

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Monday, February 14, 1994 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 94/02/14

head: **Committee of Supply**

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee come to order. This evening we're here to begin the first of two days of debate on the 1993-94 supplementary estimates.

Before commencing and calling upon the ministers to speak on these and begin debate, I wonder if I could get unanimous consent from the committee to revert to Introduction of Guests. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.
Edmonton-Strathcona.

head: **Introduction of Guests**

MR. ZARIWNY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like this evening to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature two members of my constituency who deserve our best wishes and congratulations this February 14, Valentine's Day. These two people have chosen our beautiful Legislature Building and grounds to make their commitment to each other in the form of their engagement: Nicole Hebert and Charlie Letourneau. Nicole is a schoolteacher, and Charlie owns his own construction company. We wish you health, happiness, and prosperity. May I ask you to rise and receive the sincere warm wishes of this Assembly.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Before we commence, I just would like to gently remind the hon. members – I'm sure that the absence of a few months from committee would not dim your memories, but in case it has. For the benefit of those in the gallery, we would say that committee stage is a less formal stage of the Legislature. People are allowed to move from place to place. The only restriction is that they have to stand in their place in order to be recognized in order to speak, and other rules are relaxed. We allow coffee and hot chocolate to be served in here, and people may even take off their jackets. We discourage conversations or lively debates or arguments and invite all members who wish to engage in the same to remove themselves to the chambers after they have received the permission of their respective Whips.

With that in mind, I'd like to call upon the Provincial Treasurer.

head: **Supplementary Estimates 1993-94**

MR. DINNING: Welcome to the 1994 version of the Committee of Supply. I know all of my colleagues behind me and those four across the way, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, look forward to many a concentrated hour of debate and dialogue on expenditure in this Legislative Assembly and in this Committee of Supply. You have before you this evening the request by the government to the Assembly to appropriate to Her Majesty some \$100 million in three areas.

I would refer hon. members to, first of all, page 11 of the book where we are asking to appropriate from the general revenue fund funds for the Legislative Assembly. This is some \$128,815 for the

purchase of capital assets, Mr. Chairman. Most of these, of course, are to fund the purchase of some capital assets in constituency offices. Again the dollars that have been appropriated for operating purposes will be underspent by a minimum of \$128,815. This appropriation is required because there is at this point questionable ability to transfer funds between the capital and operating votes.

I'm sure that my colleagues will be happy to answer questions on the Legislative Assembly. I believe you, Mr. Chairman, or the vice-chairman of the Members' Services Committee – I don't believe the chairman of Members' Services Committee will attend upon the committee to answer questions on the Legislative Assembly vote, but I'm sure that members of the Members' Services Committee would be happy to, especially for those dollars associated with the increased purchase of capital equipment for the offices of the Official Opposition.

I would turn you to page 21, where the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism tonight will explain his estimates for some \$40 million directly associated with the national infrastructure program. Again, Mr. Chairman, these are dollars that are being appropriated, but let us make it perfectly clear that these are also dollars that are being reallocated and are going unspent in various other parts of the provincial government's spending plans this year, including the likes of the Department of Transportation and Utilities.

Of course, I see my colleague the MLA for Wainwright is right there, Johnny-on-the-spot, wanting to make sure that his constituency is getting their fair share of asphalt, oil, gravel, and all of those things that the people of the Wainwright constituency would expect their MLA to be doing on their behalf. Again, the benevolence, the good fiscal management of the Minister of Transportation and Utilities is in effect making these dollars available by underspending his budget, and these dollars are being reallocated to the national infrastructure program.

As well, Mr. Chairman, on pages 25 and on are some \$60 million in expenditures being requested for the operating side of the Department of Health budget. Again, the Minister of Health will defend these and explain them, but where are those dollars coming from? They are going to come from the unspent or underspent budgets of the Department of Health in their capital equipment program as well as in the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, where that department's capital program is associated with health projects and the various other projects are going underspent.

So I can assure hon. members that the \$100,128,815 that is requested of the Committee of Supply and subsequently through the Appropriation Act will not lead to an increase in spending by the government or approved expenditure by the Legislative Assembly for 1993-94. I think that's important to give that assurance to all members, to this Assembly, and most assuredly to all Albertans, Mr. Chairman.

With those opening remarks I would turn to my colleague the Deputy Premier, Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, to begin the debate related to Economic Development and Tourism's vote.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as the Provincial Treasurer has pointed out, what we're asking for under the supplementary estimates on pages – at least the ones that are particular to the Department of Economic Development and Tourism – 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 are essentially not new dollars within the whole system. I think that the government itself should be congratulated and the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer. In the 15 years that I've had the privilege of being in this Assembly,

I think this is the first year in essence where there has not been a special warrant passed during a whole 12-month period, and that is quite an accomplishment, ladies and gentlemen. I remember there was a time in the past where in fact special warrants approved by cabinets on a weekly basis over a year would total \$500 million to \$700 million. There is a new fiscal plan, a new fiscal reality, and I think that's very significant.

What we have here tonight are estimates amounting to \$40 million for the first participation of Alberta in the new national infrastructure program. Now, I'd like to say a few words about this program and bring all members up to date as to where we're at right now, because I think this is very important. The public has the right to know. This government when Mr. Chrétien's government was elected, the new federal government of Canada, very quickly after the election said the province of Alberta would participate with the new federal government in the national infrastructure program. A lot of work has been done with respect to this program, Mr. Chairman, but I think tonight hon. members would like to know exactly where we're at and where we're going with respect to this.

8:10

First of all, the infrastructure works program, as all members know, is a two-year \$6 billion co-operative program between the federal, provincial, and local governments in Canada. I might add that in the discussions that have been held across Canada in the last couple of months, there are a lot of variations with respect to how this program is being implemented in different provinces. There is no one consistent way that it's being implemented by the federal government, the same way or equitably, across the country of Canada. So each province basically had to sit down and talk about a number of things.

First of all, Alberta had to determine what its share was going to be. We've negotiated what our share would be. We calculated it using a factor derived from the provincial population and the level of unemployment in the province of Alberta. We've arrived that the Alberta share for this program is \$172,732,000, and that would of course be exactly the same, then, for the municipalities in our province, and that would be exactly the same figure for the federal government. So if you were to take all of that \$172,732,000 and multiply it by three, in essence what you have is a total co-operative investment to be made for infrastructure works in Alberta, \$518,196,000 over two years, and the one-third share is very easy to determine in terms of what that is all about. That's behind us, hon. members of the committee. That's been signed off, and that's been dealt with.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, then is: how would Alberta deal with this program within the province of Alberta? Some provinces have taken the position that all the federal dollars must go directly to the provincial government, and the provincial government then would make a decision on the provincial level of how these dollars would then be reallocated within its province. This minister, who's been appointed the lead minister with respect to this program, did a consultation with the provincewide leaders of the Alberta Association of MDs and Counties, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the Improvement Districts Association of the province of Alberta, as well as the mayors of Edmonton and Calgary, and after lengthy discussion and consultation with all of our colleagues, Alberta will allocate its dollars on a per capita basis back to the municipalities of the province of Alberta.

So we will determine the population of the province of Alberta on January 1, 1994. We will divide that population into that share of \$172,732,000. If you were to do that on the basis of the 1993-

94 population, you in essence get \$67.083254 per capita. That's what it amounts to. It's \$67.083254 per capita.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because we're still in one final discussion with the federal government and we are announcing it in essence tonight by saying that, we will send these dollars out on the basis of a minimum of \$66 per capita for the two years. I just finished using the figure \$67.08. There's going to be some small portion of administration and some other things that have been agreed to with the federal government that have to be part of the program. So at this point in time, the correspondence that will be going from the province to all of its municipalities will be saying that they could expect for the provincial share to be at least \$66. Now, it could be \$66.53 or \$66.24, but that's something that will be dealt with. That's a figure over two years, so you have to divide it by two in order to get the annual allocation. It would be \$33 per capita. That in essence is now behind us as well and agreed to with no difficulty whatsoever.

We said also that we would deliver programs in the province of Alberta on the basis of applications from municipal governments. Now, I want to make it very clear that that's the way we're going to do it in Alberta. In other provinces in this country the provincial government has determined that it would decide how these dollars are going to be spent on the basis of its municipalities, but this is to be a municipality initiated program in the province of Alberta. Municipalities will know what their population is. They'll know what they're eligible for. They will send a letter to us outlining what projects they want to have considered under this program. We agreed on one consideration: that projects submitted for funding consideration must – I underline the word "must" – have the endorsement of the initiating local government by way of a formal resolution or motion, and a copy of the resolution or motion must accompany the application. In other words, it will not be a position whereby the director of sewage control in a particular municipality sends the application to Edmonton unknown to its local council or its mayor or its reeve or what have you. So the local municipal government will have its meeting, pass a motion basically saying they're eligible for so many dollars under this program, send the list over to us, and I have indicated to them that the province of Alberta will use a minimum amount of bureaucracy with respect to the implementation of this program. That, in essence, is one of the matters already agreed to.

Now, it's called an infrastructure program, and we've agreed in the province of Alberta and we've agreed with the federal government that in Alberta we will have the broadest possible sense of definition of the word "infrastructure." A project, again, will have the widest possible kind of definition with respect to it. Infrastructure can include and be such things as physical, capital, technological works, transportation works, waterworks, sewage works, electronic works, communications infrastructure, agricultural infrastructure, irrigation infrastructure, recreation infrastructure, tourism or environmental infrastructure, or any other form of infrastructure which may be deemed to be a priority of the respective local governments. We're asking them to be very flexible in terms of what it is they want to do at their local level and how it is that they want to deal with these matters at their local level. While there was some debate with the federal government, who wanted to narrow that restriction, in terms of our consultations with various federal ministers with respect to this program they could understand that every province's municipalities have their own priorities and they must be dealt with. So we, in essence, have the widest possible kind of flexibility with respect to it.

Mr. Chairman, the last day for project approvals will be March 31, 1996. The last day for project completions will be March 31, 1997. The last day for claims and payout reconciliations will be September 30, 1997. Now, again, these are local government priorities from our municipalities based on a per capita allocation. They know what their population is as of January 1, 1994, January 1, 1993. In essence, they will know that they can do their planning on the basis of \$66 per capita over the next two years. They'll determine their priorities. It will not be the government of Alberta that will determine their priorities. So in the city of Fort McMurray or in the city of Calgary their councils will determine those priorities, not the province of Alberta. Secondly, in order to forward their applications to us, they must have a resolution of their council, in essence, so that all of the duly elected people in that municipality have been a participant in the decision-making with respect to this. Thirdly, the project must be infrastructure based, but I've defined what the word "infrastructure" can relate to, and it can have the widest possible kinds of interpretations. Fourthly, we hope that they will show demonstrated job generation with respect to each and every one of these applications. Of course, we're quite prepared to accept an incremental project or an acceleration of an existing project. In other words, if a municipality has something under way and they want to in fact add something to it, that can be part of this program, or if they want to advance a project that they've said normally would take three or four years to do, then in essence under this program if they can get it done in two years, that's even better, and we'll bend over backwards to try and deal with it.

Now, we also would encourage regional applications. If municipalities want to come together and in essence two or three municipalities pool their so-called dollars or their commitment, we would be acceptable to that. We would be accommodating with respect to that.

Mr. Chairman, it was our hope at one time that in essence we could simplify the administration with this program to be very, very simple. First of all, the municipality has its one-third of its dollars. It submits an application to us. We know what our per capita allocation is, and we send a cheque to them based on the per capita allocation. We had approached the federal government and said: "Look, you, federal government, send your cheques directly to the municipal governments. We don't need an infrastructure. We don't need a middleman in Edmonton that basically says they have to come to a central point here, a clearinghouse." We thought they were going to accept that, but now in our most recent conversations it seems that that is not the wish they have. We have one additional consultation tomorrow or the next day. It seems that in essence they don't want to send their cheques directly to municipalities. From our perspective that would be great if the federal government did it, but it seems we're going to have to have a mechanism, a management committee here at a provincial level to deal with the federal allocation.

8:20

To this point in time the federal government is not quite clear in their own minds if they are going to come in at the tail end with their dollars. It was our hope that they would put their dollars up front, as the province of Alberta is putting their dollars up front. It may very well be that the province of Alberta will have to in fact assist in the carrying of the costs with respect to the federal participation. As I said, though, there are still some more hours of consultation to go with respect to this, and hopefully we'll be able to deal with that.

We've also attempted to get the federal government to accept a recommendation from us that in addition to several people from

the province of Alberta and several people from the federal government being on the management committee, we also have a representative from the municipalities in the province of Alberta. We've advanced that, and I'm pleased to say that they've now agreed, after nearly a month and a half of saying no, that in essence we will have a municipal representative on the planning committee as well. It will be someone selected from among the three leaders of the Improvement Districts Association of Alberta or the Alberta Association of MDs and Counties or the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association. Unfortunately, because this is a partnership arrangement with the federal government they do not believe that the municipal participant should have any voting rights, so the municipal participant on the committee will simply be a participant with observer status and not voting status. We were quite happy and in fact we wanted to have a leader from our municipal governments in the province of Alberta to have full voting rights as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will conclude this very shortly. The two things that basically have held us up to this point in time are the two items that I've just talked about in the last few minutes. There was discussion with the federal government as recently as today with respect to this, and there'll be some more in the next several days.

I should add one other thing: that Indian reserves are separate. They are not part of this. Indian reserves are being handled directly by the federal government.

What you have, Mr. Chairman, is a profile for the remainder of this year, to March 31, 1994, a request for \$40 million. It would be my hope to have this agreement signed with the federal government within a matter of days, maybe as early as this weekend, and then to have, hopefully no later than next week, the documentation going out to all of our municipalities in the province of Alberta on the basis of which we have talked about now. I've been saying this for the last two months, so there's nothing new in terms of the parameters. Any overtures we've had from any municipal government in the province of Alberta, basically we've been telling them to get ready. Many of them in fact will already have figured it out and already have got a resolution of their municipal council. If they can deliver it to us as soon as possible, we will hope to have decisions made prior to March 31 of 1994 for the allocation of these \$40 million that the Assembly is being asked to vote on today. These dollars will be allocated prior to March 31 of 1994 to get this program going.

When the Provincial Treasurer comes down in a couple of weeks from now, he will have a dollar figure for the fiscal year 1994-1995, and then we will have another figure for the fiscal year 1995-96, and there will be a small figure to tidy it up in the third year. What is important with respect to this is that the cash flow that the province has to deal with of course fits in with the balanced budget profile that the Provincial Treasurer will be bringing down. It would be very convenient, very conducive in fact, if the federal government of course could find the dollars to put up at the front rather than having to put their dollars up after the fact, because there's a carrying cost then for our local municipalities. We've done a test run basically looking at the fiscal parameters of the municipalities in the province of Alberta, and we're pretty well satisfied that the dollars are now in their kitties, so to speak, to initiate the program.

There is no way of determining and I cannot answer if some member in this Assembly were to ask, "Well, what are the anticipated jobs associated with this?" If this had been a program that we had initiated from the top, we could have done that analysis. We're in a position of being led by the municipalities in the province of Alberta. I can't tell you today because no

application has come forth from any municipality. How many jobs will be created in a municipality? I'll never be in a position to do that until it's all over. In essence, because our view was that this was to be a locally initiated program at the local level, the best source of information with respect to that would be the municipalities themselves. Presumably by March 31 of this year when we've allocated that first \$40 million I'll be in a position in the early part of April to respond to a question, "Well, how many projected jobs are anticipated from this?" but at the moment we don't know.

We're doing this in harmony with the federal government. We're doing this in harmony with our municipalities. It's a locally initiated program. The province of Alberta is accommodating this in terms of the request made from the new Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Chrétien, who viewed this program to be of significant importance to his new government, and that's the process they're taking.

Mr. Chairman, there may be questions with respect to this or comments that individual members would like to raise, and I'll be very happy to deal with them. It's very simple: these are not new dollars. These are dollars that, thank heaven, the fiscally responsible Minister of Transportation and Utilities was able to find in his budget. The only way we can deal with it under the new rules of this wide open Assembly and the responsibility of all MLAs is to have all MLAs vote on it. It probably would be rather tragic if the 32 members of the opposition voted against this \$40 million request, but it would be quite interesting – quite interesting – on not only the national level but the provincial level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health, [interjection] Would you like to hear from the third minister, and then we can go with the free flow of the questions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; if you're going to call for the question, then I have to ask the question. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

DR. PERCY: We would like to hear from the other ministers, because there are two evenings of debate on the supplementary estimates, and it would be better . . . [interjections]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Hon. members, when we're in estimates and we have two nights, if you call for the question, the Chair is obliged to ask the committee, "Are you ready for the question?" All it takes is for one member to stand up, and that member must be recognized, because we do have a deadline on that, which is the end of the second night. Just calling the question invites exactly what we have got going here. So if you wish to have the ministers speak, fine, but if you want to keep calling the question, then we go back, and as long as there is a member standing for the next two nights, we will go.

DR. PERCY: We would prefer to hear from both ministers before we initiate our debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I was hoping for too.
All right; the hon. Minister of Health.

MRS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to make some very, very brief comments on the supplementary estimates for the Department of Health. As all members would recall, there was a commitment made in the budget of the Department of Health last year to find some \$127 million of savings in consultation with the health providers in the public of the province. This process began with a roundtable at Red Deer, and a number of very excellent recommendations on where to achieve those savings were raised. The one recommendation in particular is the one that we will deal with tonight, and it was a very strong recommendation from the participants at that roundtable to freeze, to delay any capital expenditures in health pending the continued roundtable discussions on the restructuring of health. That occurred, and we are appropriating from the Public Works, Supply and Services estimates on capital projects some \$31,800,000 and from Health's capital area some \$28,200,000. Those come to the \$60 million that we are discussing tonight. I realize that this required a great deal of understanding and indeed in some cases some sacrifices from members of our communities across this province, but I truly believe it was a wise decision. The communities now are assessing their health needs and with that their capital needs, so I appreciate the understanding of the people of this province who had projects that indeed were important to their communities. They have been very understanding, very co-operative in working through this process. I think indeed by proceeding this way, we will have capital projects that are more in keeping with today and the future needs of our health industry.

With that, I invite comments and questions from the other members in the Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, after the orgy of self-adulation from the Deputy Premier on the fiscal integrity of the province, I would just like to bring the debate back to a little reality. First, it is true that there have been no special warrants, but again since we just had a budget that was passed mid-October, it's not surprising. What is surprising, of course, is the tendency of this government to make significant shifts from capital into operating. If you look at the numbers in the May 6 budget, capital investments were \$847 million. On September 8 budget capital investments were \$808 million. In the November 24 budget update capital investments were \$679 million, and there's been a lockstep rise in operating expenditures. So there's been a significant array of shifts that have occurred between operating and capital so that the fiscal integrity basically relies upon the mechanism of squeezing the capital expenditure side. That doesn't suggest a high degree of planning, certainly from the perspective of this side of the House. It suggests, then, a mechanism that they have in place by which they meet these unanticipated overruns or new programs that have come into play.

8:30

With regards to the first program that has been brought forward, let me just say with regards to the national infrastructure program as well as the unanticipated expenditures in health care that it behooves the government at this stage to provide us with full details as to exactly where the expenditures are coming from. We have a figure here that there's going to be a reallocation from one appropriation budget line to another appropriation budget line, but we don't know exactly what is being given up to finance this side of the ledger. I'm going to come in and speak in more detail on that with respect to health care.

With respect to the national infrastructure program, I have a variety of questions for the Deputy Premier. The first question I think is the most obvious question: why is in fact the national infrastructure program under the responsibility of the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism? Why isn't it under the responsibility of the minister of public works, for example, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, since this was to be a bottom-up type of exercise from the municipalities? One wouldn't like to draw the inference that the minister likes power and likes allocating funds, but one could draw that inference.

**Point of Order
Imputing Motives**

DR. WEST: Imputing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, you have a point of order?

DR. WEST: Yes. Point of order under Standing Order 23(h), (i), (j), (k): imputing false motives and leaving innuendos and allegations of certain . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, I think if you're imputing motives, it's unavowed motives, not false.

DR. WEST: You're correct, but there are other parts to this too. Listen to this one: under 23(j), "uses abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure the hon. member will take that under advice and will proceed.

DR. PERCY: The term "inference" I know is a strong term, but I'll restrain myself in the future from such language likely to incite.

Debate Continued

DR. PERCY: So the first point is: in fact, why is this particular program allocated under this particular minister when, given the justification offered by the minister, it appears far more likely to be under the control of the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the minister of public works?

The second question relates to the figures that the hon. Deputy Premier provided us. There's a \$40 million appropriation to be made, but we're looking at – what is it? – \$88 million in the first year, and the Deputy Premier was vague to the point of non-existent in the discussion of where the extra money was coming from to finance the program. What was being given up? There is reference in the press release to unexpended dollars, but there is no detail as to exactly which dollars were unexpended. Where is the extra money coming from to finance the province's share of this program? So I would like the Deputy Premier to provide us with an outline of where the money is coming from in the sense of what programs are being given up or where the cuts are being imposed or what projects are not being financed. What is the cost of the infrastructure program?

While we can commend the Deputy Premier for allocating no new additional funds – for we would have voted against it had there been new funds allocated to this program – it still is a requirement that we know where the existing funds are coming from and what is being given up. So my question is: can the Deputy Premier provide us, then, with a detailed outline of what has been given up, where the money was not spent in terms of the program allocations that were approved in the September budget?

MR. KOWALSKI: Right now?

DR. PERCY: I have more questions.

The Deputy Premier was also very clear in his discussion of the plan. It appeared that it was hands off by the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, that they basically were a facilitator in terms of allocating the funds. My question is: does the Deputy Premier then guarantee that when there is a ranking provided by the municipalities, this provincial government will stick to the rankings provided by the municipalities? Is it hands off completely? Is it the priority ranking provided by the municipal government, or will there be sort of a perception that there's a menu that the provincial government can choose from in terms of allocating the funds?

The third question to the Deputy Premier is with regards to the potential of jurisdiction overlap. There may be some districts that have a different view of how they'd like to allocate these funds compared to the municipalities' that lay therein. What happens with this jurisdictional morass? What happens if they can't agree? Does the Deputy Premier in his role as arbiter come in and say, "This is how the funds are going to be allocated"?

MR. KOWALSKI: Is that it?

DR. PERCY: More, Mr. Deputy Premier.

In terms of the program itself, a number of municipalities, Calgary in particular, have complained in fact of the undue delay that has occurred in coming to an agreement with the provincial government. We are among the last of the provinces to in fact come to an agreement, and we would like to know exactly why it has taken so long to come to this agreement. Has it been because of conditions put forward by the provincial government? From what the Deputy Premier has said, the requirements that they have put forward appear to be eminently reasonable. It's hard to believe the federal government would in fact choose to quibble over this. It seems to be more procrastination on this side about coming forward with proposals as opposed . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: We want the municipalities to have a say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Through the Chair, please.

DR. PERCY: My next set of questions are to the Minister of Health. The release and the supplementary accounts outline \$60 million to be reallocated and, again, that these are not new funds; it's to be a reallocation between appropriations. My question relates, specifically, as it was to the Deputy Premier, to what was given up. In particular, I'd like to bring reference to the report of the Auditor General, which was released subsequent to the budget. The Auditor General's report had a number of very wide-ranging recommendations with regards to the Health department in terms of setting of priorities, of measurement of performance, of cost effectiveness.

I would like to take the time this evening to discuss each of those recommendations and ask: in light of these recommendations, how has the budget allocation been determined for the shifts? We'd like to know whether or not the time and effort that the Auditor General has put into this has been in fact listened to and heard by that side of the House. The Auditor General released his report on January 12, and there are a number of recommendations in the Department of Health, many of which in fact are repeats from previous years. I think these golden oldies deserve some mention this evening because they are very important in

determining how funds are to be allocated and what's being given up and whether it's being given up in a cost-effective manner.

Recommendation No. 35 is very clear, and it's come up in previous years.

It is recommended that the Department of Health improve the reporting of the full costs of health care programs and services in order to facilitate decision making.

I read that statement as saying that in fact they don't know how they're allocating their money, and that causes me some concern when we see an appropriation Bill such as this, which is taking money from one level of the budget and moving it over. We'd like to know what is being given up and whether or not this very stringent recommendation of the Auditor General has been listened to and heard by the Minister of Health.

8:40

Recommendation 36 of the Auditor General's report is again a very clear one.

It is recommended that the Department of Health establish useful definitions of hospital programs and use this information to determine programs that are to be offered by each facility.

This suggests that they in fact don't know how they're allocating their funds, if they're doing so in a cost-efficient manner, yet we have an appropriation Bill brought forward tonight where we have no information as to what is being given up and whether it's being reallocated in a cost-efficient manner. So I think it is very much the role of opposition to highlight this and ask the minister to say, in light of these recommendations: what's being given up and is it being done in a cost-efficient manner?

There are more, Mr. Chairman. Recommendation 37, measuring hospital program costs.

It is recommended that the Department of Health take action to improve the quality of systems used to determine the cost of hospital programs so that the systems can be used to compare performance between hospitals and to support hospital funding decisions.

This strikes me as a fundamental issue that has to be addressed, particularly if you're reallocating funds from one appropriation to another appropriation. It appears from the Auditor General's perspective that the Ministry of Health does not have a very clear idea on its allocation of costs and not a very clear idea, then, of how to compare programs. If that's the case, on what basis have funds been reallocated from one expenditure line to another expenditure line?

There is yet more, Mr. Chairman. Recommendation 38:

It is recommended that the Department of Health determine whether the hospital performance information used to allocate funds to hospitals is reliable for that purpose.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Deputy Premier – Mr. Chairman; sorry for the promotion so quickly. This is a very startling recommendation. Let me read it again.

It is recommended that the Department of Health determine whether the hospital performance information used to allocate funds to hospitals is reliable for that purpose.

Here we are going to reallocate \$60 million, and the Auditor General brings into question the very reliability of the information on which the hon. minister will be basing her decisions. I find that startling indeed. In fact, this recommendation again appears to be very similar to recommendations in earlier periods.

Recommendation 39. Again this is one of very long-term importance and fundamental in assessing whether or not the funds that are being allocated are being done so in a prudent manner.

It is recommended that the Department of Health assess the impact of capital asset costs in determining hospital funding for patient care.

There is a link between capital expenditures and operating expenditures, and in terms of the reallocations that are going to occur, we would very much like to know whether or not these

issues have been taken into account. I could go on and on, but I won't for much longer.

MRS. MCCLELLAN: What page are you on?

DR. PERCY: That was page 132 of the Auditor General's report, section 2, Health.

Section 2, still, page 134, recommendation 41.

It is recommended that the Department of Health determine how accountability for specific program grants to hospitals can be improved.

Again the issue here is accountability, performance measurement. The minister is bringing forward a recommendation for a significant reallocation of funds between appropriation levels. It is really incumbent upon the minister, in light of the recommendations of the Auditor General, to show that they have listened and they have heard and that the reallocations are done in the context of the Auditor General's report. I might add that there are no such comments for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism except for various agencies or funds under its control, so the issue, then, of performance measurement doesn't seem to be as acute, at least from the perspective of the Auditor General.

Those, Mr. Chairman, conclude my questions.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the questions that the hon. member raised, first of all, it's clearly been pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer and myself in the opening reviews that these are lapsed dollars that basically came under the control mechanism of the provincial government over those last fiscal months going back to the last budget. In essence, all citizens of the province know that the province has been restructuring itself and has been asking all of its ministers, all of its departments, all of its agencies to basically prioritize on a continuous updated basis to make sure that we arrive at the end of this fiscal year with in fact expenditures less than were voted on by the Legislative Assembly. We've heard the views. The hon. members in the opposition have consistently said to do that, and we're doing that. So these are dollars that have been lost, and as I've also pointed out, essentially they came out of the Department of Transportation and Utilities by the very nature of the construction season that Alberta has endured this year.

Secondly, the priorities that we have talked about I will repeat again. They're local municipal government priorities. We're asking the local governments in the province of Alberta, be it the council of the city of Edmonton or the council of Fort McMurray – they'll know exactly how many dollars they're eligible for – to prioritize the list. I indicated that we'll bend over backwards to accommodate the submissions made by the local municipalities. If they say that this is project number one, project number two, project number three – they have so many dollars – and it fits in the package, we'll just put a checkmark by it and that'll be that. We're not in the business of holding anything up. We're in the business of accommodating it with the least amount of bureaucracy as possible and the flow through of these dollars in a dramatic way.

Now, the hon. member may not have much experience in dealing with local governments throughout the province of Alberta, but I simply do not believe there is a jurisdictional morass throughout the province of Alberta, as the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud says there is. Most municipalities work very closely with one another. They have a high level of understanding and respect for one another. Very seldom would you find local municipalities fighting among one another or being in this jurisdictional morass. The dollars at stake are taxpayer dollars.

They will be reviewed by the local municipal government. It will be in a public way, and the province of Alberta will have the dollars that this Assembly hopefully will vote to approve, and the dollars will flow. If there is a jurisdictional morass in the city of Edmonton, well, I'm sure I'll call on the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. He's a member from the city of Edmonton. I don't represent a seat in the city of Edmonton. He can sit down and talk to the municipality. If it's Leduc and there's a fight between the city of Edmonton and the city of Leduc, he can just as easily do the job. I mean, he lives much closer to Leduc and Edmonton than I do, and he can do it Saturday morning or Sunday afternoon.

The point, Mr Chairman, is that there will be very, very few. I don't know where the imagination comes in. I think these guys are in a difficult position. I mean, here's a program that their big brothers down east have invented. We had a federal election. They voted in favour of it. On one hand, they want to criticize. They want to keep these estimates going. On the other hand, it's really difficult. So I presume that that was just a moot point that really had not much merit or much validity.

The last point: would municipalities have a say? The hon. member accused me of – I forget; the word wasn't procrastinating – holding something up when I said: look, one of the things we wanted the federal government to accept from us was for us to have a municipal representative on the management committee with full voting rights. This government says that we want our municipal representatives in Alberta to join us on the management committee, and we are prepared to give the municipal representatives full voting rights. And then I'm accused of holding it up. I think the hon. member must have misunderstood me, because I hear him saying that, well, the feds and he are in the right position to say no municipal voting on this particular management committee. That is really quite an interesting signal that should go to all the municipalities of the province of Alberta.

I really appreciate the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud saying here in this Assembly that he does not have much respect for the municipalities of the province of Alberta. He does not believe they should be on the management committee that we would set up with the federal government. He does not believe municipalities are capable of participating in the management of this program. He believes it's best that they do not have a say in this committee. This government would love to have it. *Hansard* will tell you exactly what the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud said, Mr. Chairman. I really thank heaven that this government in 1971 said that they would bring in *Hansard* to have an open government, because one of the beauties of it is that when hon. members talk for the sake of talking, sometimes they walk in directions that they never think through. So thank you, Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, for saying that.

Point of Order Imputing Motives

DR. PERCY: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, Edmonton-Whitemud.

DR. PERCY: Section 23(h), "makes allegations against another member," and 23(i), "imputes false or unavowed motives to another member." I find it very peculiar that the Deputy Premier of a government that is consolidating school boards, the Deputy Premier of a government whose minister said that we cannot have elected hospital boards because they might be taken over by special interest groups, who has contempt, then, for democracy by not allowing votes for hospital boards can make allegations and

statements like that. It's preposterous, but it's so much in character.

8:50

MR. KOWALSKI: On this point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the member under these same sections in Standing Order 23 to quote where in *Hansard* a colleague of mine did say anywhere in *Hansard* that there would be no elected hospital boards in the province of Alberta. The hon. member has made a statement here in this Assembly saying that a colleague of mine has made this statement. I challenge the member to prove where any colleague of mine has said that. Quote *Hansard*, its page, its paragraph, its citation, where it is. Either put up or withdraw the statement and the allegation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the first point that the hon. member raised, *Hansard* will be printed, and I will await, sir, the review of *Hansard* to see exactly what the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud said. I heard him, I wrote it down, I know what he said. *Hansard* will find him guilty. But he does have a responsibility to this colleague of mine who was accused of making an allegation. Where in *Hansard*? Under Standing Order 23 would the hon. member stand up and give us the page, the date, the time frame where that statement was said? It's very simple. It could be dealt with immediately.

Chairman's Ruling Decorum

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members are reminded that there is a long parliamentary tradition of speaking through the Chair and to the Chair, and some of these kinds of interchanges are a direct result of the neglect of some hon. members to do that.

Point of Order Imputing Motives

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members seem to be making two separate although related points of order, both of which are going to be looked at after we see *Hansard*. I think what we will do: if we could continue with the discussion and take that under advisement until the next sitting of the committee. With your agreement, then, I would propose that we continue.

The hon. Member for Calgary-North West on this point of order.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, on the point of order as raised by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, I would just point out *Beauchesne* 318(1): "a point of order cannot be raised on a point of order." I know that the Deputy Premier may not know the rules of the Legislature particularly well, but I just thought I'd suggest that point to him for his edification.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Calgary-North West, I was trying to make the point that occurred to me that we had two separate points of order. I was not taking the point of order as being on the point of order, although presumably it started out as a reply. Both of the points of order would require us to go back to *Hansard*, and since we don't have either Edmonton-Whitemud's opportunity to find his quote in *Hansard* or the comments that gave cause for the point of order by Edmonton-Whitemud – we haven't seen those in *Hansard* – I would ask your indulgence, then, to have the two separate points of order reviewed at the next sitting unless we can produce the information in the meantime. [interjections] Are we going to have a third point of order on the points of order?

MRS. HEWES: No. Just for clarification, sir. If there was one point of order presented to you, not resolved, how could another one be there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. My resolution for the first point of order is that I would have to see *Hansard* in order to do anything more than admonish the hon. member for making allegations. That would be the first point of order. I get mixed up in these.

On the second point of order . . .

MRS. HEWES: There wasn't a second. There couldn't have been a second point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm given advice that there can in fact be two points of order. No? Okay. Maybe we'd better ask the Deputy Premier: did in fact you raise a point of order?

MR. KOWALSKI: Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. I stood up to speak. I think this is kind of interesting. I rose to speak on the point of order that was raised by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. At that point in time I took the opportunity to raise another matter, not as a point of order, though, not as a point of order. The hon. member knows full well that he's been rather naughty, and he knows full well that he has raised something that he has been challenged on. I'm sure that whoever this member is will probably rise in the question period tomorrow, on a point of privilege perhaps, whoever has been chastised by the hon. member. The hon. member may have tonight to calculate where in *Hansard* it is found that one of my colleagues made that outrageous statement that the hon. member accused him or her of.

DR. PERCY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Deputy . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we just hold it a second here? We can argue for a prolonged period of time about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. The point of the evening's exercise is to review the supplementary estimates. I have made an undertaking that if we can review the *Hansard*, we will rule on the point of order if a ruling is required. I was taking, though, only the admonishment to the Deputy Premier, whom I'm sure will comply, that we not enter into allegations or counter-allegations. If we can leave the ruling at that for the moment, subsequent to review – okay? – then I would suggest, hon. members, that we proceed with the review of the supplementary estimates. All right. Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Debate Continued

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This government cannot balance their budget in accordance with its ill-fated budget projections and does not seem to be able to find a will to do so. Hence, once again, on the very first working day of this session they come back demanding more money. It is no surprise to me that they are demanding additional dollars at this time. The ministers claim that these are not new dollars, but I put it to this Assembly that dollars not spent in other departments are new dollars being allocated to the departments requesting them. You tell me, Mr. Minister, what the point is of the great personal pain that Albertans are facing at this time when these dollars saved are not being spent directly on deficit elimination. Instead, apparently saved dollars are being spent just in the nick of time before the fiscal year runs out. Now, justify that to Albertans.

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

This government tells us that we can afford to reallocate dollars, yet we cannot afford to send our children to kindergarten or afford to let grade 12 students upgrade their marks or pick up missing courses in a second year of grade 12 or provide basic hospital care for a terminally ill constituent of mine. Surjit Brar, a 56-year-old wife and mother, is dying of an advanced stage of cancer. She remains on around-the-clock methadone pain killers. She requires a great deal of personal care each and every day. She requires specific nutritional care at this time. But her family is a working family. Every person in that family is working an eight-hour job outside of the home. They cannot afford to stay home to provide 24-hour care. Neither can they afford 24-hour home care. The home care nurse drops in daily now to monitor the situation. She is their only resource. The family and Kuljit have repeatedly asked that Mrs. Brar be hospitalized. The burden of caring for her at home is too great. Even the home care nurse has recommended hospitalization, but what's the result? The hospital says that they have no beds. There's no room for this terminally ill woman who wants to spend the last of her days in a hospital getting proper care. She's told to remain at home, that she should get her family doctor to monitor the situation. This is just one example of the costs families are facing. Of course, we don't have dollars to remedy that problem, but we've got infrastructure dollars.

9:00

The number one priority of this government to date has been to do everything in their power to dismantle the programming of this province, the very programming that occurs within the structures which this government now insists on spending new dollars on. Tell me what the point is of creating infrastructure when we have nothing happening within the confines of those walls. This is the government, asking now for more dollars, who has organized fireside chats for their Premier so he can reassure all Albertans that they are really fiscally responsible, so he can reassure all Albertans that government is on track. It can't plan well enough to be able to properly allocate its budget, but it is on track, so we are assured.

Being fiscally responsible, in fact just being responsible does not mean coming back time after time to this Assembly requesting more money and changing your minds about where those dollars are going to come from. For this fiscal period alone we've had money requested prior to the election, in estimates after the election, in one budget, and now in supplementary estimates. Where is the credibility of a government who cannot manage money for even a 12-month time period? Is this a government acting in a responsible manner? I think not. Do the people of this province have any reason to trust this government's ability to manage this province based on their record of credibility to date? I think not. The fact is that this government has already developed a track record for incompetence and fiscal irresponsibility.

The Minister of Economic Development and Tourism this afternoon talked about his government having an expenditure problem. Well, they certainly do have an expenditure problem, and it starts with that minister. It isn't enough that he's absorbed the lottery fund as a slush fund and has control over an additional 148-plus million dollars within his ministry.

Point of Order Improper Inferences

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, please. Section 23.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A point of order, hon. Deputy Premier.

MR. KOWALSKI: Standing Order 23 is very clear in terms of what it means in terms of innuendos, confrontation, and language. The hon. member must know – the hon. member has been here – that the lottery fund is voted on in this Assembly. The estimates are brought to this Assembly, Mr. Chairman. They are part of the budget of this Assembly. The hon. member was here, participated in the estimates, voted on the estimates. The hon. member will know in the budget of September of 1993 that \$88 million of that budget was allocated to the general revenue fund to be redistributed for Health, for Education, for social services, and for other activities. Those were matters that were voted on by that individual member and all other members of this Assembly. This is not as the hon. member has stated, and I want her to retract, to take that back, Mr. Chairman, because that is totally incorrect, out of character, and it's factually wrong. All members in this Assembly vote on the expenditures under the lottery system.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, certainly I can't control what people say in the House. I'm sure the hon. member has made a slight error in some of her words. By the same token, if somebody says something in the House, then it isn't up to the Chair to decide what's right and what's wrong.

Hon. member.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the minister doesn't like my interpretation of the wide degree of control he has over the allocation of those funds, I apologize.

Debate Continued

MS CARLSON: Now the minister needs another \$40 million allocated to him just to get through the next six weeks of this fiscal time period. Why? He tells us he needs the money so that he can participate in the federal infrastructure upgrading program. Well, my question is: why is this program in the hands of this particular minister? This program under the normal course of affairs would be handled by the minister of public works, who handled those types of capital projects in the past and truly should do so in the future. But it can come as no surprise to anyone in this Assembly that the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism would want to retain control of this project and therefore the power of allocating the dollars. If there's one thing that this minister clearly understands, it's the power of being able to hand out dollars to municipalities, and handling the grants is exactly where he wants to be.

Final questions for the minister. Where, may I ask, will you find the balance of the moneys required to finish this project? We're only in the first stages of it. What do you expect us to use as criteria to ensure that these funds are allocated in a fair and reasonable manner? How, Mr. Minister, are you going to ensure that there is an open and unbiased process in this? Who will make the final decisions in your department? I think that's a question not only of great interest to all of the members of this Assembly but also of great interest to all of the people in this province.

There's no doubt that what we will have by the end of this infrastructure program are wonderful roads, great public buildings, maybe even the finishing of a remarkable museum paying tribute to dead cowboys, and let's not forget about all those rural hospitals, some of which will be shiny and new, just like the one in the minister's riding. We will only be missing one thing here, and that's the people. What will happen to the people of this province if this government continues on this course? For these reasons I cannot support the estimates as outlined.

MR. KOWALSKI: Let me thank the hon. member for her statements. It's certainly my intent to make sure that every municipality and every municipal councillor in the province of Alberta gets a copy of that speech.

In essence what the hon. member did was, number one, not listen to the introduction that this minister gave when he gave the overview of this particular estimate. This minister said that this program would be driven by resolutions of local municipal governments throughout the province of Alberta. This minister made it very clear in his opening remarks. Then when the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud got up and gave his comments, the minister said it a second time for clarification. Now we've had it the third time and, Mr. Chairman, if there's anything that one has concluded from this, it's that one scriptwriter somewhere in the Liberal caucus writes his script, nobody listens to the answers, then they just get up in rotation, and they give the same speech again.

So I want to thank the hon. member. I intend on personally sending a copy of her remarks to every municipal councillor in the province of Alberta. She obviously does have little or no respect for municipal councillors in this province, Mr. Chairman. This minister has made it very clear. This program will be initiated by local municipal governments. It's quite okay with me for the hon. member to vote against the program. That's okay. I have no problem at all with that. Her municipal councillor and the people in her area that do have a wide range of needs that come under the definition of infrastructure that we've talked about already can very easily meet with her and talk to her and everything else.

There will be no hospital built in this minister's constituency. A low shot, cheap shot, but nevertheless it happens periodically.

Mr. Chairman, I'll very clearly talk about the infrastructure. I said that it was wide ranging, could include a whole series of things from technological initiatives, transportation initiatives, electronic initiatives, communications initiatives, recreation initiatives, environmental infrastructure or any other form of infrastructure which may be deemed to be a priority of the respective local governments, not a priority of the government of Alberta but a priority of the respective local governments. For the hon. member to make scandalous allegations that somehow this minister is going to nitpick and play games with this is – I don't know what the basis for that is, other than I suppose a lot of mythology that the hon. member obviously has grown up with and of course, then, the unedited reading of whatever speech somebody gave to her somewhere from deep in the Liberal caucus.

Now, it's three times that we've talked about the definition, three times that we've answered the question with respect to this, three times that we've pointed out that this is a program . . .

MR. DINNING: How many?

MR. KOWALSKI: Three times.

. . . initiated by the local municipal government on a per capita allocation, the province with a wide-ranging interpretation of all of this, Mr. Chairman.

They can find all the bogeymen they want. The next person in the Liberal caucus to get up is going to give us exactly the same speech, Mr. Chairman, and I hope at that point in time that you'll read to them the rule with respect to redundancy and repetition. Surely the taxpayers of this province can expect more than they've got today from the opposition party in this Assembly.

9:10

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to speak a bit about infrastructure, and I guess I should ask the Deputy Premier, the minister responsible, as to how he's going to implement it so we can hear him get up and give that spiel one more time.

Mr. Chairman, when we go back to October of last year and we watch what happened in the federal election, the one thing that the new Prime Minister offered people was hope. He offered hope to Canadians in the form of attempting to stimulate job creation. As a result, Canadians flocked to him – flocked, flocked, flocked. It's quite obvious that when one looks at the federal government and the seating arrangement that is now in there, with the former Conservative government decimated to two seats, one can understand the importance that job creation does have to Canadians, including Albertans. That's why one of the themes of any government has to be jobs, jobs, jobs.

The government really had no choice but to opt into this program. I think the writing was on the wall for them had they chosen not to. The unfortunate part, Mr. Chairman, is that as we see the federal government making a very serious attempt at creating jobs, at offering that hope – although we do see the provincial government opting into the program, politically they really had no choice. I think it was a wise decision that they chose, incidentally, but at the same time, for every job that may be created on this side of the ledger, they're probably destroying about 10 jobs for that one being created. So the bottom line is that as we plow ahead in Alberta, the job situation for people within this province is going to be worse. Even those that had been encouraged to take a one-way fare to other provinces such as B.C., Saskatchewan, even with the decline in those numbers, any valid calculation of net jobs within Alberta in the last few months since Ralph Klein has taken over the Premiership would show, in my opinion, that there is a very, very negative figure.

The question has been asked by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, the question has been asked by the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie, and I'll ask the question again, Mr. Chairman: when we look at the infrastructure, when we look at the administration of it, when we look at the responsibility, why would the Deputy Premier choose to assume responsibility for that? When we look at the document that's in front of us, the supplementary estimates, and we turn to page 19, Alberta Economic Development and Tourism, it's interesting the way these three paragraphs read. I'll just go over it very briefly so it's in the record. "The Ministry" is referring to the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. The Deputy Premier in addition to being responsible for his duties as Deputy Premier is also responsible for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. It states:

The Ministry is responsible for building a favourable business climate and infrastructure, in partnership with communities and business. This client-oriented Ministry is focused on increasing Alberta's exports, job creation, and the implementation of the economic development strategy of the Government of Alberta.

The Ministry is also responsible for the funding of major exhibitions and fairs through the issuance of capital grants, for the administration of the Interprovincial Lottery Act, enforcement of gaming policies and security of video lottery terminals, and through the Alberta Gaming Commission, policy direction and licensing of gaming events in the province.

Mr. Chairman, he has not left too much for any other minister, including the Premier of this province, to be responsible for. He's managed to package everything into that one neat little package and assume responsibility for it. There are so many in the front lines on that side of the House that could have assumed the responsibility of this particular program given the time that should be afforded to ensuring that the implementation of it is done in the

most appropriate manner possible. But no, the Deputy Premier has chosen to retain it for himself.

He makes reference, Mr. Chairman, addressing the hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie about his objection to the reference "slush fund" when we refer to lottery funds, which of course is within his portfolio. He makes a point of expressing how every member of this Legislative Assembly has the opportunity to vote on lottery funds. Yes, that is the case now, but how many years did members of the opposition time after time after time stand up in this House and insist in a very forceful manner that all Members of the Legislative Assembly should have the opportunity to scrutinize and to vote on how those dollars are allocated? It was year after year after year. During the period of time prior to that change being done, the Deputy Premier had some pride in the fact that he controlled what we perceived at that time as being a slush fund. I feel it's almost humorous to have the Deputy Premier stand up and take exception to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie making reference to "slush fund." I think that became standard throughout the province of Alberta when one thought of the lottery funds. When one thought of the minister responsible, right away it was either "slush fund" or "cash cow." So I would think that the Deputy Premier should settle down just a wee bit, accept the fact that it wasn't by his own doing that he chose to allow all members to participate in that decision-making process. It was only through the insistence of this opposition and through the insistence of the Provincial Auditor that we finally saw it come to be, and that's the way it should have been from day one. Finally – finally – last year for the first time we had the opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, the first question the Deputy Premier has to answer that he has not answered: why he himself has chosen to assume responsibility for this program rather than give it over to the minister responsible for public works, for example. Secondly, the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud asked a question, and I'll repeat asking that question because it's very, very important. Is the minister in due course – as a matter of fact, why hasn't it been done up to now? This program was announced a long time ago. The amount of dollars that the provincial government would have to commit wouldn't have been that difficult to figure out. Why is the line-to-line budgeting, why is the line-to-line transfer of funds not here in front of us at this particular time? Why is there a need to ask for an additional \$40 million rather than having gone through the existing budgets in the 1993-94 fiscal period and transferring those dollars and showing at this time exactly where those dollars came from so that Albertans can feel assured that it's not going to cost them additional dollars? The minister, the Premier stood up in this House and made it very, very clear that participation in this program would not mean any additional new dollars.

Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I will congratulate the Deputy Premier on, and that is his reference on a number of occasions of allowing the municipalities to be the major actors when it comes to the decision-making process as to how those \$66 per capita are to be spent rather than handling it in the fashion that we saw the lottery funds handled prior to last year where the minister himself took that determination to decide that this project or this municipality would get this dollar, that dollar, et cetera. The proof is in the pudding, and I guess time will bear as to whether that control is turned over to the municipalities fully or if we're going to see some type of influence trying to be exercised that those particular projects that the minister may favour seeing happen in different parts of Alberta will happen in the fashion he would prefer.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to give the minister the benefit of the doubt. I'm going to take him at his word that he is in fact going to allow the municipalities to make those decisions, that at the appropriate time all the projects that have been approved will be tabled in this House, and that every Member of the Legislative Assembly will have had the opportunity to know fully where those dollars were spent. On that note I'll conclude, and I look forward to the minister's response.

9:20

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, as is our tradition, we table all information with respect to all expenditures in all programs. The same thing will apply. We've done it with all lottery funded programs for years, despite statements that are less than factual. There will be resolutions of all municipal governments in the province of Alberta which will feed this. There will be public resolutions here in the city of Edmonton long before one penny is spent in the city of Edmonton. The council of the city of Edmonton will pass a resolution and basically outline all of the priorities and the projects that they have. The member need not wait two years until the program's finished. He will know by simply checking with the minutes of the council of the city of Edmonton that this is the resolution that they will pass accessing the funds. Nothing could be more open than that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few questions for the hon. Deputy Premier. You know, the Deputy Premier has said a couple of times tonight that the process will be initiated by the municipalities. I think he said it three times, and I'm pretty sure I've got it correct. The implication is, then, that the initiation will be over there but that the completion will be somewhere else. Now, maybe I'm reading into his words incorrectly, but here's what potentially could happen. The municipalities come up with a wish list that exceeds the \$66 or \$67.08 allocated, and the decision has to be made somewhere. Is that decision ultimately going to be pushed back to the municipality? [interjections] Well, they can come up with a wish list, and then a decision has to be made. So the question is: if they come up with a wish list that exceeds the \$67 per capita, will the decision be pushed back to the municipality, or is the decision going to be made by the provincial government? [interjections] Well, you can always come up with a wish list. Maybe you don't understand the term "wish list." Maybe you've never heard that before. [interjections] You're correct. You're correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want to go 20 minutes?

MR. BRUSEKER: No, no. I don't have any intention of going 20 minutes.

MR. KOWALSKI: You're just filibustering.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm filibustering? If we consider how much time the Deputy Premier has been on his feet this evening, I think we'll see who's been doing the filibustering here.

Mr. Chairman, the other question I have. The Deputy Premier talked about \$172 million from the provincial government over two years, \$40 million of which is coming now into the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. So presumably there's going to be another \$40 million from the Department of Economic Development and Tourism next year. We know that the

Deputy Premier loves handing out cheques, because we've all, I'm sure, seen photos of the Deputy Premier handing out cheques with the CFE program in the days of old. I'm sure the Deputy Premier likes to have his picture in the community halls and so on. The question is: where is the rest of the money? Which department is the rest of the money coming from? Presumably if we take \$172 million and divide it by two, a two-year program, that's \$86 million this year, \$86 million next year. Forty million dollars from this department this year. Where's the other \$46 million? Okay; that's one question to the Deputy Premier.

One of the questions that I also have is on working in consultation. I presume this is what the government is going to do. I presume that there is going to be some consultation with the municipalities, but is there any consideration of looking at both long-term and short-term jobs? Let me clarify what I mean by that. For example, in the city of Calgary I know that one of the projects that is being considered is an expansion to the Round-up Centre. Now, the Round-up Centre is a trade show centre in the city of Calgary. One of the advantages to this particular project, for example, would be not only in the construction jobs that are created in building the thing but also in the long-term jobs that go with the operation and ongoing continuation in this project. Is there going to be consultation between the province and the municipalities looking at those kinds of projects versus a project that is primarily a construction project, like an interchange or a new highway or that kind of project? I think in this regard the government and the opposition are in agreement that we need a stronger economy in this province, we need more people working, and we need more people working long term. I'm wondering if the Deputy Premier or anyone else in the government, perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is going to be working with the municipalities to suggest projects – not order, to suggest projects – to see if in fact the projects that they are going to suggest will have that long-term possible job creation rather than just short term. To simply say, "Here's the cheque" – \$66, \$67, whatever on a per capita basis and hand them a cheque – to me suggests that that is part of the difficulty we've had with finances in this province before wherein the government likes to say: we're just going to turn around and hand things out.

One of the difficulties I have with that proposal as outlined by the Deputy Premier is that it seems to be in direct conflict with what the government talked about with respect to the Speech from the Throne. Now, I know this isn't throne speech debate, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me that on one hand where we have a government saying that we're going to reduce school boards and we're going to reduce hospital boards and we're going to streamline administration and then to turn around and say that we're just going to write several cheques over the next two years for \$172 million seems to me to be a contradiction in terms even within the government's own ideology. On one hand they're saying: let's have control; let's reduce costs and expenditures. That makes some sense, but on the other hand they're saying: we're just going to write a cheque based on per capita; we're not going to ask any questions, and we're just going to write the cheque for \$172 million. So it seems to be a rather contradictory viewpoint, and I wonder if the Deputy Premier could clarify that because I am not clear on exactly which philosophy they're going with: hands-on, hands-off, or just hand out the cash willy-nilly. I wish the Deputy Premier could clarify that particular point of view.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'll cease and look forward to the Deputy Premier's response.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out now four times, with respect to the definition of "infrastructure" in

essence we're looking at long term and short term. Both of those are part of the parameter. What is very clear is that the dollars have to be expended within the time frame outlined earlier this evening. The purpose of this program is to maximize opportunity to the working population within the country of Canada, and it's our intent to make sure that we maximize job opportunities within the province of Alberta as per the initiation of our local municipalities.

Mr. Chairman, it should be very clear: this government is not going to direct municipalities. I'll make it very clear on that point. This is a program initiated by local municipal governments. It is a result of consultations with this province and with the federal government. This government will not – and I repeat not – direct as per the request of the Member for Calgary-North West that we get into the business of telling our municipalities how they are going to invest their ratepayer dollars.

There is a philosophic difference between the Conservative government of the province of Alberta and the Liberal opposition on this matter. This Conservative government has a great deal of appreciation for our municipal leaders and municipal councillors in this province. We respect that they have been elected by the people, and we respect that they are in a position to make judicious decisions on behalf of the people that they serve. That is a philosophic difference from the Liberal opposition, which feels that somehow should they ever become the government in the province of Alberta, they'll simply sit here in their ivory towers directing like dictators on high. That's not what this democracy is, Mr. Chairman. That is not what this democracy is about. We have great pride, we have great respect, and we have great admiration for all of the municipal people in the province of Alberta, and we will not run roughshod over them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield.

9:30

MR. WHITE: Thank you, sir. My questions and debate relate to very few minor matters that the minister might wish to address. Not very long ago it was his pleasure, I'm sure, to announce the donation of some of his hard-earned cash in the gambling business, being the czar of gambling in Alberta, to present AADAC with some 3 million plus dollars over three years to bolster their budget in order to deal with a problem that has now been admitted as in fact a problem, even though the minister, to her credit, had made mention of it before as being a problem. It doesn't show up in any budget here. There's a line on page 26 that was presented by the Provincial Treasurer. There isn't any inclusion, and there are in fact dollars being spent as we speak. There definitely are some moneys being spent, as the minister has noted when she was before a special committee of this House. Where are they? It doesn't seem to me – we have both ministers here. Surely if there's going to be some changing in budget from one department to another department, there should be some accounting of it. I mean, that's what we're led to believe is happening. That's what the Deputy Premier has said. That is exactly what is to transpire.

Now, moving to the business that the government would wish us to speak to, the infrastructure project. What happens, Mr. Deputy Premier, if a municipality does not make application for these funds and you end up with some funds from the federal government? How do you intend to administer those funds should they be left in the kitty? Are you going to do it on a per capita basis for the second issue through the second or third year? Or is it going to be into one of your – we shan't call them slush funds

because I know that particular term upsets you greatly. We won't do that at all.

What happens also if some of the projects, perhaps not this year but in subsequent years, that would have been funded – I mean transportation programs, infrastructure in the way of water treatment and the like – are not funded by your government through the regular means and then are funded on a per capita basis? There is no net benefit. What happens to those municipalities in that case?

Furthermore, what is the effect of a municipality . . . [interjection] I assumed he wanted to speak.

MR. DINNING: He did. He sounds better than you, Lance.

MR. WHITE: If it came from any other quarter, I might take that as a compliment, but that definitely was not a compliment.

Mr. Chairman, some \$66 a head does go a fair way. In fact, in a normal case I would commend this government for going to the extent of adding on a per capita basis to those budgets of the municipalities. In the not too distant past, while the federal election was on, to listen to some of the members opposite speak of this potential program, they weren't speaking in favour of it. It was rather derogatory, sometimes bordering on being rude. It has taken a great leap of something or other for this government to decide that, yep, this is a program that needs to be funded and in fact applauded. Where is this debate? We didn't hear any of it. All of a sudden out of the clear blue that side of the House went flip-flop, just like that, from the election to when they heard from the public saying, "Yes, we kind of like the sound of that: jobs, jobs, jobs." Where did it come from? I certainly missed it somehow. If the Deputy Premier could explain how they came to that conclusion from one day to the next or from one month to the next, I'd certainly like to hear it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

Oh, sorry. Did the minister want to reply?

MR. KOWALSKI: Ah, let him go. It would be safer to let him go.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Deputy Premier. Watching this health budget unravel and unfold is like watching a game of wheel of misfortune. We started off in May of 1993 with \$144 million to be found through stakeholder reductions. We get to July of '93; we get \$122.5 million. Then we get a budget finally, and it's \$121.9 million. Now we find out that the government couldn't quite get that right, and they've managed somehow to find \$62 million through stakeholder savings, but there's some sleight of hand going on here, and we can't quite figure it out.

I'm sure that in the government's efforts to be transparent and to be forthcoming and to be open and accountable – and I'm glad to see the Treasurer and the Minister of Health sitting side by side, so maybe they can help. Maybe they could explain how we get \$28.2 million now out of the Health budget, the hospital and nursing home equipment grants, when we were told in the October 4 release from the government that it was going to be \$27 million. Could it be that the \$1.2 million difference is the same \$1.2 million less that the government was expecting to get from voluntary wage rollbacks? It was supposed to be \$37.5 million,

but we find that they don't equal that at all. It's now projected to be \$36.3 million. So what I'd like to know is: how did that extra \$1.2 million move from being on the wages side of the Health budget to equipment for nursing homes and hospitals?

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

When the Minister of Health stood in the House earlier this evening and explained that this was really nothing but book-keeping, the minister also said that the health roundtables had said that there should be a freeze on all capital spending, but you know, not all capital spending was frozen. The minister did say that capital spending was frozen, but that's not the case. Twenty-seven projects were deferred, but 17 projects, totaling many millions of dollars more, did in fact go ahead. So I'd like to know why the minister would say that all capital spending was frozen when that's clearly not the case.

Now, we notice that administrative budgets for the Department of Health were supposed to be reduced by \$1.5 million. It's still not clear where that 1 and a half million dollars has been taken from, but it is curious to note, Mr. Chairman, that that equals 3.3 percent of that minister's administrative budget. I'd like to know on what basis a decision was made that protecting the administrative budget of the department was a higher priority than protecting the jobs of health care workers all over the province. Why would we see health care institutions being demanded by this government that they take an involuntary cut of 5 percent of their wages budget when the minister's own administrative budget fell by less than 4 percent? Of course, we're not even convinced that that will in fact take place.

I'd also like to note that the reductions in capital equipment – on October 4 the minister said that facilities may have to keep older equipment in service longer until the needs of a restructured health system can be determined. Mr. Chairman, that didn't stop the very same minister from allocating over \$2 million to health care facilities so they could upgrade cold storage facilities for waste, for garbage: more concern about storing garbage so that this biomedical waste could be held and then transhipped to this monopoly that's been set up. That was considered to be a higher priority than perhaps diagnostic or other equipment in the active health care environment.

I'd also like to question the priorities of this government when we see that they did in fact come and ask this Assembly to open up the budget again, to review supplemental requests for funds. Mr. Chairman, I would have been happy to see that if we had some sense that a careful rethinking of priorities had taken place, but again that's clearly not what's happened. In fact, we see that the million dollars that was taken out of health units for things such as community care and daily living and other contingency funds has still been scooped right out of the budget. It's gone, even with this government's so-called commitment to community health. We don't see that million dollars back in there, but we see that they're going to continue to cut.

What I'd like to know from the Minister of Health is: how can it be justified that we see this sleight of hand where we have a \$28 million cut to the health care budget being taken out on the one side and then put back in under this \$60 million bookkeeping adjustment when it looks clearly like reallocation? Secondly, how can they account for the \$1.2 million shift between capital and between wages? And why are they still insisting on forcing these involuntary, across-the-board cuts in the wages of health care workers when the minister's own administration budget is being reduced by such a small amount?

Thank you very much.

9:40

MRS. MCCLELLAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to ask the hon. member to please check *Hansard* and ensure that the comments he attributed to the minister indeed were made, and I will look for his response tomorrow. I think he quoted me rather inaccurately. I don't think at any time in my very brief opening comments I suggested this was simply a bookkeeping matter. I would appreciate if you would please check that. What I did say is that these were very strong recommendations from the roundtable process. The hon. member was there; at least I think he was. If he was, indeed he heard a very strong recommendation on freeze of capital and the reasons why. I went into that initially. So I find it very interesting that the hon. member stands in the House today in opposition to the very things that were suggested by a large number of very respected people in this province.

I also find it interesting – I will check my figures, but my recollection is that in the last election campaign there was a recommendation by the opposition members in their platform to cut some \$800 million out of capital. Could I be right?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MRS. MCCLELLAN: Well, interesting. Today we are talking about \$1.2 million . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Through the Chair, please.

MRS. MCCLELLAN: . . . from the hon. member. Interesting also that when another hon. member spoke, all we talked about was the Auditor General's report. My comment on that, Mr. Chairman, is that I will be happy to answer in detail, but I appreciate the Auditor General's very constructive comments on . . .

Chairman's Ruling Decorum

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, I regret having to interrupt you, but the noise level among the hon. members is beginning to drown you out. We would hope that hon. members, if they need to communicate with one another, would do so in an inaudible whisper so that we may all hear the Minister of Health.

Debate Continued

MRS. MCCLELLAN: All of the comments made by the Auditor General, all of the recommendations were done in a most constructive way. I would be pleased to take the time to go through those in detail. However, if the hon. member wants to review the budget books, I think he will find quite clearly where these dollars are expended. I am not going to take the time of the House tonight to refresh the member's mind. I think he can look at that quite carefully himself.

On the slight difference between the approximate amount out of the 5 percent reduction, it was an estimate of 37 and a half percent. I would remind the hon. member that 73 percent, approximately, of Alberta Health's budget is in compensation. It's a very large amount of almost \$4 billion in that budget. I would think that it's quite an achievement to come even that close in an estimate of those dollars.

I support very much the recommendations that I received from that roundtable. I respect the people who were there who gave a lot of thought and a lot of consideration to their thought in this process. They felt that the least disruption in the delivery of health services to the people of this province could be achieved in this manner.

I want to remind the hon. member that many of the projects that did go ahead were in progress. I am sure that he is not speaking against the project at the Royal Alex, that he is not speaking against the completion of the W.W. Cross, that he is not speaking against discussions of the Children's health centre and many others that were in progress. I am sure that he supports the Sherwood Park nursing home, the need for long-term beds, but perhaps the hon. member would like to clarify and identify to us in this House just exactly which projects he would like to have seen stopped in the city of Edmonton, because I would be happy to share with some of those facilities his feeling on the capital we did go ahead with.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this government does place a very high priority on the safe handling of biomedical waste, and, yes, we did continue to allocate dollars for that. I think that every citizen in this province supports the very safe handling of biomedical waste, and it is absolutely integral to that process to have the cold storage units where they can be safely stored until they can be transported to the only facility in this province that meets the licensing standards of the Clean Air Act. I think that all hon. members across the way support the high environmental standards that we have set in this province. We will continue to support the safe handling of biomedical wastes, and we will continue to ensure that our hospitals have the cold storage ability to handle those.

Mr. Chairman, I will do my utmost to peruse *Hansard* when it's complete to see if I can find any question in there that I can deal with more completely, but at this point I think that covers most of the comments that I heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fort McMurray.

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The questions that I have will be focused on specific questions to some of the ministers opposite who were involved in this budgetary adjustment process. The first comment I have is that it looks to me, an unsophisticated, noneconomist, nonaccountant, that the health expenditures in this province are going up \$60 million. So against that backdrop I would ask the Minister of Health if there is some way in which the minister can squeeze out of that budget some \$150,000 that the native folks up in Fort Chipewyan require for their isolated extra care facility. I haven't forgotten them, and I hope the minister hasn't.

Secondly, to the minister: I hope that in that \$60 million of extra expenditures in health there is some hope for the extended care facility in Fort McMurray. Fort McMurray, as you recall, Mr. Chairman, is a regional health centre in which there is no extended care facility, and as a result high-cost acute care dollars are sometimes spent on that particular facility.

Now, I noticed, Mr. Chairman – I've been trying my best to understand the hon. Provincial Treasurer's accounting methodology; I've been trying my best – that on page 192 of the extensive book on government estimates that we got entitled 1993-94 it was therein indicated that health would occupy approximately \$3.359 billion. At first glance, the health budget has increased beyond the stated \$60 million of increase, but I can see that that is because of the absorption of the alcohol and drug rehabilitation program in that budget. What troubles me is that the minister's projection of jobs on page 192 of that budget was the projection that there would be 1,600 jobs created through the expenditure of \$3.35 billion. We now see that the minister will be spending and is asking to spend an additional \$60 million and does not indicate that one additional job will be created. I wonder what the economics of that issue are.

9:50

Finally, I must say that I was confused by the layout in the 1993-94 general revenue fund supplementary estimates that the hon. Provincial Treasurer handed out, Mr. Chairman, because to a large extent if you look at page 27, it almost appears that the cutbacks do track the government's background paper which they handed out to all Albertans on October 4 of 1993. Therefore, I found it puzzling as to why they would jam the \$60 million of extra money in there almost looking like they had fallen short on their deficit program rather than just coming forward and saying that that represents \$60 million of new funding.

Moving on to the area of transportation, the last time we dealt with supplemental estimates, when the 23rd Legislature was very new and in its infancy and many members of the opposition were attempting to put forward their thoughts and ideas, we suggested to the Provincial Treasurer that handing out three or four pages of photocopy paper representing approximately \$10 billion of expenditures seemed to be a little light on information. I'm grateful that the Provincial Treasurer took some of that suggestion to heart, and now the printing and the polish is so much more sophisticated in the supplemental estimates. Unfortunately, the information supplied has not advanced to that same degree. So it is my hope that when we are next asked to compare supplemental budgets, the Provincial Treasurer will present kind of one-stop shopping. For example, on page 27 of the Health budget it might have been helpful to show the projections broken down in the same criteria and in the same order as they were in the previous material.

I would, however, ask the Provincial Treasurer if he could provide us some more elucidation on the \$128,000 spent in capital budget for the Legislative Assembly. Now, I must say that Albertans everywhere are looking at those capital expenditures very carefully.

AN HON. MEMBER: They should. They're your offices.

MR. GERMAIN: Yes. Well, I want to say and go on record for and on behalf of the citizens of Fort McMurray that sent me here to this august Chamber as saying that I got no new equipment, and it seems to me that we should have had 83 sets of equipment around for 83 MLAs, and I . . . [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear the questions.

MR. GERMAIN: I would be grateful if the Provincial Treasurer could provide us some more detail. I think the Provincial Treasurer in his role as Treasurer will acknowledge and will stand up and admit this fact, that when you come forward in the ninth hour of a fiscal period and you ask for extra money, there is a very high onus on the Provincial Treasurer to provide satisfactory detail so that people do not harbour suspicions as to the flow of the cash. I would ask the Provincial Treasurer to take that into account.

Lastly, if I might, Mr. Chairman, I was interested in hearing the observations of the hon. Deputy Premier today when he indicated that the \$40 million infrastructure program had been sponged completely out of the public works department and the transportation department. Those two ministers have not acknowledged that yet, and I would be grateful to receive a breakdown as to which of the two ministries sustained the \$40 million savings in their other budgets and in what percentage.

Against that backdrop, Mr. Chairman, that allows me to prepare to begin the conclusion of my comments tonight by reminding all

Members of this Legislative Assembly that there was recently a study done on what constituted the worst highway in Alberta. It came as no surprise to the residents of Fort McMurray that Highway 63 was adjudicated by many people to be the worst highway in Alberta. To the extent that that adjudication was based on subjective issues as to what the surrounding ecosystem environment is, we of course took exception to that in Fort McMurray, but to the extent that that focused on a perilous section of road on Highway 63, it would be my hope that there would be some machinery for some of this infrastructure money to go to complete that very vital link to the economic well-being of northeast Alberta, which in turn creates both jobs and allows for the payment of taxes.

Thank you.

MR. DAY: Given the hour, Mr. Chairman, and the tremendous distances traveled by many members just to be here today, I would move that the committee rise and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions of the 1993-94 supplementary supply estimates of the general revenue fund, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.
Are you all in favour of that report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried.

[At 9:59 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Tuesday at 1:30 p.m.]

