's going to have a restraining influence of a wife and children.

I think I will close off on this one little note. When I was first married, I noticed that my children were inquisitive about liquor. We went out to the farm to dear old grandpa's, my wife's father's place near Warburg, in Shirley Cripps' area. We took them tobogganing, and it was bitterly cold. When we came in, dear old grandpa got out his old, strong red wine and said, "You kids, it's cold. Drink some of this red wine." The kids didn't want to drink any red wine, because it was a very strong wine. I don't know what the brand was, but they didn't really want that stuff. Later they were talking to some of their friends, and they said they'd been up to grandpa's and it was cold. "Grandpa made us drink this red wine, because he figured that if we didn't, we might catch a cold or something." The

other kid they were talking to said, "You mean you got to drink wine? Oh my goodness!" There was an attitude that this was the forbidden fruit, that this was so desirable.

The point is, we can prove without any doubt that in the areas where they have alcohol or liquor available in the stores — I don't care if it's Europe or New Orleans, Louisiana or Italy or Austria. Those people are not smarter than us. We're not less intelligent than them. We can handle our liquor. They do not have the problem we have here. New Orleans does not consume as much alcohol as our people here.

I heard a comment earlier, and my comment is: our policy is broken. We do have a problem, and I think we have to fix it.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I wish to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the Assembly sit this evening. I would advise that by way of government business tomorrow, it is proposed to debate Bill 83, the Child Transportation Safety Act, in second reading.

[At 5:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

