

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Tuesday, July 29, 1986 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 21****Petroleum Marketing Statutes
Amendment Act, 1986**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 21, the Petroleum Marketing Statutes Amendment Act, 1986.

This Act amends the Mines and Minerals Act and the Petroleum Marketing Act to put into effect the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission's new role under crude oil deregulation as agreed to in the western energy accord, specifically referring to section I.7 of that accord.

[Leave granted; Bill 21 read a first time]

Bill 22**Petroleum Incentives Program
Amendment Act, 1986**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 22, the Petroleum Incentives Program Amendment Act, 1986.

As part of the royalty adjustments and royalty incentives announced by the Alberta government in June 1985 after the signing of the western energy accord, it was decided to terminate the Alberta petroleum incentives program on March 31, 1986, some nine months prior to the termination date indicated in the September 1981 energy agreement and to grandfather certain activities to December 31, 1986. This Bill is required to establish the termination date and the grandfathering provisions.

[Leave granted; Bill 22 read a first time]

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Young Offenders' Programs**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Solicitor General. My question is: can the Solicitor General confirm that the real reason for the recent decision of the minister's department that there will be automatic release of young offenders after they have served one-third of their sentence has a lot more to do with overcrowding of facilities than with the rehabilitation of young people?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, under the Young Offenders Act the disposition of the young offender is under the control of the judiciary. We have two levels of custody: secure

custody and open custody. Not knowing the number of alleged perpetrators that may be before the courts and the particular disposition, it's difficult to tell from one time to another whether the secure custody will be a bit more populated at one time than the open custody.

There's also a complication which I addressed during my estimates the other night. It requires the judiciary's involvement to move a young offender from one level of custody to another rather than through the administrative system that's prevalent in the adult population. We've addressed this issue with the federal Solicitor General, requesting that he check this particular instance with other provinces to find out their experience and initiate an amendment to the Act if at all possible. Also at the time of estimates, I indicated that there is a young offender centre being constructed in Edmonton and one in Calgary, both in excess of 100 beds, which will certainly alleviate any perceived problems.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware that there has been an increase in young offenders, longer sentences, and more people. I don't think we can build enough buildings.

My supplementary question is: how is the minister monitoring the situation to ensure that the best interests of these young offenders and the public are served by the use of automatic, temporary releases to deal with overcrowding?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader was in the House some weeks ago, I gave actual numbers of young offenders that are held in custody in relation to the number who are at large. Not having the specifics, it was approximately 500 out of a population in excess of 3,000 that are actually in custody.

Again, if I may relate to the Act, the temporary release feature is for a period of 15 days only. In the interest of the young offenders who are capable of being on temporary release, our department has initiated a program and has had this program for some time, whereby we make the 15 days back-to-back.

MR. MARTIN: That's precisely the problem we're talking about, Mr. Speaker. I've been told of cases in which teenagers who had been stabilized in special programs were yanked out before the end of the school year simply because they had finished one-third of their sentence. My question is this: what steps is the minister taking to ensure that this policy is not stuck to in some mindless way that would hurt the young offender?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, we always have the interests of the young offender at heart. Again I point out to the hon. leader that we have a number of young offenders out on the temporary release program. We have not yanked, as referred to, young offenders out of educational programs on to temporary release at any time.

MR. MARTIN: That is simply not the truth, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] If you don't like the truth, that's too bad.

According to a memo I have, the correctional services division circulated a legal opinion that government residential centres and group homes don't have to be licensed under the Social Care Facilities Licensing Act. My question to the minister: in the absence of such basic standards, how is the department ensuring that the rights of children to

proper physical conditions are being protected in these overcrowded situations?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the allegations that the young offender is not being adequately cared for in the group homes is a totally erroneous statement. The group homes are very adequate and are monitored constantly by the Solicitor General's departmental staff. In no way is a young offender yanked from these programs unless the young offender has breached the conditions on which he is out on temporary release, which is then of course required.

MR. CHUMIR: Can the minister assure the House that younger children won't be housed with hardened older youths so as to minimize the recurrence of the recent situation at the Strathmore detention centre in which an 18-year-old youth sexually assaulted a 14-year-old youth?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the safety and educational concerns of the inmates are foremost in the plans as to where these particular young offenders are placed. It is unfortunate that that particular incident arose. It was not from an undue mixing. There are people who have these propensities in all walks of life. We try to monitor those; unfortunately, some of them do occur.

Fiscal Policies

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct my second question to the straightforward, not shifty Provincial Treasurer, and I'll get some straightforward answers.

Mr. Speaker, last week I referred to an IPAC discussion paper that was released on July 16. On page 8 of that document they estimate that provincial energy revenues will decline about 60 percent or \$3.5 billion by 1987. My question: is the Treasurer floating trial balloons about increased taxes because he has information that this estimate of the 60 percent drop is correct, or is he still sticking to his budget prediction of a one-third drop?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we are slightly more optimistic than the report which has been cited. Considering all the elements of the revenue flows to the province from resource revenue, including land sales and other royalties, we believe that the one-third assumption is as accurate as any at the present time.

MR. MARTIN: Slightly more optimistic — there's a difference from one-third to 60 percent.

One would think that with a group like this, an estimate of a 60 percent drop would be quite alarming for the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer arranged to sit down with IPAC to look at their figures and review the information they have about this huge drop in our revenues?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, through a variety of contacts, both the Treasury Department and the Department of Energy are monitoring, almost on a weekly basis, variations in pricing and variations in royalty and land sales as they affect the overall revenue picture. Of course, the various cabinet committees, including the ministers directly responsible, have on an alert basis an information flow which takes place on a regular basis as well. While I can't say that I've met directly with that particular group, I know that my colleague the Minister of Energy in fact has.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Treasurer. Could the Treasurer indicate what other measures the government is considering to reduce the deficit besides higher medicare premiums? Specifically, are we looking at income tax hikes in '87, and specifically, are we looking at a sales tax?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the opposition finally is concerned with the deficit. I noticed earlier in this session that they introduced a Bill to roll back the income tax increase, which could only result in an increased deficit. What kind of responsibility is that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARTIN: Whenever they don't want to answer the questions, they try to give some right-wing rhetoric. By not answering the question, I think all Albertans will expect the worst.

The IPAC report highlights that our revenue problem is very much related to our energy policy. My question is this: will the Treasurer agree to do a study on a national floor price of between \$18 and \$22 U.S. with particular reference to our provincial revenues, which you will make public before announcing any new taxation measures?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of Alberta recognize the good management ability of this government. [interjections] No, that's a serious statement. In that context they know that this government is considering all alternatives on the fiscal side. We have a proven record of management of the resources of this province, and our record will continue through this difficult period. We know that we can bet on the future of this province. We're optimistic; we're not pessimistic. We have considered all elements, and all elements of the fiscal plan will be taken into account when we strike the 1987 budget.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Since the cornerstone of good management is an accurate budget, will the Treasurer explain to the Legislature why he is willing to ride out the next 9 months on a budget that is out of sync with the economic realities of the day instead of acting immediately to redress the problem?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is suggesting that we make dramatic cuts in the people programs, let him get up and recommend that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. It is with regard to the format that would be used in the budgeting process for the next fiscal year, not the present fiscal year. Is it the intention of the minister to establish some different format in terms of priority setting with regard to the government, or will the format that has been used in previous budgets be continued?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we will be attempting a slightly different approach to setting the expenditure side. First of all, the province is in a very good financial position. We have the heritage fund, we have low debt, and we have a very good financial position to carry us through the next few years, depending on agriculture and energy changes. Using and maximizing that resourcefulness of this province, we have a variety of options open to us. But I think the people of Alberta would want to know, first of all, that we understand the problems we're facing. We are searching

and reviewing a series of possibilities in terms of the fiscal side, including the expenditure side, the borrowing side and, quite frankly, looking at some options with respect to additional revenue. Those must be considered, and the people of Alberta want us to show that we have that under control and are examining a series of possibilities.

But we will have to examine ways in which we set the expenditure priority, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that in Alberta some of the people services are probably 150 to 170 percent above the average in Canada. In some cases we have a substantial investment in so-called infrastructure, the public services which are provided to the people of Alberta, and I think some of these can be deferred. Many industrialized countries would like to have the investment we have in infrastructure, in hospitals, universities, and sewer and water programs for that matter. Therefore, some of these can be deferred without any difficulty to the economy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Thank you, hon. minister.

Government Promises

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. From time to time during the past month the Premier has promised this Assembly that various actions would be taken. To date most of these actions are unfulfilled. For instance, apart from giving assurances, has the Premier taken any steps toward fulfilling his commitment to review the labour legislation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we've discussed that matter several times in the House. As I said, the throne speech is clear: the Alberta government has set a course to review labour legislation. It's extremely important that it be done in a measured and careful way by having input from members of labour, members of management, and the public at large. Very shortly we will be able to announce to the House how that review will be conducted. It will be conducted throughout the province, perhaps even outside the province, in as thorough a way as possible.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, another commitment: will the Premier fulfill the commitment he made to the House on July 8 to table the agenda for the upcoming Premiers' conference?

MR. GETTY: It's been done, Mr. Speaker. It has been made public already.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, that's not so. There was a news release in which neither energy nor agriculture was mentioned. There was no agenda tabled in this House.

Has the Premier taken any steps to review the operations of Alberta Government Telephones, in light of his commitment to ensure that AGT is not competing unnecessarily against the private sector?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Also among the promises, Mr. Speaker, has the Premier made a decision with respect to setting up a task force to review cost cutting, a government proposal which in the July 18 *Hansard* he said he would consider?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: I'll try to pick one of the questions to have a supplementary. To come back to the labour laws, could the Premier be more specific and tell us when he hopes to have this review over and ready to have legislation in the Legislature?

MR. GETTY: As I said, Mr. Speaker, we will be asking a group of Albertans, which we trust will be a very balanced group representing both management and labour and citizens at large, and they should do their job in the most detailed and thorough way possible. We would hardly try and get them to come up with something that wasn't adequately done by setting unrealistic time frames for them. They would be asked to, and I hope they would, fulfill their commitment to carry out their recommendations to the government with the utmost haste. But we will ensure also that they have the time to do it in a thorough and detailed way.

Deficiency Payment for Grain Producers

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. During the recent Western Premiers' Conference there was a call for a \$1 billion deficiency payment to western Canadian grain producers. I was wondering if the minister could indicate what discussions have taken place with his federal counterpart to implement this particular decision and what progress, if any, has been made at this point in time.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the hon. Member for Little Bow, I can share with him at the outset that I hope to raise the topic again with the federal Minister of Agriculture when we have the opportunity to meet with him tomorrow here in our legislative office. In addition to that, we have had discussions with our federal counterparts. Unfortunately, to date no specific action has been forthcoming, but we are continuing to pressure, and I know they are very sympathetic to offsetting some of the hardships that are caused with our agricultural sector.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Premier or the minister. It's with regard to the Alberta government's position with regard to the deficiency payment. Has the government of Alberta recommended a specific formula for the payment, or is the government at this point in time supporting the concept in a general way?

MR. GETTY: In a general way, Mr. Speaker. I want to make it clear to the hon. member that there is no way that we can stand by as a nation and see other countries supporting their producers and literally devastating the producers of Canada. Therefore, we feel that we have to first try and discuss on a commonsense basis with these other nations and then meet there with the same type of tactics, the type of subsidies that they are insisting on.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree that what's happened in the world marketplace with regard to subsidies in other nations is unfortunate.

A supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate in terms of his remarks any type of a timetable that is being established? Are we looking at a deficiency payment for the crops of 1986, '87, or will the deficiency payment be based on the amount of pressure or crisis that western

grain producers may possibly face in terms of marketing in the fall of 1986 or in 1987?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it was our intent to have the federal government consider it in light of two factors: first, their success or lack of it with regard to negotiations with other countries and, secondly, by observing the state of our agricultural industry and, in particular, how matters develop through the fall of 1986.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, in view of his statement to the Legislature a couple of weeks ago that he supports a \$10 per bushel base price as a support. Has he any study as to what he expects the price of bread will rise to in Edmonton if his two-price system goes into force?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, this is actually under federal jurisdiction. We've indicated our support for it, recognizing the hardship that the farmers are facing, especially in the grain sectors. I'd be curious to know if with his statement he's now indicating his opposition to the two-price wheat system.

MR. FOX: A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister undertaken to express this government's support for the increased domestic price of wheat to representatives of the baking industry?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, I've indicated to a number of people our support for it simply because we felt that it would offset, even though to a limited degree — we recognize that only 10 percent of the wheat produced in Canada is consumed in Canada, so it's going to have a very marginal impact. We wish to do everything we possibly can to offset the detrimental impact that the subsidization by the U.S. and the European Economic Community has caused our grain producers. I can share with both members that the impact on the price of a loaf of bread is going to be very marginal as it relates to the overall impact that it could have for our farming population.

Better Buy Alberta Program

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Solicitor General. Given this government's support of the Better Buy Alberta program through the financial support extended to the strategy for improved marketing, or SIMS, and the rural agricultural program, or RAPP, would the minister respond as to whether this program could be extended to products contained in the Alberta Liquor Control Board in the interest of identifying those products made in Alberta?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the Better Buy Alberta program is indeed endorsed by the government. The distilling industry in Alberta consumes a significant amount of agricultural products. Initially this type of program would seem suited to the liquor commission. However, the brewers and the distillers have advised the board that they wish no particular identity to be given to products in the fear that if this is contagious to other provinces where we have a far higher market penetration, that penetration would be at risk. I bring to issue Ontario as an example. The losses would be greater than the gains. So there has been a decision

in conjunction with the industry itself not to have that identity in Alberta.

Battered Women

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question related to the document which was tabled in the House on Friday, the Final Report of the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Working Group on Wife Battering. The report recommends, amongst other things, adequate funding for shelters for battered women. I'd like to ask the Minister of Social Services if she'd advise the Assembly why it is that the recommendations for adequate — as in core — funding were not met with her current budget.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a very important question and a concern that is shared right across the province. I think the hon. member is aware that there has been a very significant increase in the funding level for women's shelters. It is true that while we have identified essential services, there are a number of other services, including child care and some counselling, that can't be totally paid for by the funding that has been allowed. If the cost-sharing aspect of the funding is met and there is some small community contribution, the shelters should in fact be able to manage the full program.

MS BARRETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand what the minister is saying. Will she give this House and the public of Alberta assurance that under provisions of her department no battered women will be turned away from any of the existing shelters in this province?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, our assurances are that where there are battered women and others in the province in very dire need, if they, for instance, on occasion show up at a shelter — there are peaking times, unfortunately, when you could find a shelter full. It doesn't happen very often; most of the time there are vacancies. That individual or family will immediately be housed by Social Services.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can ask a supplementary to the Minister of Education, again with respect to this report. It has recommendations suggesting that it would be appropriate for high school curricula to include programs which will inform students and discourage students about any procedure with respect to family violence and wife battering. The response from the minister's department has been vague. Would she explain whether or not it's her intention to include as a policy curriculum development in this area?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, certainly within the structure of the career and life management program, which is part of a program that starts in grade 1 and moves through grade 12, this issue could be raised. I would be pleased to look into it for the hon. member and respond in a more definitive way at a later time.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary, if I might, to the minister responsible for the Women's Secretariat. The report also contains recommendations with respect to a provincewide information campaign. Can the minister tell the Assembly when this kind of campaign will

get under way in Alberta to inform people that wife battering is a horrendous crime?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, that program is being considered. I might indicate that in terms of education in general it is the feeling of this government that it has to take place at all levels. That specific kind of program, though, is something that's being considered.

I might add to the series of the hon. member's questions that the report she has alluded to this afternoon represents significant increases in our assistance for that very serious problem in quite a number of ways, and we have an interdepartmental task force which continues to monitor and try and co-ordinate those programs. I am pleased that we have indeed made progress in a number of departments with respect to the difficulty. We will continue to do that through the Women's Secretariat and will co-ordinate all efforts possible to make sure that this problem is one which fewer Albertans have to experience in the future.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I might supplement my hon. colleague's answer. It happens that the opposition doesn't ever raise some of the publications that are out. It's important that we remind hon. members that they should share this booklet called Breaking the Pattern throughout their communities. It is a very serious problem, and all communities should be apprised of this information.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Social Services. It said in the same report that the interdepartmental committee, a committee of the government of Alberta, published a discussion paper called Alberta's Special Report on Family Violence: Ideas for Action. It was circulated in the fall of 1985. Public input was solicited. Could the minister please tell us what has become of the government's current review of those responses and of that report, and when will they be acting on it?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the rather large enhancement of the budget toward women's shelters was the first response to that report. I think it's fair to say that there are a great many ideas out there — some of them put together by way of the report as a result of communication around the province — and the report is worthy of further study. Initially our response is by way of enhanced funding, producing booklets. There will be continuing discussion exploring further ways of looking at other items that could as a matter of fact be budgeted for by a sharing with the federal government. I think hon. members are aware that there is a concern with respect to the federal government's sharing of the costs of these kinds of programs. At this point in time they have not okayed a form that we could utilize, hopefully still keeping in mind that we want to keep the identities of a number of people that are utilizing shelters private.

Labour Legislation Review

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, we have six ongoing labour disputes in the province. The disruption is resulting in employment instability, increased policing, and violence. The situation is out of hand, and what we're getting is assurances of a review. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier tell us when he wants the labour legislation review to be presented to the House? Not "as soon as possible." What is his target?

MR. GETTY: As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, not good enough.

The supplementary is to the Minister of Labour. Will the minister take some immediate action with respect to Alberta's deficient labour legislation by introducing an amendment to the labour Act protecting the jobs of striking workers?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I've explained before in the House that the protection of the jobs of those who are employees — that is, those who are working for an employer at the time that there is either a lockout or a strike — are protected currently.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, what action is the minister taking to ensure that the dispute is settled and that the Gainers plant stays open now that the recommendations of the DIB have been rejected?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, currently I am considering no further action on behalf of the government. The situation is that we've had a disputes inquiry board. It was held by a man with 30 years of experience in this area. He considered the information that was given to him by both sides in the dispute. He presented what he felt — and we have to recognize his stature — was a reasonable series of recommendations. Those recommendations were rejected democratically by 94.6 percent of the employees and by 100 percent of the employer's side. In that case one has to accept the decision of those people, and I can see no point in further intervention by the government at this time.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. Has the government discussed utilizing AOC funding to assist Gainers' workers or anyone else in financing the purchase of the plant? Or is the government simply not concerned about its continued operation?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister of economic development or the Minister of Agriculture may wish to supplement this answer, but within the Department of Labour no consideration has been given to financing of any group by the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement the answer of my colleague the Minister of Labour. I'm not aware of the plant being for sale, nor am I aware of any approaches to the Alberta Opportunity Company by anyone to purchase it.

MR. SIGURDSON: To the Premier or to the Minister of Labour: who has the Minister of Labour or the Premier contacted from either labour or management to serve on the review committee that's been proposed for so long?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be proper to mention all of the people who have been approached, because obviously, we only want to mention those who have accepted and have been appointed.

Licensing of Cats

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the interest of removing the recent threats by the city council of Calgary to unload what I might term "catcalls" on the Calgary members of

this Legislature, is the minister prepared to amend the Municipal Government Act to enable the city to pass bylaws to license cats?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't have a particular feline for this answer, but I should say that the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association has tried to deal with the same issue and no doubt struggled with it in the same ways that the city council of Calgary has. The response to the association was that some consideration would be given to clarifying the Municipal Government Act in a way which could allow the cities to pass bylaws in respect to that issue. However, I should say that no recommendation to that effect has yet been formulated for presentation to the Assembly. It is, therefore, under consideration.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I understand that AUMA has been pressing the government since 1971. Why is it taking so long for it to be under consideration before bringing a recommendation to this Assembly?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, review of the issue shows that it goes back some 800 years to the time of Henry II, and the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: This question and the answers are not really a howling success. The Member for Edmonton Strathcona followed by the Member for Bow Valley.

Small Business Equity Corporations

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question concerns a conflict of interest in the Legislative Assembly and is actually addressed to the Premier. Since it appears to be the position of the government that it is okay for hon. members to form small business equity corporations and then get money under the Small Business Equity Corporations Act, when will the government take steps to amend section 28 of the Legislative Assembly Act to outlaw this and put that transaction on the same footing as transactions with the Alberta Opportunity Company and AADC?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the House last week, it did not appear to me that there was any conflict with the Legislative Assembly Act. That Act is constantly reviewed. If the hon. member or any other members of the Legislature on either side of the House — since it is the legislation which governs their very own conduct in the Legislature — have suggestions, I'd appreciate receiving them and will look at them seriously.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier not agree that it is all the more important to outlaw this type of transaction with SBECs inasmuch as grants are made under that, whereas with the Alberta Opportunity Company . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The question's clearly out of order as it solicits an opinion.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase that. Inasmuch as the money that comes under the SBEC legislation is a grant, does the Premier not agree that it is all the more necessary to amend the Act since with AOC and AADC they are merely loans?

[The Premier rose]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. Premier. The question as framed is still an opinion. Would the Member for Edmonton Strathcona care to continue for the third supplementary?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this is again to the Premier. What plans does the government have to deal with a cooling-off period for ex-ministers and indeed ex-Premiers by proper amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act, so that he or she will not be able to make use of knowledge gained in public service for private profit for a reasonable period of time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows — and he raises the question of AOC and AADC — there is a variety of grants that are made even to members of the Legislature: if they are in farming, cattle payments per head grants; in the area of the farm fuel allowance there is a grant made; there's a grant made in one way or another in the area of horse racing — I might say that they aren't big enough; in the area of interest rebates in mortgages when there was shielding. It is generally defined in the Legislative Assembly Act that if it's available to a class of Albertans, they should not discriminate against Members of the Legislative Assembly.

In the specific area that the hon. member is further talking of, a cooling-off period, as he says, it's something that can be considered. I would be interested in knowing what the hon. member thinks would be an adequate period. I caution him, though, that the longer he's in the House, he will realize that there are many restrictions on Members of the Legislative Assembly, many matters which make serving in the House difficult to accommodate for family and others and that perhaps before making a quick judgment on this, it should be given some considerable thought. Then if we can frame something, we would perhaps consider doing it, but I think we have to do it very carefully. We do not want to make it more difficult for members to take on the consideration of such an important function as being a Member of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: This wasn't available to everyone; it was a grant available only to those lucky enough to file in time.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Premier when he will be ready to answer the question I asked him last week, that he said he would take under advisement, as to how many ex-cabinet ministers had availed themselves of forming corporations to apply for the SBEC.

MR. GETTY: As soon as I have the information, Mr. Speaker.

European Beef Imports

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. It has to do with the Canadian Import Tribunal's ruling on beef that was imported from Europe in regard to countervail. As I understood, that report was suppose to be available on July 25. My question is: has it been made public yet?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian Import Tribunal ruled in favour of the cattlemen. They indicated that there was cause for future harm to be caused to our cattle industry, and because of that the import restrictions and the countervail will remain intact.

MR. MUSGROVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Was a temporary countervail carried out during the time this ruling was being studied?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There was a countervail put in place in early 1986, and that countervail will remain in place. The European Economic Community has the opportunity to appeal to GATT. It's our understanding that this appeal process can take in excess of one year, and for that time period those countervails will remain in place, so that it will be helpful to our Canadian cattlemen.

English as a Second Language

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower regarding English as a Second Language. During the Department of Manpower estimate debate on July 23 the minister commented that he shared a concern about immigrants and that this government had an English as a Second Language secretariat that is responsible for the co-ordination of provincial activities that relate to ESL. In January of 1986 the settlement services area for the department prepared a report, Comments on ESL Issues in Alberta. Has the secretariat prepared an action plan to deal with the concerns addressed in that report?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I should advise that yes, I and this government are indeed concerned about a number of programs. As I indicated, English as a Second Language is a very important program to me, particularly with a constituency that has a high number of people from the ethnic community. I have discussed with my department the various workings and the consultation process going on with that secretariat, and on a regular basis they will be advising me and making recommendations to me so that we can as a department and as a government react in a very timely manner with regard to issues, particularly in the area of the second language matter.

MR. SIGURDSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What specific plans has the department to alleviate the potential backlog of some 35,000 immigrants requiring English language training in Alberta?

MR. ORMAN: As the member indicated, Mr. Speaker, we have an ESL secretariat that on an ongoing basis recommends and reviews these matters along with my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education. We work very closely as departments in dealing with the Alberta Vocational Centre and the English as a Second Language program there. Actually, just a couple of weeks ago I met with the president of the Alberta Vocational Centre, and we discussed the ESL program. He did indicate to me that there is a tremendous amount of interest in that program, and I think all we can do as a government is continue to react to the request made by centres like AVC and by the secretariat as those recommendations are made.

MR. SIGURDSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Question period has expired, hon. member. Might the Assembly grant unanimous consent for this final set of complete supplementaries to be exhausted?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Given that last November there were some 1,400 people on a waiting list at AVC in Edmonton, can the minister advise how that number has been reduced and what the current number may be at?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education may want to supplement the answer. As the Department of Manpower we are involved in buying the seats for people from the ethnic community, the new people to the province that are looking to take English as a Second Language. We are demand driven in that regard. A lot of times it's difficult to anticipate the influx of interest in that particular program. We have noticed over the last six months that there has been a tremendous amount of interest, and as I indicated in my two previous answers, we are on a regular basis monitoring the situation and attempting to react in a very timely manner. I can give the hon. member the undertaking that we will continue to do that.

MR. SIGURDSON: I'm glad you're monitoring the situation. However, is a review planned or is a review presently under way to determine alternate methods of ESL to improve both access and enrollment in the classes?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont indicated in his first question, we have an ESL secretariat that is in conjunction with a number of the departments. Certainly I am, as is the Minister of Advanced Education, continually in touch with the advice we get from that secretariat. Certainly this is one of the issues they're examining. I would be pleased to contact the secretariat to see if they are considering alternatives, but I can assure the House that the members of that secretariat are very hardworking civil servants, and I'm sure we can look forward to recommendations that are of an urgent nature.

MR. SHRAKE: A final supplementary. I wonder if the minister has had the secretariat of ESL co-ordinate with the Immigrant Aid Society, which is funded by this government, and the immigrant referral and vocational referral service which is funded, as was mentioned, under the Minister of Advanced Education, and in the case of Calgary the...

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, hon. member, we're not here to make representations. One question is good, thank you.

MR. SHRAKE: Maybe I could just wrap up quickly. [Is he] aware of the new facility we have in Calgary Millican, which is an entire floor of the Romoco building?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the minister care to reply?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I also had the opportunity to meet with the Calgary Immigrant Aid Society and the Language Referral Centre that is in conjunction with that. I met with the president; I met with the director, and we discussed in some length the ESL program. Certainly I know the location; I was there. I'm very pleased with the quality of people that are involved in those programs that we fund. I can assure you that on a regular basis I meet and discuss with them issues like ESL and many of the other issues that are of concern to the ethnic community in this province.

MR. CHUMIR: To the Minister of Education. Is the minister aware of any downgrading of the degree to which English as a Second Language is being taught in Calgary schools?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: No, I'm not at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I would be happy to look into it and get back to the member.

Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday a point of order was raised at the end of question period which the Chair took under advisement. The response has been circulated to the House leader for the New Democratic Party and also to the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, who raised the original issue.

Having examined the Blues I would share this following information with the Assembly as a whole. The third supplementary as given by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway yesterday, July 28, should have been ruled out of order because of the statement, "to restore investor confidence." This is an expression of opinion. Members should refer to *Beauchesne*, 357, which reads:

A question oral or written must not:

- (f) contain an expression of opinion ... [and]
- (h) contain inferences.

With respect, the original supplementary question as posed by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway referred to not only the Alberta Securities Commission but also the Alberta Stock Exchange. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has confirmed that a review will be undertaken regarding the Securities Commission but no review of the Alberta Stock Exchange is contemplated; therefore, the third supplementary question as framed was correct to refer to one body but entirely in error regarding the Alberta Stock Exchange. As the House leader for the New Democratic Party pointed out, I was incorrect, as chairman, to cite anticipation; however, the question as posed was still completely out of order.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order, and it is this. In the remark made by the Leader of the Opposition in the course of asking his first question of the Solicitor General, he made the remark that the response was not the truth. I draw Your Honour's attention to citation 320 of *Beauchesne* at the top of page 108 where that language is declared to be unparliamentary.

MR. MARTIN: A point of order. If the Government House Leader had gone to page 113, under that same citation he would find that since 1958 it has been ruled parliamentary to use the expression, not telling the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: During the course of question period the Chair was also making reference to *Beauchesne*. The relevant passages to be quoted also refer here to 357, as found on page 129 and 130. "The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the House." This is the relevant section:

A question oral or written must not:

- (q) contain or imply charges of a personal character ... [and]
- (t) impugn the accuracy of information conveyed to the House by a Minister.

This all occurred within question period, and perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might care to make a corrective measure with respect to the comments as made.

MR. MARTIN: It's not impugning the motives of the minister. I just said that that was not the truth, because I have evidence that there were kids turned away. That's the only point I was making.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has been asked if he might consider withdrawing his statement. I wonder if perhaps my hearing was a little fuzzy back here, because the sound system is a bit difficult at the Chair. Perhaps we could have further clarification.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I was not impugning the minister's motives. I asked the question specifically whether he was aware that certain people had been taken out of the school program. The minister said that never happened. I said that's not the truth. And that is not the truth, because I know of instances where that's happened.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I think to say that something is not the truth is a dispute over facts. To say that the minister is not telling the truth is entirely different. But he said that this was not the truth, and I think that's a dispute over facts and that can be quite [inaudible].

MR. SPEAKER: Having listened with care to the various comments with respect to the point of order, the Chair will take the matter under advisement, and we will together check the Hansard Blues and deal with the matter at the end of Oral Question Period tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would move that questions 150, 152, and 159 and motions for returns 154, 158, 162, and 163 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

155. Mr. Gibeault moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all reports and other documents received by the Agency for International Development of the Department of Economic Development where those reports and other documents are chiefly concerned with supporting one or more applications for funds from the agency by Project Concern, Alberta.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to propose an amendment to Motion for a Return 155 by adding to the motion: since Project Concern began participating in the program in the fiscal year 1975-76, such material to be provided with the approval of Project Concern.

I'd like to advise members of the Assembly that that approval has been sought and given, and the material is being gathered now. I'd also like to advise members of the Assembly that it will take some considerable time to gather the material, because it goes back to 1975-76 and a lot of it is in the Archives. As soon as we are able to gather it, we'll be prepared to respond to the motion for a return as amended.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Motion as amended carried]

157. Mr. McEachern moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of

- (1) the Abacus Cities Ltd. investigative report, commonly called the Baines report, delivered to the Alberta Securities Commission on July 14, 1983;
- (2) the findings of the minister's task force, presented to the Alberta Securities Commission, the Attorney General, and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on May 7, 1984; and
- (3) the report of the Alberta Securities Commission re: Abacus Cities Ltd., Part I, dated May 18, 1984, and Part II, dated July 13, 1984.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend motion 157 by striking out clause (3). I believe this has been previously circulated to members of the Assembly.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I stand to urge the members of the Assembly to reject this motion. Having said that, let me say firstly that I'm pleased that the amendment has been passed, because as referred to on page 994 of the 1985 *Hansard*, specifically May 14, copies of both parts I and II of this report were made public, and indeed a copy was sent directly to the opposition offices. Therefore, they have had this in their possession for over a year.

Members are probably aware, because it is a matter of public knowledge, that there is a hearing having to do with Abacus Cities Ltd. in progress in front of the Alberta Securities Commission. The hearing started some time ago, was adjourned, and then reconvened on June 23 this year. It continued until July 11 of this year and has been adjourned again to a subsequent date. During the course of that hearing, one of the counsel for an interested party who was participating in the hearing made application to the Securities Commission that the report, which is colloquially known as the Baines report, be produced and the Securities Commission rejected that motion and refused to release the information.

Vis-à-vis part (2) of motion 157, I would draw members' attention to Part I of the report, which is referred to in part (3) of motion 157, in which the commission has previously indicated that that is a synopsis of the Baines report, forms part and parcel of the Baines report, and therefore is to be treated similarly. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that this matter is under administrative consideration, which is similar to being under judicial consideration, and it would not be appropriate to release the information as requested. Furthermore, there are recourses for those who are participating in the hearing itself. If they disagree with the ruling of the Securities Commission, they can of course appeal that to the Alberta Court of Appeal and the matter can be adjudicated there. Until those proceedings are completed or the parties most directly affected have decided to take a course of action or not take a course of action, I think it would be most improper for anyone in this Assembly to move on this motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister will assure us that at the completion of those events, the report will then be disclosed to the public. It was a report

commissioned at public expense, and the public are entitled to know what the result was.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the last point of the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, I would submit that an investigative report of this nature falling under the heading of either a judicial or quasi-judicial investigative report, summoned, true, at public expense, is very like other investigations conducted by the police or the RCMP. The details of such investigations are not made public, but the results certainly are in terms of the action taken flowing from such investigations.

MS BARRETT: I'd like to speak on this motion too, Mr. Speaker. The case made by the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs was that releasing the information the Member for Edmonton Kingsway was requesting under the motion for a return would have the effect of interfering in a process that one legal party in the process has asked not to be raised. We're trying to be very reasonable about this. We're asking that before we vote on the motion, can we have some assurance that long after the fact — everybody knows that the Abacus Cities issue could go on for a long time in either a judicial or a quasi-judicial sense. On the basis of our vote and the good will of our vote, according to the request of the minister to turn down the motion for a return, we're asking if we will we have the assurance of the government that the documents that are being referred to under this motion for a return will be made available. That is in light of the special nature of the request that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has put forward. I think it would be reasonable in even a nonpartisan fashion to have a straight answer for that.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the procedural issue which I'd like to speak to, a motion has been made, amended, and is before the Assembly today. We are voting on that motion, not some potential hypothetical motion which may or may not be reintroduced by a member of this Assembly following adjudication upon this matter. It's just not a proper case or situation for seeking an undertaking of a minister. We must deal with the motion as it stands on the books today. If in the future, after the adjudication of this matter in the courts, other members wish to bring the matter back, they might very well do so, but to give an undertaking at this time, Mr. Speaker, would be quite improper and I suggest not in order.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs made a reasonable argument: because it was in a judicial process. The question was simply if they would be prepared at some point to open that up. Surely the minister could make that amendment. We have amendments to things all the time from the government. Clearly the minister, if the government wanted to do that, could make that as an amendment, and that's the point.

MS BARRETT: Then we'll vote against it.

MR. MARTIN: If the government doesn't want to, there's a different argument advanced over here. She says it's because it's that same old red herring, the quasi-judicial board. That's a way to get around a lot of things that have to do with public business. That's a different argument than the first argument advanced. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the

minister could amend and say, "After this we'd be prepared to do that." It would be totally legal to do that at this time. To say that it's hypothetical is not the case, because we do amendments here all the time. The government minister did one just today, changing dates. So that is not an answer to a very reasonable request at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: The government spent some . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Kingsway has been recognized.

MR. WRIGHT: On a point of order. Is the hon. member closing debate? If so, I wish to propose an amendment and therefore I . . .

MR. McEACHERN: I waited briefly, hoping the minister would stand up and propose an amendment. She didn't, so I thought I'd better close debate, because the members were calling for the question.

The government spent some \$3.5 million on this investigation, and it seems to me that in the long run the taxpayers have the right to know what that money was spent on, what happened with that report, and what the details are. It's all very well for the government to say that there is a judicial inquiry going on — or semi-judicial, as the minister is fond of using. The Alberta Securities Commission reports to the minister and the minister should report to the people. I think this information should be forthcoming, and the government should make an undertaking to provide it at least after the hearings are over.

[Motion as amended lost]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

212. Moved by Mr. Bradley:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to adopt the recommendations of the South-western Alberta Medical Diagnostic Review of health concerns of residents living near a gas plant in the Twin Butte, Hillspring, Glenwood, Mountainview, and Willow Creek areas.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to propose a motion to the Assembly with regard to a very extensive medical review of health concerns in the constituency which I represent, Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. In bringing forward this issue to the Assembly today, first of all I'd like to discuss what the problems are in resolving public health issues related or perceived to be related to industrial activity. I'd like to give a review of the history of this issue in the Twin Butte area. I'd like to refer to a number of studies which have been conducted to date in that area over the past number of years. I would also like to comment on the setting up of the acid deposition research program in this province, the process under which that program was set up, which led to the government's decision to proceed with this medical diagnostic review. I'd like to review the process

and the results of that medical diagnostic review and move that this motion be accepted by the Assembly.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to an article entitled *Toxic Waste Uproar: A Community History*, by Jeffrey S. Harris, from the June 1983 *Journal of Public Health Policy*. It seemed to me when I first read this particular article a number of years ago that what was taking place in the Twin Butte area was very similar to the history of this toxic waste uproar in Memphis, Tennessee. The article refers to these types of issues as confusing and upsetting to public health officials, to private health professionals, to industry, and to the public. Usually what occurs is that a member of the public is concerned that exposure to a chemical or an industrial activity must be to blame for the health concerns which they are experiencing.

Initially a review is done of those health concerns which were brought forward by either a health department or county a health department. Surveys are done, and after the results of this initial medical review, it's felt that there is really no evidence to continue to have concern that the health concern is related to an industrial activity. However, the individual citizens remain convinced that the illness which they are experiencing or perceived to be experiencing is due to this exposure to industrial activity.

The history of these events is that there are repeated environmental surveys done in terms of looking at these suspected causes. The environmental surveys come out as being negative in terms of detecting any possible levels of pollutants that people may be exposed to that could relate to the health concerns expressed. However, the citizens continue to express health concerns and they continue to be convinced that their health problems are there.

The issue tends to escalate after a number of years, even though the studies have been done, and the media tends to play a role in this escalation of concern. I quote from page 186 of the *Journal of Public Health Policy*:

ABC Television did a special program on the alleged presence of birth defects from chemical contamination in [the specific area in the United States], ignoring all of the negative test results up to that point.

I think we have some history of that in terms of this particular issue before us. It also refers to a local newspaper doing a nonrandom survey of its citizens using invalidated, improperly constructed questions. The pattern of events described above continues. There is continued concern in the community, and the issue continues to escalate.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote again from the *Journal of Public Health Policy* in terms of this issue. On page 189 it says:

To summarize at this time, it appears that there is no evidence of chemical contamination in the [study] area.

It goes on to say:

. . . a number of citizens in both neighborhoods who continue to complain that a wide variety of health effects must be ascribable to the presence of chemical contamination in their neighborhood.

It concludes:

In short, we have evidence of one highly publicized phantom chemical dump, one real dumpsite, and numerous complaints of health effects without a clear route of exposure and without a clear symptom cluster. An enormous amount of resources has been consumed so far, both monetary and human, in answering complaints and charges.

The article goes on to analyze some of the issues. One is the public perception of risk. Others are the availability and dissemination of accurate and scientifically valid information, agency interactions, and management of the situation. In terms of what has taken place over the last 25 years in the area that I represent, I think what we have is a classical textbook example, which this article refers to.

The article goes on to discuss public perception of risk. Mr. Speaker, I think this is very germane to the discussion before us, so if I may quote from this particular source:

A large part of the public and the media perceive that unsecured chemical dumpsites are a grave danger to life and health, with the potential of causing cancer, birth defects, and other diseases. In many ways the reactions to chemical pollution resemble the reactions when an epidemic occurred or was rumored to be occurring before the germ theory was well understood. Since epidemics have become rare, those of us in public health have not had much experience with such reactions.

Those who perceive themselves to be affected by chemical exposure are afraid and angry. They are angry because they perceive that something with potentially adverse consequences has been done to them without their consent or knowledge. The public has come to expect warnings about potential hazards. Government is expected to protect citizens. . . . It appears that this perception is partly the result of media reports of similar situations, partly due to the threatening and incurable nature of the diseases, and partly due to the lack of information. . . . As is frequently the case when information is lacking, misconceptions may be widespread among the public and even among health professionals. While this perception of risk may not be consistent with what is proven in the scientific literature at this time, the reactions, opinions, and feelings are real.

The article goes on to say:

It has also been observed that toxic chemical issues act as a magnet for unanswered health concerns among community residents about diseases which members of their family have. Either these diseases or conditions had never been adequately explained to them by the medical community, or they would not accept the explanations.

The article goes on to say:

Under such circumstances, it is important to carefully determine citizens' concerns to avoid misunderstanding and subsequent possible polarization and hostility.

Mr. Speaker, this article goes on, and I recommend it to members of the Assembly. I believe some of the perceptions in it are very germane to the topic which we have under discussion. These issues tend to escalate, and there tends to be a lack of trust and public confidence in terms of those who are doing studies. There has to be a process brought together to resolve these issues, because when people bring forward concerns, they must be addressed. I think we have an example of this in this particular case.

I'd like to outline briefly the history of what has taken place in the Twin Butte area. Back in 1957 the Waterton gas field was discovered. In 1957 the then British American Oil Company, which is now Gulf, began production. Within a year there were complaints registered by residents in the area regarding odours, health effects, and livestock operations.

That continued, Mr. Speaker, and in 1962 a second gas plant became operational, the Shell Waterton gas plant. Continued public complaints were received after this operation went into effect, and the minister of health appointed a scientific advisory committee on air pollution to review the concerns of the citizens in the area at that time. I'd just like to quote briefly from the study that was done back in that 1963-64 period. The conclusions were reported in 1964. One is germane to this study, because it seems to be similar in conclusion.

Specific adverse affects have not been observed, despite careful studies by persons professionally competent in medicine, veterinary science, and plant pathology.

Following that, in about 1965, litigation occurred, and residents in the area proceeded with litigation in the courts against both Shell and the British American Oil Company. In 1971 there was an out-of-court settlement made. In 1971 the Department of the Environment was formed and carried out the functions of monitoring air quality in the region.

In the period 1972 to 1976, Shell Canada Resources hired the farm and ranch management consultants division of McKinnon Allen & Associates of Calgary to do a review of the effects of airborne emissions from their gas processing plant on crops and livestock in the area. That was a four-year study. Basically, it concluded that there were generally no significant differences in terms of the effects on crops or livestock.

A number of other studies have come forward since that time, Mr. Speaker. I did some research in the library and brought the studies with me just so the members would be well aware that there has been a great deal of research and repeated studies looking at environmental effects, health concerns, livestock, and what is coming from those plants. Besides the scientific advisory committee on air pollution study done back in the early '60s, there was the one I just referred to, the McKinnon Allen study. We've had an evaluation of health effects of air pollution in Alberta done under the Department of Community Medicine at the University of Alberta in 1975. The main author was Dr. Stanley Greenhill.

In October of 1980 there was a report to the Environment Council of Alberta regarding health complaints of families living in the Pincher Creek-Waterton, Alberta, area. This I believe was by Dr. McCoy, and it came forward with certain recommendations with regard to this issue.

In November of 1980 a report was completed by the Kananaskis Centre for Environmental Research, a branch of the University of Calgary, relating to a preliminary evaluation of selenium levels in the Pincher Creek-Waterton area — an interesting report. In May of 1981 there was another study by the Kananaskis Centre for Environmental Research by M.T. Strosher, relating to environmental selenium levels in the Pincher Creek-Waterton area.

Then a group from eastern Canada, I believe, with a taga 3000 unit — that's trace atmospheric gas analyzer — mobile laboratory, did extensive surveys throughout the province. I think it cost some \$50,000 per day to have this specific air quality monitoring done in and around the province. At the same time, as part of this, we had a report done on trace organic compounds in the atmosphere near industrial development, again by the Kananaskis Centre for Environmental Research. Mr. Strosher was involved. This related to the taga study.

Finally, because it was such a complex scientific process and difficult to interpret the results, there was a review of those two reports: a scientific methodology assessment com-

mittee report by Dr. Steve Hrudý and others from the university and other officials who interpreted those results. There were some very interesting conclusions from that in terms of levels in the Pincher Creek-Twin Butte area versus what was being experienced in other parts of the province. Mr. Speaker, we then had a study by Dr. Earle Snider commissioned by the then Minister of Social Services and Community Health and now the Minister of Energy, which looked at the Twin Butte environmental health study. The first report was The Twin Butte Difference. This is another interesting approach to looking at resolving the concerns of citizens of the area.

As part of that commitment at that time, the Department of Social Services and Community Health did a comparative analysis of health statistics for southwestern Alberta communities. At the same time we had the Energy Resources Conservation Board commission the Sage Institute to look into and review a process in which we could come forward and resolve the issue as to whether or not residents in the area were experiencing health concerns and how to deal with this whole issue. There are three volumes regarding that.

The ERCB also had the Industrial Research Institute of the University of Windsor look at a trace element emission study at selected sour gas plant incinerator stacks in the province of Alberta. They looked at five gas plants in the province. The Waterton Shell plant in Pincher Creek was one and the Gulf plant was another.

We had an internal review by — and this again relates to the report of the Industrial Research Institute of the University of Windsor with regard to their conclusions. Shell did a review and evaluation of the Twin Butte environmental health study by Franklin White of the Faculty of Medicine at Dalhousie University. Because of concerns raised with regard to substances found in the Gulf ponds at Pincher Creek, the Minister of the Environment at the time, myself, commissioned the Twin Butte Soils and Water Evaluation Task Force to review what was taking place in the soils and water in the area with regard to off-site pollution by gas plants in the area. Those reports are available for members of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, if I might show the members, there is a good foot and a half of paper, and I'm not sure all the background volumes are there in terms of some of the initial reviews done with regard to concerns expressed by citizens in the area. I think there has been a great volume of resources by government and industry in terms of looking at this issue and how we might be able to resolve it.

I want to quote from the Sage report, because I think there are some very important observations made in the conclusions of the Sage Pincher Creek Health Study of June 1983. If I may be permitted to briefly quote from the Sage study;

Some community residents are deeply concerned that if the issues are not finally and quickly dealt with, the negative impacts upon industrial development which have already been felt will damage the economy and the lifestyle of every individual in the community. To prevent further degeneration of opinion about living in the Pincher Creek or Twin Butte areas, it is essential that only factual, well documented and researched information be disseminated.

On page 31 it goes on to say:

It was observed that lack of confidence in people and organizations seems to have contributed to the frustrations of people on both sides of the arguments that

are expressed. During this study, and particularly among participants on the steering committee, there was a movement toward increased respect and trust. This must be fostered and continued, for it is in the interests of everyone that the further research that is recommended above be conducted with the full cooperation of all parties. Continuation of the extensive dialogue which is now in progress must occur.

That was very important.

Mr. Speaker, I made some reference in terms of the *Journal of Public Health Policy* with regard to media. I'd just like to review with members a couple of media headlines which have again aided in my judgment that the issue had escalated and required resolution because it was becoming a much larger issue in terms of sour gas development in the province of Alberta, particularly after the Lodgepole blowout. One news headline on the front page of the *Edmonton Journal* on May 27, 1983, relating to the Snider study said "Cancer Linked to Gas Plants." I carefully reviewed Dr. Snider's study and in my judgment those conclusions were not made by Dr. Snider's study, but that was the headline which the media portrayed around the province. I believe it was a misleading headline, but it contributed to the increasing misunderstanding, confusion, concern, and anxiety in the province and in the Pincher Creek area.

Another headline: "Pincher Creek Nightmare." A further one was "Town not told of Chemical Leak," when the company involved had already advertised that they were going to make the results of their investigations available to the public. So the media has contributed to this. There was also a CFRN documentary, *Fugitives in the Wind*, which I believe did not look at all sides of the issue properly.

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to come to how the medical diagnostic review of concerns in the Twin Butte area came about. After recommendations from the Alberta petroleum industry/government environmental committee, known as APIGEC, which had a subcommittee known as SCAGE, the steering committee on acid gas in the environment, in 1983 the province advised that an acid deposition research program be proceeded with. This was to be funded over a seven- or eight-year period with some \$8 million in contributions, 50 percent from industry and 50 percent from the government of Alberta.

The components which this acid deposition research were looking into were basically two: a biophysical research program and a human health research program. In order to focus in on the human health area and the biophysical research area, a number of workshops were conceived as the way to look at it. Mind you, given the history of all the studies I've just referred to, the concern out there, and the media attention, this became a very high-profile workshop with regard to human health. The idea that was put forward was: we know we've got this concern. There have been people in the communities expressing concern about health concerns. We've had studies done. There have been contradictory results. We've had studies which we believe are scientifically credible, but the public didn't accept them. We've had studies which have been publicly acceptable, but the scientists have said they aren't scientifically acceptable. How do we resolve this issue? How do we develop a process to bring this issue to a resolution so the people of the province and the people in the area can know what is happening and what is taking place?

So 23 world-class scientists were invited to Banff in January 1984 to come up with a plan in which we could

review these concerns with regard to sour gas development in the province, emissions, and health concerns. Those scientists came from all over North America: from John Hopkins University; the University of British Columbia; the Dean of Graduate Studies from the University of Nebraska; the Director of the Division of Respiratory Sciences at the College of Medicine at the University of Arizona; the Associate Professor in the Department of Chemistry Trace Analysis Research Centre from Dalhousie University; the Assistant Professor of the Department of Gastroenterology of the Montreal General hospital; a doctor from the B.C. Cancer Research Centre for Environmental Carcinogenesis Unit; the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry; the National Centre for Toxicological Research in Jefferson, Arkansas; the Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute of the Lovelace Biomedical and Environmental Research Institute of the University at Albuquerque, New Mexico. The list goes on and on, from the University of California hospital to the Agriculture Research Centre of the U.S. Department of Agriculture at Beltsville, Maryland, to the University of Toronto Faculty of Medicine.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member could forgo the list and carry on with the rest of his comments, please.

MR. BRADLEY: I wanted to make sure that members knew there were 23 world-renowned scientists in their field who came up and recommended to the acid deposition research program that we proceed with a medical diagnostic review of health concerns. That was one of their first things. They said we have to find but if there is in fact a problem, and the first thing we should do is to go to the people who have been complaining and from a medical point of view see if in fact there are health concerns. Then we can move from there in terms of the directions we would go. Mr. Speaker, that's basically where the medical diagnostic review of health concerns research project came from: that acid deposition research workshop in Banff in January 1984.

Where did the process move from there? We then set up what I thought, that a medical diagnostic review would take place. It was announced by the Minister of Social Services and Community Health at the time, the Hon. Dr. Neil Webber. What was important was that the terms of reference were appraised by an independent Scientific Advisory Board made up, again, from the participants of that Banff workshop. There was a second peer group which McGill itself set up, a scientific advisory group, which reviewed what the McGill group itself was doing. So there were two scientific peer reviews in terms of this project. In addition, it was felt that the community must be supportive of such a program and must be involved if it is to work, if we are to have a publicly acceptable study, and the community advisory board was set up.

In June and July of last year, Mr. Speaker, the actual testing was done. If I might just review what took place, some 3,600 residents in three areas of Alberta received a four-hour series of health examinations. This included two medical exams; questionnaires; blood, urine, and hair samples; electrocardiograms; and a spirometry test, which I believe relates to the lungs. A cancer study, a reproduction and birth defects study, as well as health questionnaires from more than 2,000 outmigrants, or individuals who had moved from the areas, were done. That's an extensive field study. It has been suggested that this has been one of the most extensive environmental medical studies ever conducted in Canada.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, this study concluded that the mortality experience in the area was not different from other populations in southern Alberta and in fact was considerably more favourable than for Alberta as a whole. It also concluded there was no evidence to suggest an excess in the overall incidence of cancer in the study area. It suggested that residents of this area experience a lower than expected overall incidence of the remaining killing and disabling malignancies. The levels of trace metals in the hair and blood specimens were within normal limits. The distribution of respiratory function of residents of the study area was within normal limits and similar to the respiratory function of residents in the reference populations. The study concluded that the prevalence of medically-observed birth defects in the participants of the cross-sectional survey was similar in all areas.

The study went on to say:

Based on objective clinical assessment, the investigators found no excess of delayed or abnormal childhood development among residents of the Index Area and their offspring.

A very important conclusion:

From the full array of major health status outcome measurements and indicators the investigators conclude that the Index Area residents do not have different prevalences of life-threatening disorders or seriously disabling disease than the [control] area.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very extensive and exhaustive study. I could go on to read some of the conclusions, but basically it states — I could quote Dr. Spitzer. He says they were unable to detect any excess of life-threatening or disabling conditions. He goes on to say:

The greatest concerns of the population in the Index Area were about excess mortality, high rates of cancer, diminished respiratory function, dangerous levels of trace metals in the body, higher rates of unfavourable reproductive outcomes and birth defects, and delayed or abnormal childhood development. For all the foregoing concerns [we] have not detected objective evidence to perpetuate the concerns. [We] are confident of the scientific basis of that reassurance.

He goes on in that similar vein to reassure the residents of the area that they should not be unduly concerned about the health symptoms or concerns which they have felt, that they are as healthy as other Albertans, if not more healthy.

He goes on with three recommendations. First, that we continue to have vigorous monitoring by the Department of the Environment of the industrial activities in the province, that we do not in any way become less vigilant in our monitoring. That's one of his key recommendations and one that I sincerely support. His second recommendation is to set up a registry of birth defects. That's not an issue which I know a lot about, but given that this recommendation came forward, I certainly have to accept that. Finally, he says that the investigators recommend that further clinical epidemiological or demographic studies involving new data collection in the field not be done.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very extensive study. I should say that it has been independent, it has been at arm's length, it has not been controlled by the government. One of the important factors in terms of proceeding with this study was that the principal investigator said to members of the government, "If there is any interference whatsoever in terms of the conduct of this study, I'm going to blow the whistle. That will say that you people have been interfering." That did not occur.

Mr. Speaker, I've had letters of support from the municipal district of Pincher Creek with regard to this study and also from the Pincher Creek Chamber of Commerce. I believe we've had this issue before us in the province of Alberta, that it's had a history — one of confusion. I believe this study has been a very responsible one. It is one which should resolve the issue for the people in the area, and they can be assured they do not have an incidence of health concerns greater than that experienced by other people in the country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge hon. members to support the motion, which basically asks the government to endorse the recommendations of Dr. Spitzer's study. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion, I would like to say first of all that although it is a very exhaustive study — maybe not as exhaustive as the hon. member's summary of it; nevertheless, it did cover a great area — I can't see, even using his rose-coloured glasses, where he gets the conclusions that are so beneficial to Alberta, as he would like to outline. For instance, when one reads the conclusions as they are outlined in the report, I think there is a great deal of editorializing. For instance, conclusion 4 says that "the distribution of respiratory function of residents . . . is within normal limits." That's an editorial comment. What is a normal limit? Is it bronchitis three times a year? Is it pneumonia out of every ten people? What is it? He said it's within normal limits. We can go on. You pick that up in a couple of other areas. For instance, in detecting an excess of some symptoms, it said, "a small excess of some of the symptoms." What is a small excess? Burning and watering of eyes, itching of skin, throat irritation: he says there's a small excess of these in ordinary life.

When you have medical results such as that, I don't think by any stretch of the imagination you can say that result cleared the area as far as being more dangerous to live in than other areas. To these investigators, it may well be that burning and watering of eyes, runny noses, and itchy skin are just normal little things you put up with and don't mean anything, but I think it is something that means quite a little and, therefore, would not jump to the conclusion that our hon. member has.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

I go on. One of the biggest things that I then come to is in the area of the recommendations. He mentions emission controls. They say "a sustained policy." I for one don't believe that the policy we've had covers the broad spectrum of dangerous gases and trace elements as well as it should. It may cover sulphur, sulphur dioxide, H₂S, but I'm not too sure it covers the other band. We go on; for instance, an Alberta registry of birth defects. What bothers me here — when I look through the recommendations, there are really only three: one, continued emission control; second, a registry of birth defects; third, data collection on population studies in effect ceases.

Maybe as a background to some of the statements I make, I have spent most of my life in the open. I'm a geologist by training, have hoofed it over a great deal of the globe, and have spent a great deal of time outdoors. Anybody that's ever been around sulphur plants or industrial pollution can tell you that there are effects, whether you are a rancher and notice that the barbed-wire fence in the

area of a sulphur plant turns black and rusty some five to 10 years ahead of a barbed-wire fence just five miles away upwind, or whether it's a case of you're a rancher — this was supported by the government's own studies — anywhere in the area running from Rocky Mountain House practically down to Pincher Creek, along that whole foothills belt where sulphur plants are put in, and you have a calf born and have to give it a shot to keep it from having white-muscle disease.

The reason, of course, that you have to give a calf white-muscle disease shots is that it has a selenium shortage. We had a study done by the provincial government on selenium effects about 12 years ago which found that there were no effects on people. What it did find was that sulphur dioxide coming down onto the grass somehow or other chemically takes the selenium out, so there are selenium shortages in any of the cattle grazing on the grass.

I submit to you and members of this House that if a warm-blooded mammal — there again, I don't think you have to be a geologist to realize that a mammal is not that different from a human being. We walk on two legs rather than four, and because we're maybe a little more powerful, we get to elect Legislatures and so on and eat the other half. The point is that as far as the animal kingdom is concerned — blood and fur and walking around — a cow that grazes and eats that grass day after day and walks around with four bare feet rather than shoes ends up with a selenium shortage and its calves have a selenium shortage.

I submit to you that if cattle are having trouble, there may be some ill effects on human beings. I'd like to go a step further. Not that you have to have grey hair, but it was 30 years ago in her book *Silent Spring* that Rachel Carson showed that nature could be one of the first harbingers, the first warnings, of anything going wrong that could affect people. She was the one to point out that there were bird species dying out because of infertility or thin-shelled eggs or the concentration of what at that time were thought to be the wonder chemicals coming out of the war, 2,4-D and all the rest, that were concentrating in the bloodstream. The birds in our society showed it first. Hence, she argued that if we were to do nothing about it — and we found out 20 years later that she was probably right — we would indeed have a silent spring, because the animal and bird life would not be there.

Of course, this isn't the first time we have used animals and birds to give us warning. Being an old mining engineer and geologist, when I first went to school, it was considered that the best way of deciding whether an area was safe to move into was to put a canary in a cage. If the canary came out rather prostrate and out of it, you knew it wasn't too safe for you to go in. If the canary went under in a couple minutes, a human being would take maybe four to five hours, but he or she would go under too.

What I'm getting at here is that in these studies, not one element was shown on just where . . . I'm not saying whether they study canaries, but not one bit of this study . . . [interjections] We have a lot of them over there on the back bench anyhow. They sing whenever the Premier makes a signal, but nevertheless . . . [interjections] I think we're going to stir them up a little bit. I woke them up there, Mr. Speaker. The point is that not one bit of this study was done on the wildlife and the ecology of the area. It was devoted to seeing what illnesses could be present in people but very little as to what was going wrong with the ecology and the flora and fauna of the area.

So I submit to you that when you look at this study, it just took a very quick brush at what was bothering people.

In effect, it's contradictory, because it says we should sustain the policy of strict protection. Then it comes on with its last recommendation: that new data collection in the field not be done. How in the name of all that's holy can you detect whether your sustained methods are working if you decide ahead of time that you're not going to collect data. The collection of data is the very way that you measure whether or not your sustained methods are working and whether sustained methods have an effect.

I would like to urge the members here to vote against acceptance of this report, because it lulls you into a false sense of security. First of all, they said there's nothing wrong. Secondly, it ignored the whole field of flora and fauna outside the human element that could have been a harbinger and a pointer of what could happen to us down the road. Thirdly, it's contradictory in its own conclusions when it says, "Sure, we'll continue what has been done," presupposing that what has been done is any good. Worst of all, it says, "We will not continue any surveys." How can you tell that what you're continuing to do is any good if you're not going to continue to survey it?

That, Mr. Speaker, is it.

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and debate Motion 212 today. The resolution asks this Assembly to urge the government to adopt the three recommendations flowing out of the Southwestern Medical Diagnostic Review report which was made public just this past June. For me, this whole issue goes back much further than even the formation of this diagnostic review. In fact, I have personally been involved in this matter for about a decade.

Mr. Speaker, just over 10 years ago I moved to the Hillspring/Glenwood district with my wife and family, and it has been a place that I have been proud to call my home. In those 10 years I have raised my family, become involved in the community, and enjoyed a life in one of the most tranquil and idyllic settings in all of Alberta. It also happened to be the setting for the Southwestern Alberta Medical Diagnostic Review and is in the heart of the so-called index area referred to in that report. So you could say that I'm somewhat conversant with the health concerns of the residents of that area, being a resident myself.

Shortly after moving to Hillspring, I became aware of the variety of health concerns of the people of Hillspring. After all, when a community has only 500 or so people residing in it, one knows of the aches and ailments of practically everyone in the country. Perhaps that has something to do with the party-line telephone system.

Neighbouring communities were also expressing some concerns, particularly Twin Butte; it had been for many years. It was felt by many people that the cause of these health problems was the operation of the sour gas plants in the area. Naturally, people in these areas were concerned and anxious about whether there was some link between the emissions from the sour gas plant and these health concerns. Environmental pollution is a very sensitive and emotional issue, particularly in the absence of conclusive evidence.

I took an active part in the studies of the committees which finally led up to the review. After numerous studies over many years, the jury was still out as to the link between the sour gas plants and health concerns. This uncertainty and lack of solid information had created a climate of mistrust and suspicion. It was in this atmosphere that the government of Alberta announced the formation of the Southwestern Alberta Medical Diagnostic Review on

May 1, 1985. My community of Hillspring had not been included in any studies prior to this review.

Because the people in the community were becoming increasingly aware and concerned over their health, it prompted Social Services and Community Health to include them in the study. I was present when the former Minister for Social Services and Community Health, now our provincial energy minister, announced the undertaking of the new study at a public meeting in Pincher Creek. I also had the good fortune to be introduced to the head of the project, Dr. Walter Spitzer, and came to know him very well. He spent some time in my home, and we met on various occasions in committee.

At this meeting the parameters of the study were outlined, and the general details of how the study was to be conducted were planned. I was very pleased at the time that the government of Alberta was prepared to fund a valid study at their own expense. More importantly, I was encouraged by the fact that it would be an arm's-length study and the only government involvement was to be the financing of the medical review. I'm totally satisfied that our government has stayed at arm's length throughout the study.

This set in motion one of the most comprehensive studies of its type ever to have taken place on this continent. Funded at a cost to the government of \$3.7 million, the research group consisted of over 80 participants: epidemiologists, environmental scientists, toxicologists, and clinical investigators. At times it seemed that we had more people with master's and PhDs in that area than we did cattle. The area in which I lived was coined the index area, as differentiated from the two control groups used in this study. An important aspect to the success of this review was the creation of local citizens advisory committees. These committees were set up to overcome barriers to community participation, to ensure and enhance communication and understanding between investigators and residents, and to assist in logistical problems. I was a member of the index area committee advisory board, which was chaired by Mrs. Sophie Taylor from Twin Butte. Each community in the index area, namely Twin Butte, Mountain View, Hillspring, Glenwood, and Willow Creek, sent two representatives to sit on this board. I might also mention that the superintendent of the Waterton Shell gas plant, Mr. Arthur Mathes, also sat on the board. As the community advisory board, we assisted Dr. Spitzer and his colleagues by finding suitable facilities for their clinic in a central area and, from time to time, helping out to ensure the highest citizen participation possible.

I think the tremendous interest by residents was evident by the participation rate. Of the people randomly selected, over 90 percent participated in the study. This enviable rate is not often equalled in a study of this nature. It was no small feat, given that the study took place during the summer months. This was the time when most people took their summer vacations and when farmers were facing drought conditions and having to worry about their crop yields. This was quite an achievement for another reason. Each participant had to give a sizable amount of their time to be part of the study. The study of each person was quite rigorous, taking up more than four hours of their time in total: two full physical examinations, lab studies, and questionnaires. I should know because I went through it. It was quite a time commitment for people with large families of young children.

I was impressed by how effectively and quickly the study was done. Over the three months, all of the field work of

the index and two control areas had been completed. A total of 3,600 people in these areas had been examined, and approximately 2,000 others who used to live in these parts had also been looked at. All that was left to do was to let the scientists verify and analyze the data and write the report. On June 11 at a public meeting in Pincher Creek the report, in which three recommendations were made, was made public, which leads us here today to debate this resolution that calls on the government of Alberta to endorse these recommendations. My comment on the report is that by its very nature the report and its conclusions are very technical. For the layperson to analyze the some 542 pages contained in the report is all but impossible. I approach the report from that perspective, as a layperson. It's difficult to assess all the graphs and charts, much less the medical language. I feel somewhat at a loss as it's difficult to make an independent assessment of the data.

But getting back to the issue before the Assembly today, being the three recommendations arising from the report, the first recommendation calls on the government to continue its policy of strict protection of the environment in Alberta in the short and long term. I fully support this recommendation. Alberta's dependence on primary resource extraction industries does pose many environmental problems, and any socially responsible government must go out of its way to ensure the protection of its environment and citizens. As in many matters, the balance must be struck, for no primary resource industry is completely free of by-products. The sour gas industry in Alberta is but one example. However, every precaution must be taken to minimize the effects of that industry on the surrounding area and its inhabitants.

With regard to the second recommendation, I would like to again lend my wholehearted support to an upgraded registration of birth defects in Alberta. As I understand it now, the current system of registering birth defects has two major drawbacks. First, only those defects discovered in the first year of the child's life are recorded. However, many birth defects such as heart and kidney defects may not show up until after one year. Secondly, I'm told that where there is a cluster of cases of a particular birth defect in an area, investigators cannot adequately follow up as it is difficult to obtain ethical access to the patient and the patient's family. An upgrading of the current registration could perhaps overcome these two drawbacks. Although this would undoubtedly entail an expenditure of funds, I believe it would be well worth while. If, for example, there had been a higher instance of birth defects in my district, the only way you could find that out now under the current system would be to launch a large-scale study such as this Spitzer health study. If, however, you had an ongoing surveillance mechanism in place on a provincial basis, then diagnoses and corrective measures could be taken at a much earlier time.

For this reason, I believe that the government expenditure on upgraded registry would be well worth it. I feel that since the government funded this expensive study, the data arising out of this study should be made available to other groups and organizations. Data could be used for other studies. Personal medical records cannot and should not be revealed, but the aggregate should be accessible.

Mr. Speaker, one could say that perhaps more than any other person in this Chamber today, I have a stake in this matter before the Assembly. In the very broadest sense, one might say that I am in conflict of interest. This diagnostic review hits me at home. My wife, children, friends, and neighbours all make their homes in this area, which Dr.

Spitzer and his colleagues so exhaustively studied. We sincerely hope that the findings and conclusions of this report are accurate.

As for the third recommendation, it states in the last sentence:

The investigators recommend that further clinical, epidemiologic or demographic studies involving new data collection on the field not be done.

AN HON. MEMBER: What does that mean?

MR. ADY: It's in the report.

That statement dovetails with my earlier comments about accessibility to the general data, should there ever be a need for any type of study requiring it. Having voiced my support for the first two recommendations and passed comment on the other, I will take my seat and look forward to the debate on this motion.

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, a number of points concerning the motion and the issue of what I term the sour gas study in the Pincher Creek area. It's with a sense of irony that I call it a sour gas study, because in fact there was no air monitoring done in the area to determine the levels of sour gas emissions during the time of the study, although that seemed to be the major source of complaint for the people living in the area.

I'm concerned with one point just mentioned by the previous speaker, and that is the final recommendation that no additional study of this nature needs to be done. I think for a comparison I could go back to a statement made some centuries ago by the Catholic church: that the world was flat and was the centre of the universe, everybody knew that, no further study on the subject was required, and anyone who wanted further study must have been either hysterical or possessed by Satan. We find that this study is saying that the people down there who feel these symptoms must be feeling them psychosomatically and they're not really sick. I find that hard to accept. I find it hard to accept that on any matter of a scientific nature we can safely say that no further study needs to be done. So that certainly would have to be one of my greatest concerns.

The first speaker on this issue referred to the Sage study and a study called Researching Acid Deposition: Workshop Proposals, which was organized by the acid deposition research program. First, a few points about the Sage study, because the two of these together were what led to the terms of reference of the health study now under discussion. Throughout the Sage study — in fact it is implicit in many things they say that there are chronic conditions of ill health in the area that need to be investigated. On IV, on page 29, many of their recommendations are based on an implicit acceptance of two things: one, that there are health concerns that need to be addressed and investigated; and two, that air monitoring, air quality testing, must naturally be an integral part of any reasonable and scientific examination of the situation even though, as I pointed out, that was not done during this test.

On page 24 it indicated another problem that I don't think has ever been addressed; that is, the Pincher Creek Industrial Pollution Committee. They had a number of concerns. They said they felt that government and industry do not want to make the issue more high profile or politically sensitive than it is at present. They believe the government wants to appear to have things under control so that no new studies will be necessary. In fact one speaker on the

topic pointed out that the Chamber of Commerce in the area feels that this study is great and should put everybody's mind at rest, and now expansion in the area can go on without any concern for health conditions because that's all been laid to rest.

A number of people in the area, albeit a small number who live in the plume area of the plant and the plume areas of the sour gas wells, have felt that at times they are almost subject to some animosity by other people who would like to get this whole thing dealt with so that economic expansion in the gas industry can go on. They felt it was almost as if they were being accused of slowing up progress. So they were looking at the study as something that would vindicate their claims that they as a small group within the index area, a group of perhaps 250 out of 3,600 of the index area, were subject to higher levels of pollution in the plume areas and did have legitimate complaints. I think for a number of reasons these complaints weren't dealt with by the study.

The acid deposition research program which, as the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest pointed out, was the result of 23 worldwide experts — I would point out that in their chapter on human health studies, they had a section called Exposure Monitoring, Environment Monitoring.

With regard to community epidemiology, continuous environmental monitoring should be carried out in the study areas. This should be sufficiently extensive to allow categorization of the degree of exposure of the residents in the area to allow identification of sudden increases in exposure throughout the study period.

Indoor-outdoor monitoring studies should also be carried out in a subsample of households in the study area.

Implicit in what is said there by these 23 worldwide renowned experts is that in fact to have any meaning whatsoever a study must include very careful, very sophisticated, and very wide-ranging air monitoring of the source of pollution that's being investigated to see if there are any variances in pollution level during the study period and to see if that results in changes in people's symptoms.

Also, as far as I can see there's a problem that the ADRP approved Dr. Spitzer's original proposal for the study, and yet the final study did not fulfill everything that was listed in the original proposal, and no revised proposal was taken to the ADRP for their approval. So in fact the ADRP did not approve the apparent terms of reference that seemed to be followed.

I would point out that one of the changes was that nine heavy metals were left out of the test, and a previous speaker pointed to heavy metal testing. Zinc, nickel, iron, manganese, chromium, copper, cobalt, vanadium, and aluminum were not considered important enough to be part of the test, even though copper had been named earlier as a high-level heavy metal in the area and chromium is supposed to be given off by the production of sulphur in the sour gas treatments. So that should have been studied.

Also, four gases were left out: CS₂, COS, ozone, and mercaptan. Dr. Spitzer referred to those four gases in his original proposal as plausible environmental exposures with potential pulmonary toxicity; in other words, he named those four as being potential causes of respiratory difficulty, and yet they were left out of the final study. Also, ozone is recognized as a synergistic substance, meaning that it not only causes problems by itself but increases the problems caused by other pollutants that are present. If you have ozone and another pollutant, you don't have just two causes; you have a third damage done by the combined effect of

the ozone and the other pollutant, so it most certainly should have been tested.

Because these changes were never formalized in the terms of reference and were never brought to the ADRP for final approval, nobody can really be sure who, in fact, had the deciding voice in those changes being made. Did Dr. Spitzer decide independently to leave them out? Was that the suggestion of gas and oil company executives involved in it? Was it recommendations from the Environment department or Community Health? That question cannot really be answered, and I think it's too important to the validity of the study to leave it unanswered or to accept the results of this study until it is answered.

I have some question about Raymond-Stirling as an unexposed control group, and I would like at this time to table a couple of letters, one from Dr. Spitzer to Sophie Taylor, who was mentioned earlier, and one from Jean — and I'll leave it up to members when they read the letter to pronounce her last name, with my apologies — to Dr. Spitzer, both of which deal with the Raymond-Stirling control group area. I do have a number of questions related to them.

In his letter to Sophie Taylor, Dr. Spitzer says:

To my dismay and annoyance, I have discovered that air quality monitoring was not done in the Stirling area during the time of the winter sample. It seems that, for whatever reasons, the request for such monitoring, made of Alberta Environment by the ADRP Co-chairmen, was missed, overlooked, or obviously, not taken as a priority.

That indicates to me that the ADRP considered it very important to test or monitor air quality in the Raymond-Stirling control group area to ascertain and to be definitely sure that it was a bona fide, legitimate, unpolluted, unaffected control group area. Without the air monitoring, I think we have to say that at best we can't be certain. We had assurances that it was, but we did not have testing to prove it.

In the other letter to Dr. Spitzer, the communications co-ordinator for the acid deposition research program said:

Sophie Taylor called me yesterday with some information that would be appropriate for you to know.

A contact she has in Lethbridge advised her that during the time of the winter sample, a well was being cleaned at Wilson Siding just north of Stirling. The cleaning caused highly unpleasant odors and certain allergic reactions in some, reports the contact. The contact confirmed with Alberta Environment in Lethbridge that this well clean-up was underway.

At the time of the odour and the reactions to it, somebody contacted at the Lethbridge office of Alberta Environment confirmed that there was a well clean-out going on in that area. Later on that confirmation was not forthcoming, and just this afternoon the latest information I could get was that a gas well was flared at Coaldale and Mr. Ron Findlay, who is co-chairman of the ADRP and also an executive with Amoco, said that that is not close enough to the control group area to affect them. I taught in Lethbridge and my teams played in Coaldale and, as I understood it, it was not all that far from Raymond, so I'm not entirely certain myself that it was far enough away that it would have had no effect whatsoever, especially if people in the area said that they could smell it and had allergic reactions to it, although those as well may have been psychosomatic.

The ERCB investigated the accusation and came to the conclusion that they could not confirm that a well clean-

out took place and therefore assumed that none had in the Wilson siding area; however, they do admit that in fact their only information is what the companies write back to them in answer to any queries. So again, all that is proven is that if such a clean-out took place, the company that did it did not write back to the ERCB telling them that it had happened. I would say that not only shows a serious flaw in government policy concerning reports of well activity and clean-out; it also indicates that with the lack of air monitoring, no one can prove that Raymond-Stirling is an unpolluted, unaffected control group area, which I consider to be a very serious flaw in the study.

Another flaw I see is in the focus of the study, which I did allude to. First of all, as was pointed out, it dealt primarily with fatal and life-threatening diseases. That seemed to be Dr. Spitzer's area of concern, and he echoed that to him it seemed to be the area of concern of the majority of people. Yet those I've contacted in the study area, especially the plume areas, including Sophie Taylor, assert that in fact it is the chronic, long-term health symptoms, the chronic continuing respiratory problems, nosebleeds, stopped breathing in their children, and so on that concern them and that they have been demanding study for the past while. So that area, which was entirely left out of the research study, was a concern to people in the plume areas, and they wanted it to be studied. Also, I would point out that the two previous documents that led to the study presumed that those would be areas of research, that those accusations of chronic ill health would at least be part of the study. I don't say they should have been the whole study. I'm merely saying that it's a serious lack that they were at least not part of it. Again, we must therefore question whether or not we have laid to rest people's accusations that there were long-term health problems.

I would also point out that the statistical analysis for the area was not broken down to separate the plume area in the Twin Butte area and other plume areas of the gas wells which involve about 250 people. They were not separated from the larger population totalling about 3,600 in the entire index area, even though, in fact, people in the area say that the greatest extent of problems is in the plume area of the plant and the plume areas of the gas wells.

In view of the fact that the study did show about a 5 percent difference in what the doctor termed two-week prevalence symptoms, even though the plume area populations were mixed in with about 3,400 additional people, that indicates to me that a review of the plume area statistics, which I am told were kept separately but were never put in the study, may indicate a significantly higher level of those health symptoms amongst the plume area populations, which Dr. Spitzer adamantly refused to do. According to people who worked on the ADRP, he in fact got very angry when someone suggested that they should separate those out and study them. He did have a statistical justification for it. He said:

It is dangerous to test a hypothesis after the fact, after having seen the data, because of the certainty of finding some significant results solely by chance. Therefore, although tempting, post hoc hypotheses are usually data-driven and have been set aside by our team of investigators.

What he's saying there, in other words, is that it's just not statistically valid to separate those smaller populations out and view them separately to see what their symptom rates are. He says it's because the hypothesis should come before

the view of the data, and you should check to see if the data supports the original hypothesis. According to the terms of reference, and I think as everybody understood it, the purpose of the study was not to test a specific hypothesis that item A caused all of the health problems but to see if there were health problems and to see if it could be determined what caused them. His argument that the hypothesis should come first doesn't seem to follow to me, and I think it's perfectly legitimate to look at those statistics for the smaller groups in the plume areas. As long as that hasn't been done, I have grave concerns about it.

Also, I would note that the cancer statistics, according to some members of the ADRP, were broken out for smaller groups even though the health symptoms weren't. Perhaps it will help to explain the two-week prevalence symptoms. Dr. Spitzer only counted those reported health symptoms if the people either exhibited the symptoms when they were being physically examined or had suffered the symptoms within the two weeks previous to the examination. That means the person may have said, "Well, I've had these symptoms 100 times in the last year," but if it hadn't happened in the last two weeks, it would not show up in the study because of that two week prevalence definition, which again I think would leave out a lot of data.

I would also point out in terms of that that people in the area have claimed that their symptoms seemed to be coincident with flare-offs of the nearby well, flares at the plant, sulfur meltdown for transportation at the plant, or what are termed plant upsets, which may cause either flare-offs or the level of pollution given from the stack to be higher than what is considered optimum of 99 point some percent of it being held back. All of those things, according to the people who suffered the symptoms, seemed to be coincident with their symptoms, and yet again the air monitoring wasn't done to see what level of activity there was in the index area. In fact, members of the ADRP and others in the community have said that there were no sulfur meltdowns during the test period, there were either no or very reduced flare-offs of the gas wells and at the plant, there was a minimum of plant upsets, and although regular procedures at the plant went along as normal, those unusual things which seem to cause the people symptoms didn't seem to be happening. There is no air monitoring to see if, in fact, that reduction of activity reduced the level of pollution that was causing the problems people indeed complained of.

As I said before, I have some reservations about the one recommendation of the study that no further health studies need to be done. The wells that are being used in that area are usually in the neighbourhood of 30 percent or less sour gas. There are applications made to deal with 90 percent wells and even higher. To say that no further health studies need to be done, in view of the consideration of these much higher concentrations that are being looked at, I think would be quite dangerous. I don't think we dare accept it. I also think we have to look at the ADRP assumption that in fact the test as outlined by Dr. Spitzer to them represented only a method of finding out what the problems were, so that eventually future studies would find ways of dealing with those problems once we knew what they were.

I have grave reservations therefore that we should not proceed with this particular motion, and I think there are a number of reasons. The validity of the control group, to me at least and hopefully to other members, is in some doubt. The focus of the study has been criticized by members

of the ADRP, by the citizens group. There's disagreement over the focus, and that disagreement caused internal conflict between Dr. Spitzer and members of the ADRP — quite serious disagreements. Most experts involved in the formative period of the health study expected and wanted to see air monitoring done, and it wasn't. At this point the ADRP has not endorsed the study. It has merely accepted it as information. Their Scientific Advisory Board has not finished its report on the health study and says it will make that report public when it is done. The Public Advisory Board has not transmitted their evaluation to the ADRP, and the ADRP members I've talked to say they're reluctant to endorse or reject the study until they've seen the opinions of the Public Advisory Board.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment which I have right here and will get to the pages. I will read it aloud. I would move an amendment as follows:

deleting all of the words following the words "urge the government to" and substituting therefor the words "make no decision with regard to the recommendations of the Southwestern Alberta Medical Diagnostic Review of health concerns of residents living near a gas plant in the Twin Butte, Hillspring, Glenwood, Mountainview, and Willow Creek areas until such time as it has secured and considered the report of the Scientific Advisory Board and the report of the Public Advisory Board, both boards having been established under the authority of the acid deposition research program, concerning the review."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MUSGROVE: Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the proposed amendment changes the complete intent of the motion. It's my understanding an amendment is to slightly change the intent of a motion but not to completely reverse it. As I understand the amendment that is being proposed, it would completely reverse the intent of the motion. On a point of order, I believe that the amendment is out of order.

MR. YOUNIE: I'm not changing the intent at all, because I'm not saying that the government will never endorse the findings of the study. I'm merely saying that I would recommend that we wait until these two very important sources of information have reported. The government, all members and the opposition included, can then look over their findings and make a decision based on the best scientific opinion and so on of the study.

Moving forward now, especially in view of the finality of the last recommendation of the study that we'll never have to do any more testing in this area again — I think we should wait until we have better scientific information about the study and its scientific validity and methodology. All I want is to have the government act very reasonably, responsibly, and in a measured way by getting that additional information before moving ahead and considering any endorsement of it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Ponoka-Rimbey on the point of order. Or are you speaking to the amendment? I'm sorry; Olds-Didsbury.

MR. BRASSARD: I'm speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take exception to the latitude with which the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry quotes

the report to which he referred. The report does not state that the people studied who thought they were sick were not sick at all and other such generalizations. The report makes no such statements as he has quoted. Although the member has made observations and conclusions like an expert on the subject, which he is not, I must conclude in favour of Dr. Spitzer, who is.

MR. YOUNIE: A point of order, please? First of all, I never attributed those statements to the study itself. I attributed them to a previous speaker on the study, that being the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, who had in fact indicated his belief and quoted an article that supported his belief that most of their symptoms were psychosomatic or caused by something other than genuine health concerns.

MR. BRADLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not make the statement which the hon. member is now alleging me to have made.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour . . .

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favour of this amendment. I think it's important . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think I already called the question, and no one was on their feet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: A point of order. With due respect, Mr. Speaker, before the discussion about the point of order on the amendment, the hon. member had already risen in his place. I think you were looking around on discussion of the point of order and most likely didn't see him rise. I believe the hon. member stood well before you asked to put the question.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm amazed that you can see better from the back of your head than I can from the front. Hon. member, proceed with your point of order.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I want to speak in favour of this amendment. I think it is in fact an important amendment to the original motion, and it's not contrary to the original motion. As we discussed earlier, it is an enhancement of this particular motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I thought you were speaking on the point of order, not the amendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: No, the amendment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has already been called.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, if you please, on a point of order. I too, just as the Member for Calgary Mountain View, turned around to see who else was going to speak when someone from the other side called the question and the issue of points of order started to arise. I saw the

Member for Edmonton Mill Woods stand to speak. He did not have a chance to utter into the microphone whether or not he was going to speak on a point of order or in favour or against the amendment. But it was pretty clear to my eyes that he was standing up and wanted to speak. Under those circumstances, I would plead with the Speaker that it's his right to speak to the amendment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member will proceed to speak on the amendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I think it is in fact an important amendment to the original motion, and it is not, as perhaps other members might be trying to infer, a negation of the amendment. It is in fact trying to say that there are other very important dimensions and assessments of this study that need to come before the government and to members of the Assembly so that we can make the most informed assessment of the study itself and the other relevant factors to make sure there are no deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, people in the area are in fact sick. There are a number of deficiencies to the original study that have been alluded to. This amendment is simply saying that we need to have all the information before us before we make this kind of important decision about the original medical diagnostic study.

I think some of those have been briefly referred to. We've talked about some of the shortcomings in the original study that I think may be addressed, hopefully by the Public Advisory Board and the Scientific Advisory Board. For example, we're looking at the reference that was made to the fact that many people were included in the study that did not live in the plume area. So the health results of those who do live in the plume [area] was significantly diluted. I think it is important for us to consider what the Scientific Advisory Board and the Public Advisory Board may have to say about that. I would suggest that is a serious shortcoming in the study, and I would be very surprised if either of those two boards did not comment on that particular fact.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

There are of course other considerations as well. If we accept the original motion — that is to say, accept the recommendations — we are making an implication that this medical diagnostic review is in fact the definitive statement of the problem and there are not other assessments we should consider. I think it would be shortsighted on our part to accept that report without, as I said, the assessments of both the Scientific Advisory Board and the Public Advisory Board.

There are a variety of factors which I think need to be looked at. I referred to one; that is, the question of other people being included that were not in the plume area of the plants and developments under consideration. I think there are perhaps some other factors as well that have come out in public information recently which have not come out in the medical diagnostic review. There is the whole question of, for example, the information that has come forward from the acid farming initiatives symposium held in May of this year. One was a statement by people from Health and Welfare Canada that said that in excess of some 4,300 human deaths were due to long-range transfer of atmospheric pollutants of the nature being considered in this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very shortsighted of us to come to any kind of assessment of the medical diagnostic review without the scholarly consideration of the Public Advisory Board and the Scientific Advisory Board. I think it would behoove us all to support this particular amendment, which is not to say that we should not at some point adopt the recommendations of the medical diagnostic review, but not until such time as we have the additional reports of both the Public Advisory Board and the Scientific Advisory Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Mr. Speaker declared the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, the main motion to the Assembly is Motion 212 on the Order Paper, as moved by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. However, an amendment has been proposed by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I trust that copies of the amendment are before all members of the Assembly.

For the motion:

Barrett	Hewes	Roberts
Chumir	Laing	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	Martin	Taylor
Fox	McEachern	Wright
Gibeault	Mitchell	Younie
Hawkesworth	Pashak	

Against the motion:

Adair	Fjordbotten	Orman
Ady	Getty	Osterman
Alger	Horsman	Payne
Anderson	Hyland	Reid
Betkowski	Isley	Rostad
Bogle	Johnston	Russell
Bradley	Jonson	Schumacher
Brassard	Koper	Shaben
Campbell	Kowalski	Shrake
Cassin	McCoy	Sparrow
Cherry	Mirosh	Speaker, R.
Crawford	Moore, M.	Stewart
Cripps	Moore, R.	Webber
Day	Musgreave	West
Dinning	Musgrove	Young
Drobot	Nelson	Zarusky
Elzinga	Oldring	

Totals: Ayes—17 Noes—50

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion, I would just like to say a couple of things before I move that we adjourn the debate. It's one plain, simple fact, and I welcome the debate by my colleagues on the government side of the House. I think it's been a very informed, very intelligent debate, but may I be so bold as to suggest that the members on the opposition side come back to the debate the next time this motion comes up on the Order Paper perhaps having read the report by the medical diagnostic review team. From the things they've been saying today, the comments of the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon as well as the Member for Edmonton

Glengarry, it is clear and plain that they haven't read the report yet, and I'd encourage them to do so.

I look forward to participating in this debate in the future, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is an absolutely crucial document in this province today for the long-term health of all Albertans and certainly for thinking about our natural resources in this province and the safe and economic development of those resources. So, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to move to adjourn debate on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion, all those in favour please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any, please say no. The motion is carried.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this evening at 8 o'clock the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the estimates of the Department of Culture and the committee stay as such until it rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Acting Government House Leader that when the members reassemble at 8 o'clock they will be in Committee of Supply, does the Assembly agree with the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed?

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

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of Culture

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister like to make some opening comments?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, it's my pleasure to make a few opening comments, at least few by comparison to some of my colleagues on the front bench. [some applause] Thank you. I'd better take the applause while I'm able to. I'm not sure how much more often it will come.

Mr. Chairman, because this is my first opportunity to present estimates as the Minister of Culture, I'd like to take this time to generally indicate what my philosophy with respect to the Department of Culture is and, since many hon. members are as new to Culture estimates as I am, to generally outline for them what the department does and what its goals are.

I should indicate that to me culture means more than just the opera or the ballet, although those are important

parts of it. It means the enrichment of our lives. This is the department which is responsible for the enrichment of our community and the individuals in this community, and I'm pleased to have the opportunity to head it. Whether it's reading a book or admiring a painted Ukrainian Easter egg, that's an addition to our life. It's for that purpose that this department exists and indeed for that purpose that many Albertans and many volunteers, who I'd especially like to recognize tonight, contribute a good part of their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I'm most fortunate to be preceded in this portfolio by two ministers who contributed a great deal to culture. I would be doing them wrong if I didn't recognize tonight the excellent contribution of Mary LeMessurier who, in my travels through the province, is well respected from one end to the other for her contribution, and of course Horst Schmid, the first full Minister of Culture in the province, whose energy and enthusiasm gave impetus to a lot of the projects which are realized today.

Mr. Chairman, since I have the opportunity, I'd also like to say thank you to my personal staff in the office. Those individuals, and there are four of them, have given unstintingly since I took over this position and have worked long hours and done so without complaint. Two of them are in the gallery tonight: Charlene Blaney, my executive assistant, and Di Geneux, who is my secretary. I would like them to stand, just so you know who they are. As an example of their dedication, I didn't even ask them to be here tonight, but both are staying through the estimates. I don't know if it's out of fear for their paycheques if we don't pass them or if they want to make sure I'm doing the right thing. The latter is something they have accomplished in the early months of my administration of this department.

There are also a number of people from the department in the gallery. I'd like to generally express to the department my appreciation for their assistance in the early months of operating and for their commitment as dedicated public servants to culture in this province and to what we've been trying to accomplish.

With those opening remarks, I'd like to briefly give the committee an outline of the three divisions that comprise the Department of Culture. They are the cultural development division, the historical resources division, and the cultural heritage division.

To deal with those in order, the cultural development division is responsible for assisting libraries and helping to develop them. Members will find a \$1.7 million increase in that area in this year's budget. Most of that money goes to the Peace library system, but we're quite proud of the libraries that have been developed and the systems that are established throughout the province. The other parts of that particular division of the department really have goals related to all aspects of the arts, and they generally fall into four main goals. The first is to increase opportunities for Albertans to have exposure to and education in and through the fine arts. The second is to encourage increased demand for an appreciation of the arts in both rural and urban communities. The third is to encourage fiscal responsibility for arts organizations and to strengthen leadership in the cultural sector. The fourth is to pursue co-operative ventures with the Alberta arts community in the public and private sectors.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, that division carries on a wide variety of programs and provides a great deal of assistance to artists, ranging from training programs on through to helping them to make sure their work is displayed or performed. In recent years we have also had significant

contributions to projects such as the Calgary Centre for Performing Arts, which many people consider a flagship of the arts in Calgary and which is now bringing talent from around the world into Alberta and helping Alberta artists to perform in facilities which are world standard. The budget this year will show a continuing commitment to that particular facility but also reflects a drop in the amount of money that's allocated over last year's estimates because of the completion of that project. Mr. Chairman, that's the cultural development division in a general sense.

The historical resources division of the department really has the responsibility for safeguarding Alberta's history and for developing it to the point where we as individual citizens can appreciate and learn about our past. Mr. Chairman, I might say that in a more general sense I'm convinced that not only is educational and cultural development important to us individually; it's important to the province economically. Indeed, the opening this past year of the Tyrrell Museum in Drumheller has brought hundreds of thousands of dollars into the community of Drumheller. That facility has been recognized in every communication to me as one which Albertans and visitors from around the world have appreciated to a very great degree. I personally believe that whole area of palaeontology, the study of the dinosaurs and our ancient past, has the long-range potential for making Alberta the kind of world focus in that area that the pyramids are to Egypt, for example.

I think there is at least one other area in terms of our historical resources that holds that potential, and that is embodied in the development of Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, which will be completed by the summer of next year. Within its mandate, an interpretive centre that's being developed there will be able to show Albertans and the rest of the world 6,000 years of native history. Again, that time frame is comparable, if you want to do that, to the pyramids in the development of Egypt, and I think in future years we should work more to not only develop those resources that are available in that respect but tie them to our tourism and awareness programs through the schools to ensure that those very unique aspects of our history are well developed and well utilized for Albertans throughout the province.

I could go on with the other responsibilities of the division at some length, but suffice it to say that through the division of historical resources we've designated well over 200 sites in Alberta as historical sites. We have major developments, from the Fort McMurray Oil Sands Interpretive Centre on through to the Frank Slide Interpretive Centre in that part of the Crowsnest Pass. It's a division that's active and constantly looking at what has to be done to ensure that our past is maintained for our future. The cultural development division and the historical resources division are the first two divisions.

The third division within our department is considerably newer in terms of its status as a division. That's the cultural heritage division of the Department of Culture. It was formed in 1984 and really underlines the commitment of this government to preserving the cultural heritage of our people. It's our belief that without that taking place, we'll lose the very rich cultures and all that can be contributed to ourselves now and our citizens of the future.

I'd like to congratulate the more than 1,400 ethnocultural organizations around the province who this division has the opportunity to work with in ensuring that we not only stabilize and make sure we preserve those cultures but also share them with the rest of Alberta so that in this one province we'll have the benefit of the positive developments of all the cultures in the world.

Mr. Chairman, during the last year there were four regional offices developed with the cultural heritage division. Those regional offices are in Lethbridge, Red Deer, St. Paul, and Fort McMurray. Those are of course in addition to offices in Calgary and Edmonton. That division continues to try and find ways through grant programs and direct assistance to encourage those volunteer organizations to continue the excellent work they've carried out through quite a number of years.

Those are very general comments and only a brief overview of the three divisions of the department. Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I might give you some general figures about culture in Alberta. It's interesting to note in studies that approximately 8 percent of the cultural organizations in Canada exist in Alberta, and that's about what we'd expect because of our population base. It's also interesting that 9 percent, roughly speaking, of the people who go to performing arts or arts events are here in Alberta, and that's again about average.

Alberta shines in two particular areas. First of all, 16 percent of all the provincial grants to culture in Canada come out of Alberta, far more than our proportion per capita would normally be. Even more astounding, Mr. Chairman, and even more to outline the commitment that Albertans have to culture, private individuals in Alberta contribute 17 percent of all the money contributed to culture in the country. Put another way, as a government the Alberta government contributes 50 percent more than any other province on average, and citizens contribute 80 percent more than people in other parts of the country on average.

Mr. Chairman, those are brief remarks. Generally with respect to the budget itself, the budget reflects the high level of commitment this government has towards the cultural life of our province, but it also recognizes the economic realities and the difficulties we have in terms of trying to continue with a restraint program. This budget is in fact smaller than last year's. The primary reason for that is the completion of major capital projects, largely the Calgary Centre for Performing Arts, the Tyrrell Museum, and the development of the interpretive centre at Fort McMurray.

There are fewer employees, though not by many, and there are increases in some cases. Generally speaking, they can be justified on the basis of mandatory wage evaluations and, in some, office capital that's required. But I'll be happy to try and answer any specific questions the committee might have, Mr. Chairman.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the minister's introductions, I must say I've been wondering where Charlene Blaney is, and I'm glad to see that she's still around this building.

I'm afraid I have to offer a brief critique of the Department of Culture, not in too many specifics but more in terms of where the department is going. Under consideration of the general administration of this department, I think our first point has to be that the Act under which the department operates is very vague in terms of its mandate. That is, no objectives are set out in the Act. I did hear the minister refer to the importance of culture, but it seems to me that with other foundations we have objectives set out in their Acts or regulations or both.

In this particular instance, it's a department of some substance, and I think it might be a good idea if we had a formal recognition of the importance of culture, some statement about culture and the arts being the creative expression of human experience, a very important legacy,

the one sustaining factor by which all societies are remembered, and our desire to foster that sort of thing. Bring the department itself into that kind of focus. It does manage to function despite this absence. However, it may not be able to function in as precise a way and in a less ad hoc way, shall we say, in terms of spending if we had some points for its objectives and what it is that it tries to accomplish set out in the provisions of the department.

On a matter of money, I note the minister was mentioning the amount of money that is spent by the department compared to other departments across Canada. However, I would like to point out that when it comes to a percentage of the overall budget of a province with respect to cultural designations — I'm not talking about overall, and I can do that too — we in Alberta are in fact talking about the second lowest ranking in all of Canada: 0.18 percent of our entire annual budget is specifically devoted to culture. The only other province that ranks lower is Nova Scotia. I've calculated the average across Canada, which comes to 0.35 percent of total provincial budgets. So I think it's not necessarily the case that we're spending hand over fist compared to other provinces. One of course has to keep in mind the overall size of a provincial budget and the type of value we're going to ascribe to spending on the arts.

One of the documents I've read a lot in the last year or year and a half since I was first able to obtain it from the Department of Culture is a report that was based on a study carried out by Woods Gordon in 1984 called the Economic Impact of the Arts in Alberta. Let me just read a little bit from the executive summary first:

In summary, the 'Arts' are very important to the economic and employment health of the Province. They show a great deal of potential for further growth, and the estimates produced by this study indicate that a relatively low level of support or subsidy is required relative to the number of jobs and the economic impact produced.

I think what this study is conveniently saying is that the funding going to the arts in Alberta can be allocated in an arbitrary fashion without having too much impact on the existence of the arts or what it is that the artists in Alberta are attempting to do. The other way of looking at this, Mr. Chairman, is to recognize that there is a fairly substantial multiplier factor as identified in this economic analysis.

My understanding is that in some instances, the oil industry, for example — and this is not to criticize one of our two major industries — we can have a multiplier factor of around 1 to 1.5 because it's very capital intensive. On the other hand, the arts are very labour intensive. They produce a lot of labour-intensive spin-off benefits to a society. In other words, patrons of the arts, for example, will find themselves paying for parking downtown, going to nearby cafés and restaurants, and indirectly employing people in that way by virtue of the dollars they spend in support of the arts. Ticket agencies and so forth are supported by the arts. This in fact represents a pretty high multiplier factor. We can get double that multiplier in some sectors of agriculture, and we know that. But I think this is not to be sold short of its importance in the overall economy of Alberta.

I would like to make clear in these remarks, however, that I am not justifying the arts, their participation in our economy, or our public support for the arts on a purely economic basis, because as a consumer of the arts, I believe they satisfy another desire altogether personal and social,

which has nothing to do with sheer numbers and making an economy go around.

I also notice in this report that we do see a fair number of out-of-province expenditures with relation to the arts in Alberta. I'm sure the minister is quite familiar with this report. When he rises again, I wonder if he would speak to this issue and inform the Assembly if he has any plans to try to harness that money which we publicly support and inadvertently or otherwise send out of the province. Does he have any measures in mind by which we can recapture that portion of the money and its consequent spin-off benefits, its multiplier effect, back into Alberta?

We know Alberta is constantly in a state of competition with not only other provinces but other countries with respect to keeping our artists here. One of the very good ways to do that is to show that it is a self-sustaining "industry" and make sure that people understand that the more we go for public support of the arts, the more benefits there are right here in Alberta in terms of costumes, design, technology for sound systems, and that sort of thing. As I say, that can be pretty important not only to the economy but helping the arts in Alberta sustain a livelihood which wouldn't be subject to cutthroat competition from outside the province.

This brings me to another matter, Mr. Chairman, that has to do with our government's position on free trade when it comes to the arts and culture. The reason I bring this up is that I'm certainly not aware of any statement on behalf of the minister with respect to federal actions which saw the publishing industry in the United States being subject to a sudden jump in tariffs for their products entering Canada in response to a dispute which broke out with regard to the Canadian shakes and shingles industry. I certainly do not believe the issue of trade is a simple one. I recognize that it took many years to design the mechanisms used in GATT. I fear for the counterlosses, shall we say, with respect to Canadian artists, and Alberta artists in particular. It seems to be a problem that Americans want to include items like entertainment in the same breath as the arts, at least at the trade level. It's not an argument I buy. I do not believe the television industry is necessarily, in the commercial sense at least, an industry related to the arts in the way that we as Canadians understand and value our arts.

Whether or not we have a government that likes the idea of free trade — and I'm sure we do have a government that likes free trade — we have to recognize the validity of the concerns of those people who spend their time and their occupations in a creative fashion not simply for the benefit of themselves or their pocketbooks but for the benefit of those who consume the arts all around Alberta and those who will benefit in the long run in terms of the legacy we leave behind. If we allow our artists and our arts communities to be pitted against those of the United States, I wonder if we can win. I therefore look to the minister for some indication that within his government he is prepared to defend keeping at minimum the arts and our cultural identity off the negotiating table with respect to free trade.

I mentioned earlier that it seemed to me that there was an ad hoc approach to funding the arts in Alberta. I might even call it a shot in the dark approach to funding the arts, because cultural organizations never know from one year to the next whether or not they will indeed be beneficiaries of grants from the Department of Culture or from one of the foundations related to the Department of Culture. What happens with these communities is that they're turned into funding entities as opposed to projects which are designed

and really want to be creative expressions of human experience. Very important time is taken away from those applying for support when necessary, because they're asked to do so on a project-by-project basis. In other words, don't we need a program which will look at sustaining the operational capacities of whatever cultural organization we recognize to be important on a one-, two-, three-, or four-year basis as opposed to asking them to please come up with a special project which will justify the spending of the money?

I have an example of the underlying philosophy of what it means to be market driven in terms of applying for support. I actually have several examples; I'll only enunciate one. An organization wishing to publish in-depth arts criticism and a literary magazine in Alberta, having applied to the department for support and with only two days' notice, was asked to come up with a two- to five-year marketing plan, a list of contributors for the first two issues — that one is not so unusual — and then a market analysis survey showing the need for the publication. That can consume an awful lot of time.

I know small businesses who've spent \$10,000 doing the kind of market survey these people were being required to come up with. It really pits one interest against another, and I do believe this might be related to the objectives of the department or the lack of objectives of the department.

To jump a little bit more, I'd like to point out that I think there's a problem with Economic Development as opposed to Culture being responsible for the film corporation in Alberta, partly because Economic Development hasn't really got a cultural component per se. When I look at provinces like Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec, they actually have programs which will sponsor film production through their departments of culture, so they're not necessarily focussed just on being market driven. They have that expectation, and in some instances it's clearly written out as to a kind of formula percentage of the overall target that one wants to achieve in terms of what is market driven and what is sustained by public funding. More importantly, it provides that cultural dimension, so that we don't just see film production as a business; we see it as an art. So we encourage the consequent and related artists and their activities coming together in support of that. While we keep our funding for films under Economic Development, we lose our ability to suggest to Albertans that it is worth while to develop related businesses and arts to keep that industry in Alberta more and more.

I'm sorry to jump around, but I've put my notes in a backwards order. If I take too long trying to figure out which order they should be in, you'll get bored.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're bored anyway.

MS BARRETT: Now, now. I'm trying to be nice and trying to make a clear case on behalf of artists, and I'm not trying to fight. So bear with me.

I want to jump to another part of the film industry, and that has to do with Alberta's ability to stipulate that a certain percentage of the films shown in this province can be or should be of Canadian or Alberta content entirely, in part, or that sort of thing. The American industry calls this the entertainment industry. In terms of the types of awards that Canadian films win internationally, I think we have to recognize that Canadian film producers actually represent an area of the arts as opposed to something like the American television system and that we can have an impact on keeping the arts in Canada. For example, we

can prevent film directors, producers, actors, actresses, and costume designers from heading either to Ontario, which has a much larger culture budget, or south of the border where this is a much more developed industry and, I might suggest, recognized slightly less as a value. I'd like the minister to comment on any designs he might have to encourage the film distribution agencies to meet this kind of target so that we can keep our arts at home.

Similarly, with respect to book publishing, I draw to the attention of members an important document called *Out of the West* that was prepared for the Alberta Publishers Association, Alberta Culture, and the Writers Guild of Alberta in March 1986. I won't go through this in detail. I'm sure the minister is well aware of all that's in here. What we know is that where properly fostered, publishing and writing can be an important economic stimulator as well. I'm sure the minister will want to respond to any initiatives that he might have in this regard.

There are lots of recommendations in this tome, but on behalf of the Department of Culture I'm even thinking of asking for simple measures like: is the department willing to fund a program to sponsor special bookshelves for booksellers so they can showcase Canadian publications and Alberta publications at eye level? We know that Safeway markets its own products by promoting Lucerne products at eye level and putting other brand name products either well below or well above the average eye level. Of course, being not even five feet, I wouldn't qualify for average eye level, would I? However, I am astute enough to notice that Safeway does that. When I go into bookstores, I don't notice the same sort of thrust being taken by the Department of Culture. I think we might look at little programs — they needn't cost the earth — to aid our arts right here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I have a specific question with respect to cultural development if the minister will entertain it. That is to explain why it is that we're going to see a decrease in the amount of funding going directly to grants. It seems to me that the economic arguments I set forward at the beginning are really important in terms of making a case for at least sustaining our previous levels of direct support to the arts and possibly even expanding them.

That brings me to another section of the minister's department, and that is multiculturalism or, as it is noted in the minister's estimates, cultural heritage. I'll be brief with this. I again want to make the case that we need a strong focus in the department's Act itself and in the objectives of this division so that we can actually be talking about not just restoring old buildings or making sure we've kept pictures of things that have happened in the past, or even nice — and I think worthy — scientific programs like the Canada-China Dinosaur Project and that sort of thing, but actually going into a more outreach type of capacity with respect to multiculturalism. I believe we can do more than promote something like Heritage Day. By either bringing in a mandate to this section of this department or creating a separate mandate for multiculturalism, we can make multiculturalism more three dimensional and less of just another song and dance.

The minister is aware of the types of programs that we could be doing with respect to even things like English as a Second Language and working with the Minister of Labour with respect to professions and occupations in ways that might affect those who have had their professional training from abroad and that sort of thing. It's not a critique of the amount of money that's being spent. It's more how we are spending it and for what purpose. Can we not define

those purposes, make them clear, and get a public consensus on this matter?

On that point I think I will take my seat and listen to the minister's responses.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member had extensive remarks, and I'll try as best as possible to go through those item by item. One art that I don't particularly have is writing well, so if I misinterpret them . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. ANDERSON: My colleagues are well aware of my particular idiosyncracies.

First of all, the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands dealt with what she perceived to be a lack of objectives in the Act governing the department. I suppose there's a case there, though generally speaking, with respect to all departments of government, we create our objectives and define our goals based on what's possible in any given year and try and establish those directions and programs here in government. Sometimes a general outline and direction is helpful in an Act for a particular department in the long run. If she has specific suggestions in that respect, I'd be happy to take a look at that and consider it. I don't think that's an unreasonable suggestion. However, I'd hate to get so restrictive in objectives in Acts that you aren't able to be flexible with respect to programs you are trying to develop or respond to at a given time. So that flexibility would be a primary goal in any changes that might be considered.

Second, the member dealt with the percentage of the budget in a different way than I had dealt with it. I don't know who it was, but one of those vague, ghost-like wise men said, "There are lies, dam lies, and statistics." I suppose we could argue those all night. There is no question, however, that Alberta's per capita spending is higher on average by far than most other provinces. We can talk about GNP; I understand it's about average if you take GNP. The percentage of a provincial budget I think is a very — with due respect — specious argument, because what we do there is say, "Gee, because you're spending so much in health care, you have a lower percentage in culture, or so much in social services and you have a lower percentage in culture." I question statistics in that respect, but we can argue those all night and I'm sure we'll argue them from time to time in this House. So I won't dwell on that for any great length of time.

I would completely agree with the economic impact of the arts that the hon. member talked about. There's no question that the spin-off effects in terms of the arts are positive in an economic sense. I dealt with some of the dimensions in terms of the historical resources division with the Tyrrell Museum and the whole move towards the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump. But the case the member appropriately points out — and perhaps I should have had it in my opening remarks — can well be made for the arts in general and the development that's there. My deputy minister recently returned from a conference in B.C. where businessmen constantly indicated how they located their businesses where the arts were most prevalent and where that quality of life was there. Not only in terms of its direct spin-off effects but also in terms of the kind of environment, it provides for potential dollars moving in and citizens with capabilities and innovations that might be used by the province. There's no question that the arts do that. That's

certainly one of the reasons, though not the only reason, why this government places the high priority it does on culture.

Money out of the province for the arts: I wasn't sure what the hon. member was referring to there. She mentioned a study but didn't say which study, and I'm not sure what that was about. In terms of our department, I know we do from time to time help our own artists to go out of the province, which I think is essential in terms of giving them that national and, on rare occasions, international exposure they need to properly develop their prominence in the world and the world of culture in particular. I think that's a positive aspect. The member used a couple of examples about sound equipment and so on. I think that's an area we could look at more and are in a number of respects, particularly as it relates to the Motion Picture Development Corporation. Generally, there were a number of issues with respect to film, which happens to be close to my heart. To quite a degree I come from a radio-cum-television film background.

My first official function as Minister of Culture was to attend the Banff Film Festival, which we're heavily funding from the lottery funding we receive in the province. On that occasion I had an opportunity to sit with film producers from France and Germany, who were so enamoured with the surroundings of the province, the quality of the people they met at the film festival, and the abilities there that they wanted to talk further about bringing their productions into the province.

When we talk about economic development and culture, I don't know that those are competing interests. I know they can often be seen that way, but it's not competing in the sense that if you bring in those dollars to produce films, I think you'll be using the talent in Alberta and you'll be developing the industry further, probably in fact initially with specialties in certain areas and then strengthening it to the point where it can compete on an overall basis.

In a general sense I really don't think we should be afraid to have our artists compete anywhere. We have people of high quality and high ability in the province. True, we are in an embryonic stage in the development of some of our specialties and there might be some reason to support them, as we try and do from the government in those initial stages. But I don't know that our people need to be protected in an overall sense from competition anywhere. I think they're capable of doing it, and we have artists of worldwide renown who've been doing that. I only mention one that we've been assisting a little bit in Britain because I know the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands is a fan of hers: K.D. Lang. I read some article at least that intimated that. We continue to try and encourage our people to take their art elsewhere to develop the national reputation so that Albertans will have that.

I kind of mixed up a few of the issues, particularly as they relate to free trade. The member mentioned cutthroat competition, and I'm not sure what that was with respect to, but there's no question there's a legitimate fear in some of the arts community about what's unknown about free trade. I think free trade may well be a boon in many respects to individuals as long as we develop it properly. One of the responsibilities of my office and of our department will be to watch the free trade talks to ensure they don't develop in such a way as to create an unfair situation for Canadian, particularly Alberta, artists with respect to their American counterparts.

But philosophically, I do think free trade can be a benefit to our artists in the long term if it's handled properly. All

of that depends on how those trade talks go in the future, and again we can speculate about those for a long time this evening or any other time. I find it difficult to deal with before we get the ground rules established and some specifics to respond to.

The member talked about long-term commitments to arts organizations, and I recognize there's a problem with the year-to-year grant situation, as there is with any part of government in any of its funding on a year-to-year basis, be it a social agency or an environmental organization. Unfortunately, we make decisions in this House on a year-by-year basis. The budget is developed on a year-by-year basis, and so long-term commitments are difficult if not impossible. We do it and have a long-term commitment of several years, for example, with the Calgary Centre for Performing Arts. We do with the Glenbow museum as well. There are some programs with which that's possible, but when you're dealing with public funds and safeguarding them, there is some difficulty in establishing long-range programs. When you're dealing with volunteer organizations, I suppose because of the nature of the organizations, that sometimes becomes even more difficult, though I realize the member may be talking about professional versus volunteer. I'm not sure. In some cases, and we have to judge that on an individual basis, there is the possibility for that planning to take place.

I was unsure about what the member specifically meant in terms of a percentage of films to be shown in Alberta. At first I thought the member was talking about a law that would require that, and then it seemed like it might be some target goals. I think the latter is not a bad suggestion. If we get an industry developing, we may look at some goals to be achieved and reached. That would be a far more favourable way than again telling Albertans what they have to watch and being in the situation where we are presenting our films with the argument that they might not be good enough if that law wasn't there. So if the member meant goals and objectives, that's a possibility. If she meant laws, I probably would oppose that direction.

Book publishing was mentioned. Indeed, the Douglas report outlines some excellent recommendations which we should consider. This government, it should be remembered, initiated the largest book publishing project in Canadian history, and that of course was the encyclopedia in the anniversary year. That was an \$11 million project, and we provided \$4 million. In this budget as well the member will find there is \$200,000, I believe, for each of the coming three years, this year and two others, in order to update the encyclopedia. I think that kind of move has spurred a lot of other potential activity in the publishing industry. I look forward to discussing various possibilities with the members of that community. In fact, I hope to have a meeting quite soon with the president of the association responsible for book publishers.

I wasn't sure again about the shelves at eye level. I walk into some bookstores and there is a section for Canadian books. I haven't seen specifically Alberta books, but I don't know how the member would have us implement that, whether there would be a law that they have to have this, or maybe she was providing some suggestions. I'm not sure, but I'd be interested in talking to the member about any specific suggestions there might be in that respect. Certainly we want to promote Alberta books as much as possible. Again, our department does have some grants through the foundations that assist developing authors in that regard and try to assist in making sure they're provided

with that base in developing the books they have. We've already dealt with publishers.

Reduction of grants for cultural development: was it development the member wanted or cultural heritage? If it was cultural development, the only reduction that I'm aware of overall is with respect to what we've been giving to the Calgary Centre for Performing Arts and other buildings to develop. If the member had a specific vote, perhaps I could address that to a greater extent. I understood the overall amount of money spent on grants was in fact equal to what was there last year. The reductions we have in the budget relate to the facilities that we're developing, but I could be corrected on that. After I'm finished, if the member wants to give me further information in that respect, I'd be happy to supply the specific answers she might require.

Mr. Chairman, I think I've generally covered most of the questions. At the beginning of my remarks I indicated that my notes aren't in great shape and that I won't be applying at the end of my term of office for a job as a secretary anywhere. I think I generally responded to the remarks and would appreciate from the hon. member, as I would from any hon. member, ideas that are constructive and that can progress the cause we seem to all support in terms of cultural development in the province and would be happy to receive any suggestions along that line.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin my remarks by simply stating that I'd like very much to congratulate the minister for attaining the portfolio of Minister of Culture. I think he will do a remarkable job for the simple reason that having worked with him for three or four years in the past and having served with him on the Select Special Committee on Senate Reform, I have discovered that he's quite a formidable man, really knows what he's doing, makes a terrific study of anything he attacks, and comes out smiling at the end of it like we did last year. Dennis, you did a remarkable job of that, and nobody else in Canada has put a report out like you did.

I want to congratulate him, too, for increasing the funding for libraries. I don't think I will dwell on the finer sections of arts and culture in view of the fact that I presume other people could rather hone in on that and congratulate him and work with him in that respect. I would like to say, though, that in the constituency of Highwood I'm very proud that past ministers have had the good foresight to improve on and take over our railroad stations and build beautiful places for people to develop their culture and enjoy plays and a lot of things that come under his jurisdiction.

The second division that the minister referred to, historical resources, is where I would like to dwell for the simple reason that he's just finished asking for suggestions, and his program delivery mechanism concerns:

Inventory of and research on historical resources; collection and preservation of historical specimens; protection of provincially significant historic sites and localities through cooperation with land management agencies; financial assistance to organizations with compatible aims; public programs to identify and interpret historic monuments, sites and trails; planning, development and operation of direct-access public facilities to display and interpret historical materials . . .

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the minister that I've got all the answers he needs in that department, and I can use every nickel he has allotted to that very thing. For instance, on the road to Turner Valley from Okotoks

in the Highwood district, there is a great erratic that was deposited there by glaciers many hundreds of thousands of years ago. Laying there on the flat prairie are 18,000 tons of rock just to be enjoyed by countless thousands of people who come and visit there year after year. There is no protection for those rocks whatsoever and no significant way you can get onto private property and enjoy them. Mr. Minister, what I'm suggesting is that we buy a little of the property. I think the program is already under way in a sense, yet we're not moving on it very fast. I thought I'd bring it up for the rest of the people so they would realize that I am making an endeavour to buy 20, 30, or 40 acres of that property so that we could enjoy those and preserve them under your department, probably fence them and possibly pave a parkway there so that people can come off the highway in a far safer manner and picnic around the place.

You might even work with the Minister of Recreation and Parks in that department if you wished. Certainly the Minister of Tourism would be more than pleased to lend a helping hand and an ear to the problem. The Minister of Manpower would undoubtedly like to get into the act, as well as the minister of transportation. The minister of transportation is going to widen Highway 7 from Okotoks to Turner Valley. We might as well do this all at the same time so that we don't waste a lot of taxpayers' money in the future when we have to rebuild it or something of that nature.

It seems to me that while he's at it, he might as well come out to Turner Valley, where the interpretative centre really should have been placed in the first place. That's where it all began. That is where the genuine artifacts of the oil business are, Mr. Chairman, and people there are now busily gathering them up. They're hunting up all kinds of material. You'd be surprised at what they've gathered already and the marvelous plans. They have in fact circulated some of their plans amongst the membership. I would think that the minister would like to join me this weekend, since we're on the subject anyway, and get right out there and have a good look at it. There are trails designed for walking. There are roads especially designed and earmarked for car rides, autobus rides, and one thing and another to take the people around and visit this tremendous part of Alberta that not enough of us know about. It's odd. I was actually raised there, so I know all about it; it's like the back of my hand. But I'm sure millions of Albertans and certainly tourists from all over the world would like to visit Turner Valley at some time or another and see how the hard work used to be done.

I would have brought that up this afternoon in my remarks with regard to the gas problems, but we never got that far. For some reason or other there was a standing vote. I was standing here creating it, and it sort of loused up the program. In any event, Mr. Minister, with those few remarks I would like to suggest to you that as quickly as possible we get together with some of the other ministers and really look that situation over. If significant historic sites and localities truly mean something to you, we've got them in Highwood.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could briefly respond to the hon. member's representations. I should say that the citizens of Highwood should be proud of their hon. member not only in terms of the personal experience I've had with him in the past, but he's been a most persistent

and effective advocate in terms of these two projects that he has raised in Committee tonight. Indeed, I know that the citizens couldn't have had a better one in that regard.

With respect to the Okotoks erratic, it has of course been looked at by the department, and we're involved with trying to look after that important historical resource. The problem at this point is with respect to acquiring the land which the member alluded to. We are actively involved in trying to do that. Reaching conclusions on the price of land is always a difficult question, but if that can effectively take place, I'm sure the member would be the happiest among us in that respect. We are working on that question.

In terms of Turner Valley, there is an important historical resource there. I happen to know that the hon. member has a personal past involvement in the industry that's so well represented by our designation of that area and by the involvement we have with the Turner Valley oil field society. The department has been assisting the local society to develop the area, has of course developed the interpretative trail and so on that is there.

Unfortunately, at this point I can't give the member any assurances that funding will be available for further development in the immediate future. I'm sure he appreciates that we have a couple of hundred designated sites in the province, most of which would like significant funding and which we would like to give significant funding to for development. All are very important historical resources; however, budget limitations do restrict that. I look forward to discussing that with him in the future, although I shouldn't raise the expectation that that might be an immediate possibility.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, may I first of all congratulate the minister for undertaking this most important portfolio. As he has informed us, he follows an illustrious sequence of ministers as the department has grown and developed and adjusted to the contemporary situation. I have known and respected the two former ministers and have enjoyed working with them on many projects.

While I've not always agreed with individual programs, Mr. Chairman, I think this government and the former government are to be commended for their initiatives and action to support cultural and heritage activities and heritage preservation in the province. This to me shows a recognition of the need for support and development of our cultural identity, past, present, and future, to create an exciting, beautiful environment to stimulate our senses and to support the creative instincts of the poets, performers, artists, writers, and musicians that lead us. It's also a recognition of culture as a progressive, thriving industry that is proving economically advantageous to Alberta. The presence of cultural influence adds in large measure to our economic development activities and to the tourism industry that hopefully will grow dramatically in the near future.

Arts and culture are not a luxury, never were in my mind, and certainly are no longer thought of as such. The department, to its credit, appears to be holding the line on expenditures this year, and I think that's an important acknowledgment to make.

The minister has already commented on the extensive use of volunteers in cultural activities. We all know how quickly that voluntary input and voluntary dollar compounds in community activities, and arts and culture are certainly a primary example of that. While commenting on holding the line, I think I should caution against any indiscriminate reductions in recession years. We have an increasing need

in our province, in the face of a drab future outlook, for beauty and pleasure of all kinds, to keep a kind of balance. Also, we have need for the industry. Many jobs are already at a relatively low level of remuneration, and gate receipts and attendance are less predictable than before. Perhaps the minister can comment further on any grant reductions or lack of increase in grants and any anticipated impact that will have on jobs or on the lives of artists in our province.

Mr. Chairman, I note that in the Alberta revolving fund revenues are down by \$330,000 this year. I'd ask the minister to respond if I'm right in assuming that this is because of fewer activities and lower attendance and not some change in marketing or upward change in the tariffs charged for the use of our facilities.

I see vote 2 is down overall but not in areas I think of significant support to people. There is a substantial increase in film and literary arts. Perhaps the minister can also comment further, as he already has, on anticipated investment in the years to come in the film industry, which for some 10, 12, or 15 years we've been talking about as a growth sector in Alberta. Hopefully there will be increasing encouragement for spin-offs in this sector.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment about library services, in which I'm particularly interested. I understand they are now at \$4.04 per capita throughout the province and have recently been increased. It appears to me that that's a reasonable amount. We're still in the lower half of provinces across the country, but at least we're not at the bottom any more, and I'm grateful for that. At present the municipal property tax picks up approximately 80 percent of library costs throughout the province, and I believe the province pays the remaining 20 percent. Perhaps the minister can confirm that ratio and how that has changed over recent years.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that consideration be given to indexing the per capita grant for libraries to inflation. Municipalities are desperately in need of library funding. I believe there's a disproportionate importance of library service in hard times. There are many activities for all ages in our libraries throughout Alberta. There are AV, storytelling for the young and old — excellent for individuals and families alike. It's fabulous value for the dollar. The municipalities have expressed to me some uneasiness about their per capita funding with a projected declining population. While they welcomed the increase given last year, there are increasing demands on library services throughout the province. I think it would work a real hardship to Alberta citizens if that per capita were gravely reduced through a reduction in population when the demands and expectations are continuing to increase. To my knowledge, the city of Edmonton has the busiest library system in Canada, closely followed by the city of Calgary. I think it's important to ensure that this information and educational asset of our communities grows and develops with new technology.

Hopefully we can continue with historical resource development. The province is unquestionably young in years but rich in its heritage from native Canadians and pioneers. Mr. Chairman, I stress the fact that things in our province need not be old to be historical. I would hope that that idea, that concept, pervades decisions made in the department, because I believe there are many things that are very new that have historical significance in our province and are still threatened as the province grows and develops.

There is enormous potential in our ethnocultural activities and in our strong multicultural population. It's unquestionably a very attractive part of the provincial background, but it's

also important to us in our potential for international trade. There's a slight increase in our allocation here, and I hope we continue to support the cultural exchange. I don't think of multicultural and ethnocultural activities and events as food, song, and dance, Mr. Chairman, or support to them as only supporting those kinds of activities. I see it as a very important preservation of the best parts of other cultures, of family and community life and business and commercial activity that come from other nations as gifts to our nation and our province, and I believe it must be fostered.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, festivals: a growing and very popular part of the cultural scene, summer and winter. With this development I hope the minister will respond to whether or not the department now has a firm policy for support for such projects. There usually is a very high voluntary component, and it appears that they are attracting ever larger crowds on a regular circuit throughout the country, Alberta being no exception. I believe we have not only a growing interest and growing demand in festivals but superb skills in organizing and producing them throughout rural and urban communities in our province — again, a cultural industry that can produce considerable economic gain. Hopefully, we will foster an aggressive exporting of the arts of Alberta, not just artists and performers and works but also our skills in technology, production activity, marketing, and all of the ancillary businesses that we have developed.

Mr. Chairman, I see arts as a utility. It used to be that for industry the utilities were gas, water — available and cheap resources. Nowadays culture, education, and recreation are the new utilities that are absolutely essential to attract and nourish new industry in our province. It's an important investment, and I support it.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the hon. member that I didn't catch some of the details of her questions; however, I would commit that when reviewing *Hansard*, I will try to respond in writing, if not in the House, to questions that have been asked by the hon. member and others that I might miss this evening by my notes and other things that are going on.

The member started with a suggestion that there not be an indiscriminate reduction in terms of the cultural component, that that not be lost at a time of economic restraint, and I would share that feeling. I think we're all committed to culture. It does become easy at times for some people to suggest that that be the first area to be done away with when there are difficulties, but the level of commitment that is evident in this budget I believe shows that this government is not inclined in that direction. That isn't to say, of course, that should there be a need for an overall reduction of budget because of income, we wouldn't have to shoulder our share. But I share the member's hope — and I see myself as the advocate of culture in the cabinet and in the caucus — that that won't be a substantial problem, and I don't believe that it will because of the commitment of the government to this area.

The member talked about the revolving fund and the reduction that has taken place there. Interestingly, there has been less liquor consumed at our auditoriums, which I suppose is a positive factor in terms of the money that goes into that revolving fund and through it. There have been to some degree fewer people at the auditorium, particularly of course the Jubilee Auditorium in Calgary since the opening of the Calgary Centre for Performing Arts, although the reduction has been much less than we anticipated, and there

is still quite a demand for the use of that auditorium, an increasing one in some areas at some times of the year.

The member also — as did the Member for Edmonton Highlands — talked about the film industry and asked generally, I believe, about plans in that area. It is an area in which I plan to spend a fair bit of personal time, in part because I know it and believe there is a developing industry there that we can assist, perhaps to an even greater extent than we have in the past. I'd like to see us as a department spending a lot of time with the Motion Picture Development Corporation in the other department and indeed with ACCESS, which I worked with for a number of years. It does utilize the talents of a lot of Alberta artists in that area. I think we are developing quickly and we need to look at an overall direction. Before I took over the department commissioned a study on film which we now have and are trying to develop a response to. It's my hope that sometime in the future months — let's say over the next six months maximum — we should be able to put out to the film industry a package of suggestions for direction based on the report that's been done, our department's response, and hopefully economic development's as well. So I'm looking forward to working heavily in that area and forwarding the excellent work that's been carried out in the past.

The member dealt with library services and I believe asked a couple of specific questions which I didn't get down, and I'll review *Hansard* on those and respond to them. Generally, with respect to library services, of course we've started to move toward a regional library system. We've developed the basis for that, the availability of capital funding in particular, but funding in general will be a major factor in how quickly that evolves. But it is still a direction of the department, and we continue to try and provide library services as they're needed through the province.

The member dealt with the indexing of grants to libraries. I guess indexing is a question we deal with in all areas of government and a difficult one, because while there's logic to that in all respects, the problems with inflation, the budget, and the income that we have are always difficulties. So I don't know that that one would be easily accomplished, but the principle is hard to oppose.

The member alluded to cultural exchanges — I, too, think those are positive and we should continue to encourage those — and asked questions with respect to festivals. I wasn't sure if she was alluding to the heritage festivals which we'll see taking place this weekend, because she began talking about the cultural heritage area, or whether it's arts festivals, jazz festivals, that sort of thing. In both areas we provide significant assistance. With the former, the heritage festivals, we're providing assistance to in excess of 50 organizations throughout the province for those that will be held this coming weekend. In terms of others like the Edmonton jazz festival, we've again provided significant amounts of money. It does vary with the project and is dependent on the kind of initiatives the volunteer and professional organizations in a given area have developed, but in that respect I should mention that generally speaking the government and my department try to respond to volunteer initiatives or the initiatives of local communities with respect to development. That really goes throughout the department, from historical resources on through to the cultural development end. So to a very great degree the priorities in developing those programs are determined by the people of Alberta.

Those are the notes I was able to read. I should mention that I've known the hon. member for some years and

appreciate her suggestions and look forward to working with her in this House. My thanks for the initial indications that she made in her remarks of general support for the government's direction in the cultural area.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have just two areas of concern, so I won't take too much of the committee's time. First of all, I'd like to mention that I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to work with the minister on Senate reform. I saw the thorough and responsible way he conducted his deliberations, and I saw that if implemented, the results he brought out would benefit all Albertans. I know he will carry out his services in his present capacity to the benefit of all Albertans. I know he will do it in the same thorough and responsible fashion.

I was going to speak basically on libraries, but I want to touch on the cultural area. I hear it mentioned quite often; the minister mentioned it too. He mentioned something about the Ukrainian Easter egg and something about protecting all cultures, but there is one culture I want to draw to his attention which I feel has never got recognition for the contribution it has made to Canada and to society generally. It's gone too long without getting the full credit it deserves. I hope the main thrust of his cultural activities for the next four years will be to raise the public awareness of the contribution of the Irish to Alberta and Canada. I just wanted to get that across.

Now on to libraries, which I really want to talk about. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, in times of restraint the first thing they cut is libraries. They can do without libraries, but they don't realize the important part libraries play in our lives. They're the basis of our school systems; they are the basis of our knowledge. We can go there and gain that knowledge and do it in our own homes at our own time and at our own speed without some great big academic telling us that they're smarter than us and to listen. We can go and read for ourselves. So the libraries make a tremendous contribution. Unfortunately, they do get caught in times of restraint.

In the library area I want to talk in particular about the Parkland Regional library. It makes a major contribution to public schools and to libraries from Wetaskiwin to Didsbury in central Alberta. It plays a major role in the academic activities of the schools. The public libraries rely on it for service, and it gives excellent service. Mr. Chairman, they need a new headquarters building. To underline that, I want to advise the House and the minister too that the present building they operate out of was built in 1959. At that time it served 38 libraries. Today it serves 125 out of that same premise. I might say that the type and extent of the services offered have also increased, practically at the same rate, so it demonstrates that we have a problem of space to provide this tremendous service to that area of Alberta.

This excellent service provided by Parkland is recognized not only by the people in that service area but by areas around it. Only this year requests from the counties of Camrose and Flagstaff were accepted. They added those two counties to the service even though space was cramped at that time. That takes in another major area in the central part of the province. Also presently waiting and asking to be accepted are the city of Camrose and the county of Stettler. There is just no way we can provide that needed service to those areas unless we get expanded facilities.

It is a desperate, urgent need, Mr. Chairman, and I want to draw that to the attention of the minister. If toward

November he finds that a lot of his estimates aren't up to the level of the estimates and he finds a little bit of surplus, hopefully he will start the process to build a new headquarters building for Parkland Regional library. If he can't do it then, hopefully he will make it his top priority in the fiscal year 1987-88.

MR. ANDERSON: First of all, Mr. Chairman, very briefly with the hon. member's initial request that the Irish be recognized to a greater degree than they currently are: I had thought that Brian Mulroney and Ronald Reagan had well established the basis of that ethnocultural group, but he can rest assured that they won't be forgotten in our department either.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the member's articulate, effective advocacy for a building in his area, I appreciate his bringing that to my attention. I will indeed add it to the lists of requests for capital projects that the department has, and I look forward to his advocacy with the rest of our colleagues in that regard. I'm sure the people of the area appreciate that.

MR. ADY: Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to make some comments relative to the estimates of this department. First of all, may I congratulate the minister on his appointment as Minister of Culture. I also wish to acknowledge the contribution his department has made to the furtherance of culture in my constituency. Many things were funded by that department that would at best be difficult to find funding for otherwise or perhaps would be totally lost to us.

I'd like to make note that Alberta Culture has been very helpful and supportive of a project in my constituency that I believe will become a major historical resource available to all the people of Alberta, if we have enough funding left over after we take care of the Member for Highwood's rock collection in Turner Valley. Of course I'm speaking of the Remington Carriage collection in Cardston, which was offered for donation to the province of Alberta last year. This carriage collection was recently appraised at a value of nearly \$1 million. Mr. Don Remington of Cardston has offered to give the collection to the people of Alberta on the condition that the province, through the hon. minister's department, establish a proper interpretive facility in which to display the collection. A study has been conducted on this concept, which included a review of the inventory of horse-drawn vehicles in Alberta, an assessment of the significance of the collection against others in North America, how the era of horse-drawn transportation affects us today, how this interesting story could be interpreted, and what the tourism potential and economic impact of this type of attraction could be upon southern Alberta and the province as a whole.

I found it really interesting to learn that if the Remington collection were amalgamated with other major carriage collections owned by the province, Alberta could shortly create the largest collection and best interpretive program on this subject in North America. This is very important to southern Alberta and all of our province because we would also have an important resource that could be used by Alberta to trap the large tourism market in Glacier Park, Montana. I know that in 1985 there were in excess of 15 million visitors in Glacier Park. Right now we are at best getting just more than 14 percent of these people into Alberta, which is just 18 miles away. I think a major interpretive facility in Cardston could be used as a showcase and capture point that could draw thousands of Americans out of Glacier Park

and then encourage visitation to other Alberta attractions like Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Frank Slide, the city of Calgary, Banff Park, the Tyrrell museum, the city of Edmonton, and other interesting attractions that we have in our province.

The projections are that the Remington facility could draw 180,000 visitors a year and inject into the southern Alberta economy annually some \$2.5 million. This would mean that the facility could pay for its capital investment in less than four years. Not many of our cultural facilities can match that record. The town of Cardston is solidly committed to this concept, so much so that they have recently purchased or obtained options on a \$1 million land base as their contribution to the project. We were fortunate to have the Premier tour the attraction earlier this year. Our understanding was that he was certainly impressed with it, and we were able to have him ride in a carriage. Recently he, along with Mrs. Getty, rode in a carriage in the Klondike Days parade. We certainly look forward to his support for the project.

My question to the minister is: what is the state of the negotiations with Mr. Remington concerning his donation, and when may we expect the hon. minister to visit Cardston and become personally acquainted with the Remington collection?

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, in responding to the hon. member's presentation and questions, I'd say that I have had an opportunity to discuss the Remington collection with him and with other members of the Assembly who believe it is an excellent collection which would indeed provide, as the member has indicated, a one-of-a-kind opportunity for Albertans to visit in that part of the province. In terms of the Department of Culture, I should indicate to the hon. member that this particular collection is high on the priority list. I do so without saying when there might be dollars available to meet that priority, because that has to be established in terms of our discussions with the Treasury Board and our decisions in this House with respect to budget, but it is a priority of the department. It is recognized as a resource which will contribute much, and the member's representations have been most effective in that respect.

In terms of my own personal visit to the Remington collection, I look forward to doing that and hope that will be possible soon. That will to some extent depend on how long this House stays in session, but I'm hopeful that this fall we'll have an opportunity to personally review the collection together and discuss it further. I might indicate that I am meeting within a couple of weeks with members of the hon. member's constituency involved in the collection to discuss personally what is taking place there and how we as a government might assist.

MR. SHRAKE: First, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to congratulate the minister on his new position. I've always thought that when I grow up, I would like to be Minister of Culture, because it's got to be one of the most exciting and challenging jobs going. I'm sure he gets a variety of different foods as he goes to the cultural events and so on.

I do want to make a comment on one program. I really want to congratulate the government on what they're doing with their senior citizen grant program, whereby you can get a \$1,000 grant for a senior citizen organization and you can match up to another \$3,000. The program has

gone well. Within my constituency there are probably more senior citizen groups than anywhere in the province of Alberta, and we have taken advantage of the program. We've bought tables, chairs; we've had barbecue sets; we've got lounge furniture, TVs, video machines, and shuffleboards. Some of them have a little office and they need a copy machine or typewriter. You name it; they have it.

I will point out one problem. Many senior citizen buildings — most of the ones in Calgary Millican — often are not incorporated as non-profit groups under the Societies Act. It has made problems for these groups applying for this grant. We found a way around it. We always get the closest adjacent organization, whether it's the legion or a community association, to come in as our sponsor so that we use their charter. You must have a charter to apply for this grant or you don't get the grant, of course. So that's one I hope he would look at and find a way to change the regulations a little bit in order — if it's Murdoch Manor or a senior citizen building with 364 suites and they've got a senior citizens' social club within the building but aren't registered as a chartered society — to get around that and recognize the fact that they do exist and so on. They should qualify.

I'm very happy with what we have done with the cultural associations. There is more to culture than just our traditional lines of thinking: the ballet or the opera. I do carry season tickets for the ballet; I love it. But we have our multicultural or ethnic organizations. Calgary has the largest number of ethnic organizations in Canada and probably among the world, surprising enough. We have, of course, more than Edmonton, which is . . .

You have your German Canadian Club, which your association did get involved with. We did give them a grant for \$600,000. The Germans, being a little frugal, built the building as far as the money went, and rather than run into the overrun deficit situation, they shut the building down, boarded it up, and went back to raising money. When they get more money, they will build again. But they still have their old building where, surprisingly enough, they still run their German language school. I think they are self-sufficient on that. Then they have all their under groups: the German choir, the Sängermannschaft; the Rot Weiss Karnival Gesellschaft group; their soccer club; the shooting club; and all of these organizations.

But most of our ethnic groups in Calgary that have banded together and gotten all of their groups under one roof have been lucky and successful. They worked hard, but they did get a lot of help originally under the multicultural/recreational grant. Thank goodness the province and the Department of Culture did come out with the community recreation and culture grant. It has helped bail out the groups that got into financial trouble.

In the future I think other organizations will build in Calgary. As it is now, we have the German club. The Dutch Canadian Club has a very fine organization there. They have a choir, dining facilities, dancing facilities, and a library. It's a fine centre. We have a very fine Ukrainian hall. Believe it or not, even the Sikh Temple received some funding from this government. That was a very ticklish one, because we don't fund religion, and with some of these ethnic groups, you cannot separate religion from the culture; it's so tied in. We did find a way for the Sikh Temple. They use this facility. The religious portion of the building was not funded by the province, but a section of their structure was. We ended up measuring the square footage, dividing the cost per square foot, and we did give them a grant toward the cultural portion of the building. I thought that was good.

The Austrian club is doing well. I think we did help the Polish hall a little bit. The Hungarian hall: the Hungarians bought a fine old curling rink and made a very nice cultural centre out of it. It's beautiful; if you ever get a chance to go there, go to the Austrian club for lunch. The Polish hall: they have something that is built like a hall for performances, and it's excellent, sir. The Greek community has been more affluent, and they have a very fine facility there which is tied in with their church. The Italians have a very fine hall in northeast Calgary, and the Italian club has been very active with sports. They ran into problems, and I noticed that the CRC grant, with a little help from the city, bailed them out on that.

Of course, in Calgary Millican you have the Chinese community, Chinatown. It has more organizations in Calgary, even though they don't have the population of, say, the Germans, and every one of them is active. They have Chinese broadcasting, which I think received funding, which was good; the Chinese public school, which gets some help; the Dat Koon Club; the Chinese National League, which is our oldest; Sien Lok Society; Oui Kwan Foundation, which does a lot of work with the seniors; and the Chinese cultural association. Then we have the tongs. For those who don't know what tongs are, they're not something sinister; they are the families. Among the Scottish you have clans; the Chinese have tongs. You have the Campbells and the MacDonalds; in Calgary you have the Gee Tok Tong, which would be a Chinese family.

Anyway, something to look at in the future: these other organizations will eventually require funding. They will want to build a cultural centre and preserve their traditions, their heritage, and I do hope you will be able to assist them basically through the CRC grant program. Some of the groups there are very large, with many thousands of people, and I think they will pull together. There are the Filipinos, Fijians, Ismailis, Irish, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Caribbeans, and the Sons of Norway. We even have our British organization, the order of the empire. The Scots have the New Caladonians. We have the Swiss. In fact, if you ever get a chance, do go to any of the functions that the Swiss invite you to. Half of those people are head chefs throughout Calgary, and you'll never get a bad meal if you go to the Swiss.

I wish to urge you to continue to support multicultural events. I've been to some where you have the Polish chardas, the Ukrainian folk dances, and then you end up with some Scottish highland dancing, Swiss yodeling, folk dancers from India, and you even get a belly dancer thrown in sometimes.

I do want to make a comment or two on the historic sites, as Calgary Millican has more historic sites than any other constituency in Calgary. Of course, one of those is where Calgary began; that's the Fort Calgary site. But as you are requested to declare these a historic site, I hope you will follow the lead of city council, because we have had buildings in the past that were torn down and these were sites that should have been saved. Then we've had people go to extremes on the other side and say, "We want to save this building as a historic site," and the thing was not built until 1958 and had no redeeming features to it. You wonder why are they trying to save this structure. But so far you've declared in Calgary Millican the old fire halls numbers 1, 2, and 6, the old city hall, the YWCA and, of course, legion number I, which used to be a fire hall that had horse stables and the works and is now the number 1 legion — and they are number one.

We've got the fine old sandstone schools which I'm counting on your department to save. That is: Haultain

school, Alexander school, Colonel Walker school, Ramsay school. These are the last and the best of the old sandstone schools that were built in Calgary. Also, we have the old customs warehouse, St. Mary's parish hall, for which I think you have an application or two in, and you will get more. They're trying to get the Calgary ballet to go in there. Surprisingly enough, we are cultured in Calgary Millican. We've got Knox United Church, the dominion bank building, the Burns Building, and quite a number more.

Sir, the one thing I hope you will continue to do is keep the balance between our regular cultural events such as the performing arts. The performing arts is going to cost us a lot of money. There will be a lot of money spent, but in years to come, it will be utilized. But by that same token, I've had visitors from the States. I've taken them out during Stampede week. We went to the German club for a Stampede function. We ended up at the Croatian club. We stopped and had supper at the Austrian club. Along the way we stopped in at a couple of the Chinese organizations. They said, "How wonderful; we don't have this in the States." The reason they don't have it is that they did not get the support from their government. They did not get the encouragement, and they've had the feeling they should blend, all melt together and come out at the end all looking like the same type of sausage, while in Alberta your department has had the wisdom to encourage our cultural groups to retain their traditions, their culture, and it's showing. We have a greater variety in Calgary, and I'm counting on your support to carry on this support.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the remarks by the hon. member, I should not comment on the initial one regarding food and the amount of it that's available to me in this portfolio. I will try and comment briefly on the other points the member raised.

With respect to the senior citizens' grants and the need for incorporation, I appreciate the issue the member raises and realize that it's a difficulty for some groups that don't want to formally incorporate. We do get into a problem with just assessing the grants, though, without some sort of criteria. We have tried, on a couple of occasions that I'm aware of, to give the grant to an associated organization and have it spent on its behalf, and that has caused a difficulty or two in that respect. So if the hon. member has a recommendation that would allow us to solve the problem that he underlined and still makes sure that the public dollars are properly safeguarded and looked after, we'd be more than happy to receive that.

With respect to the member's suggestion about designation of a number of sandstone buildings in Calgary, I look forward to looking at the applications and what community support there is and considering that possibility at that time. On the other point the member raised with respect to support of ethnocultural organizations, I can assure him that this government will continue to place as a high priority and, if possible, an even higher priority, the multicultural aspect of our way of life in Alberta and the importance of it to all Albertans.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise a couple of points in regard to the debate this evening on the Department of Culture. The first thing I'd like to discuss is the funds that are proposed for library services in the province of Alberta. I'm looking at page 34 of the elements book and vote 2.5.2, financial assistance. It indicates there

that the proposed expenditure will be increased 15.7 percent. Given my great use and respect and admiration for the public libraries in the province, I think that's commendable. I would say, however, that some people in the public library system have brought to my attention that they're concerned about the unknown element in terms of funding for public libraries. There was an increase last year, and it looks as if there's going to be an increase this year, but for the previous three years funding levels were apparently frozen, and next year they may again be looking at no increase.

I guess what they're really wondering is if there cannot be some kind of a rationale for consistent funding adjustments in the future. One proposal has been that funding increases to libraries, if there are going to be any, be provided on the same basis as they are to the Department of Education. That seems to me to be a very sensible approach to take. I was wondering if the minister could give us some indication if he'd consider some sort of a guideline for public library funding to give the people in the public library sector some kind of guidance and assurance that funding for public libraries is based on something more than simply a whim or the current political winds blowing.

Having said that, though, I think there is much that is well done in the province in terms of libraries. One thing I'm having some concern about, however, is that generally speaking the level of provincial support for libraries has perhaps decreased over the years to a point where now in many libraries it's in the neighbourhood of 18 percent for provincial support and 80 percent for local support. I'm wondering if that's a similar trend that has been happening to education funding, where more of the load is being taken at the local level as opposed to the provincial level. But I think the basic factor there is: can we look at some kind of a mechanism for funding that says to the people in the public libraries that you can expect to be treated in a manner similar to the people in the basic education sector or in some other logical manner, so that it removes this threat or this apprehension of simply an unknown approach to their funding level in any particular year?

Mr. Chairman, the second item that I want to address to the Culture department debate is to ask the minister if he would have some discussion with his federal counterparts to see if they could not eliminate the recently imposed federal tax on books. The people in public libraries have indicated to us that this is a hardship in terms of their budget and generally a very irrelevant tax as it was introduced to try and deal with the shakes and cedar tariffs introduced by the Americans. It is having a negative impact not only on libraries but also on booksellers. I would ask if the Minister of Culture might take that up with his federal counterpart.

The third item I would like to ask the minister, if he would give us his thoughts here, is on the question of — I'm looking at page 35 in the elements book, vote 2.7, which is film censorship. I see there is an 8 percent decrease proposed for the '86-87 fiscal year. I'd like to know what the basis of that decrease is. It would perhaps also be an opportunity to expand a little bit; many people in our province are concerned about not only films but also the increased distribution of videos and the increasing amount of sexual exploitation and violence in particular that is becoming predominant and common in many of these videos. Is the minister looking at any sort of mechanism for regulating videos as they do for films? Can the minister give us any indication if he has any particular views on this whole question of pornography and censorship and what

Albertans might expect under his leadership as the new minister for the Department of Culture as it regards film and video censorship and pornography regulation in the province of Alberta?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I am responding to the hon. member's remarks. First of all, I do expect to be discussing the tax that's been placed on books with my federal counterpart, hopefully around the ministers of culture meeting which we'll be hosting in Calgary and which I'll be co-chairing with the federal minister in September. That will give us an opportunity to review quite a series of federal/provincial topics, and the member appropriately raises one that may well be discussed at that time.

With respect to the library grants, generally speaking, it's my understanding that grants over the years have increased to libraries rather than decreased, though in recent years there has indeed in most areas been a freeze, as there has been in most government expenditures, in the overall formula provided for library systems. We all wish that more money could be provided in most areas of government. This is one of those. We have to be realistic with respect to the financial situation the province is in, however, and balance the needs we have in the province to meet those expectations that are there.

In terms of censorship, the reduction that is in the budget this year relates primarily to one position being removed, and that was a clerk V position at the Board of Censors. It was part of our overall reduction of staff in the department this year. The function of the board continues to be the same, with four full-time censors who view the films and classify them. I might say that the general philosophy is to classify rather than cut or remove. That's not true in all instances, but in the vast majority, where there is a question, that's the approach that's used. I personally — since the member was looking for a philosophy in that respect — would support that continued direction.

Videos are a difficult question, I know, for a number of people who are becoming concerned about pornography, regardless of how you define that, and its distribution through that system. We're still awaiting the results of some court cases with respect to jurisdiction on that question. As well, there is a definite problem if we try to go into viewing and operating those. The whole availability of video cassettes, how easily they're available, how quickly they move, and the plethora of them which would have to be viewed by censors and classified would require far in excess of the allocations budgetwise that we have at this point for that. So I'm reluctant to get into the area. We are watching it carefully, looking at the court cases involved, and seeing what concerns the public has in that respect, but it would be a difficult area for us to get into in terms of even classifying the video cassettes that come into the province.

I think that deals generally with the questions that were raised. The whole issue of pornography is an important one to our society. I've seen a variety of definitions of the term, so I hate to respond in a general sense without knowing the hon. member's definition of that. Generally speaking, I think all Albertans oppose films or other material which exploit other people or which degrade in any respect. Those would be the two main criteria that I would consider when judging a work to be pornographic or not. There may well be other definitions as well.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to echo the congratulations to our minister and also echo

the fact that any duties he's had in the House before, I have always felt that he did a good job on them.

Mr. Chairman, a very important historical thing happened in Bow Valley constituency on April 19 when we had a sod-turning ceremony for the new Tyrrell building in Dinosaur Provincial Park. Dinosaur Provincial Park up until this time has been a supplier of fossils for the rest of the world. Although I congratulate Drumheller on having the Tyrrell museum, I would like to add that a lot of the fossils that are in the Tyrrell museum came out of Dinosaur Park. But there are fossils all over the world that have been brought out of there. The beginning of the discovery of fossils was in the early 1900s, and in the '20s they literally shipped carloads of fossils from that site that were spread around in museums all over the world.

I'm quite excited about the Canada-China dinosaur group and have followed them up. I've been at several meetings with them. These people are attempting to establish a relationship between the fossils that are found in the Mongolian desert in China and the fossils that are found in Alberta and particularly in our area. Their intention is to set up a display train to advertise the relationship. They've already had bids from museums all over North America and in Japan, China, and Europe. This will be the best advertisement for Dinosaur Provincial Park that I could think of and certainly will bring people to see where these fossils have been discovered. It should do a lot for the tourist industry in Alberta also.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words about some historic buildings in that area. In Dinosaur Park we have the historic cabin of a coloured rancher that was well known in Alberta, John Ware. It is in the park at the present time, and I do know that the Department of Culture feels that it is not related to the dinosaur part of the park and would like to see it removed. Because there were no displays and nothing to show except that people could visit the diggings in the park, the local people feel that the cabin should be left there as a part of what Dinosaur Park has stood for for all these years. I agree with the Department of Culture that it is out of place in that setting, but I also have some compassion with the local people.

We have another set of very historic buildings. They're actually in the constituency of Chinook but immediately north of the park. These are the Mexico Ranch buildings. The Mexico Ranch buildings date back into the 1880s. Lord Beresford moved here from Texas, built up a ranch, and brought cattle in from Mexico. He was killed in a train accident in 1906, and one of the Texans that came up with him homesteaded the site. He left Lord Beresford's personal part of the ranch, where he lived, untouched until Mr. Jackson's death in 1946. These buildings are getting in a very bad state of repair. If they are to be salvaged, it will have to be done fairly soon.

I would like to promote that the John Ware cabin and also the Mexico Ranch buildings be moved to some proper setting within Dinosaur Park but away from where the new Tyrrell building and the dinosaur-related activities will be going on. There is such a setting within the park boundaries in the new overnight camping area. Although I have done some investigation into possibilities of getting these two buildings re-established somewhere in there, it seems there is a problem with the ownership of the buildings and also with the moving of them off the original site. So I would ask the minister to see if there is a way whereby this could be accomplished, either through his department or maybe advise if there are some other ways of having this done.

I want to say a few words about libraries. Some time ago I was the chairman of a municipal library board when the province and municipalities started up the matching grants for library services. We were not involved in the operation of libraries because we had a number of community libraries around the municipality and what our municipal board did was that we got the provincial per capita grant and matched it and then disbursed it among the community libraries throughout the county. This worked out well and was very well accepted and appreciated by all the community libraries.

I understand that since the time I spent on that library board the program has been enhanced. That certainly is a boon to those people. The concern I hear from my constituents at the present time — because they know there, is an austerity program because of the economy of Alberta — is that it will be discontinued. I have assured them that I have not been notified of any discontinuance of this program, but I hear quite often from constituents about that concern.

Mr. Chairman, those were just a few comments of Bow Valley's problems with the Department of Culture. Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could briefly answer the member's remarks. First of all, let me say that the Canada-China Dinosaur Project is something that all members of the Assembly should be aware of, I, too, am extremely excited about the possibility of it. It's in the early stages, but it proposes to have the paleontological resources of Alberta together with similar remains in China brought together on a worldwide exposition. If that could take place, it would be indeed a major taking off point for future activities in that respect from Alberta's perspective.

With respect to the John Ware cabin and the Mexico Ranch building, I am aware that there are difficulties with respect to those two. I thank the member for his representations in that respect and look forward to discussing potential options with him and with the department. Might I say that any decision in that respect will depend very much on the hon. member's input and involvement in that decision.

I thank him for his remarks on libraries generally and assure him that I have no intention and this budget does not reflect a discontinuance of the grants that he was talking about.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin by adding my congratulations to the new Minister of Culture. I wish him every success in the new portfolio. It has already been my pleasure on a few occasions to deal with him. I find him to be very amiable, and he relates well to the concerns I've brought to him.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Department of Culture is a very important department that touches the lives of Albertans every day and in so many ways. Indeed, the Vegreville constituency is one that one tends in many ways to associate culture with because of the way in which the Ukrainian people in Alberta generally but in Vegreville constituency particularly have preserved, maintained, and enhanced their cultural traditions. It gives the area a very special feeling for me. As someone with an English background it was all very new to me when I moved there and was able to feel a part of these traditions, feel welcomed by people. I've just been so impressed by the degree to which not just cultural traditions like dancing and ways of eating and diet and things have been preserved but also a real sense of

history and roots and a sense of belonging. I think that sort of attitude that the minister's department tries to foster, people remembering their roots and maintaining contact with their ethnic backgrounds, makes this province a rich and very vital place socially. We want to be sure that we continue making efforts in this regard.

The activities of the department, as I say, touch people from young to old in many ways. I can think of a number of groups in the constituency that seek and often receive funding from the department. For example, Ukrainian dance groups from Two Hills, a couple of groups from Vegreville, the Sopilka dancers and the Vegreville school of Ukrainian dancing — a couple of these groups have made plans to go to Expo this year and perform there and show off the talents that young Albertans have.

Some hon. members have referred to libraries before. I think libraries are a very important facility in rural Alberta. We want to make sure that people in rural Alberta have many of the same opportunities and resources available to them that urban Albertans do, and I think libraries are one way of ensuring that people have access to educational materials. I am pleased to see the budget commitments to library services, and I hope that can be maintained in the future.

I know there is concern that some of the smaller libraries be able to maintain their autonomy. I suppose there may be some benefit to being able to share books in larger regional groups, but the local libraries want to maintain their own book stockpile, if you will, and their own decision-making at the local level.

We have a number of major cultural activities that go on in the Vegreville constituency. The hon. minister had the opportunity to attend the opening ceremonies of the Pysanka Festival. I was there with him, and it was a very good ceremony and an introduction to what has become just a fabulous annual event, attracting visitors from all over western Canada and the United States.

I'd like to talk briefly about another major cultural and tourist attraction that isn't exactly in the Vegreville constituency but it's adjacent to, and that's the Canadian Cultural Heritage Village. I'm very pleased with the department's commitment of funding over the past number of years to that excellent facility. There's going to be a special day there a week from this Sunday. I'm not sure if the minister will have the opportunity to attend, but I know a number of people from the government will be there, and it will be a special occasion.

I would like to talk very briefly about museums, if I could. I believe this falls under the minister's jurisdiction as well. We'll be attending the opening of the Vegreville museum on Sunday. There is a museum in Tofield. It's a fairly small facility located in the recreation centre. I was able to be with them and help celebrate their 25th anniversary. They're looking at relocating, and I want to ask the minister what kind of funding provisions there are for that sort of thing. The situation in Tofield is that they're just about ready to open a brand new hospital, and it leaves the old hospital building open and available. It's a building that is almost old enough itself to be declared an historical site, and people are wondering about the possibility of locating the museum in the old hospital. Could the minister tell us if there are any funding provisions for that sort of capital acquisition that would enable this museum group to relocate?

I think that sums up my comments, Mr. Chairman. I would like to express my concern to the minister that when

we get into tough times economically, when budgets are tight, people tend to want to cut back on the wrong sorts of things. I know that some school programs — when they're short of teachers or short of funds, they want to look at cutting back on the fine arts type programs. I know the minister will do his best to resist that sort of funding pressure in the future, when we look at budgets next year and the year after. I want to pledge my support to him for maintaining spending in this very important area, because I think we need to enrich our life in every way that we possibly can. When times are tough and we've experienced high unemployment, people need alternatives to help them cope with these difficult times, and often the kind of cultural activities that we can generate in our communities can help provide people with meaningful growth opportunities that may better provide them for pressures ahead.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, might I first thank the Member for Vegreville for his kind remarks and indicate that I enjoyed attending the Pysanka Festival with him in Vegreville, where he extended courtesies which I appreciate.

Most of the remarks the member made were by way of information. In terms of the funding for moving a facility or moving a particular museum, I would have to check and see what might be available in the department. I would undertake to get back to the member in that regard. Mr. Chairman, I don't think the member had other specific

questions. I did, as I say, indicate my thanks for his support of the department for its continued emphasis in Alberta.

I do sense that we might not get to vote on this estimate this evening. Given the hour, I would move that we rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, when it will discuss the estimates of the Department of Education in Committee of Supply.

[At 10:18 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

