

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, November 23, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to file with the Legislature the report of the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices for 1980-81.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Constitution — Aboriginal Rights

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, both my questions today were to the Premier, but I could ask the House leader or Acting Premier at this point in time. The first question is with regard to the new proposal of the government with regard to aboriginal rights in the constitutional package. Over the weekend, specifically on Friday, I felt the government made a rather radical change in their stance. I wonder if the hon. Attorney General could clarify why the government made that change on Friday and over the weekend.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, except in a matter of emphasis and a slight change in the language used, there was no change in the position the government had long maintained. The Premier has made it clear on a number of occasions, in both the constitutional conference and meetings with native delegations, that the government of Alberta was interested at all times in the preservation of existing rights. I think the key words may well be "existing rights". The government took some objection to the possibility that one form of the constitutional declaration, which was inserted without any consultation with the provinces, could create new rights that had not previously existed. But there was no question of our support for treaty rights and existing aboriginal rights in all respects. We were always fully supportive of those.

What occurred on Friday — and I can provide the hon. leader with a copy of the statement, although it was made public on Friday and perhaps the leader already has a copy — was that as a result of several meetings involving the Metis Association of Alberta, an alternative wording to what was previously Section 34 was proposed and brought forward. I think careful examination will show that the only aspect of it that's different from earlier proposals is the stipulation that it deal only with existing rights and therefore take away some of the uncertainties there might have been about the possibility of creating new and unknown rights.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General with regard to the acceptance by other governments in Canada. As is indicated in

the press release, the 10 governments would have to agree to this change in the accord. Could the minister indicate at this time what agreement has been reached? From a statement of the Prime Minister and, as well, the hon. Mr. Chretien, I understand there seems to be agreement at this point in time. Could the minister comment on the sequence of events following the suggestion of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, about all I could cover on that is that discussions or at least exchanges of positions by the various governments are continuing to take place today. The federal government has suggested that they hope by tomorrow a consensus might occur as a result of these exchanges. I don't know whether that will occur, but my strong belief at this point is that it's most likely.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General — it's more for clarification; I think I understood the answer — on the differentiation between endorsement by the Alberta government of existing rights versus endorsement of any new rights that may be requested through the amendment in the constitution. One of the greatest concerns in terms of new rights is in reference to property rights. Could the minister indicate if that's the concern of the government of Alberta at this time?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would be possible to go through a sort of catalogue of what the concerns would be. That is one of the real overall difficulties in this matter. If I can put it this way, our concern always was that no one knew what rights were being referred to if it was stated in a sufficiently vague and uncertain way. It was the vagueness and uncertainty that caused concern. Therefore, we could see the possibility that any number of rights might at some point be claimed to have been created by the particular wording suggested. Our view was and is that so long as it's clear that existing rights are the ones all parties speak of, that would be adequate and satisfactory, and certainly supported by Alberta. But to go beyond that and say of those uncertainties that there is a list or catalogue of what our specific concerns were, that's not the case. The real concern was the absence of any clarity about what might be involved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General with regard to Metis people being aboriginal, using the definition that "aboriginal" means the first people, or that a person was in a land at the dawn of history. I wonder if the Attorney General could comment on that definition as it applies to the Metis people of Alberta or Canada. What special rights will be awarded to Metis people by their inclusion in the constitutional amendment?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'll do my best to interpret what I believe is really involved in the sense of Metis people. Over a period of years, certain well-known representations or public positions have been taken by the Metis people, in which they have said that certain rights were an entitlement for various reasons that pre-date the present time. In giving careful attention to those representations and expressions on the part of Metis people, we have always taken the position — and I think any other government in a similar position has done the same — that certain types of rights do exist. We have

often said that those matters may well be interpreted one day by a court. In other words, if there's a right, there must be evidence of it, and it must be something that can be presented and convincingly argued. So the rights that are, in effect, being fully recognized in regard to Metis people are any rights that from this point on they would succeed in establishing. And there's always the alternative to the court procedure; that is, by way of agreement. There may be other ways, but it seems to me there are two ways of establishing the basis for the representations. One would be a decision in a court and the other would be by way of agreement, no doubt following discussion and consultation.

Whatever the rights would be at that point, our position, as described on Friday, is that those would be treated as rights that were in existence at this time. So the passing of a new constitution and the coming of future events and new laws as a result of the constitution would leave the Metis people in the position that if, after all those events, the right were established, we would still come back to the present time and say, because it is clear that a right had been established and was in existence in 1981, that is the right we would recognize.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Attorney General with regard to the constitutional conference that will be held later in 1982. If the other governments of Canada as well as the government of Alberta endorse the concept that existing rights will be protected, could the minister indicate the purpose of this new conference? Would it be to add rights to the various aboriginal groups such as the Metis, Inuit, and Indians of Canada? Would that be the function of the conference? If Section 34 is put into the constitution at this time, or this suggestion of Alberta is inserted into the constitution, is that assurance enough to the aboriginal groups that their rights will be protected? Will the conference then be seen as a conference to look at new rights for these specific groups in Canada?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it is not in the mind of any one of the parties — by that, I mean the native people in their capacity as potential participants, as is intended in such a conference — nor is it in the minds of any of the governments of the provinces or Canada that new rights be created that have not previously existed. I think that is entirely clear. What is involved is that because of uncertainties, there should be some benefit from sitting down and discussing what is really involved in a further definition of aboriginal rights. Everyone hopes that such an attempt to give that further definition would succeed, although my understanding of the position of the government of Canada has long been that what really is involved is a conference with an agenda, of which this would be one of the important items, and that the native people would at that point be directly involved — which they aren't always at such conferences — and *bona fide* efforts would be made to carry the question of uncertainty a little further toward agreement and greater certainty.

Edmonton Area Road Systems

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, some of the constituents of Edmonton Whitemud have expressed their deep concern regarding the expansion of the Whitemud freeway from a four-lane to a six-lane dangerous truck route. My question is to the Minister of

Transportation. Can the minister advise whether the government of Alberta has contributed directly to the cost of the expansion of the Whitemud freeway? If so, has the minister given any directions with respect to the use of the Whitemud freeway as a dangerous goods route?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we've contributed to that particular road in the same sense that we contribute to transportation corridors generally in the cities. We cost share, but we do not designate exactly how that funding is used. Certainly we haven't been part of designating that road in a specific way.

MR. KNAAK: Is the minister advising that he has had no influence whatsoever on how the funds were used, whether they were used for light rail transit or for expansion of the Whitemud freeway or some other road in another part of the city?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, for many years we've had discussions with municipalities and cities about funding and the formulas we use. It has been pretty clearly established that they would like the jurisdiction on how they spend funds provided by the province. We have honored that as a commitment. So the decision on how funds are expended, but more specifically on what routes, is totally in the hands of the city administration. Our planning people have had discussions with the city planning people to assist. But when it comes to the final designation, apart from perhaps designating the proportion that would be used for operation as opposed to capital investment — as an example, some suggestion that a certain amount might be beneficially allocated to LRT — we do have that sort of discussion between our planners. But we do not try to influence the cities and the administration on how they use each dollar specifically.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise what progress is being made in planning and constructing a road through the greenbelt which, if completed, would constitute an outer ring road?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can give a very detailed report, other than to say that we are still in the process of acquiring land in the RDA, that a good deal of land remains to be purchased, and finally that the purchase of the right of way for this corridor, which will include a transportation utility corridor — which means there will be uses other than straight transportation — has been carried by the Department of the Environment.

MR. KNAAK: Supplementary to the Minister of Environment. Can the minister advise the House what progress he is making in acquiring sufficient land in the southwest portion of the greenbelt to permit construction of an outer ring road to take some of that heavy traffic off the Whitemud freeway?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I missed the earlier question from the Member for Edmonton Whitemud. To review what I think the question is, it has to do with the responsibility for acquisition of what we now call the utility corridor around the city. In terms of the circumference of the city, we have acquired approximately 40 per cent of the total land required for utilities and road construction in the future. I'd have to look specifically at

the area concerned to determine just what stage negotiations may be at in that area.

MR. KNAAK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the undertaking of the minister to provide information on what progress is being made in the acquisition of lands for the purpose of constructing an outer ring road. I wonder if the minister can advise on the timetable which would permit the planning and construction of an outer ring road in the southwest portion of the city.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to bounce the ball back to the Minister of Transportation, because in terms of land acquisition, we rely on the various departments to prioritize the area they are most concerned with. On the basis of their recommendations, we proceed to acquire the land. If land is readily available, doesn't have to go through the difficult task of expropriation, there is a reasonably short time frame to it. But I think the question as to the time frame and actual road construction would be better asked of the Minister of Transportation. We take over from there in terms of land acquisition.

MR. KNAAK: A further supplementary to the Minister of Transportation. Can the minister advise the House whether he's had discussions with the Minister of Environment to prioritize his needs for land acquisition in that area of the city?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, we have, Mr. Speaker. In that regard I think it would be useful to comment here that after the land purchase is completed, it would probably take a minimum of five years to build a southwest leg of the outer ring road. You also have to keep in mind that the amounts of money involved not just for the construction but for the purchase of the land would have some bearing on how fast we'd be able to move. The numbers are now getting pretty large and, as the Minister of Environment has pointed out, because we haven't done all the purchasing, that implies we're probably going to have to go the expropriation route to purchase some of the land. Therefore, we can't even put a handle on the final amount of money that's going to be involved.

MR. KNAAK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I beg the indulgence of the House; I only have two more. I wonder if the Minister of Transportation can advise what progress his department is making in upgrading Highway 60, the Devon by-pass, and if that highway is now adequate to carry some of the heavy dangerous goods traffic that normally would not be destined for the city but would merely be passing through.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we actually have two highways involved. We have 39 from Leduc west that joins Highway 60 and then swings north and would join with No. 16. That route is now used quite extensively. It's a primary system, capable of carrying the loads involved here, and is being used to a large degree by the kind of traffic that doesn't want access to the city.

MR. KNAAK: A last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise if any inquiry has been made whether upgrading of the road system just discussed would divert traffic from the Whitemud freeway to that by-pass system?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, that road is of a good standard, capable of carrying that kind of traffic, and the people in the business of moving goods are quite aware of it. I think a misconception exists that building that so-called southwest ring road would to a fairly large extent relieve the Whitemud freeway. The fact is that it wouldn't, because the percentage of traffic whose origin or destination is the city of Edmonton is pretty high. We haven't got an exact figure now, but the previous numbers we had were that as high as 90 per cent would want to either access or leave the city. Therefore, we are not going to be able to unload that system to any great degree by diversion. However, the road that has been discussed, 39 and 60, is not capable of carrying that traffic.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Transportation. In the event that he receives an undertaking to reduce expenditures on the west end of the Whitemud freeway, would he consider an undertaking to spend it on the east end?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has been very patient about asking his supplementary, but I regret to say that it's entirely hypothetical.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The people in the southeast area along 50th Street, where heavy traffic emanates from Refinery Row, are experiencing the same type of problem. Has the minister or the department given any consideration to staging in the development of an outer ring road so that it could be done in segments, as opposed to doing the whole thing at one time?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We're doing that now in conjunction with the city planners.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Transportation. Has he considered giving Mill Woods even a part of a ring road?

MR. KROEGER: No, Mr. Speaker.

Rural Road Systems

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. I speak as a rural member when I raise this. In the considerations of per capita grants to the cities of this province, is the minister looking at a formula by which towns and villages of the incorporated areas of this province could receive equal grants to build streets and roads coming up to these respective villages and towns?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we have a total program that is aimed at trying to anticipate where the traffic flows will be so we can be there when the time is right. I might add that if you were to listen to the representation we get from urban centres, we're overdoing that now.

Hire-a-Student Program

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It refers to his news release of November 17 regarding an Alberta hire-a-student program. Mr. Speaker, there is a statement which reads:

The jointly funded Alberta Hire-A-Student program

is unique in Canada in that the programs in other provinces are funded solely by the federal government.

Could the minister advise whether this is another exercise of the Ottawa government to discriminate against Albertans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a representation.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Medical Examinations

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Has the minister received any representation or complaints from citizens with regard to Alberta physicians not performing certain services; for example, Alberta senior citizens who, by statute, require a medical to have a driver's licence?

MR. RUSSELL: To date, my office has had two calls, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Solicitor General. In view of the fact that some 40,000 drivers over the age of 70 require this medical examination, has the minister's office had any complaints about senior citizens whose licences will not be renewed because of not having the medical?

MR. HARLE: I've had no representations.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could he advise members of the Assembly what advice they could give if senior citizens call with regard to physicians not performing that necessary medical?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the only response we've given to the two calls we had — and they were with respect to an unemployment insurance benefit matter, not driver's licences — is to go and see another doctor who would be willing to fill out the form.

Health Care Insurance — Doctors' Fees

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, dealing with the status of negotiations between the minister or the health care people and the doctors' association in the province. What is the status of negotiations at this time?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, last week, about mid-week, two letters were received from the AMA, both of which were responded to by me and the chairman of the plan's negotiating committee. Those in turn were acknowledged. We were advised they were to be discussed at an AMA board of directors meeting last Friday and then further advice would follow. To date, we haven't received that advice.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister commenced developing some contingency plans so that after the first of the year, individuals like those mentioned by the Member for Lethbridge West will not find themselves in a difficult position? I raise the question in light of comments coming out of Red Deer over the weekend that

in fact members of the medical profession were seriously considering removal of those kinds of services from the public.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say in response is that it's my belief this problem would be best resolved at the bargaining table. I think the plan, the government, and the doctors have to get their teams back to the table because we're still a long way apart. Withdrawal of services isn't going to do anything except annoy people. I guess there's a limit to how long people are willing to put up with that annoyance. But that won't solve the negotiations, and it certainly won't get the doctors an increase in fees by the first of next year, which is everybody's objective.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister outline the government's last offer, from a standpoint of percentage increase, to the medical association?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we've been approaching the matter on this basis: we look at overhead and professional income in separate components, then blend those figures into a total increase. This year, the portion of the total fee deemed to be overhead is 43 per cent, which I think is very close to the average for the majority of doctors in the province. The last offer was a 13.5 per cent increase in their overhead component. I'm going by memory. It's either 13 or 13.5. The last offer of the other part of the fee, the professional income for the doctor himself, was 9.5 per cent. When you blend those, you get a total global increase of 11.1. I think that's got to be a pretty fair offer for this point in the negotiations.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, how does the minister explain the point of view put forward by people in the medical community, that when they take that 11.1 per cent offer the minister says the government has generously made, that ends up as a 4.9 per cent increase when doctors take into consideration their increased operating costs in their offices?

MR. RUSSELL: I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I have difficulty understanding the mathematics put forward by the AMA. Their last offer was for something like 55 per cent overall in what it would cost the government by way of contributions to the plan. I indicated what our last offer was and how we reached it. Their 55 per cent comes to 32 per cent in global increase in funding, plus another 23 per cent and a fraction in added benefits. You can see from those figures that the two sides are far apart. I've had no direct communication with the AMA with respect to those details. That's in the hands of the negotiating committee. That's why I'm so anxious to see the two sides return to the table. The kinds of communication the hon. leader has just put to me are going forward by means of individual communication between doctors and their MLAs and via the media. Quite frankly, it's my impression that there's an incredible amount of misunderstanding out there.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one of the points made by people in the medical community has been that doctors would cease filling government forms — i.e., workers' compensation forms — as of the first of the year. To either the minister or the Minister of Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation: given the wide divergence between the government's last offer and the doctors' last

offer, what contingency plan does the government have in place so that in fact the workers' compensation program doesn't get caught in the middle of this argument in figures between the minister and the doctors?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, the new legislation as of January 1, '82, will not require an automatic medical report and, with that in place, will not in any way jeopardize a claim by a claimant. The new procedure will require a more extensive report, which the Alberta Medical Association and the Workers' Compensation Board are working out. It will be a different fee structure, separate from the fee that the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission will be paying for the medical services. Those two are separate and should not in any way jeopardize the claimant.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by a further one by the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, and then a final one by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. That will deal with the problem of claims which are already in, but what about new claims? What contingency plan is in position for new claims, as of January 1? I've given the stated objective of some members of the medical community not to fill out the WCB claims.

MR. DIACHUK: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member didn't catch my point. That will also apply to new claims. New claims will not require an automatic medical report, as is presently under the Act. The procedure will be under the legislation that was passed this spring. A more extensive report will be required, but that will be at a fee structure different from what has been in place. My advice is that there's been no difficulty with that negotiation.

MR. R. CLARK: Who's going to sign it?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could he indicate to the Assembly what the average annual net income of doctors in Alberta is now, and what it would be proposed to be after the offer of the provincial government?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that's a very difficult question to answer. The average estimated net income for all doctors in Alberta is in the neighborhood of \$68,000. That's misleading because it includes semiretired doctors, doctors who submit one billing a year, and doctors who are in the employ of a clinic or on salaried staff at some kind of institution. The advice I have from the statisticians is: taking \$60,000 as the gross claims from the plan, and taking that as the number of doctors who are deemed to be full-time independent working doctors, gives you a far better picture. If you do that, the average then comes closer to \$85,000 a year.

Adding 9.5 per cent to a net income, I believe we're looking at some fairly reasonable increases at the present time. I know the bargaining hasn't finished and those kinds of things have to be determined, but that gives you some idea of the range of figures we're talking about.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I've already recognized the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. We have two members who wish to ask their first question. Perhaps we could come back to this topic.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. In view of the answers by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care that people should seek out another doctor, and the fact that it's a statutory requirement for those over 70 to have a medical or they can't have a driver's licence, could the minister advise the Assembly whether his department would give consideration to the medical health officers throughout Alberta providing this essential service for the senior citizens if things become so difficult that people cannot get physicians?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the hon. Member for Lethbridge West is aware, the medical officers of health are not employees of the department. They are in fact employees of the local health authorities throughout the province. If medical officers of health chose to provide such information, they certainly could do that as members of the medical profession. But in terms of any instruction going out either from my office or our department, that's something we would not consider, Mr. Speaker.

Cattle Industry

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. For approximately a month now the minister has had in his hands Dr. Hugh Horner's report on the beef industry in the province. Could the minister indicate if he's had the opportunity to study this report, and if he'll be acting on any of the recommendations in the report?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we've certainly had the report for some time, since just before Dr. Horner released it to the public. Recognizing that the report itself covers the total livestock industry, both short term and long term, and covers the area of production as well as marketing, some of the recommendations tie in very closely for a longer term direction and benefit to the industry. Recognizing that we are just in the process of closing the review of the total livestock industry for both short-term and long-term solutions, at the present time we are in no position to comment directly as to any specific recommendation in the report. Of course, there are a number that are short in nature, and would be tied on the short term, that perhaps one would be able to implement for the benefit of the industry in total. Those would be indicated when the final report on behalf of the total industry is made.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. One recommendation in the report that's been causing a lot of problems in the beef industry is the drastic reduction of the consumption of beef over the last two years. Is the department making any changes or improvement as far as marketing our beef is concerned to try to hold up our consumption in Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the per capita consumption of beef has dropped dramatically in Canada and is

recognized by the industry. Collectively they have looked at an area of promotion in selling the basic product. At the present time, we're in the process of putting together a start of a promotional scheme to perhaps convince consumers that the per capita consumption should again start to rise.

On the announcement of a promotion program, the government at that time announced that they would be willing to share with the industry both physically and financially as soon as a program was available to us. At the present time, we're still in the process of waiting for a program to be submitted, and whatever sharing arrangements, both in the financial end and, of course, in the area the department could play in the total program.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on the recommendation that we set up a Crown corporation. Could the minister indicate if the intention would be to work with present packing plants, or would they be setting up a Crown corporation at, say, the lamb plant at Innisfail? Would that be part of the corporation, if it was set up?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question is tied with one of the recommendations. Of course, the answer would certainly have to be tied to whatever decisions were made in the acceptance and implementation of those recommendations, so I couldn't answer that at the present time.

Sunday Observance

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, some of my constituents have advised that they have considerable concern with respect to the proliferation of Sunday openings. I wonder if the Attorney General could advise the House what steps he's taken since the springtime in moving forward to enact Sunday closing legislation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I explained earlier the process by which the existing Sunday observance legislation is enforced. Of course, it is federal legislation. The responsibility for prosecutions under that legislation lies with the provincial administration of justice through the Department of the Attorney General. The policy is to respond to complaints when made, and to lay charges. As to other approaches, such as new legislation in the provincial sphere, I can't add anything to what has been said previously in that respect. That is, the matter is under consideration.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the Attorney General made representation to the federal government encouraging it to do something with Sunday legislation? Also, have many charges been laid with regard to Sunday openings?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a statistic in respect of the number of charges laid. It would be possible to get such information. I think the situation is that they are more numerous than in previous years. That would be a direct reflection of the fact that breaches of that particular legislation are more numerous than they've been in previous years.

As to making representations to the federal government about amendment of the Sunday observance legislation, I have not made any representations.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on this topic. Has the minister been able to evaluate the impact any change in Sunday opening laws would have on the retail food industry, be it the small grocers or the large stores?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I've had representations from a group that organized itself under the heading SIGN, which has as its goal the furtherance of the interests of the independent grocer in this province. They have made certain representations with respect to Sunday openings, from the point of view of the grocers providing the service rather than the point of view of the consumers needing the service or society's views on what in fact should take place on a Sunday.

Generally speaking, I have not received much in the way of concerns or complaints with the present system from consumers as such, indicating that their needs are fulfilled with the present operations.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary on this topic. Will the minister undertake to investigate the impact of any changes, be it strengthening the current law or changing it in some substantial way? Would he undertake to investigate what effect that would have on the retail food industry, and have that available before this House considers any changes?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I can give due consideration to the request.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the Minister of Labour received any representations from employees across the province with concerns about having to work on Sundays?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I have received one or two representations on the matter.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is that one or two individual representations or group actions?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, when I receive representations allegedly in the name of the group, often the group doesn't indicate how many people were there and whether in fact it is a point of view of one individual writing on group letterhead or a considered view of a general membership meeting. I can't respond further.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. . .

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I probably got up too quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: This appears to be Edmonton White-mud day.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's time I had a day.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Attorney General advise on any timetable planned in considering new legislation? There's no doubt that the longer it's postponed, the harder it will be to address this question. I wonder if he has addressed the question of a timetable?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say that I have not addressed the question of a timetable. But that does not mean I am able to indicate anything to the hon. member today that would be a clear-cut response to that question.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's not next Sunday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones and the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks would like to deal further with some topics raised in a previous question period.

Utilities Legislation

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, on November 18 the Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked a question that was taken as notice by my colleague, the Associate Minister of Telephones. The question was: when had I met with the Union of REAs? I'd like to reply by advising the members of the Assembly that I met with the general membership of the Union of REAs on June 23. Subsequently, I met with the board of directors of the Union of REAs on August 4 and with the chairman on a number of occasions since then.

World Student Games

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier a question with regard to the World Student Games. The question was: has the government committed further funds to this program? On December 18, 1979, I received a letter from the mayor requesting certain funds. On January 9, I replied with our commitment. Since then I understand they are looking further at the budget, but there has been no official request to us for further funds and we have not taken any action.

Also, the Premier suggested he would table a letter he made public in Baden-Baden in regard to the winter Olympics in 1988. I'd like to file three copies with the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I must admit to having lost my way among my notes and overlooked another question by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Health Care Insurance — Doctors' Fees (continued)

MR. R. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A very brief question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It flows from the question initiated by the Member for Lethbridge West, dealing with the last proposal the Alberta Medical Association put to the government. Has an examination of that proposal been made? Can the minister confirm that that proposal would in fact put doctors in Alberta on a par with doctors in British Columbia?

MR. RUSSELL: There are two ways to measure parity, Mr. Speaker. One is a fee schedule. There are so many components to that that I don't believe any two provinces have exactly identical fee schedules. It is true that the B.C. fee schedule is presently higher than the Alberta schedule. Notwithstanding that, I still believe the net income of Alberta doctors is probably the highest in the country, when one takes into consideration our incorporation laws and our tax situation in Alberta.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if I could ask you to review a matter. Earlier today I noted that a lady sitting fairly quietly in the gallery, but wearing maybe unusual apparel, was forcibly removed from the gallery. I didn't see any cause or disturbance occurring. I wonder if the Speaker could review that matter and report back to the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll do that.

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1982-83 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

1 — Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly think we should discuss this matter. To date, I note that the expenditure with regard to the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital is some \$28,330,000. The amount we're voting at the present time is \$2,970,000, which is a very significant amount of money and certainly for a good project. I wonder if the minister could comment on some of the functions and new processes going on at the hospital. I understand that with the hospital in southern Alberta, we're able to meet a lot of the complex health problems we haven't been able to meet before because of putting money into this facility. I'm sure there have been some excellent successes. That's number one. I wonder if the minister could comment on that. I think it would be of great interest.

Secondly, is there a research component to that facility so the medical staff who work at the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital can do special kinds of research, specialist work? Are they working on some areas? That certainly would be of interest to us here in the Legislature. Thirdly, I would like to look at the area of the autonomy of the hospital. I understand that the hospital works almost autonomously. There was a question as to whether the northern Alberta children's hospital would be here in Edmonton; the southern Alberta children's hospital would be this facility in the south. I wonder at what stage that thought is at the present time.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the child health centre project at the Alberta children's hospital in Calgary was originally approved for planning in July 1975 by the hon. Neil Crawford, minister of health. Cabinet approval to award tenders within a project budget of \$31,508,000 was given in October 1977. Construction of a 128-bed, active treatment hospital to replace the present hospital began in January 1978. In April 1979, the hospital requested approval of a change order to add an additional 28,000

square feet of shelled-in space to provide future flexibility. In July 1979, this was approved by cabinet at \$1,324,000.

The hospital has also requested additional funds to, (a) offset inflationary increases in cost of construction change orders, (b) enable the hospital to develop as a tertiary care centre and assume pediatric caseloads from other hospitals, (c) offset inflationary increases in equipment prices and acquire more high-technology equipment, (d) provide necessary upgrading to the existing structures. Certain financial requirements are connected with those requests. The hospital has requested a total project budget of \$43,557,000. The recommendation of the government is for a total of \$40,492,955, which would be supplemented by \$2,350,705 from other sources.

The major reasons for the cost increases over the figures alluded to by the hon. Leader are: one, slow construction time. Construction began in January 1978. The target date for completion was October 1981, and that was met. A delay of over 12 months has been attributed to labor problems and shortages in the Calgary area. Two, construction change orders. A major change to add 28,000 net square feet was approved by cabinet in July 1979. Other change orders were required to improve the functional utility of the building, in view of significant changes to the hospital's role in providing tertiary level pediatric care. Three, construction management and commissioning. No pre-opening and commissioning costs were included in the original capital project budget in 1977. A construction management co-ordinator was engaged when it became apparent that delays and difficulties with the contractor were occurring.

Four, equipment cost increases. The equipment and furnishings budget was established in 1977 at \$3,400,000. Heavy inflation in equipment prices over the past four years has increased this figure by over 100 per cent. In addition, the hospital has assumed the place of the Foothills hospital in providing pediatric tertiary care, with the consequent need for additional high-technology equipment. Five, upgrading the existing structure. Additional funding is required to upgrade the fabric of the existing buildings.

So the \$2,970,000 requested in this year's vote is to finish funding the construction of a child health care centre in Calgary, which will be used for diagnostic assessment and treatment of children with complex health problems. This is done by way of the province providing grants to the Alberta children's provincial hospital board.

The project has been constructed in two phases. Phase one, the construction of a school, provides 42,850 square feet of space for a full range of educational services for children with complex health and related learning problems. This phase was completed some time ago. Phase two, the construction of the hospital portion, provides 403,450 square feet of space for 128 active treatment beds, outpatient services, laboratory, dietary, X-ray, surgical, diagnostic, and support services. When it is completed, the facility will replace the existing Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital. The government has approved the change in scope. This approval of tertiary care and full-range pediatric care will replace services presently provided by the Foothills Provincial General hospital.

As I mentioned, the hospital is owned by the province and operated by a board established by order in council. Incidentally, that board is completely autonomous and responsible for all matters relating to the hospital. Contracts to construct the centre are with the hospital board. Grants from the heritage fund for capital construction

and equipping of the facilities are made to the board after approval by the authorizing vote in the Legislature, and operating costs are funded on an ongoing basis from the General Revenue Fund of the province.

It's intended that the centre provide the most up-to-date treatment facilities and services to children in the southern part of the province. The integration of active care and rehabilitation will be emphasized. An educational component is provided for a wide range of specialized health professionals.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate that complete answer, and even a little more, to more questions than I even asked. The minister was attempting to look ahead as to the kinds of questions we would be asking. Certainly that is good information, and we on this side of the House appreciate it.

At this time, we have one year to complete the capital facility. We have to spend another \$2,970,000 to complete it. One of the questions I ask is: is the hospital operational, fully functional at present? Specifically, what kinds of things are left to do with this some \$2 million? I notice that it's to finish funding the centre, but I didn't see the specifics at hand. Is the hospital operational, functional at present? Then we can go from there.

MR. RUSSELL: The hospital is operational and functional in every sense of the word. I can relate what's being done with the \$2.9 million, which of course is a vote that doesn't come into effect until April 1 next year. So really, the work that's ongoing now, out of the \$9 million in the current fiscal year, is primarily concerned with renovations and rehabilitation to the old existing building which was left there and which will be put to use. The \$2.9 million that comes into effect at the beginning of next year is \$1,750,000 to finish a parkade, \$300,000 to finish the landscaping. It's estimated that \$100,000 will be needed to finish the construction management fees, and \$820,000 for the last of the equipment that will be purchased. The hospital officially opened in October this year, and the school of course had been operating for some time prior to that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In terms of the question I raised earlier about special kinds of things being done at the hospital, in comparison, let's say, to the facility in Edmonton, is there co-ordination between the Royal Alex facility and the hospital in Calgary? Is a general type of service performed, or can special things be done in Calgary, and is the equipment bought for that special purpose, that may not be performed in Edmonton? Is there a transfer of patients back and forth to meet that requirement?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, there's not much transfer of patients from Edmonton to Calgary. I tried to get the statistics for that, because of the current interest in building another children's hospital in Edmonton for northern Alberta. The reason I was given is that the facilities available at the University hospital and the Royal Alex are, in essence, almost identical to what's available at the children's hospital in Calgary. So there aren't many referrals from Edmonton to Calgary.

The best way I can explain it is that, in the trade, this hospital is called a tertiary care hospital, which is third level, the highest sort of referral centre. So you would get referrals to it from all over southern Alberta. Notwithstanding that, as with adults, some specialties would still

be referred to other hospitals in Canada or the United States.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I raised that sequence of three questions about research being done in the children's hospital in Calgary specifically. Maybe the minister could comment about the Royal Alex or, specifically, the University hospital. Are research projects being funded by the government? Has the minister considered that as a possible proposal or extended use of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? I know research funds are available. But have any of those funds been directed specifically for children's health care, the betterment of children's health?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, each year when submitting their budget, every hospital in the province, if they wish special funding for research projects, will include that in their budget request. Without referring in some detail to what's going on in hospitals throughout the province, I'd be unable at this time to give a detailed list of specific medical research projects related to child care.

The two health care institutions that are really going to become the seat of medical research in the province are, of course, the two university-related hospitals: the University of Calgary and the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. In their new building project, they include a fair amount of specific research space, which isn't present to that degree in other hospitals in the province. So to a degree, research depends on the people the particular institution has on staff. They may go to the federal government for some of its medical research funding, or to their board and thence through to the department for general revenue operating funds. More recently, the third avenue open to them is the heritage medical research fund of \$300 million that was set up. But that's more in the pure research field, and only time will tell if specialists interested in child health care will take advantage of that.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I'd be very interested to know the status of the northern Alberta children's hospital proposal. My colleague the leader indicated that some reference was made by the minister in his earlier remarks. But I raise the question in light of discussions which took place in this committee last year, when I noticed the name of Vote 1, the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital. If my memory is accurate, last year during Heritage Savings Trust Fund legislative committee hearings, the minister and members of the committee discussed this. At that time, it seemed to me — I was going to say "thinly veiled"; that may be unkind — certainly an attempt to make the hospital in Calgary an Alberta children's hospital as opposed to the idea, put forward by people in Edmonton and north, of a northern Alberta children's hospital which, from my point of view, certainly had a considerable amount of merit.

Over the past two to three years, I've been involved in a number of discussions with those people. Quite frankly, we're convinced, one, of their sincerity; secondly, that in fact that's an area we certainly should be looking at as far as this province is concerned. I well recognize that once we start to move in that direction, a great deal of soul-searching is going to have to be done in other major hospitals in the greater Edmonton region. Because as soon as one starts to talk about a northern Alberta children's hospital, you then have people from the major hospitals in the city of Edmonton seeing a portion of their area of service certainly impinged upon.

To start, Mr. Minister, I'd be very interested to hear what's happened from last year until now, from the standpoint of seriously looking at the idea of a northern Alberta children's hospital. Then, to be quite direct, last year we asked the minister to look at this question of the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital in Calgary and make it very clear that that hospital would not really take the place of an Edmonton-based unit, something like the northern Alberta children's hospital, but initially was set out to serve the needs of young people in southern Alberta, if I recall, when it first came out of the trust fund committee about three to four years ago. This has undergone somewhat of a name change; so has what used to be the southern Alberta cancer centre. Then later wisdom prevailed, and the term "Specialty Services Facility" was added, for reasons that I think we all understand. But I haven't heard any legitimate case to change from the initial name to this name for the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, that's a rather complex question with many parts. It's true that an attempt has been made in the board structure to regard the children's hospital in Calgary as having a provincial aspect. For that reason, we appointed a lady from Lethbridge and a young gentleman from Edmonton to serve on the board to try to bring to it more than just a Calgary attitude. It involved replacement of an institution that had been in the city of Calgary for some 65 years in one form or another as a special children's hospital. After a series of studies were done on child health care facilities in southern Alberta, my colleague Mr. Crawford, whom I referred to in my opening remarks, finally gave approval for rebuilding the hospital. In our childhood days, many of us knew it as the Red Cross crippled children's hospital and a whole variety of names. But in any event, there was an attempt for obvious reasons to give it that provincial aspect.

In the first commitment of heritage trust fund dollars to health care capital projects, I think the package designed as a first step made good sense. There was the children's hospital in Calgary; the southern cancer treatment facility in Calgary, with all the attendant things that went with it; and the rebuilding of the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre in Edmonton. We were told by the experts that once those facilities were complete, along with the other hospitals that support them throughout the province, we'd have a very excellent system of health care, and that if something was missing in one city, it was quickly available in the other.

In watching the growth of the children's hospital, it's been quite interesting to see the reaction that's come from other hospitals. Ironically, we had a fairly heated argument and debate between two provincially owned hospitals, both of whose boards had been appointed by the government, debating — I was going to say fighting; maybe that's too strong — the health care services that each institution ought to have. Finally the decision was taken, in the case of Calgary, to close a pediatric ward in the Foothills hospital and put all services of a specialized nature in the provincial children's hospital. I've used that example to point out to people in Edmonton, who are salespeople for the children's hospital for northern Alberta, that that's probably the kind of decision we would have to face here. Because at the present time, there's a surplus of pediatric beds in Edmonton and likely will be for a long time.

So the question is: where can you best provide health care programs for children? Is it within the community-

based hospitals that have the other departments with them, or is it in a separate freestanding structure? As you know, public and professional opinion is pretty widely split on that question. I've referred the latter matter to the Edmonton area hospital planning council, which is made up of representatives of all hospital boards within the Edmonton metropolitan region. Along with the sister body in Calgary, they are trying to develop a long-term plan for bed needs in the two metropolitan areas.

The special question that was given to the Edmonton council was to give consideration to the long-term requirements for pediatric beds in Edmonton for the northern Alberta region, and they are doing that. Hopefully, we'll get some good advice from them when they look at the pediatric requirements within the context of all bed requirements. That still won't respond to the question we'll simply have to answer; that is, to build or not to build a separate children's hospital.

In responding to groups, both the Premier and I have said that we'll get the best and most complete advice we can. If the answer comes out that a hospital is needed or desirable, no doubt it would be built. It would come here as a request for the Legislature to fund such an institution. But at the present time, I would be unable to answer whether or not that is the best way to go. For example, there are more beds in the Royal Alex children's pavilion than there are in the entire children's hospital in Calgary. That gives you an idea of the problems involved in bed numbers. The second issue that would evolve is which hospitals would be asked to close down their pediatric wards, and to what extent, for those particular communities if the children's hospital in Edmonton were to be built.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, if I were thinking in terms of perhaps reflecting upon the time when I had the responsibility of being minister and didn't want to rush into a very quick decision, I think I would have done the same thing you've done in asking the Edmonton area hospital planning group to look at whether there is a need for a children's hospital in Edmonton. Without trying to be the least bit critical of the group involved — I know some of the people who are on the committee, and have respect for their commitment and their abilities — the likelihood of a group like that coming forward and saying there is a need for a northern Alberta children's hospital is extremely remote indeed. Number one, the question of children's facilities is not by any stretch of the imagination at the top of their priority list.

Secondly, as I understand the commitment the group has, they have many other demands on their time as a planning group. The individuals who are on that group, as good and sincere as they are, basically represent various hospitals in the greater Edmonton area. It would be a somewhat strange kind of group that in fact would recommend to the minister that beds be taken from this hospital, that hospital, and other hospitals, and that a freestanding northern Alberta children's hospital be developed. Mr. Minister, I think this is an issue where after a reasonable period of time, a decision to build or not to build, to use your exact terms, is going to have to be made at the ministerial level. I say that because if my memory is accurate, the city of Edmonton and its capacity to serve not only northern Alberta but the northern areas within the Northwest Territories and the Yukon — Edmonton has a unique opportunity to meet a very serious need in that area.

It is true that if we go the freestanding route, a number

of beds that are presently used for children will have to be used in another capacity. Not long ago, when I checked with people at the Calgary Foothills hospital, they assured me quite vehemently that those areas at the Foothills which had been pediatric could be revamped and used for something else. They went to great length to assure me that that wasn't going to be waste space. I'm sure if they can do it in Calgary, they can do that in Edmonton too.

Down the road, after the additional hospital in south-east Edmonton has been built, there will come a time when there will once again have to be additional beds in Edmonton. It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that that's a reasonable time to go the route of a northern Alberta children's hospital. There will be a lot of flak from each hospital board in Edmonton and the university; no question about that. There will be a lot of flak from people from the medical community. But I suggest that that's going to be one of those occasions when the minister of the day will have to bite the bullet and say, we're going to go ahead with a freestanding children's hospital in Edmonton to serve Edmonton, northern Alberta, and those areas north.

Secondly, the commitment will have to be that we'll have to make use of the existing beds for children — certainly not all children's beds but beds for children with very serious problems — in this freestanding facility, and that there will be a need to reallocate beds in the Royal Alex and other hospitals in Edmonton. I'm under no illusion that it's going to come easily. But I would put far greater faith in the minister taking that kind of decision than I would waiting for the Edmonton area hospitals planning group to do it. I'd be very surprised if they ever came forward with that kind of recommendation, because basically that's going to eat away at their own area of responsibility and jurisdiction.

That isn't to say that those people haven't got the best health interests in mind, but it's simply a matter of the reality that that's not going to be a priority with them. I doubt very much that the minister is going to get that kind of advice from the group. Mr. Minister, that's why I make the plea that I think it's important that you, sir, and your cabinet colleagues recognize that the decision is going to have to come from the front bench and is not a decision one can expect to come from the Edmonton area hospital planning group.

MRS. EMBURY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury hopes he will finish in the Legislature on November 30, I suggest he might look at the estimates we are discussing at the present time. According to the book I have in front of me, the money to be voted is for the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital in Calgary. I would like to suggest that the member is slightly off topic. I would hate to have a long debate at this time about the future plans for the Edmonton region.

MR. R. CLARK: Speaking to the point of order, I would never want to be critical of the hon. member who just raised the point of order. But I point out to the hon. member that from a Calgary point of view, to have Vote No. 1 called the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital is a pretty good move in assuring there will be no northern Alberta children's hospital. If one is to raise the point, I think now is the time to raise it rather than let it slide through, and in a few years time say that we already have an Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital.

The minister will recall that I raised this matter a year ago, and that's why I raise the matter again today. For the information of the hon. member, I'm going to be out of here on November 30 whether you are or not.

MR. SINDLINGER: On that point of order as well, if I may please, Mr. Chairman. I think there is a great deal of relevance here for two reasons. One, when the project was initially announced, and since it has been under implementation over these last years, it was in fact called the southern Alberta children's hospital. Of course, the implication there is that if there is a southern Alberta children's hospital, there has to be a northern one. It is like if I got up and said, "the first reason I want to give you is this", that naturally implies there is a second reason. It follows there as well.

The second reason I think it is a relevant point of order is that a question of the adequacy of the southern Alberta facility has to come up as well. We're saying that it has 128 beds. We have to determine whether or not those are fully utilized, what the occupancy rate is, and where the people who are using the hospital are coming from. If a geographical factor is involved here, it has to be taken into account in regard to this vote. It may be we should vote more for this particular hospital, to expand it so it could accommodate the needs of all Alberta, or we ought to be giving consideration to a northern facility as well. So I don't think the question of relevancy ought to come into this matter at all. The question of a northern children's hospital is very relevant to this vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No doubt there is a matter of relevancy here, because we're now into a specific amount to be voted for a specific purpose, which differed from the discussion we had the other evening on Bill 69 which gave us a general amount to be incorporated into the trust fund. So I think the member from Calgary has really raised a legitimate point, and I would say that in my estimation the discussion should be on the Calgary child health centre and the vote that is under consideration.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to your ruling, might I simply say that for the sake of consistency, if my memory's accurate, if you and members of the Assembly went back to the first vote taken with regard to this commitment of funds from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, we would find it was the southern Alberta children's hospital, and that's how the money was initially voted. It first appeared last year, and we raised it at that time. Since that time, what was the southern Alberta children's hospital has now become the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital.

I make the second point, Mr. Chairman, that if one wants to hold to a very rigid view of relevance, one could then make a great argument for the facility in Calgary not being large enough to serve all the needs of the province. I would choose to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that if in fact there is to be a facility in Edmonton sometime in the future, then this appropriation is adequate. But if there is not to be a hospital at Edmonton for northern children, then this vote certainly doesn't meet the needs of the entire province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak in support of what my hon. colleague has said; that is, that at this point in time we are talking about an Alberta facility. So that means we broaden the perspective of the debate from what it was, say, a year ago. In Edmonton

we're saying, is the \$2.97 million adequate to supply all Alberta? My hon. colleague is saying, no, I don't think it is, because Edmonton requires a facility. We did an extensive survey, a questionnaire in Edmonton and district, and citizens in this part of Alberta wholeheartedly supported a northern Alberta children's hospital. Now the government has said that this facility is going to serve the main needs of children in special cases. So we have to look at it on a broader perspective than we did before.

I would certainly appreciate it if the Chairman would look at it on that basis. Because if we just say one facility is planned and don't look ahead a bit as to where the dollars should go . . . maybe that amount should be expanded. As the minister explained, this is a final amount; this will finalize that project. But we're saying, let's examine it; maybe we should be spending a little bit more if there's only going to be one facility in Alberta, and that's in Calgary. If there is going to be another facility, and that's what we're trying to find out from the minister, then maybe this is an adequate sum of money to vote at this time.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, before you rule on that point, I think we're getting off the track here. The question seems to be being raised: is this project adequate to look after children's health care needs in Alberta? That's not the question at all. There are many other hospitals with operating votes that support child health care programs throughout the province, including projects in Edmonton. I said in my earlier remarks that the reason there are so few referrals from north of Red Deer to this hospital is because there are duplicate facilities now in hospitals in Edmonton.

So when you're ruling, the question is not: is this capital project the be-all and end-all for children's health care services in the province. The question that still faces us for the Edmonton region and which, I agree with the member from Calgary, seems to have little to do with this capital appropriation in front of us, is whether or not child health care programs are better located within existing general hospitals, or whether a freestanding separate children's hospital should be built. That's quite different from the point raised by the hon. members.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, please. I think it's trying to be demonstrated here that the health care facility in Calgary has to be ample and adequate for the entire province. The minister has just indicated that that's not the case; it doesn't have to be because there are in fact duplicate facilities in the northern part of the province. I would then think it would be incumbent upon the minister to demonstrate that there are in fact duplicate facilities in the northern part of the province. Exactly what are they, and where are they?

MR. CHAIRMAN: At this time, I feel that the ruling I made previously would have to stand. The question being asked on the matter of adequacy as far as this vote is concerned, deals with the child health centre in Calgary. If the discussion wants to relate to that particular topic, certainly it should be kept in that perspective. The minister has already outlined twice — the last time briefly, I admit — the matter of what other facilities are available for child health care in various parts of the province, and this is the question that was raised by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. But in all fairness, not wanting to restrict debate but not wanting to expand it unnecessarily, I

would have to say that the question under discussion is the construction of the child health care centre in Calgary. The amount to be voted is for that purpose, and the discussion should be related to that particular vote. So I would have to rule the same as I did before.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, what's the name of the vote we're voting under? It isn't the child health care centre in Calgary; it's the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital serving all of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, we have to look at the objective of the vote. It is the fund for the construction of the child health care centre in Calgary. I don't want to enter into an argument regarding this thing. I have made a ruling and, of course, there are procedures you may use if you don't agree with my ruling.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I ask you to leave the Chair. I think we should have a review of the matter because, in my mind, I'm sure the topic is much broader than just one child health centre in the province. We're talking about the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital. When you say "Alberta", that means a facility for all Albertans. So we should be able to raise the question: is this amount from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund adequate to meet the needs? My colleague has made a case that we require another facility in Edmonton called the northern Alberta facility. At this point, as I understand, the sequence of events is that you leave the Chair, we re-call the Speaker, it's raised with him at that time, and he makes a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to Section 54, I presume.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point raised by the hon. members, before we consider the question of whether or not you leave the Chair, I think they've got their committees mixed. The ministers who have these votes appear before a Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee. We appear with our officials in that row of chairs, and committee members sit here, and every question under the sun can be asked about the vote. Surely that's the time these matters should be raised. I can recall very little interest in those matters at that time, and that was only a few months ago. The time has now come in the fiscal year to decide whether or not a capital grant of \$2.9 million should be made to this particular facility. Those other questions were certainly available for discussion and answers in the other committee, and I submit that's where they ought to have been asked.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with equal sincerity, I submit to the minister that if we want to be very actual about it, that other committee discusses the operation of the fund last year. Here, we're being asked: are the funds for this year appropriate? That's totally different.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I understand a motion has been made for you to leave the Chair. According to Standing Order 54, with which you are obviously familiar since you have referred to it, this matter is not open for debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the motion was not made. That's what I was asking the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and we consider the matter at hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the committee, who are perhaps not looking at their *Standing Orders*. Section 54, the motion is that the Chairman leave the Chair. This motion is before the committee. It cannot be debated. It takes precedence.

[Motion lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could continue with the discussion and relate it to the matter being voted on.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, given your ruling and the subsequent vote in the House, and given our inability to determine what is and isn't required and what is in place in the northern part of the province, I therefore ask the minister to go into considerable detail on this vote and the expenditures to date, outlining what services are provided by the construction of the hospital and, in particular, the details of this vote before us today. I'm asking the minister to go beyond the items he identified earlier in regard to change due to inflation, changes in orders, in scope, and equipment requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to refer to earlier transcripts, if I may please. This one is from the heritage fund committee, to which the hon. minister referred earlier and asked why we members of the opposition didn't do our work there. Here is the transcript from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, Wednesday, September 12, 1979. In these transcripts, the minister is asked for the total estimated cost for completion of various projects. The minister did in fact address all the projects which are under his scope of authority.

In regard to the children's hospital in Calgary — and I'm not sure at this time whether it's being called the southern Alberta children's or the Alberta children's hospital; nevertheless it's the one in question — the question was, in essence: what is the total cost of the southern Alberta children's hospital? The minister replied that that cost

... was a fixed-price contract, so that there are no escalation factors in there with respect to inflation

... The question was pursued further, and the minister replied that there were two different total cost estimates at the particular time. One was \$29 million, the other \$29.7 million. The minister went on again and referred to it as "a \$28 million project", and compared that to the \$29.7 million tender price, the \$28 million being that which was announced. The minister then went on again to say that this is a fixed-price contract: "So other than a few extras it shouldn't change."

The reason I bring that up is because it's worth while to compare that to other projects under his supervision. There are five of them. One is the Alberta children's hospital, to which we're referring now. The others are the W.C. MacKenzie Health Sciences building, the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre, and the applied cancer and heart disease research; the last two being research, not construction, projects. Comparing those five projects, it looks like this Alberta children's hospital will have no changes due to inflation.

As a matter of fact, one of the handouts the minister gave to the heritage fund committee just this fall, two months ago, dealt with cost changes and changes in scope. All the projects in here are listed: the Alberta children's hospital, the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and Speciality Services building, and the applied research for cancer and heart disease. All these have changes in scope identified and changes in cost due to inflation. But of the five projects, only one has no change in scope; only one has no change in inflation. That's this particular project.

Just two months ago, September 4, 1981, from D. J. Russell, the minister, to Dr. Ian Reid, chairman of the Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act: the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre has inflation identified. It appears to be an average of about 11 per cent per year over the period 1975 to 1981. The Southern Alberta Cancer Centre appears to have inflation of 10.4 per cent per year over the period 1977 to 1981. Applied cancer and heart disease research both have arbitrarily applied inflation factors of 6 per cent per year. But for the Alberta children's hospital, no inflation factor. Why? Because going back to the transcript of the committee of September 12, 1979, we the members of the heritage fund watchdog committee are told the children's hospital is a fixed price contract. Now, however, we're dealing with an escalation on this project of about 33 per cent.

We were told in the initial stages that we have a project of about \$28 million. Granted, there are changes in scope that bring it up to \$30 million. That's fair and understandable. But until two months ago, we were told that we were still in the range of the original cost estimate, the ballpark price: total approved provincial project cost, \$30,990,955. That's not very far from \$29.7 million; it's only \$1.2 million difference. And on \$30 million for a construction project that I believe has taken over three years, that's not too bad. But suddenly, from September 4 to November 23, we're looking at a total project cost of \$40.5 million which comes from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We're also told this afternoon that there's going to be another \$2,350,705 from other sources. I don't know what the other sources are; perhaps General Revenue Fund, perhaps donations, I don't know. But if you look at that total project cost now, \$40,492,000, and compare that to the fixed contract price of \$29.7 million, that's a change of over 33 per cent.

I guess the major question is: why do we have a major change of 33 per cent, when we're told initially and in the heritage fund committee that this project is worth \$29.7 million? Now suddenly we're at \$40 million. If there was going to be escalation, why wasn't it included in comparison to these other projects, the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre? I don't know why, and that's the question I'm posing to the minister.

But another question came up as the minister was speaking earlier today, in regard to the hiring of a construction management co-ordinator. The minister said that manager was hired after something became apparent. I'm not too certain what that something was, the minister was speaking so quickly. But I'd like to know what was so apparent that a construction manager/co-ordinator had to be hired. Were there cost overruns in certain areas? What were the cost overruns? Were there changes in architectural plans? Who made the decisions, and when were they made? I hate to think of the heritage fund committee and the government making ex post facto decisions in regard to expenditures from the heritage

fund.

I'll leave two questions right now. First of all, in the last two months since September 4, why have we had to go from a fixed price contract, announced initially of \$29.7 million, to a total project cost now of over \$40 million, a cost increase of 33 per cent? If we can't get down to determining the needs for children in northern Alberta as compared to southern Alberta, and I think it's a legitimate comparison, then I think the minister ought to take the time and go into detail and describe the needs this facility is intended to serve: what they have in place now, and whether that's in fact adequate for the children of southern Alberta, in fact for those of all Alberta, now that we no longer have a southern Alberta facility but an Alberta facility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't want to suggest to the minister what he should answer and what he should not, but I still remind the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that the objective statement is fairly clear-cut. The money is for the construction of this centre for diagnostic assessment and treatment of children with complex health problems. However, I'll leave to the minister to decide what he wants to reply.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. members over there are either confused or trying to create a tempest in a teacup. This hospital has always been known by this name. I've got here The Provincial General Hospitals Act, being Chapter 286 of the *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1970*:

- 2(1) The following Provincial General Hospitals are hereby established . . .
(c) the "Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital".

That was done when the opposition was the government; that was their Act. So what's all the fuss about?

Secondly, replying to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo and his concern about cost escalation, if he'd taken the trouble to read the footnote on that memo that I distributed to the committee chairman, it says:

- Note 1. As of August 1981 the department is considering the Board's request for additional project funding attributable to inflation, change orders, and equipment requirements in the amount of \$9.5 million.

That's in addition to the \$30.9 million that was outlined there. He asks where the money's going, so I'll tell him.

The total provincial approved project costs were \$30,990,955. Moneys that were expended in '77-78 were \$4,604,207; '78-79, \$10,855,825; 1979-80, \$7,169,142; 1980-81, \$5,701,539; and to September 1981, \$2,660,422; giving a total of \$30,990,955. So the funds available at October 1 were nil. On April 1 this year, the projected expenditures provided by the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital were: phase one, school construction, \$2,024,083; furniture and equipment for the school, \$395,917; giving a phase one total of \$2,420,000. Phase two, hospital construction with a parkade underneath: \$25,639,700 for the hospital; \$1,850,000 for the parkade; architects' and various consultants' fees, \$2,497,000; furniture and equipment, \$9 million.

Now I should stop while I'm going down the list and say that that figure has escalated very rapidly from the time the hospital was first broached. In 1977, the furnishings and equipment budget was estimated to be \$3,400,000. By August 15, 1980, the same estimate was inflated to \$6,897,000, and on March 31, 1982, it's esti-

mated that it would be \$9 million. That's the escalated figure we have for equipment in there. I believe the reasons for inflation for this highly sophisticated medical equipment, much of which comes from offshore is apparent, but I could go into that. Landscaping, \$400,000; upgrading and renovation to the existing building, \$387,000; construction management, \$430,000; commissioning, \$250,000; for a total project budget of \$42,873,700, less a contribution of \$1,840,705 from the Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, that foundation is a holding structure for contributions made by a variety of sources, all the way from grateful families and relatives of ex-patients to people who just have an interest in the institution. That foundation donated \$1.8 million. There's an estimated federal sales tax rebate, which of course is available to all these kinds of projects, of \$540,000. So the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund funding required as of this date for finalization of the building, including the commissioning and the furnishing of it, which were not in the fixed construction tender amount, is \$40,492,995.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand now the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund first annual report, 1976-77. On page 46, it quite clearly says, under "New Health Care Facilities", "Southern Alberta Children's Hospital". I now have in my hand the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund 1977-78 annual report. On page 35, it quite clearly says, under "Health Care Facilities and Applied Health Research", "Southern Alberta Children's Hospital". Mr. Chairman, I now have in my hand the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund 1978-79 annual report. On page 50, under "Health Care Facilities and Applied Health Research", it quite clearly says "Southern Alberta Children's Hospital". Mr. Chairman, I now have in my hand the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund 1979-80 annual report. On page 34, it quite clearly says, "Southern Alberta Children's Hospital".

Mr. Chairman, I now have in my hand the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund 1980-81 annual report. On page 42, it says "The Alberta Children's Provincial General Hospital". So, Mr. Chairman, of the five annual reports published by whomever — I presume the Provincial Treasurer — dealing with the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, four clearly identify this project as the southern Alberta children's hospital. Mr. Chairman, it's not good enough for the minister to stand up and say that this project was contemplated in the days of Social Credit, and it had a different name. [interjections]

MR. RUSSELL: I didn't say that.

MR. SINDLINGER: Here we have a publication of this government that says this is the southern Alberta children's hospital. Certainly, that has to bring questions to mind, about the need for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has under discussion a matter that isn't a matter of the vote. The naming or the designation of the hospital is not what we have under discussion today. We're talking here about a sum of money to be voted for a specific purpose. The name of the hospital, and the change of name, could be a matter for question period or some other day, but not under this vote.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I only appeal the decision you have made, in that in debate in the Legislature the minister came to that conclusion. He said, now look, this is final evidence; I have an Act of 1970 which says this is the name of the hospital. In fairness, as our Speaker of the Assembly shows quite often in question period — we in the opposition start a debate, then I think the minister has the right to debate back or vice versa. It happens many times; there is much precedent for it. My hon. independent colleague has said, look, a comment has been made; I have information contrary to that. I think he should be allowed to present it.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to give information to the committee, but I'm really having trouble finding out what their bloody hang-up is today. Is there some misunderstanding of which project we're talking about? I think it's in the hon. member's constituency. Is there anybody in the room who doesn't know what building we're talking about. If there is, I can lead them by the hand and we'll go and look at it. I think everybody knows.

There seems to be some problem about the name. Contrary to what the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo said, I did not say this project was contemplated by the former government. I said the Act naming it, back as long as when the former government was in office, clearly named it the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital. It's been called a variety of names. When I went to the official opening, the hospital board passed out brochures which made specific reference to the southern concept of the thing. It's been called a variety of names. I have their last letterhead here. On their letterhead they call it the Alberta children's hospital. They've dropped the word "Provincial" and the word "General". That's what the board themselves are using for their official letterhead. I suppose there are five or six names.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo was first concerned about a memo I'd put out in August; he hadn't read the footnote. Now he's confused about what the name is. I don't know if he's quite sure what project we're talking about. Surely, the important thing is that a grant is being asked for this facility this year to finish construction.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised you let the minister use what I would consider to be a profanity, when he refers to something as being "bloody". I think that's clearly disparaging. [interjections] Nevertheless, we'll have to let it pass as being one of the minister's infrequent indiscretions.

Let me go on to another point. Mr. Chairman, I should point out that the children's hospital is in Calgary Buffalo. It's on 17th Avenue and Crowchild Trail.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bravo.

MR. SINDLINGER: I wasn't sure all of you knew where it was. Of course, the minister brought up the point; he said he's not too sure you all know. I'm telling you all now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

AN HON. MEMBER: We were wondering if you knew.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I beg to differ with the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I don't believe the hospital is on the Crowchild; it may be directly east of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually, the location of the hospital itself is another factor we're not considering in this vote. Perhaps we could leave that and go on to some other topic.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'd hate to have that poor old hospital mislocated. I'm certain it's in Calgary Buffalo. It wouldn't be the first time a hospital has been mislocated. I know the member's been at the Foothills hospital. I might point out to her that I was a surveyor for the Alberta government when I was in university, and I did a location survey on the Foothills hospital. Could you believe it was built 15 feet out of place. That nice big hospital built 15 feet out of place. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could get back to the matter of the vote.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'd like to, Mr. Chairman, but I get interrupted so often that I have difficulty getting back. Notwithstanding the fact that they built the Foothills hospital in the wrong place, I'm sure they have the Alberta children's hospital in the right place. I thought it was generally said it was on Crowchild Trail. My constituency office is just a few blocks down from the hospital. I might point out to the member . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: You're wasting time, you know.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm sorry, I don't want to waste any more time, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to point out that I am familiar with the project. The minister was questioning whether I did in fact know what project we were talking about. Well, I do drive by that hospital many times a day. I wanted to point that out because my constituency office is right there, and my home is just on the other side. I have watched the development or construction of that project with a great deal of interest over the years. As a matter of fact, I was a frequent visitor in the hospital prior to any new construction being undertaken. When I was a small child, one of my best friends was in that hospital.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

In all those years I drove by that hospital and the construction, one thing I observed was that there was no way one could determine who was paying for or building it. It is a very nice facility. No one here is questioning the need for it. Certainly there is a need, and a demand is being satisfied by the structure today. One thing we always wonder about in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is how we identify Heritage Savings Trust Fund projects. All the years that was under construction, big signs outside indicated who the contractors and subcontractors were, and who was doing this and who was doing that. But there was no way one could tell that the money for the project was coming from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That may surprise this member here, but that's in fact true. It wasn't until the final stages of the project, just prior to its opening, that a supplementary sign was put up that said this project was being funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I'd like to come back to the memorandum the minister provided to the committee. But before I do, since I'm on this other point, I might ask the minister what has been undertaken to ensure that future visitors and users of the hospital will be able to identify whether it was paid for by Heritage Savings Trust Fund money? Over the last two years, the watchdog committee has passed recommendations saying when a project is undertaken with heritage funds, there should be something to identify that particular project for the public. We've attempted to do that in certain instances; for example, the grain hopper cars. They are painted bright blue and yellow, the heritage fund colors, and they have the logo printed on them. It's hard to miss the fact they were purchased with Heritage Savings Trust Fund money.

Other projects, of course, have a difficulty; for example, the Minister of Environment brought this up in talking about a dam. He said it certainly wouldn't be appropriate to put a six-inch plaque on a dam and say this was funded by the heritage fund. And I don't think it would be appropriate either, Mr. Chairman, to paint the children's hospital Tory orange and yellow either. They are nice colors and they catch the eye, but certainly it wouldn't be compatible with the other buildings around it. Before getting back to this memo, maybe I could simply ask the minister what has been done to ensure that people who visit the hospital and use it in years to come will be able to readily identify the fact that it was constructed through the use of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, if I'm not mistaken, at least one of the plaques in the main lobby does identify the Heritage Savings Trust Fund involvement. The hon. member is quite correct; it would not be appropriate to do some of the garish things he suggested for this particular building. It's my understanding that the information brochures available for people visiting the hospital or people who have friends or family staying there, make reference to that, as well as the ongoing advertising program being carried out to give information to citizens of Alberta about where their heritage trust funds are going. I was there on opening day, and I know there was heavy emphasis on the fact that this was heritage trust fund money and where that money came from.

MR. PAYNE: While we're in committee, I'd like to direct a question to the minister. It's been drawn to my attention by more than one constituent that some families residing in south Calgary have mistakenly taken children who are in need of emergency treatment to the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital, under the mistaken notion that the hospital does have a fully equipped and fully operational emergency facility, and have in fact been redirected to other hospitals that are so equipped. While we're in discussion of this vote, I wonder if the minister could speak to that misconception and whether there will be any provision, now or in the future, to remedy the apparent difficulty.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the experience the hon. member refers to is happening during this transition period, related to the fact that one hospital is closing down its pediatric facilities while another is expanding. I'm advised that the emergency ward will be fully operational by March 1982. The expanded emergency service is located in that additional shelled-in space, the west extension of \$1.3 million that I referred to in my summary of

expenditures. So for the time being, until that is fully functional and fully staffed — they do have a nurse on duty who can see the patient and if there's bleeding, stop the bleeding or do other temporary emergency things of that nature — they are redirecting emergency cases to the Foothills hospital until next March.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the review of this vote, the minister referred to a construction management co-ordinator. The minister indicated there were very apparent reasons for this step, but he didn't go into those reasons. I wonder if the minister might address his attention to that particular point and identify for the Members of the Legislative Assembly why it was necessary to hire a construction management co-ordinator; not only identify the reasons, but perhaps the point in time when the construction management co-ordinator was hired, by whom, and to whom he reported.

MR. RUSSELL: The construction manager was hired by the hospital board and reports to the hospital board. I don't know the exact date; it was about a year ago. But that can be checked if necessary. I referred to the way this contract had grown, first with the fixed sum tender for the main building; later naturally, in a project of this size and scope, there are going to be some change orders. Additions were approved by the government, which went beyond the scope of the original tender and, of course, there's the commissioning phase and all the equipment to purchase. Frankly, all those things resulted in a substantial delay in getting the building finished, in conjunction with the fact that the hospital was getting into difficulties with respect to the severe construction work stoppages that had occurred during the summer of 1980 when construction activity was at its peak, as was the case in many projects in the Calgary area during that time.

Last but not least, was getting the hospital into the commissioning stage, which is quite an onerous task. Quite frankly, I'm told that the management of the hospital just found it too big a job to carry on keeping the hospital operating and still undertake the construction responsibilities that resulted for the reasons I've just outlined. For that reason, they did hire a construction manager. Quite frankly, I think it was the right move.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, the minister has indicated that this construction management co-ordinator was hired just about a year ago. If it was just about a year ago, it seems to me that most of the project had been completed, or at least most of the votes or expenditures made. For example, the comparable '81-82 estimates we have are \$9.2 million. For this year, that is \$2.9 million or almost \$3 million; the total project cost, \$42,873,700.

Obviously, at least 80 per cent of the project had been completed by the time this construction management co-ordinator was hired. The expenditures we're looking at now, this \$9 million that has yet to be expended, or \$2.3 [million], I'm not too sure — I'm sorry, the minister went a little too quickly for me to get that down. Nevertheless, the point is that this construction management co-ordinator was hired after most of the construction was done, it seems to me. Certainly phase one was completed. But now it looks like about \$4 million is going to phase two construction.

I'm looking at the memorandum the minister provided to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee on September 4, 1981. I'm looking at the Alberta children's hospital, Calgary, report on costs. I believe the minister is

following me as I go along here. The costs in that table add up to \$30,990,955. But a few minutes ago, the minister just gave us what I believe is an update of that. I couldn't get all the numbers, but under construction for phase two, the number given to the committee on September 4, was \$21,948,460. I understand it's now \$25,639,700.

I can't get a reaction from the minister, but I presume that \$4 million of this remaining expenditure to get us from \$31 million up to about \$43 million, is still on construction. The parkade is increased by half a million, the architect and consultant fees by about \$300,000, and landscaping has increased \$100,000. The equipment, of course, was the big item: furniture and equipment went from \$3,400,000 to \$9 million. If we look at those numbers, it looks like there is only about \$4 million left for construction, and the total construction cost was about, say, \$26 million. So on that particular one, it looks a little bit like shutting the barn door after the animals have all got out.

I wonder if the construction management co-ordinator was hired to remedy problems or to prevent them in the future. Since most of the construction had been completed in any case, it appears that the construction management co-ordinator was hired to fix those things which had already been done. If they require fixing after just having been done, one would wonder what the problem was with them, why they had to be fixed up. So again I ask the minister if he wouldn't mind addressing that construction management co-ordinator, inasmuch as most of the construction appears to be complete. Certainly, from driving by it every day, it looks like almost all the exterior construction is completed. Perhaps there is interior construction. That might be in regard to the renovations in the older part of the building. Is the construction management co-ordinator working on the renovations of the older building as opposed to new construction?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is quite correct. The construction manager has been on the job longer than I indicated. He was there in the '78-79 fiscal year. During the '78-79 fiscal year, \$76,504 was spent on construction management. The reasons the construction management company was hired are still as outlined. I was simply reading those from a written briefing I've been given. In '79-80, construction management fees were \$161,553, and in '80-81, they were \$167,256. So the total to March 31, 1981, was \$415,886. That's where that figure comes from.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister: was one of the responsibilities of the construction management co-ordinator who was hired, to monitor expenditures to ensure that those things being done by contractors met the specifications and design drawings?

MR. RUSSELL: On this job, as with all others. Mr. Chairman, the usual array of people, like architects' and other consultants' representatives, were visiting the job. I'm not sure, but I believe a clerk of the works was also on this. Of course the construction management job goes beyond the kind of limited job that the clerk of the works or consultant inspectors have. Inspectors from the department were also visiting the site from time to time and going over cost claims, invoices, and those kinds of things. But when you mention specific things the con-

struction manager was doing, he was managing the project.

I don't know how to put this well, but the particular firm hired to do the job was involved in a number of change orders on this job, which proved very difficult in the end; in fact, it came to the point of pending legal action before those change orders were settled to the satisfaction of both sides. In addition to that, there was the very serious delay brought about by work stoppages in the construction season of summer 1980. So those are some reasons for those things.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, two questions. First of all, in regard to the clerk of the works — and there's so much noise in here, I couldn't figure out if that was the terminology used. Could the minister indicate what the clerk of the works is and to whom he or she is responsible? Was the clerk of the works responsible to the Alberta government, to the hospital board, the architects, or whomever?

Following along, the minister indicated that they were on the verge of — if the words are right — pending legal action. I ask the minister: if legal action was pending, by whom and for what?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, again, I'm not sure if we're supposed to go to past fiscal years on this. This discussion has certainly been very wide-ranging. It doesn't deal with the vote in front of us. Frankly, I have trouble addressing some questions to the terms of reference of this committee, which is being asked to transfer one grant to a capital project for the fiscal year beginning next April.

As with everybody involved in the grant for this project, the clerk of the works is responsible to the owner of the hospital, which is the board.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The minister is quite right in his interpretation that we are supposed to be looking at the amount of money to be voted for the 1982-83 estimates. The rules are quite specific, too, that some questions are being asked before the minister took over that particular responsibility in his portfolio. He cannot be answerable for some questions being asked.

MR. SINDLINGER: Well, I don't want to range too far afield on this particular vote, Mr. Chairman. But before members of the Legislative Assembly vote on this particular vote, I want to ensure that they have all the details before them in regard to past expenditures. Because what we're really doing right now in regard to this project is saying, let's stop right here and review what's gone on in the past. If we can assure ourselves that this project has been undertaken and executed in a prudent, responsible manner, then of course our conclusion will be, yes, let's vote on this and appropriate the funds for the minister to carry on.

However, if the minister cannot address these questions in regard to prudent and responsible management and execution in implementation of the project, perhaps we might have second thoughts before providing more funds to carry on with it. So I think it would certainly be in the best interests of the minister, also in our best interests in fulfilling our responsibilities, to ensure that we do know what happened to funds already appropriated for this particular project. I'm asking these particular questions to that end.

I don't think the question of pending legal action was

addressed by the minister, though. If pending legal action was contemplated, by whom and in regard to what?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, just responding to those two points. That's exactly my point; I said it before. If the hon. member is concerned about past expenditures, a select committee of the Legislature sits here every summer to go over all these projects with a fine-toothed comb, just as Public Accounts does the general revenue expenditures. That's the time to ask all these questions. We are now in Committee of Supply. According to the rules of our House, we're supposed to be addressing a future vote. If you want to ask questions about the past, I was here this summer with all my officials. We could have told you everything under the sun that you wanted to know. But you didn't want to know it then. And I don't know why you want to know it in committee today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could the minister please use common parliamentary language.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

The second thing: who was legal action pending between? Between the general contractor, Foundation Company, and the hospital board. The matter in dispute was change orders and delays brought about by those change orders, plus the construction strike.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. minister made a statement with regard to Committee of Supply. Rule 47 of the House, "There shall be a committee of the whole Assembly called the Committee of Supply", certainly doesn't set out any terms of reference as to what the discussion should be. The other day, we had a discussion with regard to relevance of material. The definition of relevance is very flexible, in that it's a judgment of the Chair, of the committee assembled — the Committee of Supply, Committee of the Whole, or whatever committee. In terms of our *Standing Orders*, there is no statement — nor in *Beauchesne*, nor I believe in *Erskine May* — that in talking about supply, we can only talk about the use of money in the future. I think the terms of reference are much more flexible and much broader than that, and it would be unfortunate if we took that definition at this time. If the chairman or any member of the Assembly can point to a definition different from that, then I'd be willing to review the position I've just taken. But I don't know of that definition so enunciated by the minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In response to the point of order of the Leader of Opposition, I draw the hon. leader's attention to Section 52 of our *Standing Orders*, which is very specific. Subsection (1) says that the rules of the Assembly shall be observed in committee. Then I'd draw attention that we are here today to vote a certain amount of money for the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I can only say that in order to determine the future expenditure, we must talk about present and past accountability. I think that's part of discussion. To say I can only talk about where this dollar is going is limiting the discussion to any item on which \$2,970,000 is spent. At the same time, we have no discussion on the other some \$40 million. Your predecessor who was in the Chair a short time ago said very clearly to us that we're talking

about a child health centre in Calgary and that should be our focus of discussion. He said we couldn't talk about a northern one, but we could talk about a child health care centre in Calgary. Now we're even limiting that discussion to the objects outlined very carefully and very well to us by the minister, in terms of the items under consideration. As I recall, those were with regard to upgrading of the old facility, additional cost of equipment, renovation, and construction. These were delineated very carefully. If that's the Chairman's ruling, I think we have two different rulings. A few moments ago, your predecessor said this; now you're in contradiction. I think we should clarify where we really stand.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, an observation on the points of order being discussed at the present time. I think it was observed before how difficult it is to apply a rule of relevancy, and everyone will concur in that. Of course that means that in specific instances, a ruling must be made. That ruling is based on what may well be a flexible interpretation, but it zeros in on the specifics being raised at the time.

Insofar as it is within the abilities of any members here to aid the Chair in determining what is relevant and in making argument directed to that point and urging a particular interpretation in respect of a specific discussion as to whether it relates sufficiently to the subject, it should be observed that what is relevant on any resolution — I use the word "resolution" in the broad sense of whether it be a Bill, a resolution, or any other proposal that is in one or another of the various correct forms to submit to the Assembly or to a committee — is based on what that resolution or other proposal says. If within the terms of that resolution or other proposal you cannot find the matters raised in discussion about it, then those matters are not relevant. That would be the closest I could come to trying to assist the Chair in nearing a definition in regard to relevancy.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order, it's not the first time it has come up over the last little while and I expect it won't be the last. Nevertheless, in my opinion the ruling given to us the other day by the Chair pretty well covered it all. The Chair ruled in regard to the point of order brought up by the Member for Three Hills. The member indicated then that she wasn't quite certain what relevancy was in the particular item being discussed. It was further debated by the Member for Calgary Fish Creek. They both referred to Section 52 of *Standing Orders*, in particular Subsection 2. For the benefit of those members who do not have it before them, that section says that:

Speeches in committees of the whole Assembly must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

The Chairman at the time referred to *Beauchesne* and to *Erskine* as authorities. In regard to relevancy, the Chairman referred to Citation 299, which reads:

- (1) Relevancy is not easy to define. In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt.
- (2) The rule against repetition is difficult to enforce as the various stages of a bill's progress give ample opportunity and even encouragement for repetition. In [fact], wide discretion is used by the Speaker and the rule is not rigidly enforced.

The Chairman at the time referred to Standing Order 52(2), dealing with strict relevancy, and to *Beauchesne*,

Citation 299, dealing with relevance and repetition. After having referred to those two authorities, the Chairman went on to rule that he as well as the Deputy Chairman of committees had had difficulty in discerning exactly what the relevancy of the debate was, but having referred to *Standing Orders* and the benefit of the doubt which is given to the [member] concluded, in my interpretation, that since the subject was so broad and general in nature, there was indeed broad scope to do these things.

The conclusion I would like to make is that inasmuch as this matter has been discussed at length by various members of the Legislative Assembly, and that we have been given a ruling, at this time we have a precedent for us to follow. The precedent is simply that it is very difficult to establish what is and what is not strictly relevant or repetitious, therefore the benefit of the doubt has to be given to the member debating a particular issue.

In this case, it seems to be very straightforward to me. I don't think it makes much sense for us to debate strictly the vote in front of us; that is, the particular number, \$2,970,000. The first two natural questions that flow from a vote are these. One, what is the money to be used for? That's quite straightforward; we've addressed that question. I don't know that we've covered it in its entirety, but we have addressed it and will continue to until we are satisfied that we have solved it.

The second most natural question that flows from any vote after what it is to be used for is what has been done with the money in the past. Certainly in making a judgment about what is to be done with the money in the future, one has to ascertain what was done with the money in the past. It is not difficult to conceive that perhaps money was taken and not used. We found instances in other votes where, on a consistent basis over six years, votes appropriated amounted to twice as much as was actually required by the department.

I think it's incumbent upon us to ask those two questions. More than it being incumbent upon us in the opposition to ask those two questions — what the money is for, and what has it been used for — is the responsibility that has been assumed by the government, the liability it assumed when it took responsibility for its acts, to answer those questions in the greatest detail possible and to take the time to answer them, to ensure there is no question or misunderstanding on the part of us in the opposition or anyone else in the province of Alberta.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some further observations. What the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has raised has really highlighted and made much more clear what is involved in the point of order in regard to relevancy, so far as it deals with estimates in a general way and in particular so far as it deals with estimates of the nature of the capital projects division spending estimates.

I'd like first to make an observation in regard to the citation from *Beauchesne*; I know this will have occurred to the Chairman, in any event. Any argument made, that the benefit of the doubt is resolved in favor of a member who raises something in a borderline matter, must depend on the fact that the Chairman has exercised a judgment on what has been raised at that point, applies the reasonable doubt, and then decides whether or not the member who is, by way of argument, being said to be out of order, is in fact entitled to the benefit of the doubt. It doesn't say you must at all events let him do as he pleases; it says he is to be given the benefit of the doubt.

When a member is found to be irrelevant, and the

Chairman says he has taken into account the question of whether there is any doubt and decided in his own mind that there is no doubt about relevancy, then clearly the ruling is that it's out of order. I don't think any attempt should be made to create a rule which goes so far as to say that the Chair loses control over the situation simply because the rule book that we refer to so often, with great respect, raises the question of reasonable doubt. So it's the matter of being satisfied in that respect. That's done all the time in all sorts of proceedings. Of course, one has to be satisfied in regard to his doubts before making a ruling.

But more importantly, Mr. Chairman, I want to take strong exception to the suggestion that past estimates are relevant. They were relevant when they were passed. Hon. members here collectively approved the ones in the previous column and asked questions about them at that time. To say that the first two questions may well be: how will the \$2.97 million in this particular appropriation be spent — I agree that's the first question; that is why we're here, and the questions relative to that are indeed relevant. But to then go further and say it's proper in any sense to raise the question of how previous moneys were spent, is absolutely wrong.

Out of respect for what I believe to be the good intentions and the conscience of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I will say that he probably doesn't know that. Otherwise, I don't think he would make the argument. He probably doesn't know how irrelevant that is. The proper place to examine past expenditures is in Public Accounts or, in cases like this, they can certainly be raised by way of some questions in the committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But to say that a matter that has already been dealt with by the House and relates to funds which have previously been appropriated — how many times do we have to appropriate the same funds? Once. To say that it's proper to open up everything in respect to past expenditures is, of course, a wrong approach.

If I might, I'd like to use an illustration. In the normal discussion of estimates, the current estimate is often compared with the previous one, usually on the basis of why 40 per cent more money is required for that purpose this year than last year, or why have you provided for only 20 per cent less this year than you provided last year in respect to a particular estimate? At that point, an answer is being sought by way of comparison. For what purpose? For the purpose of this year's estimate. Whenever that question comes up — why is it more; why is it less — it is because the question relates to this year's estimate, not because it relates to some other year's estimate, even if it be so recent as last year. The temptation to ask questions one forgot to ask a year ago no doubt is there, but it's not a relevant matter. [interjections]

The interruptions I'm now getting from the hon. Member for Clover Bar, Mr. Chairman, satisfy me of the fact that he is so persuaded of what I've said, that he can't think of anything else to do but interrupt.

DR. BUCK: [Inaudible] Mr. Chairman. I was waiting for him to start.

MR. CRAWFORD: Okay, I'm back on the record, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the hon. Member for Clover Bar for saying that he continues to look forward to listening to what I have to say.

Mr. Chairman, I've made my point. In respect to past

estimates, I just want to say again that of course they're used to a certain extent in regard to making comparisons for the purpose of asking questions that are relevant to this year's estimates. There's no question about that. But to raise the question: how was last year's estimate spent, and to raise it in a motion which is to appropriate other funds, is irrelevant. I think all hon. members know that.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in response to what we've just heard from across the floor — the comment about the Member for Calgary Buffalo being "absolutely wrong". Well, if the Member for Calgary Buffalo was absolutely wrong, I think he is standing in very good company, and I will refer to two things that would support what I've just said.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, in regard to referring to past estimates, this estimate we have before us today, the '82-83 estimates of proposed investments, itself has in it comparable past estimates for 1981-82. So clearly, it's the intention of whoever prepared this — and I presume it's the government — that reference be made to past experiences; in this case, past estimates, past expenditures.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman . . . [interjections] I thought interruptions came only from this side of the floor. Now we have them from over there.

Mr. Chairman, again in regard to this point, no less an authority than the Auditor General makes this recommendation:

. . . in the interests of improved accountability to the Legislative Assembly and more effective budgetary control, appropriation bills should be supported by more extensive financial information on major capital expenditure projects.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the Auditor General is incorrect in saying that, nor do I think, in the words of the Attorney General, that the Auditor General is absolutely wrong. I don't believe the Auditor General is absolutely wrong.

He goes on to say that the information that should be included on these major capital expenditure projects are, one, "details of the original estimated costs and scope of each project"; two, "cost and scope revisions"; three, "costs incurred to the end of the previous fiscal year"; four, "current year forecast"; five, "expenditures to be appropriated for the next fiscal year"; six, "estimated future year costs to completion and"; seven, "the total estimated cost for each project". Clearly, Mr. Chairman, these are the questions we've been asking this afternoon. The Auditor General says we should be asking these questions so there will be improved accountability. Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Auditor General was absolutely wrong.

I'd like to refer to one more authority who said, in regard to the printed estimates of expenditure, that review of such information can be elicited from the minister responsible by means of questions during Committee of Supply. Mr. Chairman, in regard to all those questions, the seven questions the Auditor General said we should be asking — and we have been asking them — this other authority said they should be asked during Committee of Supply and the minister will respond to them. I don't think the person who said that is absolutely wrong either. I don't think the Auditor General is absolutely wrong. I'm willing to stand by what the Provincial Treasurer has said.

The Provincial Treasurer has said that during Committee of Supply, review of this information can be elicited

from the minister responsible by means of questions. Until the point when we interrupted on the point of order, the minister was doing his best to answer them as fully and as satisfactorily as he could, and we were putting supplementaries to him. He's really very tolerant and very helpful. At least we haven't got to the point of asking the minister how many pence were bought and how many used, as that minister once did when he was in this exact position.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I draw to the hon. member's attention that this has been debated since the Committee of Supply started sitting in mid-October. In my duties as Chairman, I have called members because of the rules of our House. I draw members' attention to 52(2). Regarding debate on estimates from last year and years previous, we don't allow that in Committee of Supply when we go over the general estimates for the operation of the government *per se*. That has not been allowed in this House at other times. The estimates that are studied and looked at are the ones for the particular year where moneys are going to be spent.

MR. NOTLEY: Always in the light of what's gone before.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That's what I'm saying: in light of what's gone before. To my knowledge, I don't recall estimates being discussed of money that has been spent. We have a select committee of this Legislature, Public Accounts, that looks into that. We also have the select committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that can question where moneys have been spent in various areas.

The Deputy Speaker ruled the other night that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo should continue, that he was being relevant to the question being asked. It was on a different set of estimates, and he was coming back to that. But today, they have been straying away from why we are here: to vote a certain amount of money for the Alberta children's provincial hospital in Calgary.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of difficulty understanding the ruling you've just made. I believe you have just said to us that in the consideration of these estimates, we cannot make reference to past estimates. Now if that's true, I submit to you that there is no purpose whatsoever in continuing with these present estimates because there is no way that the government can be held accountable and responsible for its actions. There is no way that this Legislative Assembly can give approval for further expenditures, until we are thoroughly satisfied that the moneys used to date have been used in the most responsible manner and have been thoroughly accounted for. Until we can address that matter, there is no way that we can go on to the future estimates.

In regard to your opening comments about basing your ruling on what's gone before. I must admit that I have been here only three years. But in those three years, whether it's been consideration of the estimates for the heritage fund or consideration of the estimates for the budget, members have invariably and consistently got up and discussed matters that dealt not only with the future expenditures but also those expenditures incurred in the past. If you want a clear case of *stare decisis*, that has to be it. It defies all logic whatever to say that in the consideration of these estimates, in the consideration of spending for the future, no account can be taken of the

past. That's beyond my comprehension. I submit to you that outside this Legislature, it would be difficult for many of the people of the province to accept that as well.

MR. NOTLEY: On the point of order, I would ask the Chairman to defer making a final decision until he's had an opportunity to review it.

First of all, I say to the members of the committee that it ill behooves the government members to raise this point at this time. Several weeks ago, we had the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources read verbatim into *Hansard* an agreement that had been signed some years before with an oil company. I didn't notice any hon. members of the committee on the government side or the Chairman jumping to their feet to say, point of order, point of order, how could that possibly be read into the record. It was read into the record. [interjections]

MR. CRAWFORD: Why didn't you raise the point?

MR. NOTLEY: Because, Mr. Chairman, to the Government House Leader, our view of the estimates is that questions that relate to the past are relevant when we consider future expenditures by this Legislature and this committee. For the very reason the Member for Calgary Buffalo and the hon. Leader of the Opposition have been advancing their arguments, we did not object to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources spending over two hours reading a contract into the record. But, Mr. Chairman, for members of the government at this stage of the game to suddenly take the rule book and apply it in the most narrow way would be laughable.

The Chairman last week made the point, and I thought it was extremely relevant, citing 299 of *Beauchesne*. I don't think there can be any question about what that says:

Relevancy is not easy to define. In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt. Perhaps it was a borderline case, that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources read into the record an entire contract, signed some years ago. But we gave him the benefit of the doubt, properly so. Perhaps it's a borderline case that some of the questions that have been asked by both sides of the House may be pushing relevancy. But the members must be given the benefit of the doubt.

I say to the members of this committee that the public business of Alberta will not be served by a narrow definition or interpretation of the rules. I would just say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the judgment made by your colleague last week was, in my view, fair and appropriate. I ask you, before making your final decision, sir, to keep that in mind.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Clover Bar was . . .

MR. CRAWFORD: I know the hon. Member for Clover Bar would like to address the same issue. But given the time and the fact that we can't stop the clock in committee, I'd be quite prepared to look for you, Mr. Chairman, to recognize him first at such time as the committee may reconvene, and move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. SPEAKER: Is the reference to regulations intended, or was it estimates?

MR. PURDY: Did I say regulations, Mr. Speaker? Sorry, I should have said: the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the report and the request for leave to sit again?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will not sit tonight. I move that the House now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the question on the motion for adjournment, I wonder if I might be permitted to reply to the inquiry of the hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon concerning a person who was escorted out of I'm not sure which gallery. My information is that this person concealed a sign somehow or other, got past the commissionaires at the door of the gallery, then displayed the sign, and was asked to leave and escorted out.

I suppose we have to say that if people are going to come into the galleries displaying signs, placards, sandwich boards, and things of that kind, we're going to have to adopt some standing orders regarding the size and substance of them.

[At 5:29 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

