

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, May 26, 1987 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 87/05/26

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Bill 11

Historical Resources Amendment Act, 1987

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 11 and would like to, upon introducing this Bill for the second time in the House tonight, make a few remarks which I think will clarify both the reason for the Bill itself and the intent of some of the major sections and therefore the purposes of the Bill as they're defined.

The Bill allows the minister the right to

sell, lease, exchange or otherwise dispose of any archaeological or palaeontological resource . . .

As opposed to what might be thought at a quick and superficial glance at the Bill, the intent in fact is not to open wide the archaeological or paleontological resources of Alberta but rather to make clear in legislation the right of the minister to define very specifically and clearly what can and can't be sold or otherwise disposed of in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why this Bill was brought about at this time is as a result of some fossil-like material called ammonite, or ammolite in its commercial version. When I became Minister of Culture, I will admit to not having known what an ammonite or an ammolite was. However, over the past seven years in the province of Alberta there have been a number of tonnes of that material mined, resulting in pounds of it used for sale in the province and, I believe, out of the province. The material results from a squid-like creature some 75 million years old and is found in great abundance -- in tonnes to be exact -- in the Bearspaw area, around the Lethbridge region in particular, though there are certain ammolite versions or amounts in other parts of the province.

The gem ammolite, as it's called, was determined to be a gem by the organization responsible for those things in 1982 and has been for sale in limited quantities. In the past, the company that's been doing that -- the company currently in existence, and there were several others -- did it under a permit from the government of Alberta. That ability of the government to determine whether or not sale is allowed has now been questioned, and this Bill will clarify that.

Because of the resulting regulations, we will be able to control in a very detailed way, even to a greater extent than has been in the past, how that material is mined, what restrictions there have to be to do that, where it can take place, and indeed what material can or cannot be taken from the ground in Alberta. We believe very strongly in preserving those paleontological resources and archaeological resources which are so important to Albertans. This Bill will allow us to develop the regulations to do that.

I may say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I intend in regula-

tions to appoint an Alberta paleontological advisory committee that, when established, will vet all inspectors, appraisals, and the establishment of a control list for any materials which might be considered for disposition in Alberta. It is our intent not to have anything on that control list at the current time except for this substance called ammonite or ammolite and to have all excavations and mining of that carefully done within regulations that will be determined.

There will be no archaeological resources on that control list and therefore no archaeological resources allowed for sale outside of the province or in, though we may from time to time, as has been the case in the past, allow universities to hold archaeological collections or museums or other institutions of that sort or on the odd occasion possibly exchange such materials with other provinces or countries, depending on whether or not that is advisable in maintaining the history and developing the resources which we require for the museums of our province.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of this Bill changes slightly the composition of the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation board of directors. In the past that board has had nine members, six of which have been appointed by order in council and three of which have been elected by a small membership which subscribes to the foundation. That is an anomaly; no other foundation I'm aware of has an elected portion of that board. The original reason for that, according to my research, was that the foundation was originally envisioned to be a body which would be structured by government and have input by government but which would in fact get its funds, which it would expend, from private sources outside of government. In fact, that has not taken place over the years, and the funds to the foundation itself are exclusively from the lottery funds which are allocated to it by this government.

In keeping with the principle that the funds we have on behalf of the public of Alberta must be safeguarded by us, we will be appointing those members of the board if this provision of the Act is passed, thereby ensuring that the democratic process through the elected representatives in this Assembly is working properly. By doing this, Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way want to imply that members of that board, including those who have been elected from time to time by that small membership base -- which is about 1,200 people and which has in the past had a mail-in ballot, in which last time just upwards of 300 participated -- have not been dedicated to the historical resources of the province or not contributed a great deal.

In fact, the recent elections which saw three people elected to that board will see those three people remain on the board for the two-year term which they're elected to, even with passage of this particular piece of legislation. But I think it is important, first, that we be consistent in our legislation and this will make it consistent with other boards and foundations, and second, that the people of Alberta in total rather than just a small membership base, through their elected representatives, ensure who their trustees are. This piece of legislation will accomplish this.

I might say that the membership of the foundation has in the past provided good input, and we look forward to that continued input and to assisting the foundation in finding other ways in which the membership may be even further involved in the future. The foundation plays an important role in the preservation and the development of historical resources. It is, Mr. Speaker, the smallest of our boards, and it's why we have allowed for up to 11 members rather than the nine which there currently are, so that should it require additional expertise in their adjudication of grants or their development of programs, those two additional

people might be appointed as well.

Mr. Speaker, those are my introductory remarks on Bill 11. I would look forward to any comments hon. members might have and be happy to try and answer any general questions when I sum up or of course detailed questions when we reach committee stage of the Bill.

MS BARRETT: I might be the first taker. Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that I can't support the minister either in his reasons for or in his support for second reading of Bill 11, the Historical Resources Amendment Act, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, in sponsoring at second reading, the minister observed that one of the important reasons that we agree to this Act is that, after all, Alberta has been blessed with this special product called ammonite or ammolite. It's true; I didn't know anything about it until the minister introduced the Bill, but I have since checked, and it is not exactly what you would call a precious gem.

The minister says we've had tonnes of it mined and pounds of it sold. Now, if it's supposed to be a revenue-bearing product for the benefit of all Albertans, I'm not sure how much revenue we're going to get when pounds of it are sold in the first instance. But in the second instance, if we start mining it in massive quantities, I'm sure members of the Assembly would recognize that that would have, in the world of supply and demand, a downward pressure effect on the price it accrued. I'm not so sure it's so important. It ranks, according to one gemologist with whom I spoke just a few moments ago, in the order of less than topaz in terms of value. It is not particularly unique or particularly important. Probably it will never be designated to the status of a diamond, emerald, or ruby.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister says that the convenience of this Bill is that it will allow government to design regulations to allow for the excavation, selling, leasing, or otherwise disposing of this particular product. He said that after he noted that it's been mined and sold ever since 1982, since it received the designation as a gem. If we managed to get along all this time without changing the very nature of a very important Bill and by allowing those people to extract it under order in council, I don't understand why we can't carry on to do so.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to a matter of convenience, this government has no problem passing orders in council ad infinitum, spending hundreds of millions of dollars, appointing everybody they want to anything they want, and suddenly, when it comes to this particular not-so-important gem, we now have to change an Act. The minister says he's prepared under regulations -- if he's prepared under regulations, I challenge him to do it in legislation -- to appoint a paleontological committee which would oversee or make recommendations as to the extraction of this poor old 75 million-year-old creature from the ground. That's very interesting, and I think that's an important step. In fact, he might want to do that in any event.

But then he went on to say that we shouldn't worry about any archaeological problems because nothing archaeological is going to be disturbed or affected by this Bill. If that's the case, then I expect the minister to come forth with his amendment in committee in which "archaeological" is removed from all of the amendments contained herein. If not, then I know there is a secret and hidden agenda.

Now, having made the case for continuation of the former procedures which were to allow, by order in council, special designation for an area to be bulldozed or otherwise dug up subject to the provisions of the Bill -- which help ensure Albertans

not only of the aesthetic and scientific importance of what still exists beneath the ground but in the long run even helps promote our tourism industry -- I would argue that that's the way we continue to proceed with the digging up of historical fossils that exist throughout Alberta. Then the minister says: "Gee, you know, when it comes to changing that board, I really would like to bring it in line with the other foundation boards. They're not elected ever; they're appointed, so what the heck." Well, if you want to make any changes, Mr. Speaker, the way to do it is to make government more open and allow the other foundation boards to have some elected members. That's the way to improve things.

Now, it seems to me that what we've got here is a government that is consistently and more persistently engaging in siege mentality so that everything has to be under direct control of the government, or else you never know, things might fall apart, democracy might actually occur, people might have dissenting views, they might learn how to develop consensus and good policies might result. I think the way to go is to make sure that all of the foundations have some elected members so that in fact democracy does work, and it isn't just a government appointing puppets -- well, maybe perhaps for purposes of patronage -- to boards it chooses.

The people who have been elected to this board over the years by what I believe is more like 2,000 members -- perhaps not in the last election, but I believe that the membership of the foundation is more like 2,000, not 300 -- have carried some pretty important and good credentials with them. And I'm not so sure that the government appointees are going to be anything other than laypeople who have nothing more than perhaps at most a passing interest in either archaeological, paleontological, or other historical resources of the province of Alberta.

For example, one of the currently elected members, Dr. Jamieson, is a respected professor at the University of Calgary. He's the president of the Association of Preservation of Technology, and he's the co-chair of the International Council on Monuments and Sites. Now, those are pretty important positions that he occupies. It's pretty clear that he has the ability to assess, on objective merits, designations of various description and to be a useful policy adviser to the board.

Now, if we can't get people like this on the board and if the government is going to insist on appointing its buddies regardless of their ability to be civil, then how are we going to ensure that this board is really serving the public interest for which they are going to be paid, Mr. Speaker? That's what I'd like to know.

It seems to me that the other effect of taking away those three elected positions from the foundation is what amounts to disenfranchising the board itself, the foundation itself. Those people -- and I know because I got my little invitation to resubscribe, too, for \$5 a year to get the little newsletter that comes out. What are they going to get for \$5 a year? They don't get a vote. They don't get a say. They don't get anything. They get a little newsletter. Well, it doesn't mean a whole heck of a lot, Mr. Speaker. What means something is having the ability to use their expertise and their genuine personal interest to participate in the decision-making process of a body which is funded by lotteries in this province and which is sanctioned by the government. I don't think that's an unreasonable request at all.

Then I hear that there's an excuse now for changing the membership from nine to 11. As if appointing all of them isn't enough, they've got to increase the board now. Oh, come on.

That cannot be anything but the newest way to make sure that buddies of the government, who will go along with government inclination on whatever issue pertains to historical resources, will govern that body and make sure the government will occur, despite objections which may arise from the outside.

Mr. Speaker, it's not as if the government doesn't control this body already. It already appoints the majority of the members. Having a few elected allows for the proper dynamic of consideration, particularly from a learned perspective, of issues that are important to this province. You don't think it's important to this province? I point out that the Tourism minister constantly tells us in this Assembly just how important tourism is. and I hear the Member for Drumheller frequently talking about the Tyrrell museum and how important that is not only to the history of Alberta and to the scientific knowledge of Alberta but also to the tourism industry as thousands of people pass through and thousands more are expected to pass through.

When the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump interpretive centre opens -- where people can look at real bones and real arrowheads and real historical resources dug up carefully by archaeologists who know what they're doing and who aren't simply out with bulldozers in pursuit of a gem that is hardly a gem -- they're going to attract even more people to that museum. It's a very special thing that we've got here in Alberta. The Canada-China Dinosaur Project wouldn't even have been considered if Alberta didn't have some very precious historical resources underneath our ground.

I think that when we change a Bill to allow the wholesale excavation of territories of this province -- subject to limitations which may be set out and which may not be set out; subject to limitations which may say, "Well, you can't go in a particular territory, but everything else is open; it's a free-for-all" -- it's inviting danger. When you send people in who are in pursuit of one little item only -- that is, that thin, little, wee layer that you can extract ammonite from -- what do they care if they're knocking through grounds which hold remains of creatures that we don't even know about yet? What do they care if they accidentally knock through, break, and completely ruin ancient Indian artifacts? Do they care about the history? Do they care about the development? Do they care about the scientific information? Is that going to be their priority? Is that going to be in the regulations, Mr. Speaker? I don't think this is a light Bill; I think it's one of the most important ones we're dealing with in this sitting.

Now, when it comes to the importance of the Historical Resources Foundation, having lived in a house at one point which was designated by that board. I happen to know a little bit about the importance of the designations and how they go forward. I think it's all too easy to bow -- that's the word that's on the side of Edmonton Centre, by the way -- to progress, whether economic or other, in the name of disposing of historical sites which are of importance to the people of Alberta. Now, just a few days ago, what do you think happened? The last art deco building from 45 years ago got disposed of with the wrecker's ball on the corner of 82 Avenue and 109 Street: the Varscona Theatre. It's bowing to progress, Mr. Speaker. I think there is going to be a new Canada Trust building or something going up. I'm sure it will be full of concrete and glass just like the rest of them.

I remember fighting this very fight personally -- what was it; 15, 17 years ago? -- in attempting to save the old Post Office. I note every time I pass by Edmonton Centre, on the east side of it, a little plaque in the Woodward's section that says we honour

the old Post Office which so gracefully bowed to progress in Edmonton some 15, 17, or 18 years ago. And now there is talk about kind of reconstructing part of the facade of that beautiful old building in Sir Winston Churchill Square. Well, what good does that do, Mr. Speaker? We don't have the building anymore.

Now, it seems to me the same is true for the Tegler Building. I mean, what were the kind of pressures that gave in there? And the old Eaton's warehouse; there's another example. Well, now we'll have another, you know, Ghermezian monstrosity built down there instead. Now that. . .

MR. EWASIUK: And the courthouse.

MS BARRETT: And the courthouse, thank you. The Member for Edmonton Beverly reminded me of the courthouse. I also liked that building in particular, although I understand that one did have internal structural problems.

I refer the minister to a 1981 document created by the department which he now heads. It's called Financing of Historic Resources in ALBERTA. It's a study prepared for the Minister of Culture by C. Les Usher, special advisor to the Minister of Culture. And this is volume II of a two-volume set dealing with financing within the department. I refer the minister to a number of recommendations which have either not been acted upon or have not been sufficiently acted upon to ensure that Albertans continue to have access to the historical resources which we either built ourselves or which we inherited from history. I particularly would point out the recommendation that refers to the provincial government that says that

there be specific provision in either The Municipal Taxation Act or The Municipal Tax Exemption Act to allow for policies of property tax benefits to encourage historic resource preservation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, doesn't it seem -- well, I guess I can't ask you that question. Doesn't it make more sense to advocate policy development in this area and make sure that we are able to preserve our historic resources than to come in with a Bill like this that amounts to no more than government board gerrymandering by a government that is apparently suffering from a massive siege mentality?

In B.14, for example, it recommends that there be added to the present criteria for provincial designations, through an amendment to The Alberta Historical Resources Act, that structures are collectively important: (i) in the sense of belonging, (ii) the intangible loss and sense of loss, and (iii) the consideration of social impact.

Wouldn't we be much wiser to be pursuing developments in this kind of area than we are by saying, "Let's take out the bulldozers and roam through Alberta in pursuit of this one little gem that will never make the government as much money as selling matches would" and make sure that Albertans continue to have not only the historical resources that we have inherited but also the access to the democracy which ensures that those people who take a particular interest in those resources have a say in how the things are going to go?

The minister may respond by saying, "Well, I'm a nice guy; I'm open to phone calls and letters." And you know what? The minister is a nice guy, and he is open to phone calls and letters. But the board itself is going to have an awful lot of power, and if that board itself is comprised of laypeople, all of whom happen to think exactly the same way, then I'm not so sure we're

going to get the sort of discussion that's good for Albertans, good for the archaeological and paleontological preservation of this province, or good for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I think the minister would do very well to rethink this Bill and to, at very minimum, amend it. My recommendation is drop it; let it die on the Order Paper and live with those cumbersome orders in council that we've been living with since 1982 and live with that little bit of democracy and use it as a shining example of how other foundations and other boards of this government can start to embrace people who aren't just their political buddies. I think that's the very best thing we should do with this, but at very minimum, this needs a lot of amendments. I hope that at committee stage the minister is prepared to provide amendments on the basis of my comments, and provided that we don't get to committee stage tonight, if he doesn't, I will.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A thought occurred to me as I listened to the minister and my colleague from Edmonton Highlands. It seems to me that what the minister has done here is give himself a blank cheque, when in fact he didn't really need one. If he really wants to deal with the ammolite problem, why didn't he specify so in the Bill and ask this House to debate that particular issue and say yea or nay to allowing him to allow somebody else to dig this substance out and sell it? Why did he have to give himself a blank cheque to allow the sale of anything that he might want under the title of archaeological or paleontological resource? It doesn't seem to me that he needs a blank cheque, and certainly I don't see any reason why we should give it to him.

It would mean that he could sell off any one of a number of items without having to come back to the House for permission. Items in those categories, historical items, should not be so lightly disposed of. I'm not saying that this minister necessarily would, and that's usually been the claim. I remember last year when we were rewriting a lot of the departmental Bills. Every time we came to the part where ministers could make grants, it was always a total blank cheque. The minister could make grants for anything and for any reason whatsoever and to anybody he pleased. There were never any guidelines or idea of some sense of purpose or direction for those grants as to what their purpose might be or why one might do it or what limits there might be on that.

It's the same kind of mentality that's exemplified in this Bill, and I suggest that the minister doesn't need that kind of blank cheque. Why doesn't he be specific and say, "This is exactly what we want to do, and this is why and how and where and when"? Maybe we'd agree to it and maybe we wouldn't, but at least we'd discuss specifically that particular item and not have everything else on the auction block.

MR. PIQUETTE: I also rise to speak against Bill 11. I think the member indicated a very good reason. I think it's really a blank cheque, and I speak on behalf of a lot of the native communities of Alberta who are very much afraid of this Bill, that it would give to the minister too much leeway in terms of declaring what is to be sold archaeologically outside the country or even in terms of what they are attempting to reclaim as to what was exported in the past to other countries or museums.

I really don't understand why this Bill, if it is to do with this

mineral ammolite that has been mined -- why specifically the minister did not make that into the Bill, if it was necessary to even put that into a Bill. Perhaps it could have been handled by an order in council instead. I think a lot of our people in native communities are quite concerned that there has to be perhaps a hidden agenda behind this Bill. Listening to his arguments -- and I'd like to believe what he's saying -- I really think that when we're talking about Bills here, we're not just talking about this particular minister. We're putting in place precedents and a Bill which will be enacted by other ministers. They might not be as conscientious about archaeological definition and the exportation of these archaeological articles as you are. So I think you have to also -- the minister should be very careful in the sense that his Bill might be putting in practice here something which is going to be very dangerous to the future preservation of these artifacts.

We know already that without that kind of protection in the past native artifacts have been sold to foreign museums and to foreign countries, and there has been no protection whatsoever. When we have a minister, basically, on blind faith and we trust that he will be the safeguard of these artifacts, it is really stretching ourselves to the outer limit of our confidence in any individual to make those decisions.

I really would ask the minister to reconsider this Bill very, very carefully, because when this Bill was created, I really don't think the minister was looking at the overall implication that it can create in the future.

Of course, the other section of the Bill would create this board to be a totally politically orchestrated body. I think we have too many of those already, and I think government boards really should not be simply order in council appointments. They really should be independent boards which operate looking beyond party politics.

Just like after the election. For example, in my constituency when various community groups applied for funding under the recreation and wildlife funding, the first three or four presentations that the M.L.A. had, I was given the right to make those presentations. All of a sudden somebody intervened from the government that opposition M.L.A.s, I guess, are not duly elected people and don't represent their constituency, and the administrator of those funds was told to no longer allow the M.L.A. to even have any knowledge of those kinds of fund approvals in their constituency. That really smacks to me as a dictatorial, totally partisan type of approach.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, that's hardly related to this Bill, unless you've got a succinct [inaudible].

MR. PIQUETTE: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it does pertain to what we're speaking about here because when we're having boards which are appointed totally by government and only responsible to government, they really have the partisan nature in terms of the administration, and I really don't think that community groups are going to be making application to these boards. They should be totally impartial. And I can't see the purpose of why we have to have the government seemingly wanting to interfere or to control these boards by only appointing the kind of people that they want to see sit on these boards, which very often can be politically motivated or orchestrated to approve or not approve based on political parties and which could be a part of discrimination which can be built in to a lot of these situations.

So I really think this Bill 11 is a very dangerous Bill. It has

built in a lot of mechanisms which are going to be behind-the-scenes negotiations and decisions, which are not going to be open to democratic rule of government because one individual, one minister, without being responsible to the total House here, can make decisions independent of the wishes of many, many people. Government does not mean that by being in government, you have the right to dictate, to make decisions in isolation, or to use government boards, for example, or committees to basically decide totally on partisan types of politics.

I would urge the minister to withdraw this Bill or to make the necessary amendments to this Bill because it will not be easy passage if, when we return to committee, some of these changes are not made. I think we have heard here Opposition arguments which are very logical, which make total sense in the reasons why we oppose this Bill in its present form.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have similar concerns about this Bill. Perhaps the most apt description I might give with respect to it is that it reflects overkill. It definitely gives too much power to the minister to dispose of the archaeological and paleontological heritage of our community.

There is far too much focus, I would submit, in this government on economics unbalanced by values. We have seen that in the disposal of our forestry resources in recent times, the logging of 350-year-old forests, the sale of our grazing leases for reasons that are undefinable, the allowance of drilling of gas wells outside of Waterton park. All of these initiatives, Mr. Speaker, remind one of Oscar Wilde's definition of a cynic as a person who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing.

This Bill leaves open similar possibilities, perhaps not by this minister by intent, but ministers have a habit of changing. The legislation definitely needs more controls if it is to be a viable and supportable piece of legislation. An example of one type of control that one might envisage -- and I don't suggest this as being definitive -- but one form of control might be to stipulate for the recommendation or approval of the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation as it is currently constituted rather than in its newly envisaged form. Whatever limits are provided, much more are definitely needed, and what we have in this piece of legislation is open season on our resources.

The second concern I have is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Drumheller.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The second concern I have is with respect to the proposed change in composition of the Historical Resources Foundation. It's refreshing to see the limited form of participatory democracy and objective input of members elected by the foundation as is presently provided for. The members are in fact truly interested in preserving the history and the artifacts of our community. They provide a balanced view, a view which is particularly balanced in relation to appointed representatives, who amazingly and invariably seem all too often to be government party stalwarts generally eager to go along with the government initiatives. Otherwise, they would be likely to suffer the fate that we have seen in Mr. Elson, the former head of the waste management corporation.

This Historical Resources Foundation is not an entity which is being established to make decisions of a political nature, in which perhaps more political input might be required. Rather,

the foundation reflects the values of our community. It should have some independence. Total independence is certainly too much to expect of this government, but a modicum of independence is not too much, and we should demand no less. So I would speak against this as not being sound legislation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the . . . Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments to this Bill tonight are not directed to this particular individual incumbent who is serving as Minister of Culture, so they're not to be taken personally either. Nonetheless, this Bill in front of us provides tremendous powers to the Minister of Culture in order to dispose of archaeological and paleontological resources -- not a few of those resources but any of those resources. It doesn't put any limit, Mr. Speaker, on the terms or conditions under which he might dispose of it. This Bill says that the minister may dispose of these on any terms which he considers appropriate.

Well, in view of the purpose of this Bill, I listened very carefully to the explanation given by the minister because I take the attitude that if something's in front of us, it's to solve a problem. For some reason there's a problem and this particular or any individual piece of legislation is intended to solve that particular problem. So I listened to what the minister had to say. He indicated that in Alberta there's a gemstone called ammolite or ammonite which is being mined and which some persons would like to perhaps exploit to a greater degree than they do at present. So I listened to that. I presumed that that is the problem this Bill is intended to serve. But then I look to the solution that is being proposed, and it doesn't match the problem that the minister expressed to us tonight. It says that any resource can be disposed of on any basis which the minister wishes. It goes far beyond the reasons presented to the Legislature tonight.

Now, I don't know why the minister chose -- he had lots of time tonight to explain all of the situations this Bill might be designed to deal with, but that was the one he mentioned. Now, it raises lots of questions then as to what other situations might arise in which this Bill would apply which he didn't mention. And it begs for me the question as to why he didn't mention those other reasons or those other problems, because he could have quite easily added a definitions section in the first part of the Act that would define this particular gemstone and then add a section later on in the Act that would give the minister the direction to regulate and control the excavation and disposition of that particular gemstone. If that were the problem being solved, there are other ways that he could have constructed this piece of legislation to solve that problem, and the question has to be answered why he didn't pursue those other options.

But it raises further concerns, because in giving over to the minister such all-encompassing powers, it asks or begs the question: what appreciation is there reflected in this Bill and in this Act as it might be amended for the rich archaeological and paleontological resources of this province? Because these are not just the resources of Alberta. If we want to think about them as the wealth of a very unique resource, it is on a world-class scale something located in Alberta for which we are by coincidence or fate or whatever the stewards of those resources. And so it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if there was an appreciation for the wealth and richness of the resources in this province, this Bill would reflect a sense of stewardship for those resources beyond what we would invest in the individual minis-

ter of this department. So this minister would put in place certain provisions to ensure that those archaeological and paleontological resources are protected not only for Alberta, not only for Albertans, but for the rest of the country and, because of its particular uniqueness as a world resource, for all of us.

So I would have looked to this minister to bring in perhaps a much more extensive review process, prior to the issuance of any removal permits or prior to any sale or lease or exchange or disposal of these resources, some independent body that would review those applications and in that way provide the opportunity for an independent or a quasi-independent body to advise the minister or even to have some sort of quasi-statutory review process so that these permits to remove such resources would not be as easy to get as they would be if these powers are vested only in the minister. In that way we would be putting in place some safeguards, not for this minister or for this particular term of office of this government but for the future, to ensure that these resources in the future for some short-term reasons are not disposed of too quickly, too easily, and lost not only to Alberta but lost to Canada.

I know that when you do that, you put in place an independent body for scrutinizing these applications. It makes it less convenient, it would make it less quick to go through the process, it might create more difficulty and perhaps a bit more conflict or controversy in years down the road, but I think we have to be looking at down the road. Unless we are looking ahead and do that with a sense of stewardship for the resources under our management and control, often we will succumb to the short-term imperatives in public decision-making. And so it's important as legislators that we put in place those safeguards.

Now, the minister made reference to an advisory committee. The minister has a lot of faith in advisory committees, and they do by and large in many instances serve a useful and helpful purpose to public consideration or the public interest in considering issues before government. Nevertheless, I don't believe that an advisory committee, which I don't see as being established in any way in legislation as having the strength or the mandate to provide the kind of assistance or review that I'm talking about -- indeed, the only reference we have in this Bill to an independent body or quasi-independent body is that of the Historical Resources Foundation. And rather than strengthening that or recognizing its strengths, this Bill would in fact erode its independence even further.

I don't know why the minister is going about it. I listened again carefully to his explanation in his opening remarks, and I must say that this is the only time I've heard, as defence of such a move, where you would take an appointed person to replace or stand in place of an elected person and then justify it by saying that it's in the interests of democracy or the democratic process. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the members who are elected by the public in Alberta, who voluntarily join this foundation, become a member, support its objectives, work on its activities, meet, and provide from time to time some members to this board -- it provides an independent source of putting people into place to act on behalf of this foundation and for the objectives for which it was set up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to eliminate that route of appointing people or placing people on that foundation board seems to me to be a backward step indeed. And I just don't understand why. Why is it that when the public has this opportunity to participate on such a foundation, to provide that outside advice and that independent counsel to government, government would move to

take those people off that board and make all members subject to the minister's appointment? As it is right now, the objects of this foundation provide for the minister every ample opportunity to give direction to the foundation, and the legislation indicates that the minister can do that in terms of establishing priorities and guidelines the foundation ought to follow. He can give direction to the foundation as far as co-ordinating those activities and to ensure that the foundation works and fits with the programs and policies of the government.

He can already do that under legislation. And in addition to that, it provides him ample opportunity and ample numbers of people that he can appoint directly to that foundation in order to ensure that people on that board are on a good working relationship with the minister. Those powers are already there, and I cannot for the life of me understand why that small measure of independence that exists on this foundation by virtue of those elected members is now being taken away and eroded. It just seems to me to be going in entirely the wrong step.

Now, it may be that this is an omnibus Bill, that the minister's trying to take care of a couple of problem areas in one piece of legislation. But it raises in my mind whether the minister has any thoughts as to the conditions under which he might agree to dispose of the archaeological and paleontological resources and he doesn't want to have any independent review in order to question those terms and conditions under which he might act. But again I'm not sure that one can make that connection, but I put that on the record for the minister to address in his closing remarks.

But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the opening comments made by the minister in reviewing these sections that are being amended by this Bill, I can see nothing to compel or to suggest to this Legislature that these amendments are in fact warranted, necessary, or that they do solve the problem that the minister has identified, nor that they are in the public interest. So I, like my colleagues in the Official Opposition, express my grave concerns about Bill 11.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANHON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question. May the hon. minister sum up?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my closing remarks I would like to answer some of the concerns raised by hon. members, and since most concerns echoed those indicated by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, perhaps I could deal primarily with her concerns.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Edmonton Highlands has sincerity and does good research many times in this House on those things that she brings to us. This is not one of those cases. The hon. member clearly is not aware of the function of the Historical Resources Foundation, for example. I appreciated her talking about the building that was designated that she lived in and other designated sites in the province, but that is not at all the function of the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation. That's a function of the Historic Sites Board, which is a fully appointed body which does fulfill that particular responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member left visions of tractors plowing up Alberta and leaving in its wake nothing of our past or our history. And indeed if that were an accurate description of the intent of the Bill before you or the Bill itself, I too would be seriously concerned and have serious reservations about proceeding at all with this Bill. The fact is that this province has protected its resources and protected them in legislation to a greater extent than any other place in the nation. This Bill clarifies the ability for us to both make the regulations by which we protect those resources and to deal flexibly with what needs to be dealt with.

In the case of this ammonite -- and perhaps I overemphasized that and therefore led members to believe that this is to open a general exploitation of the province for unearthing these old squids from some 75 million years ago; in fact. It's only to allow for the continuation of that particular exploration. And the reason we can't use past means -- and they're not orders in council -- to do that is clearly that the current interpretation of the existing Historical Resources Act puts that at question. Therefore, the operation by the one company who's been doing that for some years, with permit under strict regulation from the government and with requirements for archaeologists to look at and ensure that the paleontological resources are not improperly dealt with, is now at question. That company in fact is in some difficulty at the moment for continuing on this limited space of land the excavations which they've historically done and done under very strict considerations. I might say, in fact, that because of those excavations, we have found some of our paleontological past there, and the day-to-day surveying or watching of that is important.

I would have liked, Mr. Speaker, to have been able to put details in the Bill about what it is we specifically would like to allow or not allow, but the fact is that in terms of archaeological and paleontological resources, various circumstances present themselves from time to time that one can't even predict in regulation, including dealing with ammonite. If another area opened up or if there was an expanded one or one had to dig a few miles deeper or if indeed we wanted to stop the company from doing what the original definition might have allowed and wouldn't have accounted for, that would be difficult to do at all if those very specific things are in legislation. There's no province in the country that in fact does detail that, and we have in our legislation some of the strictest means by which that takes place.

Now, I would say, as I did at the beginning, that there is no intent by this legislation to introduce any sale of any materials not currently being sold. There is not the intent in this legislation to allow for exploitation to a greater degree than has been allowed for in the past. It is the purpose of this legislation to allow us to define areas and to flexibly operate in the face of an interpretation of what has happened before that is now legally questionable. So that's required to take these further logical steps.

I can appreciate that hon. members may, on first reading of the Bill -- and had I read the Bill in the absence of the full historic resources Act may have felt the same way -- may feel that it's a new carte blanche. It's not that, Mr. Speaker. It is in fact in keeping very much with legislation right throughout the country.

Now, of course, the separate question is the Historical Resources Foundation. I have outlined the purposes of that before. We may have to agree to disagree. I would only again question the vision of the hon. members when they talk about stepping on

these elected members and doing away with a sense of democracy, Mr. Speaker, what in fact we're doing is saying that all of the citizens of the province have to have a process by which we safeguard the funds for the public that's here. In this instance we have some 1,200 members, and although they're interested and concerned and in many cases knowledgeable individuals, they don't represent the people of the province as a whole. They aren't answerable to the people of the province as a whole, and they therefore can't be charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the funds of the province of the people as a whole. We have that responsibility. Some hon. members may lament the fact that we do, but that is a sacred trust of this government, and in fact we have to ensure that that's the case.

Again, no maligning of the members who have been elected. We may very well have appointed the same or similar people ourselves in some instances, but we do have to ensure that democracy in fact follows through for all 2.5 million Albertans, not for the 1,200 who have membership or in fact the 350 who voted in the last elections by mail-in ballot where they in most cases hadn't even seen the candidates for election, Mr. Speaker, I think it's logical to make our legislation consistent and make ourselves and the people who we delegate responsible to Albertans for the money that we expend, and this is to bring that in that direction.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would ask members for their support for second reading of Bill 11.

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a second time]

Bill 33 Alberta Cultural Heritage Amendment Act, 1987

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be back on my feet to move second reading of Bill 33. I say with some pride on behalf of the government of Alberta that we introduce this Bill as a further major step in our commitment to the multicultural base of our province. We believe firmly that it is the heritage from which we all come that when shared among each other gives us the strength in Alberta and the understanding that is not paralleled anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, in this session, if I could put the Bill briefly in context, we introduced Bill 1, of course, which changes the name of the department to Culture and Multiculturalism. At that time we were asked what else is being done. A couple of weeks later we introduced an announcement of the Institute of Multicultural Resource Development to bring an awareness of our heritage to organizations, groups, and individuals on a regular basis. Bill 33 is in fact one major further step in that direction. It has a couple of primary purposes, the first of which is to put into the Bill previously passed a couple of additional objects or goals. One is the concept of sharing, that in addition to the other responsibilities of retention of culture and other items in the existing Act, we would add, so all can see, our belief that we must share our past, share our background so that all Albertans might benefit.

Further, there is a section which encourages the preservation, enhancement, and development of artistic and language resources. Mr. Speaker, I think the importance of that particular section of the Bill is self-evident, and we believe that too is a necessary step.

The third and major component of this particular Bill is the establishment for the first time in the nation of the Alberta mul-

multicultural commission. The Alberta multicultural commission will bring together in one body the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation and the current government division, the cultural heritage division, and will tie into the commission membership the chairman of the Cultural Heritage Council, which is representative of close to some 200 ethnocultural organizations throughout the province. Mr. Speaker, this commission will elevate the level of importance of multiculturalism in the province. It will allow the ultimate in citizens' input to what we have involved, because the chairman of the council itself, representing all 200 organizations elected from across the province, will sit as a commissioner on this particular commission. It will allow us to bring resources together and therefore plan in a long-term way for the goals we wish to achieve in this multicultural area.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, the commission would be governed in the legislation by a maximum of five voting members and one nonvoting secretary who would be the chief administrative officer of this commission. It would be my suggestion at this stage, subject to further input from ethnocultural organizations across the province, that the member of the Legislature who will chair this commission, the chairman of the Cultural Heritage Council, and the current sitting chairman of the Cultural Heritage Foundation would comprise the first year's commission of this particular body in order to tie in all of those needs and to assist us in obtaining maximum input from across Alberta from all our ethnocultural organizations and from the public at large in terms of the direction we're going with respect to multiculturalism.

Perhaps I should make it a bit more clear there, Mr. Chairman. We would intend that once this legislation is passed, the House willing, we would spend a summer period putting together the division of the Department of Culture that's responsible for this and the foundation. We would do it with the assistance of an implementation committee that I have asked be appointed: three members from the Cultural Heritage Foundation

-- I'm asking them to elect those three members from amongst themselves; three members from the Cultural Heritage Council, which as I said is representative of around 200 ethnocultural organizations in the province; and two members from the division itself. They will advise me and assist in putting together the commission body, making sure that our direction is consistent, that nothing is lost, and that the sensitivity to our ethnocultural organizations across the province is apparent. The commission, I hope, would be ready for announcement in the October-November '87 time period, and then in 1988 I would propose that there would be a consultation process held across the province, myself and the commission with members of the public and members of ethnocultural organizations, to ensure that the directions we've been taking -- which, by the way, are the most significant in the country, the most well funded in the country -- are in fact the directions we want to go, and look at ways in which those might be enhanced and defined.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very excited about this direction. I believe it establishes in Canada a basis our heritage couldn't otherwise have and will assist us in enhancing our life-styles by the knowledge and the input from all of those who make up our province. I might indicate that this legislation -- and in discussing it with ethnocultural leaders and organizations, have had them say from time to time, "This is only bare bones; this is a structure." They're entirely right. This is a structure through which we

hope will evolve the full ideas and the full resources of all of the people in the province in terms of the programming direction we'll take in the future. We purposefully have not defined further than the purposes this particular Bill and the existing Act combined to evolve. We have not defined further specifics of it so that the community itself, together with us, can do that over the next year and a half period.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, it's the first time. It brings together the full resources. Just for clarification so there's no confusion, I might indicate that the moneys the foundation has will still be available for ethnocultural organizations. The money from the division will still be available. In terms of how those grant programs are dealt with, I would expect the commission itself would act as a co-ordinating body but that we would solicit from the community as a whole -- the ethnocultural community in particular -- individuals who would serve on adjudication panels for grant programs defined with the assistance of that implementation committee and the input from organizations across the province.

Mr. Speaker, there are of course some other details in the Bill, but those are the primary directions of the Bill and the purposes for it. I do believe that this is a strong new direction. I believe it allows for an elevation of the concept of multiculturalism to a level it hasn't experienced before anywhere in the nation, and I would ask for members to support the Bill in second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, before we proceed, the Chair has been informed that the premiere event in Alberta tonight notwithstanding this sitting -- the score is 3-3. The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, in his closing question the minister said he was asking members of the Assembly to support his motion to advance this Bill through second reading, and I guess I have to say, "Oh, all right." [interjections] Tones of voice don't translate through *Hansard*. In any event it seems to me there's certainly nothing offensive about what the minister is doing here. One suspects it's a long-term project; that is, the 1988 provincewide consultation process will be timed so that it can implement policies conveniently thereafter. At first I thought "Oh no, not another layer of bureaucracy; surely you can do better than that." On the other hand, to be fair, it's actually possible -- just possible, not necessarily likely -- that this kind of body could actually help promote multicultural and ethnocultural development better than existing bodies have been able to, partly because existing structures have not been given the wherewithal to control their own destiny to the extent they would like.

One of the reasons that's true, for example, is that the divisions within the Cultural Heritage Council across Alberta -- of which there are several -- meet more regularly than the annual Assembly does. The problem is that when the divisions meet and draft resolutions which they believe they'd like to see sponsored, they don't have any control over whether or not those resolutions will hit the floor at the annual meeting because they are centrally vetted. I think that's a problem. I think either you have a body that means something or you don't.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

Now, if you want a body that means something in terms of democracy and the ability to determine some part of the future,

some measure of the future, then let it decide. Don't vet through the political offices, but let it decide what resolutions it wants to deal with when they come together as a complete Assembly. It seems to me that this is the procedure that's been adopted by Manitoba with what's called there an intercultural council, a manageably-sized body which determines its own fate and which makes direct recommendations to the minister responsible on a number of areas, not just within the purview of her department but also relating to departments, say, of education, social services, labour, and so forth. They go so far as to make recommendations to the federal government as well.

Now, multicultural development, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, isn't just a matter of song and dance. There are many more subtle issues that actually present a large reality to immigrants in particular but to members from very many ethnocultural communities, some of which suffer discrimination and some of which don't, some of which have a harder time adapting to Canadian life and some of which don't. My concern is that once again a new body or a new bureaucracy or a new layer will have been created without giving due consideration to regulatory, statutory, and policy changes within this very government that could promote a tremendous change within our society.

Obviously, one of the most important examples that comes to mind is the recommendations of the Ghitter report, most of which have been either ignored or adopted in diluted form only. As a result, some Albertans think it's amusing or acceptable to have an organization in this province of white supremacists, who think it's amusing or acceptable or tolerable to have what has been called a "hate hotline" operating in this province, to have people who -- despite survivors of the Second World War, despite in fact what's going on right now in Lyons, France, with the Klaus Barbie trial, despite the Nuremberg Trials -- are open Holocaust doubters, who speculate that it's for conspiratorial reasons not related to actual historical events that people believe one group of people, the Jews, were singled out for genocidal treatment at the hands of the brutal Nazis.

That's a problem because it starts to lead to doubts about other historical facts -- not just for one group of people, not just the Jews, but it also starts people believing that maybe the Ukrainians are exaggerating when they say, "Stalin starved us by the millions." which I believe Stalin did. And maybe we start doubting that we even invented genocide in this century. Pretty soon we start thinking that every time some group of people is isolated for systematic bad treatment, it's really just a conspiracy of those people because they want to take over the world or something nefarious like that. And pretty soon thereafter we'd find ourselves endorsing apartheid. Now, that may sound bizarre, but I have met rational or what I believed to be otherwise rational people, some of whom have put this in writing to me -- I can't imagine it -- who actually have shared their little secrets of doubt with me.

Now, a multicultural commission, unless it starts to really get this government to act on the recommendations of the Ghitter report, will be itself accused of being a conspirator before too much longer, Mr. Speaker, by the very people who now promote these bizarre theories which I believe do not recognize the primacy of human development, the right of human development, the right of human dignity as a fundamental Canadian value. It's stated in our Constitution, but that doesn't matter to some people. Hatred and intolerance have a way of spreading, particularly in recessionary times.

You know, I'm not going to use the nicknames I heard, but I

remember when I moved to this province -- I came here from Manitoba in 1961 -- the community in which I had lived in Manitoba had a lot of representation from most parts of the world and a lot of native Canadians as well. This was not a particularly well-off community, believe me; it was fairly poor. Most people I'm sure lived under the poverty line. But I never heard phrases like I heard when I moved here, which is not to say that Alberta is more racist than Manitoba; I don't think that's the case. But I never heard nicknames applying to ethnocultural communities that were derogatory and understood to be derogatory by those communities until I came to school here. Now, maybe it's because by the time I got to school here I was in grade 2 and I was too young when I was in Manitoba. In any case, that exposure surprised me profoundly. I didn't even know what they were at first. I'd think, what are all those people laughing about? Why are they laughing at this name that I don't understand? Then I started to figure out that it was supposed to hurt other people. That's what those names were being used for. You could see that through peer pressure, someone like me . . . Do you think I stood up and said, "Don't laugh at those people, they're my friends; just because they've got different coloured skins doesn't mean they're second class"? No, I didn't, because I didn't think it was important to do that. I mean, at first I was struck by this kind of nastiness and then I didn't defend them. It wasn't until later on that I realized how important it was to defend them.

That's the sort of thing that spreads through schools and through generations, Mr. Speaker. That is not the sort of thing that is going to be fixed by a multicultural commission. That is the sort of thing that is going to be fixed by motions which pass in this Assembly in which we exercise some authoritative peer pressure on communities and on individuals who would practise hatred and intolerance. We exercise it by requesting of the Minister of Education in particular that we work very hard and dedicate our resources to nipping that sort of thing in the bud before it catches fire, before we can't put it out with little watering cans we ordinarily use to deliver water to the flower pots. The thing we do is take on a campaign, the sort of campaign the Member for Banff-Cochrane likes to talk about -- that is, the campaigns he's engaged in through AADAC -- and take on those campaigns again. Because even though after the Keegstra affair occurred, there were beautiful, glossy . . . What do you call those things, those great big prints?

ANHON. MEMBER: Posters.

MS BARRETT: Posters; thank you. Beautiful, glossy posters. You'd find them all over the place and they'd say nice things like "Alberta is for Albertans." You'd see an advert or two on television. And I think that started to have effect. But those kinds of things have to be done in concert, Mr. Speaker. You can't just have an ad campaign and say, "Well look, we can scrimp on the education component. We don't really have to work up a new series, we don't have to work on the progressive components of the curriculum, we don't actually have to allow proactive measures within our Human Rights Commission, and we don't have to do a whole bunch of things. All we have to do is make these posters and the problem will go away." Making the posters can be effective. Making the posters without other concerted efforts won't do us much good. Ditto this commission, because it seems to me this commission has as its primary goal, first of all, to look at reducing and then eradicating the basis of hatred and intolerance in this province. It should then go

forward into the more positive aspects, Mr. Speaker.

It's a big job, and I wish the minister luck. I hope this is not going to be used as a vehicle for patronage or for selling sop stories to the people for the next election. Let's do a good job on this one.

MR. ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. GOGO: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to offer some thoughts to Bill 33 which we're dealing with in principle before the House tonight, I know of no one in Alberta who feels stronger about ethnic groups than myself. I've been exposed to them. I participate every year in that first great Monday in August at Heritage Days. In the riding I represent, we have 23 ethnic groups, five more than Edmonton. They've gotten along extremely well all these years. In my view it's a very patriotic day for those groups who come together and share their cultures and their values. So I feel extremely proud that, unlike the melting pot of America, we have that system we call the Canadian mosaic. It's expensive. No question it's expensive. Members could debate, I think ad nauseam, as to the difficulties in trying to maintain those people in terms of maintaining their own cultures. We would be faced in a very similar way with maintaining the family farm, which is in some people's view extremely stupid in terms of economics, but a fundamental principle of this government and of this province happens to be to maintain its traditions and the family farm is part of it.

Mr. Speaker, looking at the preamble alone, one cannot help but be excited about the Bill: "Whereas the richness of life in Alberta is enhanced by sharing the knowledge and traditions of ethno-cultural groups" and so on. One gets wrapped up in that pretty quickly. That does not mean we shouldn't have concerns. I would suggest we consider for a moment the past 10 to 15 years. I recall vividly -- and I want to address now the whole matter of the commission that's proposed under this Act, because I look at section 16 and the first thing that hits me, obviously at 16, is that "The Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation is discontinued as a corporation" which in many ways represents those 1,200 groups who annually either get funding or report to the minister. We're going to do that in the form of appointing a commission.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it might be wise to take a moment to look at the history of commissions in this province, I recall, being elected, that we had a hospitals commission. We had that group that we felt was important to maintain this distance from government to build effective and meaningful and workable hospitals around Alberta. Well, we abolished that commission. We abolished it. And as I hear many people debate today, the hospitals have never been in a greater mess than they are today -- that's a matter of debate -- mainly due to funding obviously.

We had the Alberta health care commission which operated at arm's length from government. For some reason that didn't appeal to many people, so we eliminated that and brought that into government as an arm of government. And for people who feel strongly about decreasing bureaucracy, one wonders about that motivation. We then, as I recall, had the universities commission. That's back when we only had one university -- then two, then three, now three and a half. But for some reason that didn't work, and we had to abolish that commission.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it seemed that the worm started to turn, because we then got special dispensation from Ottawa to allow gambling in Canada, which is still contrary to the Criminal Code

of Canada, but of course there are exceptions and we as a province got exceptions. We were very quickly deluged then with problems from our communities, be they the Canadian Legion, the Elks club, or whatever, because running their gaming events, they were finding out that they weren't able to pay their bills. So we then formed a commission. Well, we went through that phase of abolishing commissions, and then we discovered that by forming a gaming commission we could remove from the elected person, namely the Attorney General in those days, those groups that were unhappy or dissatisfied with the way the bureaucrat was working with regard to gaming control in this province.

And here we are tonight, Mr. Speaker, proposing that in effect we say to those 1,200 groups that the minister has funded annually: "That's not the best way to let you make your own decisions and meet through your regional meetings. We want to form a commission, and we want the commission to be directly under the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism, based on Bill 1." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns about that that I could probably best sum up in terms of questions to the minister, that he could respond to when he closes the debate on Bill 33. I would assume and I would hope, and I'd ask the minister to confirm this, that the 1,200 groups that are involved in this province each received a copy of this Bill with its opening comment at first reading as to its principle. I think that's very important, Mr. Speaker, because within my own community we have the 23 groups, the Southern Alberta Ethnic Association, and I've had reports from those people that they're not very happy with it. Now, if they're not happy, I would like to know what they and others have said to our Minister of Culture as to how they feel about it.

For example, one of their concerns under the present system: if this government were not here, then there's no reason why the foundation couldn't carry on as it was envisaged when it was established. For example, if there's a new government and there's no Department of Culture and Multiculturalism, what will happen? Because under this commission system, all funding must come from that commission that's being formed. So I have a concern there. If a government subsequent to the present government, Mr. Speaker, decides to have 20 portfolios or 15 portfolios and one of those is not the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism, what happens to that commission? Will it disappear with the MLA? I would suggest that's something that's got to be considered.

I think, Mr. Speaker, of last Saturday night I attended a function at the Canadian Polish club in my constituency. We have about a thousand Polish people in my community. They're very proud to be Canadian, very proud to be Albertan, but even more proud to be Polish. I would be extremely sad if for some reason they perceived that this Bill, Bill 33, was going to dilute their enthusiasm for being an ethnic association within that 23-member group. And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether this Bill in any way is going to affect that. I do think, though, that it would be very important to all members of this House if the minister could respond to those 1,200 groups who have individually asked to receive a copy of the Bill so they personally could respond to it.

I simply want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying we have been very fortunate in Alberta with the policies adopted to deal with cultural groups, and the ethnic groups I think have stayed alive and well because of policies within this government. I think it would be presumptuous of us to think we can arbitrarily improve on a system that's already working well. So I would

ask the minister, in closing debate, if he could respond to those very points I've raised so that if in fact Bill 33 becomes law, we end up with a stronger ethnic association in this province in the future.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make a few brief remarks with respect to the Alberta Cultural Heritage Amendment Act, 1987. Primarily my interest is with one of the proposed amendments that would add "to encourage sharing of the knowledge and traditions of ethno-cultural groups." I can't stress just how important an amendment like that is to the constituents who live in Calgary Forest Lawn.

I've heard the hon. Member for Lethbridge West speak about the ethnic diversity in his constituency. I think I could substantiate the claim that Calgary Forest Lawn is probably the most ethnically diverse constituency in the whole province. I think I mentioned before that there are some 42 different ethnic groups who are represented at the Forest Lawn high school. I mentioned that I had the pleasure and the privilege of being there the other night and witnessed so many people from so many different countries of origin receive high school diplomas.

I also had the good fortune during the past few months to attend many of the elementary schools as they helped prepare for the 1988 Olympics in Calgary. Most of the elementary schools put on little mini-Olympics, and it was again an incredible pleasure and experience to watch these kids go through their ceremonies. As part of their ceremonies they'd have a display of flags, and many of the children would actually be carrying flags from their own countries.

Just by way of giving you a little sense of what Forest Lawn is like in terms of its ethnic makeup, originally of course it was just a small town outside the city limits of Calgary. Then after the end of the Second World War, like a lot of other communities in Calgary it attracted new German, Italian, and European immigrants essentially. So it has that as its base. In addition to that, in the last few years as the population of Calgary has grown by leaps and bounds, it's become a holding stage for many of the new immigrant groups. So within the constituency of Calgary Forest Lawn you find large groups of Vietnamese, of Chinese. There's a large Philippine representation in the constituency. Many of the different groups that are represented in the subcontinent of India are also represented in Calgary Forest Lawn. You have the Sikhs, the Lebanese -- in fact you have many factions of Lebanese.

So it's extremely culturally diverse, and there's an enrichment that results from that. There are many ethnic restaurants. But there are some problems, too, because many of our policies in the past have focused on giving grants to ethnic communities to develop their own ethnicity and that kind of thing. It has tended to create some divisions among these ethnic communities, and the results of that sometimes involve physical violence; there have been conflicts between some groups of different ethnicity in some of the schools.

So I think it's a major problem and a major task for our government bodies in this province to try and do those kinds of things that would bridge those cultural understandings, bring people together, and help integrate them into the fabric of Canadian society, and I think the amendment as proposed in this Bill would help to do that, again to encourage the sharing of the

knowledge and traditions of ethnocultural groups. My hope would be that through the provisions of this Act I would have resources that would now be available to me as the Member of the Legislative Assembly representing those people, that I'd be in a position to help work with those ethnic communities, help bring them together, and help integrate them more into the fabric of Canadian life. That's what's really needed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to Bill 33, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Amendment Act, 1987. I'd like to point out that the constituency of Athabasca-Lac La Biche is also a very culturally diverse community, with some of the major partners in the building of Canada living there: the native people, the French Canadian, the English, and of course more recent immigrants to the country -- the Ukrainians, the Polish, the Russian, the Lebanese. We can go on and on with the number of other people that have arrived in the Athabasca-Lac La Biche area within the last over a hundred years.

For example, the minister was in my constituency to declare the Lac La Biche Mission as an historical site. The Lac La Biche Mission, for example, was started by the Oblate Fathers, who were missionaries back in 1849, which makes it the second oldest -- after Fort Chipewyan -- established community in Alberta. So we go back in a long history in terms of how Canada and Alberta were built in a partnership of the founding peoples of this country and then the opening up of this country to the immigrants who helped to really make this country very diverse and very beautiful.

As a former school principal and school counselor one of the things I like to point out about multiculturalism -- and this is very, very important. One of the things that I quickly realized about how people function in society is this: that you must have a self-love, and you gather that self-love from the family that you've come from and from the society you were born in. There must be that innate respect of the community, of the culture group, of the language group that you belong to before you're able to actually build the bridge to become an integrated member of society.

And I guess over many centuries we have learned to build diversity as opposed to a melting pot where we try to put everybody in a little shoe box, where we tell people to speak the same language and tell people to believe in the same culture. But it has not worked. I have to point out, for example, that when I went to Europe and made a tour of Great Britain, I was amazed at an English tradition where they imposed the English language and culture onto the Scottish people, the Irish people, the Welsh, et cetera, and that even after 800 years we still have those people clinging to their culture and even to their language.

So that policy of conquering immigrants or people that come into a country or belong to a country has not worked, and I think it's because of the fact that people are not like that. We are ourselves through our history. We live our present through our history; we live our future through our present and our history, and we cannot forget that as legislators.

One of my first acts that I did when I returned to my constituency after living in the city of Edmonton for a number of years and I became the president of the French association of Lac La Biche-Plamondon area, was to institute an annual multi-

cultural event, which was basically to encourage the sharing of the knowledge and the tradition of ethnocultural groups, and I'd like to applaud that, because really that's what we need to have. The Heritage Days that we share here in the city of Edmonton, for example, is built on that concept: instead of saying that diversity really creates division, actually the opposite can really result, that with diversity we can promote tolerance and understanding. Because one thing we have to realize is that it's very easy to be prejudiced, to be bigoted, and to have to fear something which is unknown. And really a lot of hates that are present in our society are based on fear. When you don't understand a person's culture or a person's language, you normally build up barriers, and these are the kinds of things that our legislation must work to break down: this creation of barriers that very often in the past we tried to build up between people and between cultures and between languages.

I'd like to get back a little bit into history for all members of this House. A lot of people, when I travel the province, do not understand the history of Alberta and Canada. They don't understand, for example, that it really was through the whole creation of the bilingualism and biculturalism commission of the '60s that we went back and studied how we could make this country Canada build up a greater partnership between people. And out of this commission came about the whole bilingualism/biculturalism laws that we have created in this country, and the fostering of multiculturalism.

It was in this whole procedure that we went through as a Canadian society that we have helped to foster multiculturalism. Bilingualism has helped to foster multiculturalism, and I want every member of this House to understand that. Bilingualism and biculturalism have not meant that there are only two official languages and cultures in this country. No. By simply breaking the unilingual, the almost unicultural tradition that we had built up in certain parts of our country, we have opened up the gates for other cultures and other immigrants to feel at home in this country.

So I'd like to really commend the minister. I hope through the whole implementation of this Bill that really the partnership that we have built up in this country and the whole multicultural aspect that we have built up in our society -- that we do not lose the focus of why we have created it; that it is based on very sound human psychology, and that is really the whole focus of why laws should be created. It has to be based on some sound, fundamental *raison d'être*: that we are human beings and that we need to feel good about ourselves. We need to feel self-love. I really feel the greatest thing as a counselor that I had to face in school was not the fact that an individual loved himself too much as a person. It was just the opposite. The one who does not like himself as an individual is the one who will be rebelling against society, who will be the one who will be breaking the laws of our schools, of our community, of our province. Really, self-love guarantees that we understand how we relate to other people, how our actions will relate to other peoples around us. So we must foster this love of who we are, of what we are, and of where we came from, and really build onto those strengths that we have within our diverse cultural community.

Thank you very much.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very supportive of the purpose of this legislation. It is encouraging to see the

support of ethnic cultures playing such a significant part in the policy of this government, and certainly ... [some applause] Thank you. It certainly reflects a change from views and attitudes that we have seen in this country and certainly in this province in the past.

I have some concern, insofar as this legislation itself is concerned, that there has been inadequate or even no consultation with the concerned ethnic groups. I'm not satisfied that the format of the legislation precisely suits the needs of the ethnic groups of the province. The concerns have been well expressed by the Member for Lethbridge West, and I would be very interested in hearing the comments of the minister, which I hope will relieve my concerns in that regard.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I have a rather more global concern about the direction of the government with respect to multiculturalism. The concern is that the approach of the government is a rather piecemeal and narrow one. My concern is that multiculturalism is submerged as a part of the Department of Culture, and notwithstanding the name change, the role of multiculturalism in this province is not being enhanced. And, in fact, what we are seeing is a continuation of what had been ...

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, might we have the book removed so the microphone system could work a bit more. Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave it there.

MR. CHUMIR: Should I repeat that? Words are not being recorded for posterity?

As I was saying, I'm concerned that we are seeing a continuation of what have been far too limited objectives of the government in the sphere of multiculturalism to date. What we need is not simply an organization which encourages the unique cultural aspects of the many ethnic groups in the community -- and these are important -- but we also need to address the daily problems and concerns of ethnic groups. For example, there is a desperate need in our schools for a multicultural education, particularly of the majority of the members and students in the community with respect to other cultures and races. Some of this takes place, of course, but far too little and on far too piecemeal a basis. I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Education. There is a definite need for an overall policy with respect to the teaching of intercultural affairs within all of the schools in our community, and I hope that this commission -- and I urge the minister in his role as Minister of Culture to ask the commission to address that particular issue, to consult with the Minister of Education on that issue, and not to treat the element of multiculturalism as a balkanized one, as happens too often.

Another area that is of serious concern is that of the teaching of the English language. English as a Second Language courses are in far too short supply in this province. Language is the single most important need of new immigrants to this community. It is very, very inadequately addressed, and I understand we are now facing initiatives within this province for backsliding in that area. Particularly, I have been in receipt of correspondence from ethnic and immigrant groups in Calgary that express concern about the potential closure of an English as a Second Language resource centre for southern Alberta.

Another area that is badly in need of attention is that of the

advancement of job opportunities for ethnic groups to ensure that they are entitled to equal opportunity for jobs in the province. They are all too often the last to be hired and the first to be laid off, and we need some entity which has the responsibility to review that aspect of the needs of our ethnic communities. There is no such entity. The responsibility for all of these particular problems are, as I noted, balkanized through departments of the government, and they're certainly not well looked after.

Equally important, and in fact the priority need of all minority groups in any community, is tolerance and understanding. The Ghitter report recommended the appointment of a standing committee of the Legislature on tolerance and understanding, and we have to date seen no signs of action on this notwithstanding the fact that I have raised it in the Legislature a number of times. It seemed merely to be sloughed off, and that is inexplicable.

The Member for Edmonton Highlands commented on the question of tolerance and understanding in this province and, as I've noted, that is the primary concern of any minority groups. As a member of a minority group who recalls well less happy times, I can state that that has been my own personal experience. There is nothing more important than the people of a community getting along together. I would like to state that as a lifelong resident of this province, having proudly been born in the city of Calgary, I consider this to be a very, very tolerant province indeed: certainly one of if not the most tolerant province in this country. We have very, very decent people in this province.

Yes, there are problems, particularly for East Indians. There have been some sorry situations that I'm aware of in respect of Sikh taxi drivers, in particular in Calgary, and I wouldn't be surprised if the same situation pertains throughout the province. Some of the problems are very serious indeed. The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn has alluded to some of the difficulties that he has seen even amongst and between ethnic groups themselves. And of course we have the recent reminders of James Keegstra and the Aryan Nations that intolerance and hatred never rest. However, overall there is a sense of decency, goodwill, tolerance, and understanding in this province, and what we need are policies which encourage the continuation of this positive attitude, an improvement of that attitude, and the prevention of a regression to sadder times.

I would like to say that in my view, the most important single initiative in this regard relates to the shape of our school system. In a multireligious and a multicultural community, as Canada is increasingly becoming, it's important -- vitally important -- that we don't segregate children of different races and religions from each other. If our people are to get along in future, it's important that children go to school together and get to know each other and to become friends.

My primary concern at this point in time is that we are moving in the wrong direction by encouraging the growth of private schools, by funding of those schools which started in the mid-1970s. Private schools by their very nature segregate children from each other primarily on the basis of race and religion; sometimes on the basis of wealth. If we separate our children we are going to create a climate for divisions in the future. I hope the minister and this government will recognize the importance of that particular issue, because there is no single issue that will have more impact on the way in which our people get along in 50 or 100 years from now than the shape of the school system. It is fundamental.

Mr. Speaker, there is in fact no substitute for a global view

of all of these issues. Yes, heritage and culture are important, but we also must have understanding, we must get along, and ethnic groups must have opportunities for jobs and to enjoy the other benefits of our communities. So, laudable as are the activities of the minister's department and of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation and the Alberta heritage council, it reflects a far too limited view and approach to the broader problems which we face. I hope we will see these limitations remedied elsewhere, and that the minister will use his good offices and his centrality in this particular issue to encourage his government and other ministers to see that the more fundamental issues are in fact addressed.

Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I've listened very carefully -- I think we all have -- to the participants tonight. I think this is a very important Bill, and I've risen to my feet, I suppose, because of all of the comments that have been made so far, and I look forward to the minister's summing up on the principles, the committee stage, and finally, I assume, the approval of this Bill 33.

I have a great number of reservations. There is an event that's taking place in the city other than the Flyers, who are currently leading over Edmonton 4-3, I gather, in the third period -- another event that's very important to my family. I'm wondering how our first granddaughter or grandson -- my daughter in labour right now -- may in 18 years, in the year 2005, read these words of wisdom. I was pleased the Member for Calgary Buffalo did remove the book, because I was carefully listening to his observations. So what I say tonight, Mr. Speaker, comes from me. It comes from some of my constituents who have expressed a concern to me. I don't think the majority of my constituents will be affected by this Bill. I don't think their lives will change should this Bill be passed and this commission get under way. Most have a concern about their livelihoods and about their education and about their futures as Canadians, as Albertans.

I was born in Toronto, Mr. Speaker. I grew up in a city that was growing rapidly from 600,000 people to 2 million people, and I was the son of English parents, with American grandparents and English grandparents. I went to public school, and I fought my way to school every day from the time I was six till 12, because I was Anglican. And I fought my way through. The kids were bigger than me who were not Anglican. But of course, when I got to school and I could join up with the other kids, I could fight my way back because we had more of us going back home. That was an interesting time as a young boy in Toronto. That area, interestingly enough, has changed completely now. It's a Greek community, wonderful people, outdoor markets: completely different from the time that I grew up in Toronto.

We moved to Winnipeg, and unlike the Member for Edmonton Highlands, I grew up in Winnipeg -- the north end of the city of Winnipeg -- and I went to Ukrainian schools as a WASP, a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. I learned about the different kinds of foods, the different community, about baba, about all of the wonderful things of this community. I lived in St. Boniface, Manitoba, for a year, with the French Manitoba community. I went to university and joined the RCAF, and I've lived in St-Jean, Chicoutimi, Bagotville, Val-d'Or, Montreal, Ottawa, and Cold Lake and Bonnyville and North Bay. I've lived in six provinces in different kinds of communities.

My father and his four brothers served this country. I have

members of my constituency who have tattoos on their arms because of the tragedy of the 1940 Second World War. I spoke recently to the Jewish war veterans, and I disagreed publicly at that opportunity to speak, when a colleague of mine from Edmonton Glenmore was involved in a very special ceremony at another location on that day for the Jewish community. [interjection] But I publicly disagreed. . . I said Calgary Glenmore.

AN HON. MEMBER: You said Edmonton.

MR. STEVENS: I said Edmonton. I apologize to the member, because I certainly meant to say Calgary Glenmore.

Unlike the Member for Calgary Buffalo, I spoke to the Jewish war veterans with a different message. I spoke about the importance of tolerance and of facing the kinds of things that the Member for Edmonton Highlands constantly brings up, as though in some way these aberrations in the minority of some citizens' viewpoints in some way should be attacked by all of us; that we should somehow condemn them and perhaps do what has happened in the Second World War, by some kind of government-think.

I hosted recently the Japanese Crown Princess and the Crown Prince, and have spent many occasions with the Japanese community who are so visible in the community of Banff.

I'm not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that being the first province to have a department of multiculturalism is a wonderful thing. And so my words to the minister and the commission and to the chairman and the members of that commission are intended as, hopefully, a special message. We do suffer in this country. We suffer from a two-nation concept. If we study the history of the tyranny of the British over the French in this country, if we study the rules that were applied to our brethren, one of our founding nations -- if we see for a hundred years what the English did to the French, we can understand the frustrations. But we have created this two-nation concept, and we have to live with it. I'm not convinced that we have to encourage further divisions of loyalties. We have the Indian people, we have the Metis people, we have a cry for self-government, we have a "third nation" concept.

I certainly agree, and I know the minister does too, that anyone should be able to form any ethnic group. And by the way, we've used the word "ethnic" and "ethnicity". I can't say it; I think the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn said it very well. I looked it up in a dictionary a few moments ago to see if it would help me. What is an "ethnic"? I think if you look at the dictionary, and we study it -- and we've learned to use new words, "ethnocultural communities," to show the intellect the mind, as well as just the race or just the linguistic backgrounds. But anyone should be able to form a society or an ethnic group, if they wish. I'm not convinced, though, that taxpayers' money or any commitment beyond support by the government should be expended on promoting the activities of that particular group. That is up to that group -- those individuals -- to do that promotion. If there are programs that are available to organizations, any organization should be able to apply for those programs. But I'm not convinced the government, through a commission, should be doing things to enhance the sharing of culture, which is really what this Bill is all about.

There are assassination activities in other countries. There are terrorist activities in other countries. There are political aberrations in other countries. There are refugees from other countries. I'm not convinced that by expressing ways and means to enhance these this is the right thing for Albertans, this

is the right thing for Canadians. I don't believe this is what the people who have chosen to come to this country want to see encouraged. I hope that the commission will in fact find ways to sell -- if that's the word; someone else used it tonight -- to share the good things of the cultures that are making up this country. That's the challenge for this commission. We don't strengthen our province by keeping alive in this province the hatreds, the political rivalries, and the conflicts that immigrants have fled from, much less encouraging them to pass along that hatred, that 700 years of tyranny of the British over the Irish or the 200 years of the English over the French, or whatever. Generation by generation by generation we continue in this tragic endorsement of multiculturalism.

I hope the minister can take those messages and can take from every member who has spoken, and further from the debates that will occur at the stages of the Bill in committee, and help direct the work of this commission to strengthen this province, to strengthen this country; not to continue the divisions that some would choose to have.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope my granddaughter or my grandson understands why I've raised these issues. My constituents have expressed these concerns to me in a small number, but I felt because of what's been said tonight someone should stand and make those comments here in the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will simply add to the debate briefly. Almost everything that I would mention has been mentioned before, very specifically, in fact, by my colleague from Calgary Buffalo. I therefore do not offer a new logical or a new specific argument to the case that we are making tonight. I would, however, like to think that the importance of this particular issue warrants emphasis by repetition. And if we cannot change minds by logic, perhaps we can simply change minds by the weight of our argument in that repetition.

I would like to say that by and large I am very supportive, as is my caucus, of Bill 33. I am always impressed by this particular minister's sincerity and by his effort to make positive contributions to the legislative process in this province, and I believe that this Bill has been created with every good intention conceivable. We are, of course, extremely fortunate in Alberta and in this country to have the benefit of a diversity of ethnic cultural groups. They bring a tremendous richness, a tremendous depth to our society. They provide a great deal of interest to the people who live in this country. It is therefore, I think, perhaps a *prima facie* case that we are well motivated to do what we can to promote the idea of ethnic diversity in this province and in this country, and to the extent that Bill 33 will contribute to that I think it is to be applauded.

The Member for Banff-Cochrane, however, raises a very, very significant and important matter, and that is whether the promotion of differences in ethnic backgrounds -- I think which he was getting at -- promotes intolerance, promotes competing loyalties, or actually strengthens our country. I believe that he was suggesting, at least questioning, that it might weaken our country, weaken our society, by raising the possibility of competing loyalties and so on. While I respect greatly the comments of the Member for Banff-Cochrane, I would like to come down emphatically on the other side of the argument to say that we can have tolerance in this diversity and that this diversity, promoted properly, will only strengthen our society and

strengthen our country, our province.

I would also like to mention that unlike the Member for Banff-Cochrane. I do not have a problem with the two-nation or the bicultural concept of the two founding cultures of this country. I think this gives us a tremendous strength again and a difference, a richness, in our society, and in fact I think it contributes to our ability to accept the emphasis that we place upon a diversity of other cultural groups and cultural heritages and the ability of people of those cultural groups to sustain their strength and to sustain their culture.

Therefore, we are, in summary, supportive and will support this Bill in fact. I would like to offer some suggestions for improvement or for further legislation in the future. My colleague from Calgary-Buffalo has mentioned the issue of intolerance in our society and the role that the standing committee of the Legislature on tolerance and understanding in Alberta, proposed by the Ghitter commission, would play in contributing to this important value in Alberta. We only need to reiterate -- and it's unfortunate that this has to be done -- some of the instances over the past number of years: the Keegstra affair, the Stiles affair when it first occurred, the lack of what I believe to be clear, strong judgment on the government's part recently in appointing Mr. Stiles to a government position and then in failing to deny that appointment in a way that would have made the clear statement that should have been made in the first place.

It was left to the public record that Mr. Stiles determined not to take that job. It should have been very clear that this government determined that Mr. Stiles would not take that job, and that should have been the direction of the comments so that we made a very clear statement to the rest of this province that there was in no way an endorsement -- certainly there wasn't an endorsement -- in no way were we giving credibility to the position with which Mr. Stiles was so clearly publicly acquainted.

There is also the incident now of the Aryan tapes, a very, very difficult issue. Do we suppress those tapes by raising them as an issue in the courts, or do we suppress those tapes and their message simply by ignoring them?

The fact of the matter is that no matter what course of action we take in the case of a Stiles, in the case of a Keegstra, in the case of the Aryan Nations, or in the case of the tapes, if we have a society that can absorb the arguments made by these people, which are deceitful and insidious arguments, and understand them for what they are, then we have a society that doesn't have to worry about the existence of those tapes, for example, and eventually that initiative on the part of those people will become a thing of the past.

The Ghitter commission recommendation for a standing committee on tolerance and understanding we believe is a very clear-cut step in ensuring that initiatives are taken by this government on behalf of the people of Alberta to promote tolerance and understanding amongst different peoples in our society rigorously, that each and every opportunity that is seen can be seized upon. It may be that this Bill could be improved by extending the mandate of the proposed commission to consider issues of tolerance and understanding in a broader context.

Secondly, we have a concern with the potential partisanship of this commission, headed as it will be by an MLA, particularly, of necessity, of a particular political persuasion. There always is the danger that the relationship of government to cultural and ethnic groups can be based upon a desire to promote political ends rather than a clear-cut, broader objective of promoting the interests of those people of those cultural groups without political initiative having to be a consideration.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

We are further concerned with the fact that it isn't sufficient simply to promote the ethnocultural groups in our province, but that these groups have particular problems that are not so widespread amongst the rest of us. They represent immigrants, and immigrants to our society have a range of need for specialized services. My colleague from Calgary Buffalo emphasized the fact that there may well be insufficient English as a Second Language training. There are estimates that it probably takes five years for a person to acquire a second language at a level of adequate competence, and certainly the structure in our educational system today doesn't see a five-year commitment to language services.

We are further concerned that there was no adequate consultation with cultural groups in this process. It may underline the possibility that this has been viewed in political terms as: here is something that should be appreciated by these people; let's give it to them rather than having to struggle with a more indepth and complicated consultative process. It's our feeling that, always, consultation results in better policy and should not have been something that was overlooked in this case.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, our general feeling is that this is a very positive step by this government. We acknowledge the arguments made by the Member for Banff-Cochrane and to some extent by the Member for Lethbridge West earlier today as well. However, I think we would come down on the side of supporting this Bill. We believe it could, on the other hand, go further with respect to promotion of tolerance and understanding. Specifically, we are concerned with partisanship. We are concerned as well that it won't address more broadly the issues of the need for specialized services that are still inadequate in some cases for immigrants to our society. We would like to have seen greater consultation with cultural groups involved as well.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few very brief remarks. I hadn't intended to get into the debate.

I thought the Member for Edmonton Highlands summed up our support for the Bill very nicely, but the Member for Banff-Cochrane did prompt me to get into the debate in a thoughtful kind of way. I'm not particularly upset with what he said, but I just think that perhaps he's got it a little bit wrong. At least it's not an either/or, and it's not always -- if you retain the ethnic culture of a group or the particular dynamics of a particular group, it doesn't necessarily mean that you have to retain them all. You don't necessarily have to retain the intolerance or the hatreds or the ideas left over from 700 years of warfare back in the country they came from.

It would seem to me that if we're going to live in a world which has many different ethnic or national groups in it, then one of the best places to start developing tolerance is right within your own community within your own country, and to tell somebody that they have to change because you're intolerant of them is not a way to start doing that. So I think encouraging people to know who they are, to know a bit about their background, to know a bit about their culture, to give them some pride in their history and roots, so to speak, is a good basis from which to learn to be tolerant of other people with different

backgrounds and nationalities and languages and customs and food and all the rest of the things that go with different ethnic origins. So I think we should be very tolerant of different groups, different people, and there's nothing wrong with the government promoting that and helping to encourage that. That doesn't mean that you have to also tolerate and put up with internal fighting or hatreds or intolerances that may exist when the societies were in another nation.

If we are going to have a world that's at peace, then we need to start developing that tolerance here and that ability to appreciate and understand those other groups in our own society. So I think the member had that a little bit backwards, and I think we should proceed with this Bill. I'm looking forward to hearing the minister.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the urge to uniformity, the melting pot concept, is itself a polite form of intolerance. The aim in Canada is a nobler one: to tolerate many cultures. That is the aim of this Bill. We support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister's comments will conclude second reading of Bill 33.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the debate this evening on Bill 33. I believe there have been good points of view expressed from members from all parts of the House, and I appreciate very much the expressions of support from all sides. I feel proud as an Albertan that in an issue of this sort we can unite regardless of political party and I think prove to the rest of the nation that not only are we tolerant, not only are Albertans people who believe in promoting our cultural heritage, but that as well we can lead the nation in how we go about doing that.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some specific questions well raised by both the Member for Lethbridge West, who's changed seats since I last saw him, and the Member for Banff-Cochrane, and also the Member for Calgary Buffalo. One of the those questions was with respect to consultation. Yes, there have, to the best of my knowledge, been copies of the Bill sent out to the ethnocultural organizations in the province. I met last night, Saturday, and before the Bill was introduced with the executive of the Cultural Heritage Council, which represents by election the ethnocultural organizations in the province, some close to 200, as I've indicated before. I also had dinner with the Cultural Heritage Foundation the night prior to the Bill's introduction and discussed it further with them, as I've discussed it with their chairman in its making over the past few months.

Further than that, the members for Calgary Buffalo and for Edmonton Meadowlark give me the opportunity to say thank you to the Cultural Heritage Council and those people who've been part of that and, indeed, the foundation membership who have helped to evolve us to this point. Indeed, the concept of an agency which brings together the resources was first articulated in 1981 by a resolution of the Cultural Heritage Council, so the evolution through our groups and organizations in the province has come about over that long period of time. And it's been by

those step-by-step decisions, indeed landmark decisions for Canada in terms of a foundation, in terms of a Cultural Heritage Act, in terms of a council which is second to none, in terms of the support we give it or the depth to which it goes, in terms of soliciting ideas and concepts from ethnocultural organizations around the province -- those steps have helped us take this one further step.

I appreciate very much the sincere comments and those which represent concerns that a number of Albertans feel, represented by the Member for Banff-Cochrane. I would emphasize that my definition of multiculturalism and the government's definition of multiculturalism is that background from which we all come. It's not a specific group. It's not a new group, necessarily, that comes into the nation. It's all of our backgrounds. And we will only have the wealth of experience, the fullness of understanding and, indeed, the total tolerance when we share that background among each other. And this commission, I believe, helps us take one further step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the concept of multiculturalism by that definition. I believe that supporting the ethnocultural organizations of the province and assisting them to share the backgrounds from which we all come is in the best interest of Albertans. As well, I believe firmly that all of us must leave behind the negatives in any countries from which we come; we share the positives, and we grow together as a people. This cultural heritage move, this move to establish Canada's first multicultural commission, together with the others, puts Albertans out front in this concept, out front in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank members for their expression of support and for their kind comments, and I hope that we will have a unanimous vote for this Bill on second reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 33 read a second time]

Bill 17 Surveys Act

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 17, the Surveys Act, and I would like to acknowledge the presence of the executive director of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association, Mr. Ken Allred, who is in the public gallery.

The Bill is a complete rewrite of the Surveys Act, which is the legislation governing the standards and procedures for land surveys in Alberta. The present Act has remained virtually unchanged for the past 70 years. The proposed legislation retains the basic principles of the present Act, while clarifying and consolidating the provisions in many areas. There has been a general improvement in the education and training of professional land surveyors in recent years and consequent improvement in the professional competence. In recognition of this fact many of the prescriptive requirements of the present Act have been removed to allow for a greater flexibility for surveyors to exercise their professional judgment. The proposed legislation is based on a draft prepared by a committee which was chaired by the director of surveys.

Just by way of background, back in February of 1983 the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association wrote a letter to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife requesting that the Surveys Act be, first, reviewed, and secondly, rewritten. A committee was struck. The committee consisted of representatives of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association, the Land Titles Office of the Attorney General's department, and the Alberta Bureau of Surveying and Mapping. Over a period of two

years this hardworking group produced a thorough report which formed the foundation of the legislative draft, and I want to commend them for their diligence and dedication to the task.

I want to alert the House that I'll be making a number of small amendments to this Bill in Committee of the Whole. These amendments result from some very useful comments provided on the Bill by the Canadian Bar Association and additional suggestions from the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association. I will elaborate on the rationale for these amendments at the committee stage.

I would like to recall to the memory of this Assembly the recent information session which many of us attended and which was sponsored by the Alberta Land Surveyor's Association. Most of the comments after that session recognized the fine work of the professional organization, which dates back to 1910. We were impressed that members of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association are well aware of the public trust that has been bestowed upon them to conduct their services with impartiality in order to preserve the framework for the land tenure system of Alberta.

I ask that all colleagues in the Assembly support Bill 17.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: [Interjections] Love those groans. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick comment on it after reading through the Bill, although I had one minor problem with one section of it, and I'll introduce an amendment on that.

Basically, it appears that the purpose of the Bill is to provide a better overall structure to the process of conducting boundary surveys, and is practical in that approach, and we would certainly be planning on supporting it in the future.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on Bill 17?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 17 read a second time]

Bill 22

Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Amendment Act, 1987

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 22, the Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Amendment Act, 1987.

As I said at introduction, the amendment expands the opportunity for Albertans that are members of rural electrification associations to obtain a loan as an association under the part 2 section of the Act. That's the section that refers to industry loans for capital rebuild. Thirty percent can be obtained interest free of the project costs of a rebuild.

And in addition, Mr. Speaker, we're clarifying a situation where we had offered to assist some of the native farmers on Indian reserves with part 2 loans, but we were doing it, in a sense, without the part 1 loan application in there, and so we are clarifying that in the sense of taking out of the Act that section that refers to part 1 so that they would be eligible in the future.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in addressing Bill 22 at second stage, I would like to commend the minister for taking this initiative. I think it meshes well with his initiatives through the master con-

tract process. And while the minister is well aware of concerns that I and members of my caucus have about the private-system delivery for electrical power in the province of Alberta, I think there is ample evidence to suggest that rural consumers in other parts of Canada receive their power at a better overall rate, although I'm not sure they are better served. We get very good service in Alberta. But in terms of the price people pay, I think we could find better ways of delivering power.

But that point aside, I do commend the minister for the efforts that he's made to help deliver this service to rural Albertans in a more fair and equitable sort of way and for taking this sort of initiative that helps people, especially young people who may be moving out into rural areas and find the cost of installing power to be a very onerous expense. This will help it, and I and my colleagues will support it.

[Motion carried; Bill 22 read a second time]

Bill 29

Young Offenders Amendment Act, 1987

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move second reading of Bill 29, which is the Young Offenders Amendment Act, 1987.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, reading this through, it seems to us that it is basically an Act that is based on the experience gained since the Act itself was brought in, in 1984, and has a number of sections that deal with and remedy certain shortcomings noticed in that period of time, together with some tailoring that has had to be done because of the introduction of the amendments to the federal Young Offenders Act last year. In Committee of the Whole we'll have some detailed comments, but to us it appears that the Bill is needed and useful.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on Bill 29?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 29 read a second time]

Bill 34

Occupational Therapy Profession Act

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Occupational Therapy Profession Act.

Mr. Speaker, in the province of Alberta we have some 400-plus occupational therapists. Their services are increasingly sought by local health authorities, school boards, and private agencies to provide very important rehabilitative services to people in the province. Currently no legislation exists that provides professional status to this profession, to this occupation. Bill 34 will provide this type of legislation. It is right-to-tide legislation. It provides for the profession to oversee professional education and discipline of its members. I think it will do a great deal towards ensuring that there is a high standard of professional care provided by occupational therapists in this province and therefore serve the main purpose of our professional legislation, and that is serving the protection of the public and the quality of service provided.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton

Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, thank you. Mr. Speaker, because at long last we have this Act before us. I know the occupational therapists throughout the province have been lobbying and working on this Act for years now. Again, it's a testament and legacy to the slowness of this Conservative government that they should finally, at 10:30 on this Tuesday night, bring forth Bill 34 for second reading. It has been long, long overdue, and I really can't for the life of me understand why when, as I say, other jurisdictions have determined how occupational therapists have . . . [interjections]

MRS. MIROSH: Sit down, and let's vote then.

REV. ROBERTS: Hey, wait a minute. I'm talking about Bill 34, second reading, and as I say, Mr. Speaker, it's long overdue. If the minister of . . . [interjections] Whoa, wait a minute; what's going on . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. There is really no reference in Bill 34 as to when it should be done; the matter is being done now. Would the hon. member please address second reading of Bill 34.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

REV. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The recognition, finally, at this point in time at least, of the need of rehabilitative medicine, generally of the kinds of work that occupational therapists, together with their colleagues in physio and speech therapy and recreational therapy and so on -- it's a great recognition that they finally have this Bill that we certainly will support. I just want to say to hon. members that we on this side would be much more impatient and wanted to bring this Bill forward last year, when it was ready to go. Nonetheless, there are still a number of questions that we have about it that we will bring forth at the committee stage.

It's interesting that there's no mention of private practice, though we have physios in this province who are in private practice and can set up and have services outside of the hospital sector and bill a fee for service for their private practice. Again, in Alberta it's a bit of an anomaly that this isn't provided for, as I understand it in this Bill 34 for occupational therapists, and there's some inconsistency there which I'd question the government on. I'm satisfied, however, that in terms of the hospital sector and those within long-term care centres as well that need occupational therapists, this Bill, as the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey has said, serves the public well and protects them for all kinds of abuse that may go on in this field. In fact, we have well-trained occupational therapists who need to be continued to be supported and encouraged with their training and standards that they have, and they perform a very vital function both in the active treatment hospital sector as well as in the long-term care sector. Again, it seems to me, together with physiotherapists, that there aren't enough of them, and that in fact we need to continue to develop and encourage them, and this Bill 34 will help quite a bit in that regard.

As I say, I have some more particular questions at committee stage, but certainly would want on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to bring along third reading and proclamation of this Bill so that we can get on with the good work of rehabilitative medicine and occupational therapy in this province at long last.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a few words. My wife happens to be an occupational therapist, and I thought I should undertake to read the Bill in some detail. I think that generally it's a fairly sound Bill. I certainly agree with the principle: the idea of having an Act to govern occupational therapy. I found an inordinate amount of the Bill to deal with discipline and do have some concern with section 9 on penalties, but those can be raised at Committee of the Whole.

I would just like to commend the government and say that it's about time they brought forward something like this. The idea of self-regulating occupations and professions is an important one, and it's something that we should be proceeding with. I would like to see the government do the same thing in regard to teachers, for example. So I think that it's long overdue and welcome.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Lacombe.

MR. R. MOORE: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to get up and make a few comments. I'd like to point out to everyone in this House that this Bill would have been passed a heck of a lot sooner if it hadn't been for the last two speakers holding it up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, while I pull out my suitcase of extensive briefing notes on this particular matter. How much time do I have?

I would merely like to express support for second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey wish to close debate?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, there have been several speakers, so there might as well be one more.

Just very briefly, I would like to mention that the occupational therapists' association has been very much involved in the preparation of this legislation, and having met with them on two occasions, I find that they are quite supportive of the legislation. I welcome the questions during committee.

[Motion carried; Bill 34 read a second time]

Bill 36

Podiatry Amendment Act, 1987

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move second reading of Bill 36, the Podiatry Amendment Act.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering whether the Member for Calgary Glenmore was going to put her foot in her mouth over this Act here. [interjections]

Listen, hon. members, this is quite a Bill here, number 36,

because there is nothing that's more important. I think, for the health care of a number of people in this province than the care of their feet, and their mobility is all dependent in terms of their foot care. I know it sounds in some ways trivial or something that isn't taken seriously, but I'm quite concerned about this Bill. Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am most concerned as it says it's going to repeal section 16, where it says that

nothing in this Act prohibits any person from demonstrating, fitting or selling shoes, shoe appliances, supports or remedies designed or intended for the relief of foot discomfort.

Now, there's no question that the podiatrists in this province are the chief health care providers of foot care. In other provinces and other jurisdictions in the United States, chiropodists are the ones who... [interjections] In fact certainly orthopedic surgeons and medically trained doctors who have specialties in orthopedic surgery and medicine themselves have a lot to do with foot care.

I was pleased to be at the 78th annual general meeting of the Victorian Order of Nurses today. The VON, having just concluded some difficult negotiations with Edmonton board of health vis-à-vis provision of home care, are in some ways, though, feeling pleased that they can diversify into other areas of community and personal health, and foot care is one of the areas that they would like to pursue in terms of their skill and expertise in delivery of service.

As I say, it's really a very important area of health care and a very expanding one as we come to a better understanding that people who are severely restricted in their feet and in their movement really have many other health care and long-term care needs. So if we can rehabilitate people and ensure that they have circulation to their extremities and to their feet and good foot care, their health status generally will be enhanced.

As I say, podiatrists have traditionally done this in the province. Chiropodists are others in other jurisdictions who have done it. Orthopedic surgeons are there. But I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will throw it wide open. I would like to hear, from the hon. member who has sponsored this Bill, why it is just thrown wide open to any person, so that now, with the repeal of this section, it seems that any person can demonstrate, fit or sell shoes, shoe appliances, and so on. It seems to me that there would be a number of foot doctors out there, people who might just have some very entrepreneurial ways of wanting to sell shoes and foot appliances and so on, who might also want to get into diagnosis of foot care and might have some real conflicts of interest in terms of providing appliances and orthopedic shoes, but who might not have the training and the skill and the background to know exactly how and why a certain person needs a certain shoe appliance.

In reticence about this, Mr. Speaker, I feel at this point until there's further clarification from the hon. member and committee discussion on it that I want to really withhold support and that of our caucus, because it's not clear in terms of who is going to be delivering foot care, which is so important. Who is going to be delivering it? If it's any person, are these people going to have certain training, background skills, levels of standards that are going to be maintained in this very, very important area of health care? So until those questions are clarified, I continue to have reticence about it and will withhold supporting it at this stage and wait for committee discussion on it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHUMIR: I had to share very similar concerns to the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker. The concern I have is that there's not only an issue as to who is going to deliver services of this kind, but as I read the legislation and the amendment there is no prohibition whatsoever with respect to any person referring to themselves as a podiatrist. As I read the legislation, and I would be appreciative of any clarification on this matter, there is no right to tide in the Podiatry Act. It's a very unusual piece of legislation. We've just heard the introduction of the occupational therapists' legislation; that's a right to title piece of legislation. The Podiatry Act provides for registration, and the only prohibition in that legislation is that provided for in section 15, which provides that nobody shall carry out the practice of podiatry, and if you do that you're guilty of an offence. But there's no statement that no one shall call themselves a podiatrists. If you eliminate that particular provision, then anybody can not only carry out these forms of treatment to feet, but they can go and say that they are a podiatrist with impunity and without penalty. They may not be registered under the legislation. The registration provisions apparently still pertain, but that would seem to me to be a very empty form of registration, totally without content because there is neither a right to tide nor an exclusive right to practise.

I believe that this legislation is not well thought out. The change is not well thought out; it is not well understood. I would be very appreciative, not merely of a few brief words from the introducer or any other member of the government on this matter but of a thorough explanation with respect to the concerns that have been expressed by the previous speaker and myself on this issue, because this is a serious matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are ready for the question on Bill 36? Order please.

MR. McEACHERN: I'm not ready for the question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, but you sit down, and I will announce it. Then I'll sit down, and you can stand. Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker asked the sponsor of the Bill to say a few words, and I was hoping she would stand up. That's why I was a little slow getting up. Also, what I was concerned with was that when she would get up, if she would, and make some explanation, we could also agree that she would not necessarily close debate. I know it's traditional -- and that's fair enough -- that when a minister introduces a Bill and gives some opening comments, that several other people speak, and when everybody has had their say, the minister then winds up debate. But I would be concerned that she would give us some kind of an explanation about this Bill and that perhaps members on this side would be allowed to reply before we actually put this to a vote, or does the [member] have no intentions of speaking and defending the particular Bill that she has sponsored? [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Standing Order 23 is very clear. A member may only speak twice to a Bill if the hon. member is closing debate.

Are you ready for the question on Bill 36 for second reading?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a second time]

Bill 37

Wild Rose Foundation Amendment Act, 1987

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps before we proceed with the hon. Member for Red Deer South's Bill, members are aware that the pages have left for the evening, so the Chair will be tolerant of those members who must get messages to each other. And the second point: the Chair understands there will be another hockey game.

Hon. Member for Red Deer South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to move second reading of Bill 37, the Wild Rose Foundation Amendment Act, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends the existing Act to make provisions for the Wild Rose Foundation to better meet their original mandate. That is to say that they found under the existing guidelines, under section 3, with the eight categories, that there are some organizations who in part fall under one of those categories but whose mandate is actually broader than what those categories allow for, so they're not eligible for the category. On the other hand, they're not eligible for the Wild Rose Foundation. So this is to clarify that and bring the Act into line with the original mandate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Member for Red Deer South moving second reading and providing some explanation on this Bill. I think it's important, however, to look back at some of the comments that may have been made a few years ago. I have in front of me a copy of *Hansard* from October 29, 1984, which is when the foundation was actually set up. At that time the then hon. minister, Mr. Payne, from Calgary Fish Creek, stated that

groups that have previously been or indeed that are currently entitled to apply for grants from other foundations that are funded by lotteries profits, notably those of a cultural, athletic, or recreational nature, would be excluded or would not be considered appropriate applicants to the Wild Rose Foundation.

Now, a few years later, we have the hon. Member for Red Deer South standing up and saying: "Well, we made a little mistake. Those groups should have been included in the first place. Maybe other groups should have been included in there as well." I'm just not sure that that's the case, that these groups were meant to be there in the first place. Or is it the fact that the Auditor General in the 1986 report criticized the Wild Rose Foundation because it provided funds to the organizations that this amendment will look after?

So it would appear that there was an error and rather than saying, "Well, we erred and we'd best correct that and send those directions off to those who sit on the Wild Rose Foundation board," no, we'll just change the Act. But you see, there are a couple of other problems that go along with this amendment Mr. Speaker. The new amendment doesn't provide for any restrictions actually. Groups now will be able to be double funded, and I would ask the mover: is it the intent of the government to allow some groups to be doubly funded while other groups will only enjoy funding from one source? If they should

be excluded or if there is only to be one source of funding for some groups, then this amendment doesn't address that problem.

There's also the problem that the Wild Rose Foundation board created a particular problem that's not addressed in this amendment and that was the word "organizations." Now, in the Act it says that money shall be granted to organizations. The foundation clearly went beyond that. They thought they could change that word arbitrarily, that they could just give money out to whoever they wanted, and they gave it out to two individuals. Now, I don't want the members of the Assembly to think that I don't want certain individuals to have any funds, because these particular individuals, Mr. Speaker, are quite worthy recipients of some of the funds that were made available to them. But they were nonetheless two individuals, not organizations, that received money for worthy projects. Juliette Kang from Edmonton received \$11,000 for study at Curtis Institute of Music in Philadelphia, and Mimi Luk from Calgary received over \$7,000 for participation in Up With People.

Once again, that's not been addressed by this amendment. Is it the intent of the government to amend an Act to correct a mistake that has been made by the foundation but that leaves it wide open again for that very foundation to only give to organizations and violate the very Act that says they shall only give to organizations, if they should happen to choose to give to individuals? I think that, too, must be addressed.

Finally, the amendment doesn't deal with the possibility of groups applying for money so that they may be able to pay salaried staff. Now, I'm of the opinion that the foundation is not to make money available to groups who would make the grant money available to a salaried staff person. But again, there were some errors made by the foundation board, and I think they ought to be addressed, because they're not addressed by this amendment. I would hope that the mover would be able to address some of these concerns that I have, because right now I think that it's still very, very loose and doesn't respond to the problems that the Auditor General found in his report.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on second reading of Bill 37? Hon. Member for Red Deer South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just quickly respond to a couple of the concerns that have been raised. Firstly, I would say that certainly the intent of these amendments is not to accommodate any specific individuals or situations that have occurred in the past. In reference to some of the specific accusations that the member brought forward, I would suggest that perhaps it's something he might want to bring forward at question period or on the Order Paper.

I would also say that it's not the intent to allow for double funding. The other thing that I would like to point out as it relates to individuals, is that the Act presently reads:

The purpose of the Foundation is to provide funding to volunteer non-profit organizations . . .

With the amendment it will still read:

The purpose of the Foundation is to provide funding to volunteer non-profit organizations that provide necessary and valuable community services to Albertans.

So I think it's very clear, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 33 read a second time]

Bill 35**Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1987**

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have returned.

Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of Bill 35, the Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1987.

In 1981 the Legislature enacted the Business Corporations Act, and the passage of that particular legislation culminated a very thorough and constructive review of the old Companies Act of this province. That review was done and the recommendations were made by the Institute of Law Research and Reform and, in particular, Mr. George Field. Based on the recommendations of the institute, a new approach, a fresh approach to the legislation was put forward, and the new Act resulted in a different approach entirely to company law in this province. The new Business Corporations Act at that time in effect established a different philosophy, a philosophy that the government should not be involved on an unwarranted basis in the lives of companies. The previous Companies Act intruded in many respects in a needless way beyond those areas that were really in the public interest. As a result the new legislation was forthcoming and, as I say, brought a new and fresh approach. At the same time it established some uniformity for company law across Canada.

Since 1981, after six years of this Act being in practice in the field and being subject to administrative action on the part of the Companies Act a number of amendments are perhaps in order to bring the Act fully in line with its original objectives, and that's the purpose of the Bill before us. It has, I think, approximately 27 proposed changes in the Act itself by way of amendment. I would suggest that those changes are more of a fine-tuning of the Act as opposed to an overhaul of the Business Corporations Act. I'll be glad to speak to the various sections that are affected, the substantive ones, in committee, where it's perhaps more appropriate. But in the meantime, if any other members have any comments with respect to the Bill, I'd be pleased to hear from them and address them later.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Bill in principle. It's basically, as you said, a housekeeping Bill, sort of tidying up some things. I did want to ask a question, and perhaps you'll be able to answer it tonight or in some detail at Committee of the Whole.

One of the sort of more oft-repeated changes, I suppose, that it makes -- you mentioned some 27 sections, and a number of

those sections are just changing the term "resident Albertans" to "resident Canadians." I gather from talking to some of my business lawyer friends that that's because that term "resident Albertans" was in some cases rather restrictive for small businesses. A small businessman who found himself moving to, say, the coast had to end up designating somebody in Alberta to be on his board of directors or to look after his business for him, because he was no longer resident in Alberta yet wanted to retain the ownership of the business. Because of the requirements about residency in Alberta for a majority of board members and that sort of thing, it caused a certain number of inconveniences that were unnecessary and didn't seem to help much.

So I guess I would say that removing those inconveniences would be helpful, but I wonder if you have looked at the possible problems that that may have created in some of the government programs that we have. I'm not saying that it does. It's sort of more of a question. I'm thinking of some of the requirements for companies to get Vencap loans or Alberta stock savings plan loans or SBECs or small business term assistance Act loans or any of the government programs in relation to small businesses. Will there be a subsequent opening up of who qualifies, compared to what there has been in the past and has the Bill been checked out in that regard?

I'm not really too worried that you give me an answer right now. I will obviously look into it in more detail in that regard myself, and perhaps you would have some answers for us in Committee of the Whole or tonight if you have one.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on Bill 35?

[Motion carried; Bill 35 read a second time]

Bill 43**Alberta Civil Service
Welfare Fund Dissolution Act**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 43.

As I said at first reading, this is a very simple Bill. It repeals section 27 of the Public Service Act and allows the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees to transfer the funds that remain from the Alberta Civil Service Welfare Fund into a trust fund managed by the union for its present and past members and their families and beneficiaries.

[Motion carried; Bill 43 read a second time]

[At 11:02 p.m. the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

