

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

**Title:** Monday, August 26, 1996 1:30 p.m.  
**Date:** 96/08/26  
 [The Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, as our members gather to begin a new week in our Assembly, we are reminded of the blessings which You have bestowed upon Alberta, and we thank You for this bounty.

May we conduct ourselves in our deliberations in ways that honour You, our province, and all its people.

Amen.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater.

MRS. BALSILLIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table a petition signed by 1,300 people opposing the privatization of the Pine Ridge nursery in Smoky Lake. The nursery is a world-class facility which was constructed with money from the heritage trust fund. Consequently, it is an asset and an investment and must be held in public trust by the citizens of Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: **Reading and Receiving Petitions**

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With your permission I'd like to have read the petition which I tabled in this Assembly on August 21 regarding the support of many Albertans for Bill 214. Of course, this was before the Bill was taken off the Order Paper.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT:

We, the undersigned residents of Alberta petition the Legislative Assembly to support Bill 214, The Victims of Domestic Violence Act.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two tablings today. One is a letter that was faxed to my home. It came from a constituent of the Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly. It pertains to the treatment that was received by her son at the University hospital. If in fact the allegations are true, it's unacceptable. I will table four copies of the memorandum along with instructions to the Minister of Health to have this matter immediately investigated. That tabling is at the constituent's request.

The other tabling, Mr. Speaker, is four copies of the communiqués that were issued at the annual Premiers' Conference, which concluded in Jasper over the weekend and, I might add, a very successful conference indeed.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. SAPERS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. With your permission I'd

like to table with the Assembly four copies of the new surgical and nonsurgical management of cataract guideline as well as the news release and the patient information guide that were issued on August 22, 1996.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have three different documents to table, all health related. The first one is a letter from Dr. Thomas Rich, a Calgary General and Lougheed hospitals physician, an outspoken advocate for retaining an inner-city hospital in Calgary. That letter is dated July 19, 1996.

The second document is a copy of a July 4 paper authored by Professor Chris Bagley and Pierre Tremblay explaining the incidents of depression and sexual orientation.

The third one is a copy of an August 16 paper soon to be published in a book entitled *Suicidal Behaviours in Adolescents and Adults*, by the same authors, Bagley and Tremblay.

Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

head: **Introduction of Guests**

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly a couple of visitors in the public gallery. I'd first of all like to introduce John Bethel. John Bethel worked for the Liberal caucus for a number of years, and he's now pursuing a higher education at the University of Alberta. John is accompanied today by Kelly Dyke, administrative co-ordinator for the prairie centre of excellence for research on immigration. I'm sure, as they stand, we will again see John Bethel in the forefront, following in his mother's footsteps.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce three Calgaryans from the constituency of Calgary-West. I'm introducing them on behalf of my colleague from that constituency. The three women are Jo-Ann Hrynyk, Rebecca Vincent, and Jessica Gowling. I'd ask these three women to stand now and receive the customary warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

Thanks very much.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This introduction will be a little bit unorthodox in that it will be on behalf of both myself and the Minister of Labour. So in fact Labour can work together on different issues. It gives me great pleasure this afternoon to introduce John Miller, who's the councillor for labour affairs, embassy of the United States of America, and Kimberly Klassen from the economic section, the U.S. consulate general. They've had their plans changed this afternoon, so they are able to partake in the proceedings of the House. Would they please rise and receive the warm welcome.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's always a pleasure to introduce a Leduc constituent to you and to the others in the House this afternoon, particularly one as gracious as Grace Leclerc. I would ask Grace to stand and please receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce a budding young entrepreneur from the city of Calgary, a friend and a constituent. Mr. Leigh Sullivan is here visiting the Legislative Assembly, and I would ask all members, as he rises, to give him the warm welcome of members of the Assembly.

head:

### Oral Question Period

#### China National Petroleum Corporation

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, the waiting list for home care in Calgary has gone from 33 people to 345 people over the past year. At the same time, I have here copies of two government purchase orders for \$100,000 worth of cars, four Buick Regals and a minivan, which this government sent to its staff in Beijing, China, last year in the midst of cuts to our health care system. To the Premier: what kind of priorities has the Premier set when this kind of money is spent on Buicks for China while 345 Calgarians are now being forced to wait up to 12 months for home care?

MR. KLEIN: Well, you know, oftentimes people try to compare apples and oranges, but I think that this is really stretching the situation. There's no relationship at all to that particular invoice. As a matter of fact, I don't know about it. I would like to get to the bottom of it, and I will ask the hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism or the Minister of Energy, because the China National Petroleum Corporation is a joint venture between the Alberta government and the government of China. As to the invoice for the automobiles, I have no idea, but I will investigate it.

Relative to home care we're in a state of transition. Certainly the policy of this government is to shift as much as we possibly can – understand, there will always be a need for acute and tertiary care in our hospitals – hospital care to home care where people feel more comfortable amongst their friends and their relatives. I will have the hon. Minister of Health supplement.

1:40

MR. JONSON: Earlier this year there was \$1.3 million added to the 30-plus million dollars with the Calgary regional health authority. Further with respect to the situation in Calgary, on Friday I met with the chairman of the RHA in Calgary. We discussed the whole area of funding, and I expect that there will be a set of proposals coming to us in the very near future. It's not, as I understand it, in its final form; they're still doing some revisions. So certainly we will have a look at that when that particular proposal comes forward. Mr. Speaker, certainly we do not want to see these waiting lists mount at this particular pace, and it should be reviewed.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, there is a relationship between these cars and the effect on sick Albertans. How much shorter would the waiting list for home care in Calgary be if the \$100,000 had gone to home care instead of to Buicks for China?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. I can tell you a little bit about China, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition can visit there if he wants. We do have a very significant office in China that is a joint venture between the Alberta government and the China National Petroleum Corporation. The function of this office is to facilitate, not to do deals but to facilitate, the literally thousands and thousands of businesspeople who travel to China each and every year particularly to seek opportunities in the petroleum industry. This office is in the far north end of Beijing.

If anyone has been to Beijing recently, you will find that it is a very, very busy place, and anyone would be taking their lives in their hands to even attempt to drive or even to ride a bicycle in that city in this day and age. Therefore, there has to be some form of transportation. It's either buying the car there, which is very, very expensive indeed, probably three or four times the North American price, or buying the cars here and getting them over there so that we can facilitate the kind of business that we're carrying on in conjunction with the China National Petroleum Corporation. That, we believe, is a function of government.

As I said before, we will have the hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism examine that particular invoice along with the Minister of Energy. At the same time, we will still fulfill our commitment to home care.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism to supplement the question.

DR. WEST: Yes, a little supplemental on that, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to draw a correlation between our health care and what's going on in Beijing and in China. For the people of Alberta there definitely is a link between what's going on there and our economy, because what's going on in the export industry is what fuels our revenues to this province to help us put on the great services that we have. Health care is one of them. Over 2,500 companies in this province export every year. Our fastest growing area is the Pacific Rim, and China is one of them. Yes, we're going to focus over there, because it takes years to build confidence in that marketplace, and we're doing it.

I'm going to review it in the review of everything else, but with what I see as the facts and figures going on right now, our exports are one of the fastest growing. In fact, the exports grew by 66 percent, or \$10.5 billion, in the last four years alone. Aren't you a free-market party sitting over there?

MR. MITCHELL: Free-market parties let business do it, not government offices, Mr. Speaker.

Given that last week in Public Accounts the minister of economic development's deputy minister indicated that there is only one full-time staff member and maybe some money for a part-time support staff member in this particular office, who exactly would be driving these five cars?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I was in Public Accounts, and we were dealing with the 1994-95 budget, if any of your members who were there would have told you. The essence of the question was about the Leduc training centre, which we had one person in. We didn't say that about the office in Beijing, and if you'd just communicate with the people that were at Public Accounts, you'd know that.

#### International Offices

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, just last week a woman was

forced to wait 55 hours on a gurney in an emergency department hallway with a blood clot in her leg before she was admitted to a proper hospital bed. Fifty-five hours. While he slashed funding for essential health care services, the Premier still managed to find \$22 million for foreign offices. To the Premier: why did he send so much money out of this province when it is clearly desperately needed for health care services right here at home?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, the steps that we have taken recently and certainly since I became the Premier relative to the foreign offices has been absolutely dramatic: London is all but closed; New York is all but closed; Hong Kong is all but closed now. We still have a presence in Beijing because that is a partnership with CNPC, the China National Petroleum Corporation. Indeed they have a staff here in the province of Alberta, and they operate full time in the city of Calgary to facilitate Chinese delegates who come here to explore business opportunities in Alberta. So it is a good example of relationships becoming very solid between two countries where there are economic benefits to be gained.

When the Leader of the Opposition talks about foreign offices, if he wants to be honest, which would be a very refreshing change, he would first demonstrate what we were spending on foreign offices four or five years ago and what we are spending today. It is considerably less, believe me.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Premier could answer this: when exactly are all these economic benefits which his offices are purportedly establishing going to come back to benefit Albertans, whose health care system is in crisis?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have the hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism – I can't be more proud of this government, of this caucus in terms of its economic development record. We said that we would create the environment, that government wouldn't create the jobs but that we would create the environment for the private sector to create 110,000 new jobs by the end of fiscal 1997. We have already exceeded that target.

How did we exceed that target? We didn't exceed that target by going out and getting involved in business deals. As a matter of fact, we suspended that policy. What we did is we created the economic climate, first of all, by balancing our budget, by paying down our debt, by keeping in place probably the most competitive tax regime, one of the most competitive in North America and certainly the most competitive in Canada. That's why people are moving to this province.

That's why the hon. leader of the Liberal opposition said on a radio show, oh, I think about a year ago that the future was – what he said to David Rutherford was: well, we're always being told, yet, David, I think one of the reasons business comes to Alberta is probably the tax regime; they also come to Alberta because this is a wonderful place to live. This is attributed to the Leader of the Official Opposition. This comes from the Leader of the Opposition. Do you know what else he said: it's got excellent health care; it's got excellent education; it's got a great environment; it's got a great . . . And at that point the host had to cut him off because he couldn't believe what he was hearing.

1:50

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, I thought the Premier had covered the question very well. Very briefly, please, hon. minister.

DR. WEST: I would like to give some information, because the leader asked about what the effect had been of the expenditures of money through economic development. That's a good lead-in, because I'm giving a talk tonight to some students at the university to point out exactly that. When I'm through, maybe the Treasurer could supplement a bit too.

At any rate, let me lead-in by this – and you said keep it short, but I have to give a little lead-in to it. The Department of Economic Development and Tourism three years ago had a budget of \$104 million, and under the previous minister, who did an excellent job in bringing it over, we got it down to \$66 million. The changes that I just announced will bring it down another \$10 million to \$15 million. As well, we're going to phase in certain areas with the private sector to enhance their role in it. At least when we're down to \$40 million from \$104 million, we're still getting a good bang for the buck in the province, and we're not spending that type of dollars. That \$60 million goes off to health care, which we just put \$250 million back into, and we'll continue to look at it.

Let's just look at what that money did, and now we're doing it with this kind of dollars in economic development. Alberta is leading western Canada's emergence in the economic power in Canada. We had the fastest growing economy in Canada over the last five years. Alberta's economy grew by 2.5 percent in '95, and Alberta Treasury forecasts an additional 2.5 percent in 1996. Alberta had approximately \$18.6 billion in new capital investments in 1995. We consistently record the highest investment capital in Canada. The international exports have been the driving force of Alberta's economy over the past four years. During that period exports increased by \$10.5 billion, or 66 percent.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. minister did give warning to the Assembly that he did have a speech. The Chair did not realize that we were going to be the rehearsal for that. Perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer could have an opportunity to respond in supplementary to the third question on this one, the second supplemental.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, given all of that, why is it that Alberta now has the lowest per capita funding for health care in the entire country, behind New Brunswick, behind Newfoundland, behind Saskatchewan, behind Manitoba, all of which have balanced their budget, none of which has a \$1.5 billion surplus, none of which has \$180 million of unallocated budgeted funds, none of which raise \$600 million in medicare payments every year?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Premier. [interjections] I'm sure the succinct question was caught by the hon. Premier, who wants to respond.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting to observe what is happening in other provinces as they try to come to grips with health care costs that are going through the roof, but I think that what is more important is to challenge the system to find newer and better and more effective and more efficient ways of doing things. I think that what is more important: do all of these jurisdictions, even the jurisdictions that are spending the most, the absolute most per patient have a healthier Ontarian, a healthier New Brunswicker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like them, if they're saying yes, to prove it. Prove it. I don't think they can. Yes, it's a matter of spending money, but it's a matter of spending money in the right places and for the right reasons and to achieve the right outcomes, and the right outcome in this province is a healthier Albertan.

MR. DINNING: To supplement the hon. Premier's answer, I would make two comments. One is that maybe what the Liberal leader ought to do is ask his Liberal Prime Minister in Ottawa why Ottawa is reducing its spending on health care in this province by 31 percent over a period of two years, Mr. Speaker.

I would simply also add, Mr. Speaker, to supplement the previous question: where are the benefits and where are the returns for the kind of economic development that has occurred in this province? In fact, I would note that for the first time in Alberta's history, in 1995-96 corporate income tax revenue from manufacturing was as high as it has ever been, and for the first time it exceeded corporate income tax revenue from oil and natural gas. It grew by 90 percent in '95-96. That's the kind of news that the Liberals don't like to tell Albertans, but those are the facts because that's what Albertans, residents, citizens of Alberta, have done to help this economy grow because they're confident about our future. The Liberals, the naysayers, the gloom and doomers across the way, don't want to talk about that. We will.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

#### Cataract Surgery

MR. SAPERS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. The Alberta Medical Association and its partners have issued a clinical practice guideline for the treatment of cataracts. The guideline is a tool for physicians and their patients to use when making the decision on whether or not surgery is required. It looks as though this government, however, has got different plans. They're about to use this guideline as an excuse for deinsuring some eye operations. Will the Premier please make it clear that his government will not use this clinical practice guideline as an excuse for deinsuring cataract surgery for some Albertans?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have the hon. Minister of Health supplement on this particular question. [interjection]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, when the Speaker is standing, you stop talking.

The hon. Minister of Health to respond.

MR. JONSON: I think it's important, first of all, for the hon. member to understand that clinical practice guidelines are something being worked on at the national and, in fact, at the international level to establish the best practice of medicine, standards for that, and the point at which certain surgical interventions should be made is the case here. I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that it's been possible here with the Alberta Medical Association for government to be part of the further development of clinical practice guidelines.

In the case of cataract operations I think it is a very important measure that the public of this province would want to know is there, that cataract operations are performed in the proper way and at the proper state of their condition. I think that would be

the case. The public of the province, I am sure, would want there to be a basis, in this case a set of clinical guidelines, which guides, and it's the best pool of advice that patients can have available to them when they're undergoing treatment.

MR. SAPERS: Mr. Speaker, how will the Premier guarantee that all Albertans will have equal access to fully funded eye surgery regardless of where they live, given that the guideline cautions about regional variation?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, somehow the hon. member across the way doesn't seem to think that the public of this province wants to have medical treatment when they need it, according to the knowledge and a set of guidelines that the physicians of this province work with. That is what clinical practice guidelines are. It is not a matter of insuring or not insuring. I mean, if you are not having a particular medical decision, then you don't need the treatment, and of course there doesn't need to be the expenditure of money. But if you do need the treatment and you want to have it done the best way possible, these clinical guidelines are quite helpful.

2:00

MR. SAPERS: Mr. Speaker, the depth of misunderstanding is quite astounding.

Mr. Premier, would you please explain this government policy that your Minister of Health just suggested, that some Albertans will be able to pay for surgery and get it quicker, other Albertans won't, and it'll vary based on where they live?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I think this matter in the area of cataract surgery was covered early in July, end of June, when the agreement was reached with the federal government with respect to the arrangement for funding cataract surgery and other types of procedures in private clinics across this province. Procedures such as cataract surgery will be funded according to clinical guidelines, just as are other medical conditions that are already within the system.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just emphasize that this is an agreement that has been worked out with the Alberta Medical Association. I am sure that they are interested in the best care for people in this province as well and want to be operating according to these very good directions.

#### Premiers' Conference

MR. LANGEVIN: Mr. Speaker, Canadian unity and devolution of power is on everyone's mind these days, especially when we have the best country in the world. Albertans and most people across this land are very, very proud to be Canadian and would like solutions to be worked out. My question today is to the Premier. Regarding the recently concluded annual Premiers' Conference in Jasper, would you outline your position regarding the Courchene report, released by Premier Harris of Ontario just prior to the conference?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of media coverage and a lot of talk about the Courchene report, but the Courchene report was never tabled at the annual Premiers' Conference and never became part of the agenda. This report was commissioned by the government of Ontario, and it made certain recommendations. The Premier of Ontario, Mr. Harris, has indicated that that report will be part of the overall consideration of Ontario as we start to

address the overall situation relative to rebalancing the roles and responsibilities of the provinces and the federal government.

Certainly, there was some interest in the report. I know that Premier Bouchard of Quebec said that that report was more in keeping with what he would like to achieve for the province of Quebec. Other Premiers had some difficulties with it in the context of establishing national guidelines, and as a result it was decided that this wasn't part of the agenda initially and it ought not to be part of the agenda at this particular time.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: First supplemental, Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

MR. LANGEVIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My supplemental question is also to the Premier. Would the Premier summarize the concept of rebalancing as discussed at the Premiers' Conference in Jasper?

MR. KLEIN: Basically, what the Premiers decided to do was to direct the Premiers to work with the federal government and the territorial councils, of course, to develop a three-year work plan for rebalancing federal, provincial, and territorial roles and responsibilities. This applies not only to health care, although there's a focus on health care here in Alberta, but it applies to social policy reform. We would perhaps like to work a bit more quickly on social policy reform, and we've asked with respect to that particular issue that guidelines be prepared no later than November 1 of this year and that we start to put in place an implementation program by April of next year.

Overall, what we are saying quite generally and what we unanimously agreed as provinces, save for Quebec, which wants absolutely no part of any negotiations with the federal government because of their political circumstance, is that, yes, there's a role for the federal government and there's a role for the province and that as a matter of fact the role of the province, in light of severely declining transfer payments, should probably be enhanced. Well, perhaps not enhanced, but certainly the provinces should have more flexibility to deliver services, but, yes, there ought to be national guidelines.

I think that what the provinces objected to was that in light of declining federal transfer payments there should be a new mechanism for implementation and that there shouldn't be this notion of enforcement. I'll give you a good example, the example we all know in Alberta vis-à-vis facility fees, where the federal government fined us arbitrarily. There was no judge. There was no jury. The federal government became the enforcer. They became the judge. They became the jury.

In British Columbia, where they've imposed a three-month residency requirement for welfare recipients, the federal government arbitrarily has said: we don't think that that's right; we're going to fine you. There is no process to have this adjudication. Again, the federal government has become the enforcer, the judge, and the jury. I understand that they're being penalized to the tune of some \$40 million a year, yet their welfare programs are improving because they have been able to put in that residency requirement and get the dollars to where they really are needed.

So basically what we are saying is that, yes, we need national standards, we need consensus, and we need to talk about a joint effort to achieve compliance instead of this unilateral and arbitrary enforcement that we now experience through the federal government.

MR. LANGEVIN: Mr. Speaker, my final supplemental is to the

minister responsible for federal and interprovincial affairs. Can the minister advise the House as to what follow-up there will be in the coming months?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, certainly there will be a lot of follow-up work relative to the communiqués with respect to rebalancing roles and responsibilities and social policy reform and renewal. But some individuals, including Ovide Mercredi, representing the First Nations leadership in this country, approached me following the meeting. I had a good meeting with them for about 45 minutes and assured them that I would invite all the Premiers to meet with them relative to their concerns vis-à-vis some of the items we discussed at the Premiers' Conference, and that meeting will take place sometime in October. We'll be inviting representatives from all the First Nations organizations and indeed all the Premiers and territorial leaders.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I perhaps should supplement, as well, on the follow-up. Alberta being the chair of the Premiers this year has been designated to co-chair the minister's forum, and that will necessitate naming a minister from Alberta to act as co-chair. The federal government has already named the Hon. Doug Young and the hon. Mr. Dingwall, Minister of Health, as co-chairs for the forum. The idea is that the provinces will get together with the feds to set out an umbrella arrangement under which the sectors of the social portfolios can get together to set out a game plan on how we can sort out who can do best.

It isn't a matter of taking anything from the federal government. It might even be giving something to the federal government. It's looking at how we can deliver our social programs in the most effective and efficient manner and then, once that's determined, determining how the financing of that should happen. So the officials are already looking at agendas and how we can structure that.

On the nonsocial side, also as the Premier mentioned, there's this work plan that is to be looked at, including work on national standards. National standards don't mean federal standards, but they also don't mean provincial standards. They in fact mean that all levels of government will get together and sort out what kind of standards and what kind of policing mechanism can be brought forward on those. The officials are also looking at the structure of that committee so it can get to work, because they've asked for the report by November in terms of national standards.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

2:10

### Glenrose Hospital

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Capital health authority is hiding behind a secretive employment screening exam to justify eliminating 12 long-term food service employees from the Glenrose hospital. These employees who were not rehired had a total of 183 years of experience. As the Capital health authority has refused to justify why they did not hire these employees, it's now the minister's responsibility to obtain the answers to the questions these employees and their families have. My questions are to the Minister of Health. Will the minister investigate why for an average of 15 years 12 long-term employees were well qualified to do the job one day and unqualified the very next?

MR. JONSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the inquiry that has come into my office. I've not had the opportunity to get the

details on it, but it is certainly being investigated. I think it also may be an area in which I may need to use the services of the hon. Minister of Labour. Certainly that's being followed up on, but the specifics of this case I'm not able to comment on at this time.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: First supplemental, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will either one of the ministers, then, commit to obtaining and investigating the appropriateness of the exam which was so critical to refusing employment for these workers? The Capital health authority has refused to release it.

MR. JONSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I perhaps spoke too generally because I think there seem to be many aspects to this case, but in terms of the examination itself and its purpose, yes, we would inquire about that.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Final supplemental, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister also commit to producing the results of that examination and making those public?

MR. JONSON: Well, certainly in terms of a general investigation we'd look at that, but I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that we would produce the results that individuals had on that particular examination, whatever its nature.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bow Valley.

### Grain Marketing

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Grain marketing and the compulsory nature of the Canadian Wheat Board is being debated across the prairies. Here in Alberta producers voted in a plebiscite last fall and expressed their desire to have more freedom to sell their products to whomever they choose. Alberta farmers told this Assembly that they wanted the option to sell to the Canadian Wheat Board or to others. Recently media reports have suggested that the Alberta government is anti Wheat Board. To the minister of agriculture: is this the position of the government?

MR. PASZKOWSKI: The Alberta government is not anti Canadian Wheat Board. However, what the Alberta government does advocate is that the producer should have the ability or the option to market his wheat or barley in whatever manner he chooses, just as he markets beef, just as he markets clovers, just as he markets any other commodity that he produces. The Alberta government supports the views of the producers. The producers spoke very clearly during a plebiscite when 66 percent of the barley producers in this province asked for the opportunity to have the option of marketing barley or wheat in whatever manner they so choose. Alberta supports change as well. This is critical, and it's important that indeed the marketing process meets the changing environmental needs of the world marketplace.

The one component that the Alberta government totally supports the Alberta producers on is that they should have the ability to achieve the highest price at the farm gate that is available to them.

No one should dictate that to them. They should have the option and they should have the ability of obtaining the highest price at the farm gate.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: First supplemental, Bow Valley.

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government has launched two court cases regarding grain marketing and producer choice. Could the minister explain how these cases will lead to the implementation of the Alberta producer plebiscite results?

MR. PASZKOWSKI: One case has referenced a particular procedure to the courts to basically clarify whether indeed this is a procedure that fits within the criteria of the laws of the land. The other, of course, is a direct challenge to the federal court, and that is an issue of contracting. The Alberta government feels that the clarification and indeed the justification of the contracting process are very critical and very important to the future planning of the producers of this province.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bow Valley.

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister confirm that the federal government sent investigators to interview the security services of the Legislature to determine their capabilities in identifying Wheat Board demonstrators à la U.S. senator Joseph McCarthy?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. minister, just to remind you that part of this question does appear before the court, so you should of course judge yourself accordingly as to how you'd answer.

The hon. minister of agriculture.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have been advised that federal investigators have engaged in discussions with security regarding their abilities to identify. This is something that is of concern to us of course. However, there have indeed been federal investigators in discussions with our security officials.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

### Rural Health Services

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're all aware of the shortage of physicians in rural areas these days and the resulting restrictions on emergency services. On August 14 the Minister of Health mentioned the rural physician action plan, on which the government is spending approximately \$2.8 million this year. Now, these days the town of Milk River is supporting a large, yellow mobile sign on which it says: we want a doctor. So my question is to the Minister of Health. Is that sign so far the only visible result of your new plan?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the rural physician action plan is being successful across this province. I know that in the area of Cardston, Elk Point, Bonnyville, just to use two or three examples, they are, as I understand it, in the successful stages of recruiting the needed physicians. In the case of this particular sign, I have not seen it, but certainly if they are making the proper contacts with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and utilizing that program, I'm sure there would be assistance provided.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Premier to supplement.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to have this opportunity to supplement. The Member for West Yellowhead raises a very, very good point. What we've been saying all along is that there are wonderful, marvellous opportunities for doctors to practise in the rural areas, but the doctors prefer to be in Calgary and Edmonton. Certainly these are tertiary care centres and so on.

You look at the hospitals that have been built in wonderful, beautiful towns like Milk River, the magnificent hospitals with good operating theatres.

MR. SAPERS: Why are you closing them?

MR. KLEIN: We are not closing them, Mr. Speaker. We're converting some of these to reflect long-term needs.

As a matter of fact, in Milk River people like that hospital. Moms come up to have their babies. People come up from the United States to have surgery. There are gorgeous opportunities. It is a beautiful part of the world for doctors to go to. There's Writing-on-Stone provincial park. There's a spirit and a life that is probably the most hospitable. This is a great opportunity for a bright doctor to go down and take advantage of a beautiful, marvelous facility. I'm glad that the Member for West Yellowhead has brought this to our attention.

2:20

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: I thank the Premier for a quick promotion here.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the Premier's commercial for rural Alberta and in view of the fact that this big sign by the way was put up by the town council for Milk River – it's not a tangible result of the new plan – could the Premier, then, tell me, can he give any tangible evidence to the people of Milk River, of Valleyview, of Smoky Lake: are there any doctors going there?

MR. KLEIN: I don't know if any doctors are going there, but I can tell you that it is a great place to go.

Mr. Speaker, my cousin Betty Lodermeier, who lives not too far from Milk River, nursed in that hospital for years. She loves that hospital, and she boasts about the quality of care that she was able to give. This is a wonderful, wonderful part of our province, and any doctor would be proud to operate in that hospital.

Mr. Speaker, it takes some courage to go out of the big cities, Edmonton and Calgary, and into a beautiful setting like Milk River, but by golly, once they're there, they will really enjoy it. They'll find a different kind of life altogether, a wonderful kind of life.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the Premier that words are cheaper than actions here.

Now, how does the Premier, then, explain the fact that since this plan has been in operation, since 1990, the situation has become more critical as far as rural doctors are concerned?

MR. KLEIN: I will have the hon. Minister of Health supplement.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there was an article not so long ago – and this was a preference on the part of the doctors, to work in big cities, where, you know, relative to medicine it certainly is more exciting. There are more things going on. We have the cancer institutes. We have all the research centres in the big cities and so on.

Relative to just everyday medicine and looking after people, the opportunities in the rural areas are absolutely tremendous, and I would appeal once again to those doctors that might be thinking of a move to look at rural Alberta because it is a wonderful, wonderful place indeed, so diverse and so interesting and so caring. Mr. Speaker, there is an attitude of caring and sharing, and that relates in my mind a lot to what medicine should be all about.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health to supplement.

MR. JONSON: If I might supplement, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will recall – I won't go through all the statistics from a previous day. Over the last decade, as I recall the figures, the number of physicians in the province had far outstripped in growth in terms of percentage that of the general population. So we do not have any crisis in terms of an overall supply of doctors that could work in rural areas.

Secondly, there is progress being made with the various initiatives: loan forgiveness, what might be called package benefits for areas across the province, and on we can go with the list of different alternatives that they're using. They are getting people to locate in the rural areas of this province, which in many cases, as the Premier has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, have well-equipped hospitals, good transportation systems, but it is a case where they already have a physician and they need someone there to share the load, give a person a period of time off, and so forth. So this is an area where I think we have a good news story.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-West.

#### **Employment Standards Enforcement.**

MR. DUNFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today are to the Minister of Labour. Many of us as government members believe that any delivery system by the government has to be examined for its effectiveness and efficiency. Now, it is my understanding that officials of the Department of Labour have been meeting with employment standards staff of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees to discuss a new approach to service delivery for employment standards. My question would be: can the Minister of Labour indicate to Albertans why the employment standards branch would be moving to the private sector?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the member for the question, because it is important. In one very simple word, the answer is delivery. The government maintains its role in setting policy and legislation to monitor and audit service delivery, but as we've said, not only in this particular instance but throughout as dramatic changes have taken place in government: we steer, and the private sector rows. So we see that there's been more and more opportunity for the private sector to become involved in delivering employment standards in the province of Alberta.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we've talked about the Alberta advantage and the great increase in the economic benefits in this province, the fact that there are over 1.4 million people working today. The complaints to employment standards are only up marginally, and

of the 10,000 claims only 5,000 in fact go through the registration process and are brought to conclusion. This is not new. It was put forward in the Alberta Labour business plan in February '95 and then again in the business plan for employment standards, which was released 15 months ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, the "why" is strictly delivery. It's strictly to be able to provide better service to both employer and employee, the customers of the Department of Labour, at a better price.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: First supplemental, Lethbridge-West.

MR. DUNFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Labour, then, assure constituents of mine that should they run into difficulties with employers in our area, they will be able to continue to have access to a quality service?

MR. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, absolutely we can assure that, because that's going to be the job not only of the department, which will continue its role in setting policy and ensuring compliance in going through the necessary audit functions, but the fact that there'll be better access, that employers and employees will be able to access this system in a far more efficient manner. In fact, last week my office personally handled two issues: one that came from Red Deer that took 10 months and one that came from Grande Prairie that took 10 hours. Clearly that discrepancy in level of service can't go on.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Final supplemental?

Question period is over.

Points of order. I think we had one point of order from last week, which we'll deal with after, and we'll take today's points of order.

Edmonton-Glenora.

#### **Point of Order Offending the Practices of the Assembly**

MR. SAPERS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I rise under Standing Order 23(1), which has to do with the Speaker calling a member to order if that member "introduces any matter in debate which offends the practices and precedents of the Assembly." I rise under that point of order because once again today we had the Treasurer take out his favourite script and read from it, speaking about a matter on which he only half tells the real story, in which he in fact misinforms the Assembly by leaving a tremendous amount of information out of his words.

2:30

What the Treasurer has done time and time and time again – and it's getting very annoying, Mr. Speaker – is that he tends to forget his words when he was cautioning the federal government and expressing to them that Alberta wanted the federal government to get their House in order. He forgets that part when he says . . .

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, to the point of order as opposed to a point of debate.

MR. SAPERS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINNING: You forgot yourself; right?

MR. SAPERS: The Treasurer will have a minute to speak soon, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps you could advise him of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is this. The Treasurer continues, as he does just now, by intervening from his seat. He introduces a matter into debate which does offend this Assembly, because it only tells half the story. The fact is that the Canada health and social transfer protected all of the dollars for health care. The Treasurer knows that, and he should apologize to the Assembly for misinforming the Assembly.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. the Provincial Treasurer, who will speak to the point of order.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak directly to the point of order that the Member for Edmonton-Glenora has attempted to put forward. The fact to support this point of order is that Ottawa has acknowledged that its reductions to the province by way of transfers under the Canada health and social transfer will drop by almost \$457 million by '97-98 over '94-95. I said: \$457 million. That by my calculation is pretty near – well it's almost a third. So, Mr. Speaker . . .

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the point of order raised by Edmonton-Glenora has been an opportunity perhaps for clarification. However, I think the point does bring us back to answering questions. *Beauchesne* 417 reminds us all that "answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate." So that's a reminder.

We clearly have a difference of opinion between hon. members as to what all of the story will be, and I think that can be debated at the appropriate moments, and it's not now. No point of order.

The hon. member for Edmonton-Rutherford has indicated a point of order.

#### **Point of Order Brevity**

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I raised a point of order when the minister responsible for economic development was responding to a question. In my point of order I, too, refer to *Beauchesne* 417. *Beauchesne* 417 of course clearly states that "answers to questions should be as brief as possible."

Mr. Speaker, it is very, very difficult for our side, very offensive to our side when we conduct question period in a very professional and businesslike manner, and then we see the government sort of make fun of it and provoke debate and play a little game over there where they actually try at times to burn out the clock. They try to burn out the clock as they advance down and they're responding. In this case in particular, you motioned, you signaled that minister several times to hush up, and he would intentionally look away from you, pretending that he didn't see your signals.

Mr. Speaker, it's very, very important for us to utilize our opportunity to the fullest so that we can get answers that the public is demanding from this government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we got . . .

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Sorry to interrupt. I think you've made your point. In fact the Chair, perhaps in unknowing anticipation of that, had dealt with it. We are asking for succinct responses, and I don't think any further defence is needed.

MR. DINNING: There's no point of order.



THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order other than the general admonition to all.

### Point of Order

#### Disposition of Bill 214

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: On Thursday, hon. members, August 22, 1996, after the prayers and before the daily routine the hon. Member for Calgary-North West raised a point of order concerning what he believes was an omission on that day's Order Paper, specifically a reference to Bill 214 under Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders. The hon. member indicated that there was neither a motion to remove 214 from the Order Paper nor unanimous consent to waive Standing Order 8(5)(a)(ii) and that therefore Bill 214 should be returned to the Order Paper to be discussed on the next private member's day.

While the Chair is extremely reluctant to comment on what occurred in Committee of the Whole, a review of *Hansard* for Wednesday, August 20, 1996, indicates that when the Assembly was in Committee of the Whole debating Bill 214, the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie moved pursuant to Standing Order 64(1) that the Chairman leave the Chair. Standing Order 64(1) reads as follows:

- A motion that the Chairman leave the Chair
- (a) is always in order,
  - (b) takes precedence over any other motion, and
  - (c) is not debatable.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie's motion passed in the affirmative, and the Chairman left the Chair.

The Standing Orders are not explicit as to what happens to a Bill when the Chairman leaves the Chair, but both *Beauchesne* and *Erskine May*, which are the authorities most often consulted in situations that are not covered by the Standing Orders, deal with this matter. *Beauchesne* in paragraph 905 explains that a Member wishing to supersede a question, will move "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair", and if this motion, which is not debatable, is resolved in the affirmative, the Chairman will at once leave the Chair, and with no report having been made to the House, the bill or question disappears from the Order Paper.

*Erskine May* on page 499 is to a similar effect.

Thus in partial answer to the hon. member's point of view the Chair would advise that a motion to remove Bill 214 from the Order Paper was not necessary because the Bill automatically disappeared from the Order Paper when the Chairman left the Chair.

The hon. Member for Calgary-North West also indicated that Bill 214 cannot be removed from the Order Paper unless there's unanimous consent of the House to waive Standing Order 8(5)(a)(ii), which says that

- a public Bill other than a Government Bill shall retain its place on the Order Paper until such time as the Bill has been given . . .
- (ii) 120 minutes of debate in Committee of the Whole.

What the hon. member failed to mention, however, were the closing words of Standing Order 8(5)(a), which reads: "unless the relevant motion is voted upon sooner."

In the Chair's view a motion under Standing Order 64(1) is a relevant motion for the purpose of Standing Order 8(5)(a)(ii). Indeed, pursuant to Standing Order 64(1)(b) it's a motion that "takes precedence over any other motion." Accordingly, once a motion that the Chairman leave the Chair is affirmed in the positive, that ends debate of the Bill. In short, the Standing Order provisions concerning the amount of time to be spent on private member's Bills are not absolute. They are subject to the normal rules of debate and the motions that have marked parliamentary practice at least since 1905 in this province.

Finally, the hon. Member for Calgary-North West referred to Standing Order 41. Standing Order 41 enumerates the motions that can be received when a motion is being debated. It is true that there is no motion under Standing Order 41 to remove a Bill from the Order Paper. However, Standing Order 64 takes precedence over any other motion and is always in order. Consequently, Standing Order 41 is not applicable under these circumstances.

In conclusion, the Chair wishes to thank the hon. Member for Calgary-North West for his concerns and comments, but the Chair finds that there is no point of order. Bill 214 was properly removed from the Order Paper in accordance with the Standing Orders and the usages and precedents of this Assembly.

head: **Orders of the Day**  
 head: **Government Bills and Orders**  
 head: **Committee of the Whole**

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call the committee to order.

**2:40** **Bill 46**  
**Electoral Divisions Act**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We're on government amendment A1. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you.

MR. DAY: Question.

MS LEIBOVICI: Pas aujourd'hui, je pense.

It gives me great pleasure this afternoon to rise to speak to Bill 46, the Electoral Divisions Act, and in particular to the amendment to Bill 46, which reads as follows:

The Schedule is amended by replacing the names of the electoral divisions set out in column 1 with the names set out in column 2 and by rearranging and renumbering the names of the electoral divisions and their boundary descriptions accordingly:

Column 1	Column 2
Calgary-East	Calgary-Fort
Calgary-Forest Lawn	Calgary-East
Airdrie	Airdrie-Rocky View
Bow Valley	Strathmore-Brooks
Cardston-Taber	Cardston-Taber-Warner
Olds	Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills

The last two ridings become quite a mouthful, and the hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert has jokingly said in our caucus: I guess some of the other members were jealous that there was only one grouping of names in their boundary divisions, so that's why we're now getting boundary divisions that have more than one jurisdiction within them.

What's surprising is that here we have a Bill that's been put together in conjunction with the report that the commission had put forward and what we see now in front of us, when we're not even four days into the debate on this particular Bill, are amendments already. I wonder how many more amendments the government side is planning to bring forward, especially given that there seems to be a wish to fast-track this Bill. What I would urge the government to do is to take their time, not be in a rush, to look at consultation, much as what they've requested to be done with Bill 214, so that there be the time to consult, that there be

the time to take it out to the particular constituents and constituencies that would be involved. In fact, the example they've set with Bill 214 we should see set with Bill 46.

There are models that the government could look at. For instance, when I worked with the municipality of the city of Edmonton, there's a whole process to naming. One doesn't just go about and willy-nilly pick a name out of the air, but in fact what ends up happening is that there is a process. There is a committee that's set up of citizens and government officials, and there may even be an elected official on that particular committee. What the committee does is it looks at suggestions for names, looks at the history behind particular names, puts forward to the public, to see what the decision should be, an example of what the names for a particular area or a park or a street or what have you could be, and then, depending on the public input, makes a decision as to what in fact the name for a particular area should be.

Now, I would imagine that in the report, the document that we all received on the electoral boundaries entitled Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries and Names for Alberta, those names and those divisions were in actual fact based on the discussions that the commission had with people across this province. But in fact when one looks at the amendments that are before us, there's no explanation as to how these amendments came about. There doesn't seem to be any willingness on the part of the government to go back, maybe request the commission to go out with these new names – because they in fact did not put forward these names – and get a feel for what the constituents of the proposed new boundaries would feel about, for instance, becoming Calgary-Fort as opposed to Calgary-East or Calgary-East as opposed to Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Now, if we were in normal times, when boundaries have been relatively stable over a period of time, perhaps it would be easier to do that, but as our history has shown with regards to the electoral boundaries, over the last three sets of elections – if you look at the 1986 election, the 1989 election, and the '93 election – what has happened in the period of 10 years is that we've had the boundaries change at least three times. This will be the fourth time. One of the members of the government had indicated that people don't know who their MLAs are. Well, it's difficult to keep track of that when the government insists, almost on an annual basis, on changing the boundaries, which in effect then changes who the MLA is. This is, I think, particularly distressing to the voter who is trying to establish a relationship within a particular constituency based on a number of factors and also with their MLA.

In fact, in the decisions that were made within the Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries and Names for Alberta report, there was a matrix that was put forward which indicated that one of the reasons for putting particular areas together was of course population. It was also a commonality of interest, and it also suggested what certain names were. But here in front of us we've got an amendment that again, as I indicated, does not tell us why the names have been proposed the way they have and whether the constituents of those particular new areas will in fact be amenable to that name change.

Now, when I started my address to the amendments, one of the things I indicated was that there seems to be an undue rush by the government to push forward the boundaries as indicated. When we look at the flurry of advertisements that are coming out in either the *Calgary Herald* or the *Edmonton Examiner* or perhaps in today's Edmonton newspapers – I haven't seen them – we've

already got, before this Bill has even been passed, founding meetings of constituency associations by the Conservatives. The first founding meeting, I believe, will be with the Minister of Education on September 3 to found Calgary-Nose Creek. I can see why in fact the government would be in a rush and would not want to consult with constituents as to the names.

But again the government has put forward a very high standard. What they have said, when one looks at Bill 214, is: we're not willing to pass legislation unless there has been adequate public consultation. There is, of course, no definition for adequate public consultation, but I think it's a standard that's been set by this particular government.

#### Point of Order Relevance

MR. SEVERTSON: Mr. Chairman, *Beauchesne*, relevancy. I thought we were talking to the amendments on name changes. We've hardly heard anything about the name changes.

2:50

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, hon. member.

MS LEIBOVICI: Of course I'm talking to the amendment. What the amendment is doing is changing the names that were put forward after considerable consideration by the commission. What this amendment is doing is putting forward, without any consultation, without any notice to the public, that there are going to be changes of names. What I'm doing is drawing the parallel in the process, which deals directly with the amendment which says that there wishes to be on behalf of the government – it's a government amendment – a change of six constituencies in column 1 to be changed to column 2. You can see it right here. This is without any public discussion. This is without any public consultation. The report has been put forward. That's the parallel that I'm making. Now, I can understand why the member would be sensitive about not wanting to draw the parallel between Bill 214 and the fact that the government then said that consultation was a good thing but does not want to see that same standard being put forward to this amendment. So I believe that I'm right on the amendment.

Thank you. I await your ruling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the point of order. This is a topic that is always a difficult call. As I sit here, not just today but many days, unless the member specifically gets totally off the topic, I never call them to order, and certainly the member is at times going to at least the amendment. I know that the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark will stay closer. It is a difficult call, and if the hon. member gets blatantly off topic, I will call the member to order.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you for that very wise ruling.

#### Debate Continued

MS LEIBOVICI: Now, when we look at the actual constituencies, Calgary-East is going to become Calgary-Fort. Calgary-Forest Lawn will become Calgary-East. Again, there does not seem to be any rationale that's been put forward for these particular amendments.

We see that the Calgary-East that's proposed in this particular report is composed of 61 percent of the former population of

Calgary-East, yet what we see in the amendment is that the Calgary-East which, if you can remember, composed the majority of Calgary-East is the old Calgary-East. That's 61 percent. For some strange reason that will become Calgary-Fort. Calgary-Forest Lawn, which has only 7 percent of the former Calgary-East – now, if I'm losing anyone, I can repeat this so it's a little bit clearer. But if you follow in the book, you'll see that Calgary-Forest Lawn is going to become Calgary-East. Now, I find that very confusing in that the new Calgary-East we're going to call Calgary-East even though it only has 7 percent of the old Calgary-East, and again there's no rationale. I would think that people who live in the Calgary-East area, the majority of those – because it's 61 percent of those in the current Calgary-East, which is going to become Calgary-Fort – that 61 percent of the population would think, "Well, I should be part of Calgary-East." So again, based on rationale and percentages, when I look at it, there doesn't seem to be any reason for these changes. That's why I think it's very important that there is some kind of a consultation that would go on to try and make people appreciate and understand the reason for these changes.

[Mr. Herard in the Chair]

The reason I know that this is an issue is that at one point I was nominated to run – and this might have been in the '86 or the '89 election – in a constituency that was named Edmonton-Jasper Place. In 1993 Edmonton-Jasper Place became Edmonton-Meadowlark. Now, you would think, much like the people who have put forward this amendment, that that's not a big deal, that people don't have an affinity towards a name. In reality, what I heard on a number of occasions was an affinity towards the old town of Jasper Place, that the people who had been part of the old town of Jasper Place, which, as you know, did become part of Edmonton, felt disaffected, did in fact feel that they should have been consulted before that name change was made. They didn't quite understand how one day they could be Edmonton-Jasper Place and at another time all of a sudden become Edmonton-Meadowlark. Before that, in '86, they were something else; I forget. There was another riding. So there is a lot of confusion out there with the electorate.

Unless there's some way to communicate that to the electorate, unless there's some way to actually indicate why these changes are made and to get input – because I do believe that what's important is to have input into the process – in fact we may have more disaffected voters out there.

Now, I'm sure that if I go down the list to, for instance, Bow Valley, it might be interesting to look at what has happened with Bow Valley, where the name has completely changed. Perhaps the Member for Bow Valley will get up and indicate as to what his feedback has been from his constituents now that it will be renamed to Strathmore-Brooks and whether that indeed is appropriate, to rename it to Strathmore-Brooks, or whether it's more appropriately named Bow Valley. We must, of course, believe there was a reason that those names were put forward in the first place.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Bow Valley is rising on a point of order.

#### Point of Order

#### Questioning a Member

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would the speaker entertain a question on the matter that she has referred to in her speech?

MS LEIBOVICI: Well, I'd actually prefer an explanation. If you can let us know . . .

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes or no.

MS LEIBOVICI: . . . what the history is, and whether your constituents agree with the name change, then please feel free to join in.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The answer is yes.

#### Debate Continued

DR. OBERG: I'll take that as a yes as well. Mr. Chairman, one of the mysteries of the naming of the constituency is the term "Bow Valley." As everyone here knows, the Bow River is there, but there's actually no valley at all, and indeed it's very flat.

DR. TAYLOR: How about Bow Coulee?

DR. OBERG: That's right. The proper term actually would be Bow Basin, because that is what it is, the Bow Basin. You could have the Brooks-Bow Basin, but then that would be the BBB, and they would get it mixed up with the Better Business Bureau, Mr. Chairman. So we couldn't do that.

More to the point, the mayors of Strathmore and Brooks – and I have had numerous people comment that the term "Bow Valley" does not identify them, and they wanted the name changed, after extensive consultation, to Brooks-Strathmore or Strathmore-Brooks. For obvious acronymical reasons Strathmore-Brooks was put forward as opposed to Brooks-Strathmore.

MS LEIBOVICI: Well, I quite appreciate that explanation. I think this kind of interchange is very valuable. It's very valuable in helping us understand the consultation that you have had with your constituents. I wonder if perhaps the new Cardston-Taber, which is going to become Cardston-Taber-Warner, could let us know what your constituents have said about that or the Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills to be and whether there is that same unanimous approval of the name change.

3:00

What's interesting, when one looks at the books, as to Bow Valley – what the old Bow Valley had and what the new Bow Valley will have – is that Bow Valley will take into account Drumheller. There will be a larger representation from Drumheller. In the proposed electoral division Bow Valley is 60 percent, Drumheller is 32 percent, and Little Bow is 7 percent, whereas in the old electoral division . . . Nope. The other way around. Sorry. The current electoral division is that. The proposed electoral division will be Bow Valley, Cypress-Medicine Hat, Drumheller-Chinook. In effect, we see that there are other areas – such as Drumheller, Little Bow, Chinook, Medicine Hat – that have been affected. It would be interesting to know what their response is as to whether or not they think this is an accurate description of what the new boundaries will be.

The effects, as I indicated earlier, are such that there is confusion at times within the electorate to know who is the appropriate representative for a particular area, and it becomes difficult at times for the electorate to know where they are. That's why I think it's important that there is this consultation process to go on around the names. Even though you may think that all we're doing is discussing a name, in fact what also

happens is the process of elections gets discussed and other related issues, not only the boundaries issue but the broader issue of elections within Alberta. I think that's a good starting point to try and get citizens of Alberta interested in elections. As we know, less than half of the citizens in Alberta do, on average, go out to vote. Perhaps one way to get them more involved in the whole process is to try and get them involved from the ground up. The boundaries commission did try to do that, and they did in fact, based on their consultations, suggest certain names, but here we are again. There's an amendment.

Again, if I may bring a parallel to 214, there was a Bill that was presented, it was voted on unanimously by this Legislative Assembly . . .

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, excuse me. That issue has been ruled on by the Chair, and I wish that you would keep your discussion to the amendment that we're currently working on. Thank you.

MS LEIBOVICI: I am. As I was saying, with Bill 214 the Bill was ruled on at second reading, we got to the Committee of the Whole stage, and there was a decision made by the government that there wasn't enough consultation on the amendments that were put forward in consultation with the government departments and us. In fact, what the parallel is is that this is a Bill that was passed in second reading. We're now in Committee of the Whole. There are amendments that have been put forward by the government side, and what I'm basically saying is that there hasn't been enough consultation and it should go back.

Thank you.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to speak in favour of this amendment. I'm not going to reiterate the discussion that was held concerning the boundary change to the Olds-Didsbury area because that's passed and it's been agreed upon in principle, but all of my comments would still apply.

Dealing specifically with the six lines of amendments to this Bill and specifically to the Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills portion of that amendment, I would just like to point out that in the past Olds-Didsbury did indeed represent that riding. It was in the very heart of the riding, surrounded by Sundre and Crossfield and other areas, and it did embody the trading pattern, the community of interest, if you will, in that general area. The addition of Three Hills and Trochu and Acme of course changes that considerably. As you likely know, Mr. Chairman, Three Hills is over an hour away from Olds or Didsbury and embodies a different trading pattern altogether. Their area of interest primarily is to the east.

While I'm opposed to this calculator approach to deal with people and people representation, I think it's imperative that if indeed that's what has to happen, then we make certain that those communities are still represented in this Legislature. The Three Hills-Airdrie riding, at least the Three Hills portion of that riding, has been identified in this Assembly for years and years. I think it would be a terrible injustice, after having applied simply a numbers game to change that representation, to remove that representation in this Assembly. So that is why I'm speaking to the inclusion of the name Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills instead of just Olds. I feel that the name Olds, while it's a very admirable name, doesn't represent the entire riding.

I'm speaking in favour of this amendment, and I think it's a

very brief amendment to a very complex Bill and a very sensitive debate. With that, I'd like to call the question, Mr. Chairman.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a few observations in support of the House not voting for these amendments. There are a number of reasons that could be put forward, and I'd like to address a few of those, if I may, right now.

First of all, if you go back to the commission itself, this was a movement in our province towards the depoliticization of the drawing of electoral boundaries. We heard earlier in the debate on the Bill from one of the members from Calgary who'd been part of the past Electoral Boundaries Committee and the difficulty that the last commission had in trying to bring forward a report. I think there were five members. They had five minority reports. So this has been an attempt in this round to depoliticize the whole process.

What this amendment does is to start and interfere in that again. It has members of the Legislature making the decisions about the names. It may be put forward as unimportant, and I think the mover of the motion indicated that he thought they were unimportant. When he introduced the amendments in the Legislature last week, he said that they were minor in nature, so I assume that he thought they were unimportant. But I see the principle here as being very important; that is, MLAs, active politicians, being involved in the naming or the drawing of electoral boundaries. Again, I think it's a retrograde step in terms of what this commission had accomplished. So, first of all, I think we should vote against it, because it does violate that principle of noninterference in something that affects us personally as elected representatives.

The second reason I think we should vote against the amendments is that I'm not quite sure how much sense they make. In the stated reasons in *Hansard* from August 22, 1996, the hon. Minister of Justice says, "Mr. Chairman, these amendments of names are consistent with the input that MLAs have received from their constituents." Yet if you go back, for instance, to the changing of Olds to Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, I note that in appendix D on page 93 of the Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries and Names that that member actually made a submission to the boundaries commission. I don't quite understand. Was the submission that member made on November 23 not sufficient? What happened between his submission to that boundaries commission and now that would cause an amendment to be introduced in terms of the name change? So the stated reason of the involvement of MLAs doesn't seem to be reasonable. It doesn't seem to make sense.

### 3:10

I believe we should vote against the amendments for there is no rationale given for the changes. It was indicated that they were minor and that there was input from MLAs and that's why the changes are there. But name changes are really a very important part of voting and a part of the electoral process in our province. If you look through the list of the names that we have, many of them are place names. We'll have Rocky Mountain House and Mill Woods and Gold Bar and Whitemud and Fish Creek and Nose Creek - there's a whole association with the place where people live - Chief Mountain, Lesser Slave Lake. Geography and the cardinal directions - north, south, east, west - have been used in trying to determine place names. So there is a rationale sitting

behind the names as they appear in the report. Often the names have some historic association for people in the area: Fort Saskatchewan, St. Albert; Avonmore and Glengarry with their roots in Scottish lore. There is an association they have historically with many of the names that appear there. Some of them are associated with institutions, Calgary-Varsity being a case in point. Certainly there are a number of them that are associated with people, historic people in our . . .

MR. SMITH: What about Calgary-Varsity?

DR. MASSEY: Associated with an institution. That was an interjection.

A number of them are associated with historic figures in the province: Manning; Nellie McClung, who was a heroine in our history; Rutherford, the first Premier of the province; in our city, Roper; in Calgary, McCall and Currie; and again in our city, Strathcona. So a number of the names have specific historic people references. Then there are other rationales.

I guess what's missing from the amendment and what the mover of the amendment didn't do as a courtesy was to give us a rationale. Why are the names being changed? Did the boundaries commission hear those same arguments that are being heard today from a couple of members about their constituencies? Did the boundaries commission hear those arguments and reject them? We're left in the dark as to what's actually proceeded.

I think another reason why we should vote against these amendments is that the commission didn't make any attempt to justify or not justify names in the report that they put forward. For some reason they didn't see that there was any reason to address the names in the same sort of systematic fashion that they put forward that matrix. I guess I was somewhat surprised, because if it isn't in this electoral boundaries report, I would assume that somewhere down the road the whole notion of names and how they are arrived at would be an appropriate subject for the commission to address.

If you look at the whole business of names, they can be very controversial and they can be very political. I think back again to my experience on the school board here, where one of the things that we did was to try and put forward a sound policy for the naming of schools. We looked at the local neighbourhoods. We looked at Albertans and Canadians and the contributions that they had made to provincial or national political, social, or civic affairs. We looked at people and their contributions to cultural affairs in the country. We came up with an ordering of naming schools that we thought would make some sense and tried to avoid the kind of pressure we were constantly under by people who wanted a facility named after their uncle or their aunt, or they wanted their family name to appear on a facility.

So I would think that if for some reason the commission had addressed the problem of names and decided they weren't going to regularize it or propose a rationale for the name changes, that must have been deliberate. Or if it wasn't deliberate, they must have for some reason thought that it wasn't important or that maybe it was beyond the scope of their power or their task as they saw it. I think at some point it's going to have to be addressed. Why we called electoral divisions or changed them from Calgary-East to Calgary-Fort is going to have to be made explicit. The rationale for arriving at names and some guidance for those charged with naming constituencies is going to have to be given.

I go back to the major reason and I think the most important reason for voting against the amendments – and then I'll conclude

my comments, Mr. Chairman – which is that the principle of noninvolvement of politicians, sitting politicians, in the process is being violated by these amendments. For that reason I would urge that they be defeated.

Thank you.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning.

MR. SEKULIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak to the proposed amendments to Bill 46, the Electoral Divisions Act. I've been here in the Assembly throughout the debate on this Bill at second reading. I spoke to it at second reading, highlighted some of my concerns with the Bill, and I was here when the Minister of Justice on behalf of the government introduced the amendments which are before us today and which are the subject of debate. Recalling what the hon. Minister of Justice said when he introduced these amendments, he said:

Mr. Chairman, these amendments of names are consistent with the input that MLAs have received from their constituents. They are minor in nature of course, and I would so move.

That was on August 22, 1996, page 2354 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Chairman, when we propose Bills in this Assembly, when we propose amendments to Bills in this Assembly, I would expect some detail from the mover or the sponsor of a Bill, if that's the case, or if there are amendments, then I would require more to be put forward.

DR. TAYLOR: Peter, don't lower yourself. You're above this.

MR. SEKULIC: These are just questions and concerns – and in response to an hon. member's comments, I will be concise because I do not want to hamper the progress of this Assembly.

I do want to say that when I listened to the debate throughout its stages, when I heard the amendments introduced, I picked them up, and I do thoroughly go through every single piece of legislation that comes before this Assembly and every pertinent amendment that we as legislators face. One element struck me, and one question I immediately had. I took those amendments and I referred back to the 1995-96 Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission report, the final report that was presented to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta in June of 1996. I looked at those boundaries. The specific ones that I had a question on were in column 1, where we go from Calgary-East and the name becomes Calgary-Fort, and then the second one in the order there, where Calgary-Forest Lawn becomes Calgary-East.

What I did was refer to the map found on pages 168 and 169 of the document, the final draft that was presented to the Speaker of this Assembly. What struck me as interesting and perhaps curious was the fact that what used to be Calgary-East now becomes Calgary-Fort, and what used to be Calgary-Forest Lawn becomes Calgary-East. It was interesting that out of the five constituencies that border the east side of Calgary, the to-be Calgary-East wasn't one of them. I was just curious – and I won't take up too much more time of the Assembly – why we would rename such a large constituency as Calgary-East, which in fact borders the eastern boundary of the city of Calgary's limits, to no longer be Calgary-East and rename Calgary-Forest Lawn to be Calgary-East, and the new Calgary-East then wouldn't in any way border along the eastern municipal boundary of the city of Calgary.

So that was one that I found interesting and perhaps curious, and I would appreciate if the mover of these amendments would

get up and respond to that question because I think it's a legitimate question. I think many residents in the other constituencies that border the eastern boundary of Calgary would perhaps wonder why it is that they're not Calgary-East and a constituency which is more central is called Calgary-East.

Those were the questions that I wanted to raise, because I do think that whichever points, whichever amendments, or whichever Bills we propose in this Assembly, we need to back them up. We need to explain why we're bringing them forward, and why they are of such importance. When I hear that MLAs in some of these constituencies had their constituents come to them and ask for changes, well, was it three constituents that came forward? What was the motivator? What initiated such change, or what initiated the need for such change to be proposed?

So with those few questions, Mr. Chairman, I will take my place and hopefully look forward to a response, because I think a response is warranted. Thank you.

3:20

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Lacombe-Stettler.

MRS. GORDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say that I find it rather strange that so many members opposite would question name changes when the name changes within the amendment are all constituencies that they do not represent. I really believe that the changes are reflective of the contemplated boundary lines. I do know myself that many of my constituents, during the hearings when it was first thought that my boundaries would change, asked me specifically about a name change. So I believe that many, many constituents that live and reside in many of these particular areas feel very strongly that the names should better reflect the changes in boundaries.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Redwater.

MRS. BALSILLIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm privileged this afternoon to speak on the amendments to Bill 46. As you know, I'm relatively new, so some of the comments that I may be saying may have been brought up before.

First of all, the comments that I just heard from across the floor are quite appalling to me. I thought that at this Legislature we had the privilege to talk and to speak on any Bill that comes to the floor. And that with such a serious change as this we would be told that because we don't live within that constituency or represent that constituency, we have no comment – it's appalling, actually, to listen to comments like that. What they might not know is that they may not be representing that constituency next time around. [interjections]

The other comments that I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, if I may do so without this section over here, is to talk in regards to name changes. I disagree with my colleague across the floor saying that some of her constituents understand and know the reason for the change. Most of the constituents don't even know they're being changed. This is a concern for me, that many of them have not been able to come forth and give what their opinion is on the name change.

I look at column 1 and I look at column 2, Calgary-East to Calgary-Fort: how confusing is that going to be to constituents? Have they gone out and have they spoken to these people, or is it a decision made by the MLAs on a whim? One morning they wake up and decide to make a change.

The other, which upsets me considerably, is Calgary-Forest Lane to Calgary-East.

AN HON. MEMBER: Calgary-Forest Lane?

MRS. BALSILLIE: Forest Lawn. I'm sorry.

MR. GERMAIN: Take it easy. She's a brand-new member here. Shame on you. Shame on you guys.

MRS. BALSILLIE: Well, thank you very much, Adam. Okay. What I'd like to say to the colleague across the lane here is that I don't have my glasses on. I'm sorry that I didn't have my glasses on, but thank you very much for correcting me.

I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am upset about some of these changes. I feel that the people on the other side don't realize what it means to the constituents to have the name and then all of a sudden to have it changed without any rationale. As I hear from the discussion, no one on the other side is going to give us any rationale on why these changes have been made.

MRS. FORSYTH: You weren't listening.

MRS. BALSILLIE: I've been listening and listening. I didn't hear any history or rationale. Well, why don't you tell me about it, if you've been listening? It would be nice to hear you say something once in a while.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, through the Chair, please.

MRS. BALSILLIE: So, Mr. Chairman, I ask if there will be rationale explaining to us, telling us why the changes. I think it is very serious when a change of name comes about, and it should not be done on a whim.

That's all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. BRUSEKER: Mr. Chairman, I too do want to make a few comments about the amendments before us today as proposed under amendment A1. Amendment A1 proposes a series of half a dozen potential name changes, some of which indeed are name changes for the current boundaries that we have.

The first one that I want to address is the issue of Calgary-Forest Lawn. Now, you may be aware, Mr. Chairman, that that particular name has some history within this Legislative Assembly. A constituency called Calgary-Forest Lawn was one of the constituencies represented – or that name, at least, was used – as recently as the 22nd Legislature. Of course, you know that we are in the 23rd Legislature right now. So the name Calgary-Forest Lawn as a constituency within the city of Calgary has some historical basis to be used as the name for a constituency. From that point I must say that I liked the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission that proposed that Calgary-Forest Lawn be used once again as a name within the city of Calgary. Indeed, I in a previous life spent some time working in that area as a schoolteacher in a junior high school in the community of Forest Lawn, located within the constituency of Calgary-Forest Lawn. So when the commission put forward the proposal to reinstate the name Calgary-Forest Lawn as one of the Calgary constituencies, indeed I was pleased to see that.

Now, I have no objection to the use of Calgary-East constituency – as a name, that is – but when I look at the name Calgary-

East and I look at the proposed location of Calgary-East as a constituency in the city of Calgary, indeed there are a couple of constituencies that will be farther east than the proposed constituency of Calgary-East under amendment A1. I'm disappointed, first, at the proposal to eliminate the name Calgary-Forest Lawn and rename it Calgary-East, and therefore simultaneously, because we couldn't have two constituencies named Calgary-East, to rename Calgary-East as Calgary-Fort.

Calgary-Fort is a name that will not necessarily have a lot of significance to a lot of people who live in that area. When you look at the map proposed for all of the constituencies in the city of Calgary, one might propose a number of other names rather than Calgary-Fort for that area. Geographically Calgary-East is going to be a very large constituency within the parameters of the city of Calgary; it's certainly going to be much larger than some of the other constituencies that are proposed. You've got a number of major roadways that go through there: Deerfoot and Barlow trails. You might pick one of those as a name. Certainly Deerfoot I think would be a name that would have a considerable significance to our First Nations people. There are all kinds of proposals one could come forward with rather than Calgary-Fort, because when one looks at that, again parts of the proposed new Calgary-Fort constituency will in fact be farther east than the proposed Calgary-East constituency that is in this amendment.

3:30

MR. AMERY: It's a small part.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, the member who currently represents Calgary-East says that it's only a small part. I would suggest that geographically it's a large area. Now, it is a large industrial area out there, and the resident population in the east part of what is now Calgary-East is probably quite small. Of course, I could say the same about my own constituency in that it's fairly large geographically, I suppose, compared to other Calgary constituencies. I want to emphasize that, lest my rural colleagues take some exception to my reference in that regard, Mr. Chairman. Of course, much of the population in my constituency, again, is in one area. The same thing applies to the Calgary-East constituency.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer that Calgary-Forest Lawn remain as a constituency name within the city of Calgary. I think that is very clear to the residents in that area. I think it is a name, as I said, that at least in the 22nd Legislature – and I have to be honest; I haven't referred back to Legislatures earlier than the 22nd Legislature. But I'm sure that as a Calgarian yourself you're aware that Forest Lawn was once upon a time a town unto itself, and that, I think, is part of the reason why it was preserved as a named constituency within the city of Calgary.

So, Mr. Chairman, just on those two constituencies I think the report as put forward by the Electoral Boundaries Commission more accurately reflects and more aptly describes those two Calgary constituencies in particular.

Just briefly with respect to the other constituencies that are proposed in the amendment, Mr. Chairman. We've heard the Member for Olds-Didsbury suggest that he was pleased with the proposal for changing Olds to include Olds, Didsbury, and Three Hills, and if that's what his constituents have asked for, then I suppose that would be appropriate. I would only raise the concern that I've seen respective members sitting in the Chair, either the Speaker's Chair or the Chairman's Chair, that have stumbled over the name Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert, being a rather lengthy name. I would echo the concern that if we add

more names to constituency names and get them longer and longer, it becomes more difficult for both members in the Legislature and those in the Chair who have the duty of maintaining order to call members to account. As names get longer and longer, pretty soon we might have all kinds of constituency names. Then people will say, "Well, wait a minute; if you named that constituency because it's got these two or three communities in it, how come you didn't add the fourth community or the fifth community?" or what have you. For example, I've got six different communities within my constituency right now. Calgary-North West encompasses them all, so it's a nice short name in that regard. We certainly wouldn't want to see names get longer than necessary.

So I guess if the residents in the other four constituencies are happier with those names, then so be it, Mr. Chairman, but I would just echo the concern that we don't want to see names getting longer than is comfortable or necessary in this House.

Thank you.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comments will be brief but positive. When I'm speaking to the amendment to Bill 46, I would suggest the names of the constituencies are but a small concern. The real concern, in my view, is the essence of this Bill, and that of course is constituency parity, an equal voice for all Albertans. I would, by my submission, suggest that in fact we will never arrive at a position where we will satisfy all constituents with the name of their constituency. I would make also a further submission that as I can find fault with the names, I can also find justifications for the names.

Mr. Chairman, I'm fortunate, coming from the Leduc constituency, that that is a very short type name. There was a concern expressed that the names are becoming a little too wordy. That's not a large concern that I share. I think there are ways to appease all constituents.

When I'm in a parade in Beaumont, I have magnetic signs so that I can put Beaumont-Leduc constituency. I can take the same situation out to Devon and call it the Devon-Leduc constituency. Everyone seems to be pleased with that little gesture. However, it's not lost sight of that in fact I'm their representative, and they know in the fullest technical sense that the Leduc constituency is what it's called, that it's basically the centre of the constituency. It's the largest urban component of the constituency, and the county itself is named Leduc, so I'm blessed with the simplicity of it all.

I would suggest, when I look at the names that are being proposed here, that there will be those who aren't pleased with the change from Calgary-East to Calgary-Fort and there will be those who are not going to be pleased with Calgary-Forest Lawn over to Calgary-East. So with those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we can spend a lot of time here chatting about what is the right name or what is the wrong name, but we will not appease and we will not please some constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I would leave the House with those particular comments and look forward to hearing other members speak.

MR. GERMAIN: Mr. Chairman, there has been some very interesting debate on this particular Bill during the second reading, and that interesting debate carries through to committee stage. Now, you might well ask why the Members of this Legislative Assembly are so engrossed or so engorged with excitement and

enthusiasm about this particular piece of legislation and this first government amendment, the first of many amendments, I understand, in relation to this particular Bill.

You know, some members of the public asked that same question, Mr. Chairman. There was an interesting letter to the editor of one of our leading newspapers awhile back asking why the Legislative Assembly was so wrought up with special sessions and wrought up with energy and enthusiasm to talk about where you draw boundary lines on a map and that it seemed to be an overwhelming concern, even overriding school funding and even overriding health care. You know, one of the nameless members of the government cabinet was overheard to say, "Well, you can vote for Conservatives anywhere." That was his learned assessment of the boundaries of this particular province.

That's an interesting observation, Mr. Chairman, and it begs the question of why there has been so much anxious debate on this amendment and why there has been so much anxious debate on the Bill itself. So I want to get into this from an amendment philosophy point of view, and I want to ask my colleagues in this Legislative Assembly this very interesting question. I want to ask my colleagues in this particular Assembly, several of whom spoke so aggressively and so ferociously against this particular Bill and then concluded by saying that they would support it anyway because it had an aura of independence about it, that it emanated from an independent commission: if we are not prepared to tinker with the pith and substance of the Bill, not prepared to delve into the fundamental issues of what constitutes democracy in the province of Alberta, why are we prepared to tinker with the names? Why are we prepared to pick and select name choices, and why these particular names?

Now, I wasn't going to talk particularly to this particular amendment, Mr. Chairman, until the hon. Member for Lacombe-Stettler had the temerity to allege that in this Legislative Assembly you couldn't speak on issues unless they were directed specifically to concerns of your constituency. Well, I don't believe that is the policy of the Legislature, I don't think that is the government approach to amendments, and I don't think it is the style of the Legislature. Surely, for example, if there was a toxic spill in southern Alberta, even though I represent northern Alberta I'm entitled to get up and speak to that particular issue. Even though a name might not affect the ridings that I'm involved in, I should surely be able to get up and speak to these particular issues.

**3:40**

I think that underlining the name changes in Airdrie, Bow Valley, Cardston, and Olds are fundamental community politics. I think what has happened is that the government of this province, rather than focusing their attention on education and health care in the province of Alberta, is prepared to say to those folks who are in some fashion seeing their riding change or who may be sitting back there perceiving that they are losing political clout in the province of Alberta: "We're not going to solve your problem, folks, but what we're going to do is what the Premier likes to do best, and that is to say that you don't have a problem, that it's a public relations or communications problem." Your hospital isn't closing; it's public relations. Your school isn't closing; it's public relations. Your riding is not shutting down; it's public relations. So that's why in this amendment, Mr. Chairman, we have public relations.

We're not prepared to tinker with the philosophy, but we're prepared to make it clear to those good folks in Warner that they haven't been forgotten, because now the name of their community is going to be enshrined in the title of their MLA. So when the

Speaker stands up, he will say, "I recognize the hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner," or when the Speaker stands up, he will recognize the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Well, by way of rhetorical debate on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I ask: why have we stopped there? What about the communities near and around Fort McMurray, the area that I represent? So many of those folks from Fort Chipewyan phone me on a regular basis when they come to the community of Fort McMurray to do their shopping. They phone me and they want to discuss and deal with government matters. They use our constituency office as a vehicle for information on the government. And I'm happy to be of that service, but why are we not including in the riding our native brothers in Fort Chipewyan? They're part of Athabasca-Wabasca. Why isn't there on this list Athabasca-Wabasca-Fort Chipewyan? Better yet, Fort Chipewyan-Wabasca has a nice round name to it.

MR. ADY: Why is there Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert?

MR. GERMAIN: Well, the hon. minister of advanced education you see is now invigorated by the quality of this debate this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. He wants to get right in here and he wants to respond to that challenge. He points out that we have those names in Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert. If I might dialogue with the hon. minister further, I think the reason for that is that we have two St. Alberts, so we have to break them up in some fashion to identify which part of the community they are. It's quite common to have that hyphenated constituency, but we have here simply an exercise in inclusion. That's what we have here, Mr. Chairman.

As the Premier would say and as actor Paul Newman said it best in *Cool Hand Luke* – remember that guy? I think, Mr. Chairman, you may just be old enough, just old enough to remember that show, *Cool Hand Luke*, with Paul Newman in it, where the big burly warden comes out with his big gut and he says to Paul Newman: what we have here is a problem of communication.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Lack of communication.

MR. GERMAIN: Oh, lack of communication. Some of the hon. members say I got the quote wrong. It was a cheap lawyer trick, Mr. Chairman. I was just trying to psych out that they, too, saw that movie, that they, too, saw that movie a hundred times. What we have is a . . .

MR. DUNFORD: A trick of a cheap lawyer: is that what you're saying?

MR. GERMAIN: That's right. That was a reflection on the reasonableness of my fees, practising 20 years in rural Alberta, Mr. Chairman.

So by way of humorous example, Mr. Chairman, we have now acknowledged in this Legislative Assembly that this amendment is simply an amendment to create the public relations of inclusion, but not all of it. You see, if you just did that, if the amendment just did that, if it was just the public relations of inclusion, you wouldn't need the opportunity to tinker with those two Calgary ridings. You wouldn't have to try and explain to the good folks in Calgary that their riding which is Calgary-East today is not going to be Calgary-East tomorrow, because Calgary-East is going to shift farther in the directional compass of the province of



Alberta and be a new Calgary-East, so what we'll do is we'll call Calgary-East something different.

That's why you have these two oddball Calgary name changes. You couldn't go on the politics of appearance, couldn't go up the line and add Fort Chipewyan to Athabasca-Wabasca, which would make eminent good sense and would make those folks from Fort Chipewyan, the oldest settlement in the province of Alberta, part of inclusive politics, part of that failure to communicate. So what we have to do is create a couple of artificial changes in the community of Calgary. It's true that I'm not an MLA from Calgary, but it seems to me that you do not have to be an MLA from Calgary to appreciate that if you have a riding called Calgary-East and a week later you have a new riding called Calgary-East but it's different, that will create confusion.

Now, the hon. Member for Lethbridge-West the other day stood up . . .

MR. DOERKSEN: Where is the Member for Lethbridge-East?

MR. DUNFORD: With the Speaker.

MR. GERMAIN: Yeah, with the Speaker. So you wish you'd bit your tongue on that, my friend.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much is that costing?

MR. GERMAIN: It's costing the taxpayer zero. I know you'll want to direct that same question to the Speaker in your enthusiasm for information. You'll want to direct to the Speaker of this Assembly how much it's costing the taxpayer, since you want to comment on some member sitting and working here. In any event, why would you direct that question to somebody who's right here, working hard to create vision? Here's a guy who's trying to ask people to look, and what you're doing is kicking sand in his eyes.

MR. DUNFORD: No. I was trying to encourage you to talk for 20 minutes.

MR. GERMAIN: I'm happy to do that. I don't know whether your colleagues would want to have you take credit for that. In any event . . .

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt, but debate takes place through the Chair and not across the benches. Please, hon. members, let's respect the rules and have the hon. Member for Fort McMurray continue with his debate on the amendments.

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you for bringing those Members of the Legislative Assembly that were unruly to order, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Getting back to the hon. Member for Lethbridge-West, Tuesday last week he stood up here and said that nobody in Calgary and Edmonton would know who their MLA was. I know the Premier was offended by that, but I won't go into that today. He said that they would know who their member was in Fort McMurray, and I agreed with that. He said they would know who their member is in Pincher Creek and in Grande Prairie and in Peace River. What the hon. Member for Lethbridge-West was saying was basically this. As an MLA it is easier to become known on a first name and visual recognition basis in small town rural Alberta than

it is in Calgary. I accept that, and for those MLAs in Calgary who are struggling for recognition, including the Premier, I sympathize with them. But you know, Mr. Chairman, in light of that very astute and very fair comment, why would we add to that confusion? Why would we do that? Why would we tinker and why would we intermeddle in a report that was not prepared to make name recommendation changes as it was? Obviously because it was felt that they would create confusion. Why are we now tinkering with the names if it is simply not a public relations gesture?

If we are going to tinker with the names, I'm sure that the hon. Member for Athabasca-Wabasca will himself want to stand up in a moment and urge us to include Fort Chipewyan in the name of that particular riding, because it represents a very diverse and very interesting area of the province and is not otherwise recognized with a name, a recognition of the community here in the Legislature when their hon. member is called on.

So I want to urge all Members of the Legislative Assembly to vote against this particular amendment, and by doing so, you will be further legitimizing the legislation on electoral boundaries. Then you can with fair and open consciousness decide whether you are going to accept that report and accept the Bill or reject the report and reject the Bill, but you will not be in the position of tinkering with the fine print and then paying lip service to the independence of the commission otherwise.

I know that the hon. Minister of Community Development . . .

MRS. McCLELLAN: . . . is shaking her head.

3:50

MR. GERMAIN: She now wants me to get it into *Hansard*, Mr. Chairman, that she's shaking her head. I like to always stand up here – and I will want her to – and express in a clear and cogent way my reasons and the evolution of my thought process for why I'm going to vote in a certain way. That's what I understand legislative parliamentary debate is. When the hon. Member for Redwater invited the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek to stand up and get her points known, she was reacting to her *naïveté* here in expecting that that's what debate is: that the hon. Member for Redwater would express her point of view and then others would express their points of view and maybe change her mind. I mean, that is what she thought happened here.

Now, the only other advice that I would give to all Members of the Legislative Assembly on the amendment is that you never want to have your glasses off in this particular Assembly. I think the hon. Member for Redwater has now learned that lesson. This is a dangerous place to sleep in, a dangerous place to have your eyes closed in, and of course, by extension, a dangerous place to have your glasses off.

So back to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, to the interesting debate on this amendment. It is the politics of visual inclusion only, and we should reject that. Those folks there in Warner and those folks in Three Hills are either able to have a constituency or they aren't. We shouldn't be paying lip service to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that I could go on, but I believe that there are other Members of this Legislative Assembly that are getting ready to speak and are anxious to speak. I will now take my place to hear the balance of the debate on this very important issue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to make a few comments on the amendments. I'll make it very, very clear, first of all, that I do intend to restrict my comments to specifically deal with the amendments and the nature of the amendments, and that is name changes and proposed name changes, which sort of opens the amendments to that field of generalities in terms of names of constituencies.

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

Before I do that, I again want to put it on record that I am one that does support Bill 46. I do intend to vote in favour of Bill 46 as I believe that the intent of the Bill, the guts of the Bill is a move in the right direction in narrowing somewhat, as minor as it may be, that discrepancy between the populations of rural and urban ridings and at the same time, again, respecting the fact that that report was put together by an independent commission jointly appointed by this caucus and the government caucus and that a commitment was made at that time that this caucus and that caucus would support the recommendations of that independent commission.

Now, of course that independent commission didn't get into advocating changes to names and so on and so forth. I guess one could ask: what's in a name? A name does mean a great deal. A name reflects geographical location. A name can give a perception of what a constituency is all about. Edmonton-Whitemud, for example, is a name of a constituency that will always be dear to my heart. People in Edmonton-Whitemud demonstrated very clearly that the democratic process does work and that the electorate have the ultimate right to control the nature of political representation, regardless of how extreme their move may be. So from that point of view Edmonton-Whitemud has a history of its own, and I was delighted that I was able to have my name attached to it for one term. I'm sure Edmonton-Whitemud is a name of a riding that we will not see disappear, Edmonton-Whitemud of course now being represented by an extremely talented, bright member that I know the Provincial Treasurer would give his right arm to try and lure over to that side. But that member, being committed to good Liberal philosophy, would not entertain a cup of coffee, quite frankly, with the Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment that's in front of us and what's in a name, I look now at the name of my constituency as it's currently defined: Edmonton-Rutherford. What does Edmonton-Rutherford tell you? What it does tell you is that it's located in the city of Edmonton, but it doesn't tell you whether it's on the north side of the city or the south side of the city. It doesn't tell you whether it's a constituency that houses a large facility, that houses a health care facility. It actually tells you nothing in terms of trying to identify what the riding is all about: the population of the riding, the geographical location of the riding, people's perception of the riding. It tells you absolutely nothing.

One thing it does is it reminds all Albertans – it's something that all of us can be proud of – that Edmonton-Rutherford is named after the very first Premier of this province, a very fine Premier at that, the history books tell us. I don't recall specifically what party affiliation he was involved with, but I do recall him being probably the most outstanding Premier this province ever saw. Could somebody help me? What political party was it?

MR. BRUSEKER: I think he was a Liberal.

MR. WICKMAN: Oh, he was a Liberal. Well, that should surprise me, but it doesn't surprise me.

Mr. Chairman, I look at the way that some of these name changes are being proposed. We have Olds, for example, that goes into Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. There has to be a more simple way of identifying a riding than by saying: the Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. It's like our silent one that sits over here. I call her the three S's: Spruce Grove, Sturgeon, and St. Albert. All Speakers of the House at times have difficulty remembering whether it's Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert or St. Albert-Sturgeon-Spruce Grove or Sturgeon-St. Albert-Spruce Grove and so on because of the complexity of that particular name, containing three identifications, three centres housed in that one particular constituency. That does cause some confusion; there's absolutely no question about it. Does she represent Sturgeon? Does she represent Spruce Grove? Does she represent St. Albert? No. There's another member of the Liberal caucus that represents the majority of St. Albert.

So as to how that particular name came to be in the beginning is very, very questionable, and the rationale behind it, again, would be very, very questionable. Why would we go into two more situations where we have Cardston-Taber-Warner and Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills when there have got to be much simpler ways of doing it?

If I say, "the Member for Fort McMurray," we instantly know who that is. We instantly know where that riding is. We instantly know it's represented by an excellent Member of the Legislative Assembly. I can look at the Member for Sherwood Park, the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, the Member for Calgary-North West, and so on and so forth. The same holds true. We can readily identify where that particular member comes from, what geographical location that member's riding is in. When people ask what the name of their riding is or want to remember what the name of their riding is, it makes it that much easier. So why we have some of these name changes here now being proposed, that are going to make things much more difficult than they are at the present time, I don't know. Nevertheless, these amendments are just a very, very small part of the overall Bill, with limited association to the report that came down by the independent commission.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to proceed in an orderly fashion, in a fashion that makes some sense, we would allow to remain intact what is there, Bill 46, which fulfills the objectives of the task force, and not start to tinker with the process or tinker with the Bill and start taking away from it. That's what these amendments do. Possibly an amendment to this amendment may help. Possibly streamlining this amendment, making it more acceptable by changing one, two, or three of these to something more reasonable or leaving them what they were originally going to be called or have been called in the past could very well do the trick.

Mr. Chairman, as we head down towards the finalization of Bill 46 in the next few days, we want to see Bill 46 passed. I see that on the other side of the House there are members that will stand up and speak very negatively about the Bill, leaving the impression that they don't intend to support the Bill. Maybe it allows them the opportunity to go back to their ridings and say, "Look; I fought for you; I fought for you," not telling the constituents, though, which way they voted. I would suspect that on this particular Bill on that side of the House the whips will come down. Every member on that side of the House is going to vote yes for the Bill, even though they themselves have spoken against it.

I would venture to guess that more people have spoken against the Bill than in favour of the Bill, and when they spoke against the Bill, it wasn't because they didn't like the name of their riding. It was because of the reduction in the two rural ridings, which has created some problems over there. That's unfortunate to a degree, but that happens during every redistribution. We see it happening in the proposed redistribution of the federal constituencies, where we have the member Deborah Grey, a very respected Member of Parliament incidently, now going to be left without a riding and looking at the possibility of having to shift into a riding that is not that appropriate for her. But that's the downfall of redistribution, and I guess nobody said that politics is perfect from the point of view of trying to make things as pleasant or always as beneficial as possible to individual elected representatives.

So as I conclude my remarks on this amendment – I'm sure there are going to be some government members who'll want to speak on this – again it is not my intent to vote yes on these amendments unless I see some changes occur, unless some member in their wisdom has another amendment ready to go, an amendment to this amendment. I will continue to support the thrust of Bill 46, and that's the piece of legislation as originally introduced.

On that note I'll conclude. Thank you.

4:00

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In picking up where my colleague from Edmonton-Rutherford left off, I do indeed have a subamendment to the amendment to put forward to you this afternoon. We have heard much this afternoon in debate about the various changes that are being proposed in government amendment A to six of the ridings as proposed in the electoral divisions report from the commission.

I listened to the debate from the Member for Three Hills-Airdrie and also from the Member for Olds-Didsbury in speaking specifically to the changes that are being suggested for their particular areas. Also, the Member for Calgary-East spoke about the changes that were contemplated for the change from Calgary-Forest Lawn to Calgary-East. I think the Member for Lacombe-Stettler would admonish me for speaking to various constituencies that were not mine, although I notice that the Member for Lacombe-Stettler, whose name is not on the list, rose to speak to the amendments, so I'm not quite sure exactly where she's coming from. I will continue to take my role as a Member of this Legislative Assembly responsibly and will continue to enter the debate when I think it's appropriate to do so.

The problem, as I see it from listening to the debate, is that there is the potential for some very significant problems with the name changes that are being proposed for the city of Calgary, changing Calgary-East to Calgary-Fort. [interjection] Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Treasurer is totally uninterested in the debate that's going on this afternoon, and I'd like to invite him to leave and attend to some other business if he's not interested.

MR. DINNING: No, no. I'm helping Pete. He's over your left shoulder there. He's got his computer on.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. Hon. Provincial Treasurer, I know you're going to be quiet. Hon. Member for Sherwood Park, I think one of your members on the left side of me is . . .

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just checking. I notice that he's not playing computer games, as they do on the government side of the House on their computers.

So, Mr. Chairman, the concern that has been expressed in this debate this afternoon is that the residents who currently reside in Calgary-East are going to have the name changed from Calgary-East to Calgary-Fort. As I mentioned previously, when you look at table 11 of the commission's report, the Calgary-East constituency will incorporate a number of folks from four constituencies in Calgary, but 61 percent of that riding will remain in Calgary-East.

With respect to Calgary-Forest Lawn, that constituency is going to take in 7 percent of the constituency of Calgary-East.

Mr. Chairman, I'm getting waved at to distribute the amendments, and I will do so now and move that subamendment. As the pages are distributing the subamendment, I'll continue speaking to it.

MR. DINNING: Have you been there before, Bruce? Do you know where it is, Bruce?

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Notwithstanding that the Provincial Treasurer would want to shout me down and conclude debate, I'll continue going.

#### Chairman's Ruling Decorum

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Provincial Treasurer, we know you really believe in the Canadian flag, but I wish you'd believe in not yelling across the House. If you feel you have to, then I suggest you leave the House and then come back when you've calmed down a little bit.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: A wise ruling, Mr. Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think everybody has a copy. Hon. Member for Sherwood Park, you can continue with the subamendment.

#### Debate Continued

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking to the subamendment, the concern that many members on this side of the House have expressed with the change that was proposed by the Minister of Justice is that there is no foundation for the proposed change other than the statement by the Minister of Justice in *Hansard* on August 22, 1996, at page 2354 that says that the changes "are consistent with the input that MLAs have received from their constituents." Well, I would venture to guess that it was not consistent with the views that were put forward to the Electoral Boundaries Commission, who, if they had a sense that those changes were necessary or those changes were appropriate, would have put those forward and would have then come forward with those names to recognize the changes.

Now, I have to agree with my colleague from Fort McMurray in that it is an accommodation to those communities that with the significant changes that are occurring with their boundaries – and now I'm speaking, Mr. Chairman, of the constituencies that are not the Calgary constituencies – there is recognition that communities such as Didsbury be included in the name, that communities such as Three Hills be included in the name. Currently the constituency of Three Hills-Airdrie exists, so the suggestion is that Three Hills be included with the name Olds. Taber-Warner was

the name; now it will be Cardston-Taber-Warner, recognizing that community.

There have been members on this side of the House that have spoken, I guess, against the amendment for the inclusion of those, where we are tinkering with the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission without agreeing to deal with the substance of it, tinkering around the edges and dealing with just the names. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, for myself, to include Rocky View in the name Airdrie-Rocky View is not confusing for the residents of those areas. The Member for Three Hills-Airdrie indicated that a large number of residents of the municipal district of Rocky View will be included in this particular constituency, so the name is included, much as we see with names like Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert that currently exist in the Legislative Assembly.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Electoral Boundaries Commission itself did not have a problem with naming the constituency Airdrie, I'll accept the comments from the Member for Three Hills-Airdrie that Rocky View is a substantial part of that constituency.

Bow Valley. Again, why is the change being made? The change is being made to recognize communities within that constituency: the community of Strathmore and the community of Brooks, again a consolation of some kind because their constituencies are being changed. They will then be recognized as significant communities within that constituency.

I've already commented on Cardston-Taber-Warner becoming Cardston-Taber-Warner – so the residents of that community will have recognition in the constituency name – and on Olds-Didsbury, which will include, then, the name of Three Hills.

#### 4:10

If we do this on the basis of confusion, it will not be any more confusing for the residents who will be in the constituencies of Airdrie, Bow Valley, Cardston-Taber, and Olds to change the names to Airdrie-Rocky View, Strathmore-Brooks, Cardston-Taber-Warner, and Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. That doesn't take away from the argument that it is clearly just tinkering around the edges, that we are interfering in the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, who received and included in their report not only discussion about where boundaries should occur and what population should be but also heard from residents around the province about names that are important for constituencies. That occurred in this review by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and it occurred in the last review by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, where residents came forward, Albertans came forward and spoke about the importance of the names of the electoral districts.

So here we are. The Minister of Justice is now tinkering with this, based on some meetings that he has had in his caucus with his own members.

MR. THURBER: Point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

#### Point of Order

#### Questioning a Member

MR. THURBER: I wonder if the hon. member would entertain a question of clarification on his subamendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes or no?

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

#### Debate Continued

MR. THURBER: If you follow with your subamendment and what you've asked us to do there, I have to ask you: does that indicate that your caucus is in favour of getting rid of those two constituencies, Calgary-East and Calgary-Forest Lawn? Your subamendment indicates clearly that you strike out all four of those names that apply to two constituencies, and if that's what you're recommending, I find that rather interesting.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Mr. Chairman, for clarification for the minister, if he will look at the Bill, the Bill simply lists the constituencies under "Schedule." It is the minister's amendment that identifies column 1 and column 2. If the subamendment is accepted, then obviously what will change will only be the four constituencies that remain in the amendment put forward by the Minister of Justice. That will mean that in the schedule in Bill 46 Calgary-East will remain Calgary-East and that Calgary-Forest Lawn will remain Calgary-Forest Lawn. We do not reference in the amendment the schedule that's in the Bill. We reference in the subamendment the amendment put forward by the Minister of Justice, who creates a column 1 and a column 2.

All right, Mr. Chairman, with that explanation . . .

MR. DINNING: Oh my God, she's back.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think I've just been upstaged by my colleague from Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

#### Chairman's Ruling Decorum

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, we're all very happy to see the hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan back, especially the Provincial Treasurer, but I wish his joy was not quite so joyful and that we would just have order in the House, please.

The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

#### Debate Continued

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, before the Provincial Treasurer so rudely interrupted me, I'll continue with my debate.

To clarify for the hon. minister, the subamendment would suggest that we do not deal with Calgary-East and Calgary-Forest Lawn in the amendment put forward by the Minister of Justice. As I've said, the minister has put forward no substantive argument as to why the name change is necessary or why it's required. Neither the Minister of Justice nor any minister nor any member has addressed the issue of confusion that will exist for the residents of that area of Calgary in that, as I just indicated, under the proposed boundaries Calgary-East will retain 61 percent of the current riding of Calgary-East and Calgary-Forest Lawn will only retain 7 percent of the current boundaries of Calgary-East.

So as to avoid confusion for the residents of those constituencies and in the absence of any explanation or justification by the Minister of Justice as to why this change ought to be brought about substantively – not politically, Mr. Chairman, but substantively – on behalf of the residents of that constituency, not within government caucus discussions, I propose that we do not make

that change. If the government were to pursue the change for Airdrie, Bow Valley, Cardston-Taber, and Olds, notwithstanding that it is tinkering, it does not create confusion for the residents of those communities and for the residents of those constituencies. The argument may go that it may in fact be of some assistance to the residents of those communities in that they are now being identified within the constituency name in this Legislative Assembly of the province of Alberta.

With that, Mr. Chairman, the proposal is to prevent the confusion that is going to arise by changing Calgary-East to Calgary-Fort and Calgary-Forest Lawn to Calgary-East. I don't recall, but I don't believe that the name Calgary-Fort was part of any discussion with the Electoral Boundaries Commission and is really just a monument on a site at this time. It doesn't really identify much about the constituency.

MR. DINNING: Do you know where it is? Have you been there?

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Treasurer keeps harping and chiding and chirping on the other side about whether or not I've been there. The answer is yes. I have been there, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. I do know where it is. I know that the people of that area of Calgary will not be paying as close attention to my debate and the Provincial Treasurer's debate about Calgary-East versus Calgary-Forest Lawn or whatever.

The purpose of the subamendment is to maintain some consistency for those residents of Calgary so that we do not create unnecessary confusion when we go to the polls in the next general election for the province of Alberta.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe I've put forward my argument clearly and succinctly and cogently, and I'm looking forward to the Provincial Treasurer and other members opposite standing up and justifying why Calgary-East must be changed to Calgary-Fort and why Calgary-Forest Lawn must be changed to Calgary-East.

MR. DINNING: Well, Moe's already done that. Did you not listen to him?

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Now, the Provincial Treasurer continues chirping at me about the Minister of Justice.

MR. DINNING: No. Moe did it, not Brian.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Treasurer is now saying that the Member for Calgary-East put forward some discussion about the name change for Calgary-East. Yes, I have read that member's comments, but I am still of the view that that is not sufficient for the change to be made. There is recognition of the constituency of Calgary-East at this point in time. I think they should stay the same. I'm looking forward to support from my caucus and certainly from members of the government side.

MR. DAY: Well, the member opposite has said that he thinks he explained his position well. I'd suggest he has gross delusions of adequacy. What we've listened to here has been nothing less than the beginning of a filibuster, which I hope will be short lived, but in fact that's exactly what it is.

You look at the amendment – and you have to look at it in light of history, Mr. Chairman. The history of the fact of how we're even here with these amendments is quite clear. After the last

electoral boundary shifting of lines and drawing of lines, there were some concerns that perhaps it wasn't done in conjunction with all past contingencies and in relation to all things that have to be taken into consideration when you do electoral boundary divisions.

So even in anticipation of the ill-founded shrieks from members opposite, this whole question of electoral boundaries was put to a reference. The court reference stated an opinion, not a matter of fact but an opinion, that something should be done about the boundaries. There was no binding law for anything to be done about that. The government continued to take the high road and said: even though it's just an opinion and in fact it's not binding in law, this whole question will be looked at again. It was looked at again, and we know the result. We have another shift of boundaries before us, a shift of boundaries which, I might add, Mr. Chairman, results in some rural constituencies virtually and literally disappearing.

4:20

MR. BRUSEKER: Is this on the subamendment, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DAY: This is directly on the subamendment to these names. That's what got us to this point, why we're even here.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, it could possibly result in elected members of the same party having to square off against one another in nominations. That is one possible and very real effect of these changes. [interjections] If you'll just be patient with me till we get to the subamendment, which I've already quoted, about column 1 and column 2. Again I'm referring to it here.

Mr. Chairman, what did government members do? Again, even though it has been suggested, cynically by some, that this particular approach would be resisted by government members, even though it means a loss of so-called government seats or Conservative Party seats, the government continued to take the high road and said: we will continue to move these boundary changes along in good faith. In doing that, the only amendments to come forward before we were tossed this ridiculous subamendment were some name changes, name changes that have been brought forward by MLAs who live in those constituencies, who went out and talked to the people who live in those constituencies and came up with a very short list of suggested name changes, minor items to people who live outside those constituencies but of some concern to the ones who live there. That's what has led us now to the subamendments.

We have agreement, possibly unanimous, in terms of the bulk of this electoral boundary revision. We have a few names, where MLAs who live there, who have listened to their constituents, are bringing forward some very minor amendments, and now we are seeing the beginning and the true nature of what the Liberals want to do here: filibuster.

I want you to picture what's happening here. The Member for Sherwood Park – I don't even know if he knows how to get to Calgary – has the nerve to suggest that he knows what the constituents of these various constituencies want. He doesn't even live there. Now he's standing up, squirming in pain . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

#### **Point of Order Allegations against Members**

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, citing 23(1). The Government House Leader suggests that I may

not even know how to get to Calgary. I recognize, as do all members on this side, that the Government House Leader doesn't know how to get to Banff or Jasper and doesn't know the difference between Banff and Jasper. When he was welcoming the Premiers of this great nation to our fine province in Jasper, he welcomed them to Banff. If I were the Government House Leader, I wouldn't be making those kinds of allegations.

MR. DINNING: You never would be. You never will be either.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Mr. Chairman, would you ask the Provincial Treasurer to take a pill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. This has become so ridiculous that it's pathetic. You know, if we had a bunch of schoolchildren in grade 2, they would act better than many members of this House. I am totally disillusioned that members of this House would try and disrupt the procedures of this House. I've been here for 10 years, and it becomes worse and worse. I in the Chair have no hesitation to start throwing people out of this House. This is plumb ridiculous. I am not pointing fingers at anybody; you all know who you are. If you don't, you should bury your head in a sandpit. I'm serious. Let's get on with the debate. Obviously the members of this House will never agree, but to put sarcasm in from both sides of the House is not a part of the procedures of this House. Let's get on with the business of the House and act like human beings, like regular Albertans.

The hon. House leader.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that sound ruling in dealing with that unruly member over there.

#### Debate Continued

MR. DAY: I'd like to go on to suggest that the Member for Sherwood Park, who doesn't even live in Calgary and, I repeat, who may not know how to get there – I don't know if he does or not. He certainly does not know his way around, and he has the audacity to stand in this House and suggest that the MLA who has petitioned constituents that live there has no right to suggest there might be an appropriate name change.

You know what I'm waiting for, Mr. Chairman? When I get back to Red Deer, whether I go back tonight or whether it's tomorrow or the next day, and people say, "What's going on in the House these days?" the few who know we're here, I am going to be saying without any hesitation: well, the Liberals are filibustering the electoral boundary Bill. It's all settled; the divisions have been settled. It is more hurtful to government members in terms of the changes, but we have bitten the bullet, if I can use that expression, and we are moving ahead. We are taking the high road. You know what I'm going to say to them? I'm going to be saying: the Member for Sherwood Park stood in the Assembly, introduced a subamendment saying that he really didn't think Calgary-East was the best name, regardless of what the constituents thought or the MLA thought. He thought maybe it should be Calgary-East and not Calgary-Fort or Calgary-Forest Lawn and maybe Calgary-East. The Liberals stood up one after another after another after another filibustering. Maybe they need the \$100 a day that they're getting to be here. I don't know. But filibustering . . .

MR. KIRKLAND: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, the Member for Leduc.

#### Point of Order Imputing Motives

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; 23(l), I believe it is. The hon. Member for Red Deer-North indicated that all Liberal members stood up in this House and filibustered this particular Bill. If he had been paying attention, I stood up and added some positive comments and indicated that perhaps the names were not a significant component of it. I would ask him to retract the inclusion of the Member for Leduc in those particular comments.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I am so delighted, and if it takes my comments to make them stand one by one and retract their stupidity, then it's time well spent here. I retract. The Member for Leduc has done, in my estimation, the honourable thing. He has evaluated these name changes. He has said in his own mind that if it was he who was the MLA, he probably wouldn't do it, but he realized that it was none of his business. It is the business of the MLAs who live there. He did the honourable thing. He did not waste taxpayer time and money and said that even though I don't really like it, I'm not going to hold it up. I would suggest that the Member for Sherwood Park and the others who are going to rise and are going to feign some kind of angst because they think we're trying to clamp down on democracy, who will stand up shooting wind and blowing their noses on name changes that have nothing to do with them, do not serve the cause of democracy in this province.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We've had all the points of order we need from the hon. member. Down, hon. member.

Hon. Government House Leader, we've had all the comments on this. You didn't stick to the point of order at all, and I think you should withdraw one word in there that is very unparliamentary. It's "stupidness." I don't think it's in fact in the vocabulary. Would you care to do that, or do you want to let it slide?

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, with your experience I give you total honour and respect. "Stupidness" I withdraw. Put in any other – what is that, an adjective? – anything else, the imbecility of what is happening in this House. This is one time that I wish there were cameras here in the House to witness the debate on this subamendment. Believe me, I will be making sure that this is in the newspapers in Red Deer, hopefully the ones in Sherwood Park.

Again, remember what we are talking about. [interjection] I'm off the point of order; I'm back to the debate. Did you want to rule on the point of order?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, there's not a lot of ruling to do because it's obviously a disagreement.

It seems like what I said about four minutes ago did not take effect with many members in the House. I just wish that we could get back to debate. Obviously I don't think we should be criticizing – and I'm saying both sides of the House – continuously. We've always got to take into account that we have differences and also that our points of view are never the same.

So let us just get on with the debate. I'm not going to take any more points of order. I'm sorry, hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Now, hon. Government House Leader, we have a very fine line there when we talk about the subamendment to the amendment, and that's what we've got to talk about, the subamendment.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your constant encouragement. It is so easy to digress when the line is so fine that there's no ground to stand on virtually at all.

4:30

#### Debate Continued

MR. DAY: So continuing on the subamendment, I will be publishing far and wide to every person I talk to, in here, when I visit Sherwood Park, that we spent – and the record will show . . .

MR. COLLINGWOOD: One subamendment to you is a filibuster. You're thinking of bringing closure because of one subamendment. You're so warped. You can't stand debate.

MR. DAY: You know, the whole time the Member for Sherwood Park spoke I remained silent. It was not easy, but I remained silent. What does he do now? He shrieks. He waves his finger, one extended up in the air, which is hardly a polite gesture. He can't stand it. You've already taken away his ability to raise a point of order. I think he may actually have an accident while he sits in his chair, because he doesn't know what it is to stand there . . .

#### Chairman's Ruling Relevance

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Government House Leader, it's obvious that we're not going to continue this debate in this manner. I made it very plain that all members will talk on the subamendment. If you continue to not talk on the subamendment, you will lose your turn.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, you continue to make wise rulings. I am talking directly on the subamendment, being shrieked at by the member opposite. That is what I'm referring to.

#### Debate Continued

MR. DAY: As I continue on the subamendment, I will be going far and wide, not just in the next week or two but time after time after time, and I will be talking . . .

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

#### Point of Order Relevance

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. *Beauchesne* 459, relevance. Wherever the Government House Leader travels in the province, learning new cities like Calgary, learning new communities like Sherwood Park, finding out where they are for the first time, it matters not to this Assembly whether or not he talks about the subamendment. What's clear is that the Government House Leader is allergic to debate and is so warped that he

says that one subamendment on an amendment is a filibuster on debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm not even going to ask the Government House Leader to respond. There is no point of order.

Do stay on the subamendment and not all the comments before. Let's get on to that, hon. Government House Leader.

#### Debate Continued

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, as you continue to say that, I continue to point directly to this subamendment and how it is in my view, which is what debate is all about, an exchange of views, of zero import to the Member for Sherwood Park. These names changes have been dealt with by MLAs in those areas who have heard from the constituents in those areas.

Again, on this subamendment, which is exactly what I'm talking about, when I'm asked – as a matter of fact, I will not wait to be asked. I will tell people about the Member for Sherwood Park. I will tell them about the ones who followed in debate. This is not an issue – this is on the subamendment – of debating democracy. It's not an issue at all.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: I'll tell them about all the government MLAs who spoke against the Bill and voted for it.

MR. DAY: He keeps shouting, Mr. Chairman. I'm trying to wait for him to finish. He just can't take it. It's being exposed before his eyes and ears the absolutely – I'm trying to look for a word that won't get ruled out of order. But for this member and other ones to follow to stand in their places on this subamendment, a subamendment that says – this is what I'll be telling people – that government amendment A to Bill 46 be amended by striking out “Calgary-East” and “Calgary-Forest Lawn” from column 1 and by striking out “Calgary-Fort” and “Calgary-East” from column 2,

a subamendment on that – think of the time, think of the energy, think of the dollars that are being expended as we stand here in good faith dealing with electoral boundaries revisions that are going to drastically affect all of us, and we have to put up with this drivel. It's a crying shame.

MR. WICKMAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

#### Point of Order Abusive Language

MR. WICKMAN: Standing Order 23(j), “uses abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder.” I've sat back here very quietly listening to the member intentionally go on with his abusive, insulting language. Quite frankly, it's getting tiring, and you, Mr. Chairman, should shut him down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford has in fact brought up the point of order, and the point of order he brings up is exactly what I've been trying to do for the last half an hour, that we treat each other across the House and each member with respect. I am not going to blame the Government House Leader because I've heard it from both sides of the House, what I call rude remarks, which is not called for in

the House. With that, thank you, hon. member, for bringing up the point of order.

The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

### Debate Continued

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak briefly to the subamendment as put forward by the Member for Sherwood Park. When the original amendment was put forward by the Minister of Justice, it was simply that amendments were consistent with the input that MLAs have received. Well, I want to remind members opposite of a Bill that we passed earlier in this House which is included in the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. That is the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act.

Mr. Chairman, section 7(1) of that particular piece of legislation says that

- the Commission must hold public hearings both
  - (a) before its report is submitted to the Speaker, and
  - (b) after its report has been made public,
- at the places and times it considers appropriate to enable representations to be made by any person as to the area and boundaries of any proposed electoral division.

It further says that "the Commission shall give reasonable public notice of the time, place and purpose of any public hearings held by it."

Well, Mr. Chairman, of course the commission did indeed have hearings. They came to the city of Calgary not once but twice, two different rounds, wherein the commission, which we agreed amongst ourselves in this Legislative Assembly to put forward, to go out and listen to the people and ask for input, in fact did that.

First of all, they list all of the public hearings that are held in appendix C of that book. Schedule C lists the schedule of hearings for the first round and also the schedule of public hearings for the second round. So they list all of the opportunities that were there for public input.

People came to the hearings. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I was one of the individuals who took some time to go and offer some suggestions and ideas to the Electoral Boundaries Commission with respect to those hearings. Indeed we spoke about names. We spoke about names that are in existence today and potential name changes.

Mr. Chairman, in the long list of those who came to make presentations to the commission, which we asked to have input, to receive that input from ordinary Albertans, you know what? We don't see the name of the Member for Calgary-East. We don't see the name of the Member for Calgary-Montrose. We don't see the names of a good number of MLAs from the eastern part of the city of Calgary.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was there at both of them.

MR. BRUSEKER: The Calgary hearings I'm referring to, hon. member. At the Calgary hearings, because the amendment that we're talking about deals with Calgary right now, as far as I can see, there was only one Calgary MLA other than myself who made a presentation, and that was the member for the Calgary-Bow constituency. Indeed, the Member for Calgary-Bow made a presentation to the Electoral Boundaries Commission at the second round of hearings held on Wednesday, April 24, and that is listed in their report.

Indeed, the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat made a presentation at that time in Calgary, but the only one that's listed in the report . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie, if you have a real point of order or just a clarification.

### Point of Order Questioning a Member

MRS. BURGNER: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of clarification. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes or no, hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes.

### Debate Continued

MRS. BURGNER: I wanted to clarify: were you concerned that the person physically wasn't there, that they had personally not made a presentation, or that their constituency hadn't been represented? I'm not sure when you say that you were the only person there making a presentation exactly how you're defining making a presentation, at the second meeting.

MR. BRUSEKER: I was talking about making a presentation in person as listed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission in their report on pages 128, 129, and 134. So what I did is I looked at those presentations that were listed there, Mr. Chairman, and said: gee, there's only one other MLA from the city of Calgary there who made a presentation.

Now, this commission was appointed. Part of the legislation, Mr. Chairman, indeed didn't just ask for but required the commission under section 7 of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, which I did quote earlier on, to have public hearings. Those public hearings were held. They had input from Calgarians in the particular case of Calgary-East and Calgary-Forest Lawn, as dealt with in the subamendment and indeed the unanimous report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, which was given the responsibility of hearing from Albertans and came forward with this proposal.

The gist of the subamendment as proposed by my colleague from Sherwood Park is: let's go with what the Electoral Boundaries Commission heard and suggested be put forward as the names and the boundaries of constituencies in the city of Calgary. What he's suggesting in his subamendment and the reason that I support it is that the two names being dealt with in this particular subamendment are indeed what the commission heard and what they recommended. Therefore, I support the subamendment from the Member for Sherwood Park.

4:40

[Motion on subamendment lost]

[Motion on amendment A1 carried]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the Bill itself, the hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, on the Bill itself. The boundaries as they are set out in Bill 46 are indeed taken directly from the proposals that were in the Electoral Boundaries Commission report. With respect to Sherwood Park directly there's a bit of a quandary, because the boundaries as they were created prior to the 1993 general election generally took



into account the area of Sherwood Park that is known as the urban service area of Sherwood Park. It covers all of the residential communities in Sherwood Park and comes west to the city of Edmonton boundary and then north, but all of the urban service area that is recognized at the local government level is in essence the provincial constituency boundaries.

Now, shortly before the 1993 election there was a change that occurred with respect to the urban service area so that one community on the south side of Wye Road – the Sherwood Park Freeway heading east out of the city of Edmonton coming into Sherwood Park is Wye Road in our community. According to the boundaries as they were created prior to the 1993 election, everything south of that particular road is in the constituency of Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan, and north of that road is the constituency of Sherwood Park, right down to the intersection of Wye Road and Highway 21.

One community that exists on the south side of Wye Road is a community known as the Estates of Sherwood Park. Prior to 1993 one community on the south side of Wye Road was included in the urban service area of Sherwood Park, and that community is known as the Estates of Sherwood Park, so now the entire urban service area also includes a community on the south side of the road. When the boundaries were drawn prior to the 1993 general election, the line went straight down Wye Road . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat.

**Point of Order  
Questioning a Member**

DR. TAYLOR: I'm just wondering if the member would consider a question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes or no.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Yes.

**Debate Continued**

DR. TAYLOR: He's spending a lot of time debating this issue, and I'm just wondering if he could tell us what drastic change has been made to his boundaries or if any change has been made to his boundaries to cause him to hold up the business of the House in this fashion.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the member will remain patient and listen intently, I'll tell him exactly why the boundaries haven't changed and discuss some of the reasons why the boundaries should have changed: because of the Electoral Boundaries Commission's report, because of the elements they had to consider, and because of what constitutes my constituency. So if I can, I'll continue.

For the benefit of members, we now have a part of Sherwood Park on the south side of Wye Road that is in the constituency of Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan. Prior to the 1993 general election, as I was saying before I was interrupted by the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat, that became part of the urban service area of Sherwood Park, and it was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now, the whole notion of the constituency of Sherwood Park is that it would be the urban service area, but that community was cut off from that boundary. There were comments made prior to 1993 that that community should have been

part of the constituency of Sherwood Park and should not have been part of the constituency of Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that between my colleague the Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan and myself there are constituents who reside in the Estates of Sherwood Park and there are constituents farther south of Sherwood Park that are indeed part of Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan that will avail themselves of my office, and I'm happy to receive their questions and concerns and, if necessary, forward them on to the Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

The dilemma that we face with respect to Sherwood Park, because the Electoral Boundaries Commission did not deal with this issue as well as I would have suggested they ought to have, is that if the Estates of Sherwood Park become part of the constituency of Sherwood Park, that will raise the population of the constituency of Sherwood Park even higher. I'm on record, Mr. Chairman, as you know, in debate on this Bill as saying that the Electoral Boundaries Commission did not give adequate or sufficient weight to population or to population growth when they were considering all of the elements that were part of the matrix model that they developed.

We will be, I am convinced, the largest constituency in the province of Alberta by the time the next review takes place, number one, because of the population as it currently stands and, number two, because of the rate of population growth in our community. So why would we say, "Well, let's add a larger population"? That will dilute the parity even further. That will dilute the representation of the residents of Sherwood Park in the Legislative Assembly even further.

So based on the argument of population, that should not be included in the constituency of Sherwood Park, but when you look at the other elements that the commission had to deal with in terms of identification of community, there is no question that the residents of the Estates of Sherwood Park believe they are part of the community of Sherwood Park and not part of the rural community that surrounds Sherwood Park in the county of Strathcona.

Now, as I say, Mr. Chairman, the boundaries as they are recorded in the Electoral Boundaries Commission's report, 1996, and as they exist in Bill 46, the Electoral Divisions Act, continue to model the boundaries as they were identified prior to the 1993 general election. They have not been changed. That was one of the concerns that was raised prior to 1993. It continues to be a concern. The Electoral Boundaries Commission did not adequately deal with Sherwood Park, did not adequately deal with the growth in population, did not adequately deal with parity for all voters in the province of Alberta, left Sherwood Park with underrepresentation in the Legislative Assembly of the province of Alberta, and ignored the element of identifiable community in determining that there should be greater representation for my constituency in this Legislative Assembly and that that part of our community ought to be included and represented within that area.

Those are my comments on the Bill with respect to the constituency of Sherwood Park. I know that other members on both sides of the House will want to speak at Committee of the Whole about their particular boundaries as they appear in Bill 46. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will allow other members to speak.

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

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll add a few comments to Bill 46 in committee stage and speak specifically to the riding of Edmonton-Rutherford, as the Bill itself contains very little information other than the boundaries of the 83 ridings as proposed by the commission.

When I look at Edmonton-Rutherford and look at changes, I don't want the member way down on the other side here getting excited wondering why I'm talking about my riding and what changes have been as a result of the independent commission. Let me say that of all the ridings in Alberta probably geographically the most perfect riding is Edmonton-Rutherford. In terms of going from 51st Avenue to 23rd Avenue and 119th Street to the Calgary Trail, it's just like a rectangle. It's very easy to get from one side to the other, no long driveways, nice and compact. It's a perfect constituency to represent.

4:50

Now, in the process of the redistribution it was recognized that Edmonton-Rutherford was the riding with the highest population throughout the province, so obviously something had to come out. There were no portions whatsoever in the redistribution added to it, so everything that will be there was there before. The only change of course is the loss of a community, which will take away about 3,000 people, and the community that we're losing is the community of Malmo Plains.

To the people of Malmo Plains I just want to say through *Hansard* that it has been a delight representing that particular neighbourhood. There are great people who live in that neighbourhood. It's a riding that has a mixture probably very equal between members of the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party, with very few New Democrats. But I represent them whether they are Progressive Conservative. I have a former member in my constituency that ran for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. GERMAIN: Who's that?

MR. WICKMAN: Julian Koziak, and if Julian comes around or any of his family members come to the constituency office for whatever needs, they get the same treatment that any other person would get, and that's the way it should be when you talk in terms of representation. [interjection] Exactly, exactly, hon. member, because one by one they tend to start seeing the light. They may not jump up and down today and declare themselves, but slowly they work their way in that direction. It will happen. We saw it happen with the Social Credit Party, where the old diehards said they would never, never, never, never leave that party, but we saw them start to leave, and pretty soon they were all running just as fast as they could. Unfortunately, at that particular time they didn't head towards the Liberal Party; they chose to head towards the Conservative Party. But now we see that exodus starting to occur on that particular level.

As I talk about Edmonton-Rutherford, it's interesting as I watch this whole redistribution and the thrust that I see, some of the associations out there that have a great deal of political stake in the whole process. For example, are members aware that tonight there is a meeting that has been called by the Progressive Conservative Association of Edmonton-Centre where they're going to vote upon their standing members, their board of directors for the new riding of Edmonton-Centre? The Bill has not even been passed, and already they're advertising in the *Examiner*. They're going to have a nomination meeting for Edmonton-Whitemud October 26, and the Bill still has not been

passed. What happens if we're still here on October 26? That nomination meeting, then, would not be legal; would it? I entrust this to a legal head. It would not be legal. So there is an urgency on the part of some members on the other side to attempt to keep this Bill going through as quickly as possible.

Despite what the concerns of the House leader were earlier, there is no attempt to filibuster this Bill from our point of view. It's a Bill that by and large most members of our caucus agree with, a good portion agree with. There are some that have some reservations or some that may not like it, period, but we are a caucus that is very, very free in our ability to make decisions, and we're not always hung down by the thumbs of the Whip. There are those that may make statements that don't necessarily agree with mine, for example, but the Bill by and large, as I've said before, is a good Bill, and it does protect, preserve what I feel is the very good riding of Edmonton-Rutherford.

Edmonton-Rutherford is not a riding where I can point to something and say that my riding contains the University of Alberta or my riding contains the Misericordia hospital or my riding contains the Edmonton Space and Science Centre. I guess the most noticeable thing in Edmonton-Rutherford would be a portion of Whitemud Drive, that portion that is now fenced on both sides with some bricks that were even flown in from Italy, when the city of Edmonton was freely spending money that the province was throwing at them just to dispose of the money. In the days when government didn't seem to know how to handle money, rather than tuck away as much as they should have for a rainy day, they just kept spending and spending and spending.

Two hundred thousand dollars, by the way, was spent on those blue and green bricks, \$200,000 of provincial money. The city of Edmonton asked for it, and the province said: sure, we'll pay for it. Italian bricks brought in. It's supposed to make it easier for you as you drive through Rutherford. Interestingly, they're only in that portion of Rutherford, but if you drive through Rutherford along Whitemud Drive, it's supposed to give you some peace of mind. Maybe that's why everyone in Edmonton-Rutherford is so happy, because they all drive the Whitemud and see these blue and green bricks.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very serious piece of legislation in front of us. While we've had some fun with it this afternoon and some members have gotten overly excited, nevertheless the objective is to recognize that in a true democracy we try and give as close as possible equal type representation so nobody is getting unfair advantage or nobody is being penalized. As I said earlier, this Bill does not achieve it fully, but at least this Bill is a step in the right direction in that it recognizes two things: there has to be more representation in urban Alberta to start balancing things off, and secondly, for the process to work in a democratic fashion, the recommendations have to be made by an independent commission that is created by all members of this House and not just one side of the House, unlike what we saw happen in the last term when a number of the government MLAs got at the blackboard and drew lines here and drew lines there. Fortunately for some reason my lines in my riding were drawn very, very nicely. I guess I was just lucky.

Mr. Chairman, as I wrap up, because other members do want to speak and I know they want to speak, I am going to say again at committee stage, as we advance this Bill through, that I do support Bill 46 and I will continue to support it, because I feel that by and large it is a step in the right direction for Albertans and for the democratic process.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak to Bill 46. It is indeed a step in the right direction, and it's gratifying to see that an independent commission was put in place to look at this very important issue. I'm not going to disagree with the courts of the land when they said that there wasn't fairness when it came to the democratic right of urban voters to have as equal a say as the rural. That was a decision of the courts.

I would like to say – and it's not just in the province of Alberta. I think when you look around the western world, other countries have recognized that there is a uniqueness with our rural agricultural communities, and we must ensure that to get fairness and to ensure that democracy truly is represented, that message from rural agricultural centres is heard within Legislatures, whether it's an Alberta Legislature, whether it's in Europe, whether it's in Britain, whether it's in Australia. In essence that's our future, so this definitely is a step in the right direction.

What I'm also saying is that I don't want to leave an impression that I believe that the only thing that should be truly looked at when we're creating constituency boundaries is population base numbers. I don't think you necessarily get fairness or the democratic process working for you. My colleague from Sherwood Park used the example of Sherwood estates, which is in my constituency. While, yes, it would have made more common sense and it would have been much more practical from an economic standpoint if a member from Sherwood Park did represent people from Sherwood estates or Graham Heights, the reality is that through the democratic process I was elected to represent these people, and you know when you run for election what your boundaries are.

So it behooves you to make sure that these people get the same representation in your constituency whether they're a hundred miles or a hundred kilometres away from the major urban centre. So as legislators in the House of this province of Alberta we have to ensure that if you live in High Level, your voice is also heard right here in Edmonton, in this House, because their voice is as important as Sherwood estates or Graham Heights. Although the number may not be as great, I think that it is difficult to have the same contact with your constituents when you are representing large geographic areas or, even from a budget point of view, when you have to have six local papers that you have to advertise in and also try and communicate your message.

5:00

You know, Mr. Chairman, it's not politicians that should be making those decisions, and it would behoove the democratic process if we could remove politicians from being involved in setting the boundaries for constituencies. I would like to see an even more independent process, an independent commission, where this House is tied by the recommendation of this commission, and where politicians don't have the right to dabble and change where it suits their own agenda, because that doesn't serve democracy well at all.

[Mr. Herard in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, I find it really disturbing once again in this House when I see us reducing ourselves to the level where we're using Bill 46 for our own personal agendas to ridicule members of this House backwards and forwards. That isn't what Bill 46

was tabled in this House to achieve. Yet I saw examples in this House today where that very thing was done, where the ridicule that was used does not serve the independent commission in the light that it should.

#### Chairman's Ruling Relevance

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt you, but we've already had the debate on the principles of the Bill. What we're into now is committee on the Bill itself. As I look through the Bill, I see all of the descriptions of the various constituencies, and I would expect that the debate would be relevant to what is here with respect to the boundaries and the descriptions thereof. Therefore, I'm just saying, you know, could we get back on the Bill itself, because the debate on the principle has already taken place. I recognize that perhaps the hon. member may not have taken part in that particular part of the debate, but we need to deal with what we've got in front of us. So I'd ask you to make your comments relevant to a constituency or what's in the Bill.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe they are relevant because surely if boundaries of a constituency are described in the Bill, then I have the right as an elected official to critique if I believe a critique should be made of those boundaries.

#### Debate Continued

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: My point is the fact that I'm saying – and this is where there may be a very fine line – that I believe the members of the commission who talked about the boundaries in this report, based on the input, are the people who should be communicating that to this Legislature, not the politicians. So I certainly will be supporting this Bill. As I've said, the commission in the way they put this final report together has done a commendable job, maybe not gone far enough.

I don't want to suffer the wrath of the Chair, who says I'm once again straying into the principles of the Bill. I will reserve the right at third reading to possibly go into it more at that point in time, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray.

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to talk about some of the ridings. I've heard interesting debate here today about if you're not involved in a riding, you shouldn't talk about it, and if you aren't going to be affected by the riding, you shouldn't talk about it. But I would like to do a little of both, Mr. Chairman. I've asked Legislative Counsel to approve a pair of amendments, and because there may be some mechanics in getting these approved with communications to the electoral office and the like, I'd like to outline what they will be so that at the appropriate time they will be fresh in your mind.

First of all, it was brought to me with great clarity here this afternoon that indeed we can have tripartite names of ridings if there is a legitimate and overwhelming reason to do so. One of the things that I would like to urge all Members of this Legislative Assembly to do is to consider adding the words "Fort Chipewyan" to the definition of riding number one, Athabasca-Wabasca, so

that the name will become Athabasca-Wabasca-Fort Chipewyan. Now, while I'm talking about Athabasca-Wabasca, I want to pause for a moment and point out to this Legislative Assembly that although Athabasca-Wabasca has the largest territorial boundary, it also because of its location, northeastern Alberta, and because of its exclusion of the community of Fort McMurray . . .

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, could you just perhaps hold that for a minute while we distribute this amendment?

MR. GERMAIN: I wasn't moving them yet. I was going to do a little more talking, because I hadn't had . . .

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, excuse me, but if we don't have an amendment in front of us . . .

MR. GERMAIN: Well, can't I talk about the Bill, sir?

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, you can talk about the Bill, but it sounded to me like it was . . .

MR. GERMAIN: I don't have the copy, Mr. Chairman. I was going to finish my comments and go get the copy so I could move the amendment. If the page will bring me a copy, I can see what I'm doing here.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Who wrote it?

MR. GERMAIN: I did.

MRS. McCLELLAN: But you didn't read it.

MR. GERMAIN: I read it, ma'am, but remember that Parliamentary Counsel approves all of them, and I haven't seen if he's made any good, constructive criticism. No, I see they're approved.

I want to talk now about inclusion, and I want to talk about the good folks up in Fort Chipewyan, who from time to time come to me and say, "You know, we like it when the hon. Member for Athabasca-Wabasca and the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake talk about the communities of northern Alberta and when you do it from Fort McMurray." They like that. Fort Chipewyan is the oldest settlement in the province of Alberta. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would be a useful objective in this particular Legislative Assembly, since we have already established a precedent today by creating some tripartite names, for us to add the name Fort Chipewyan to the name Athabasca-Wabasca. This would be important because it would recognize the effort of the MLA from that riding, who has never once, to my knowledge, that I've heard, publicly ever complained about the size of his riding, ever complained about the difficulty of getting around his riding, or ever complained about the logistics of communication and travel in his riding. Yet we had one Member of this Legislative Assembly who was expressing some grievance that he had to drive 100,000 kilometres a year to properly service his riding.

I say to all Members of this Legislative Assembly: if you do not like the job description, do not run for re-election. An individual who drives 100,000 kilometres a year is going to be getting \$25,000 in fees and is going to be getting his gas paid, and at the end of four years we have a situation where that individual is

going to get \$100,000 for the purpose of operating a motor vehicle in the province of Alberta over a four-year period. I think, with respect, that it evens out. You have to appreciate that the members from northern Alberta, Mr. Chairman, cover large territorial ridings and never make any complaints about it. I think it would be important for all of Alberta if we added the name Fort Chipewyan to the name of the Athabasca-Wabasca riding to create the riding name Athabasca-Wabasca-Fort Chipewyan.

I would like to move now, Mr. Chairman, if I might, that Bill 46 be amended. My specific motion is that Bill 46 be amended, that the schedule be amended by striking out Athabasca-Wabasca and substituting the name Athabasca-Wabasca-Fort Chipewyan. That is my amendment at this time.

5:10

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: We'll just take a minute to distribute the amendment, please.

Hon. member, just for clarification. At this point you're moving item 1 on your list of amendments, and that will be A2.

MR. GERMAIN: Yes, sir.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Fort McMurray, have you concluded your comments with respect to item 1?

Just for clarification, this is only item 1 on his list of amendments, and it's going to be called amendment A2. It's simply a name change.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Chairman, it's very unfortunate that the constituency people of Athabasca-Wabasca were not notified that the Liberals were proposing a change. Although I'm not opposed to the name change, normally it's advisable that the MLA or anyone who is interested in the change in the constituency, that the constituents of that area be advised or at least consulted. In this particular case, although I have nothing against the name change, it's a matter of timing. It just doesn't allow me enough time to consult with the people in the area, in Fort Chip, that in fact may be interested. Although, you know, if it's something that the Assembly would want to support, then I would not be opposed to it.

The problem in a constituency like Athabasca-Wabasca is not the name. The name does not really bring you any additional services for your particular constituents. In fact, when I was on the last boundary committee, when we did our public hearings through northern Alberta, the suggestion at the time from the constituents of Fort Chipewyan and the High Level area was to look at the possibility of eventually developing a northern constituency that could include possibly Fort Chipewyan and Fort Vermilion and some of those areas so that they would have a representative in northern Alberta. I think that makes more sense. In fact, I believe it's one of the recommendations that may have been included in one of the boundary reviews. So I believe that in the future, if the constituencies again are reviewed, that definitely should be considered. That would make a lot of sense.

With that, I would just like to thank you for giving me the opportunity.

MR. GERMAIN: Mr. Chairman, just by way of clarification. I'm delighted that the hon. Member for Athabasca-Wabasca is supportive of recognizing Fort Chipewyan. I take his constructive criticism about the consultative process to heart, and I thank him for that. I hope all members will see fit in their hearts to recognize this, Alberta's oldest settlement.

I also want to say one other thing, Mr. Chairman. There is no change of the boundary proposed in this amendment. I would not have brought it forward. This is a name change only. By way of apology and explanation on the lack of consultation, it developed only when I saw that we were prepared in this Legislative Assembly today to go to trihyphenated names. It's always bothered me that the folks in Fort Chip didn't get more recognition, but there are no boundary changes proposed here.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MS LEIBOVICI: Thank you. What I find rather fascinating is that the hon. Member for Fort McMurray put forward that Athabasca-Wabasca be substituted by Athabasca-Wabasca-Fort Chip, yet the member opposite indicated in his remarks that he didn't have time to consult with his constituents with regards to this particular amendment. Yet we just passed in the Legislative Assembly six ridings whose names were changed, some perhaps with consultation. I did not hear from one member in this Legislative Assembly, other than the Member for Bow Valley who indicated that he had had some feedback from his constituents with regards to the name changes.

The hon. Member for Athabasca-Wabasca seems to lack the fortitude and the backbone to actually make a decision on behalf of his constituents, yet he was quick to make a decision on behalf of the constituents for Calgary-East to become Calgary-Fort, for Calgary-Forest Lawn to become Calgary-East, for Airdrie to become Airdrie-Rocky View, for Bow Valley to become Strathmore-Brooks, for Cardston-Taber to become Cardston-Taber-Warner, and for Olds to become Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. When it comes to his own riding, it is rather perplexing as to why in this particular case consultation is required, but in the case of the six prior constituencies that I read out, it appears that no consultation is required.

There seems to be a mixed message here, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps one of the consistencies that we do have from the government is the mixed messages. Some things are good in certain situations but not good in other situations. It doesn't appear to be altogether satisfactory.

If I were a constituent of the Member for Athabasca-Wabasca, what I would be saying to that particular member is, "Well, if consultation is required, then hopefully you would have voted against the prior amendment, and hopefully what you will do is indicate that there is a flaw in this Bill and that perhaps what's needed is for the Bill to be held over for three months." Perhaps the Member for Athabasca-Wabasca could put forward – I believe it's a hoist amendment, that talks about putting the Bill forward for three months so that some of these problems that we're seeing arise in a very simple Bill can be clarified.

I know that the members had no problem in saying we need more consultation on Bill 214, to the point of actually taking it off the Order Paper. I would never suggest anything like that with this particular Bill, but it appears that there are problems with the Bill. There are problems with the names. I notice that the second amendment from the Member for Fort McMurray, which we have yet to discuss, deals with the boundaries of Fort McMurray. Now, to me that seems to be a substantial issue that needs to be discussed and of course should be discussed with the constituents.

It is surprising to me, therefore, that the Member for Athabasca-Wabasca would stand up and say: oh, well, even though Fort Chip is an integral part of the community, even

though Fort Chip has a strong history within this riding and constituency, I will not give it the priority that it seems to deserve by including it in the name of the other areas that are within this particular constituency. I would think that the hon. member has to look at the actions that he has taken. How can he justify on one hand saying that these amendments are okay to six ridings unless he has somewhere notes from those MLAs that are representing those ridings now that indicate which constituents they've spoken with and he can share that with all the Members of the Legislative Assembly? I think that's valuable information for us all to know.

5:20

On the other hand, he then says that he can't make a decision on this without the constituents . . .

MRS. McCLELLAN: That's not what he said.

MS LEIBOVICI: He said that he wasn't supporting it. He's not supporting it. [interjections] Well, if the hon. member would please clarify whether he was or was not supporting it, because I'm hearing that he is supporting it. [interjections] Well, let's hear it. I think that if you look at *Hansard*, what he says is that he is not . . . [interjections] Then so much the better for him that he has been consistent in his action. If he is not supporting it, then he is not being consistent in his action, and when the vote comes, we will see whether the hon. member is or is not supporting this particular amendment.

Thank you.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, again, I think that what we're seeing here shows the exact point I was making maybe somewhat heatedly earlier this afternoon. Why do we have individual MLAs commenting about the constituencies of other MLAs in terms of just arbitrarily swinging out and coming with a name change? Not only do they not know the area; the Member for Fort McMurray doesn't even know how to spell Fort Chipewyan. It's spelled wrongly. Now, we can talk about Jasper and Banff, but at least I know how to spell Banff. Here it is in writing, and he can't even spell it. That just underlines the problem we've got.

A whole lot of people in this province have gone to a whole lot of work to readjust the boundaries to bring them in line with court suggestions, and we're doing that. What we're seeing here is an ongoing filibuster, just a filibuster interfering in the constituencies of other MLAs. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not be supporting this, nor would I support any amendment not coming in a proper fashion from the MLA who's done the work in the area.

I would move that we rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

MR. HERARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports progress on Bill 46. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. All those in favour of the report, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Opposed, if any? Carried.

moved that we stand adjourned and reconvene at 8 p.m. All those in favour, please say aye.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we stand adjourned until 8 o'clock and reconvene in Committee of the Whole.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The Government House Leader has

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:26 p.m.]