

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, May 24, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to table five copies of the 1983-84 annual report of the Northern Alberta Development Council. Copies will be available for all members of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to have the opportunity to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 26 grade 7 students from Dr. Gladys Egbert community school in the constituency of Calgary McCall. Dr. Egbert community school is probably one of the finest community schools in the province. The efforts that are put into this school by the students, teachers, and parents of the community exemplify the attitude of that particular community.

I would also like to introduce two teachers accompanying the students, Donna Pyle and Shelly Schmidt, along with a couple of parents who have made the trip, Betty Forward and Maureen Molnar. At this time I'd like to ask that they rise and receive the accord of the Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce to you 25 members from the Alberta Vocational Centre situated in Edmonton Centre. They are studying current affairs. They are seated in the members gallery, and they are accompanied by their leader Mrs. Nikolai. Would they please stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 30 grade 5 students from Fulton Place school in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar. They are accompanied by their teacher Adele Wygera and by parents Mrs. Stetsko, Mr. Bjalek, Mrs. Lohnes, and Mrs. Geddes. They're situated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Health Care Premium Arrears

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Did the minister ask his officials to implement a policy of revoking the Alberta citizenships of those who are in arrears with their health care premium payments, or is this a proposal that the minister has been asked by officials from his department to review?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think I know what the hon. member is getting at with that question. It refers to statements

I made earlier in the House with respect to passage of the Canada Health Act, in which I indicated that the province would have to bring in amendments to our existing legislation in order to comply with the requirements of the Act with respect to the health care insurance program. I believe that is what the hon. member is referring to.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm that as of June 30, it will be government policy that those who owe a premium debt will be placed in a doubtful residency category even if they have a perfectly valid permanent address?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure of the intent of that question, but there is notice on the Order Paper of legislation dealing with that matter. It will be introduced very soon, and I'm sure the hon. member's questions will be addressed at that time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, just for clarification. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation regarding this matter at this late date in the spring session?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention. I've indicated that on earlier occasions in the House. It goes back to the matter of the changes we made last fall with respect to the health care premium program, in which persons whose coverage was not up to date were responsible for their own medical bills. Despite the very good success of that program, the Canada Health Act requires us to go back to the system that was in effect before then. That is the nature of the legislative amendment I'll be bringing to the House shortly.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received legal advice on this matter? I want to know specifically how the minister knows this would not violate the Canada Health Act.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little surprised by that question. The whole intention of the amendment is to make sure Alberta does comply with the Canada Health Act. As far as legal advice, the amendments are being drafted by officers of the Legislative Counsel office, and that is the objective of the amendment.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, so there is no confusion at this moment. Will the minister provide the House with his department's definitions of residency and doubtful residency as they apply to medicare coverage?

MR. RUSSELL: Again, those kinds of details will be addressed by the legislation and the regulations that follow.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, so there is not a great deal of confusion among Albertans. Would the minister indicate to this House what other measures the government has in store for Albertans when the Canada Health Act comes into force on July 1?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that if the hon. member can wait to look at the legislation which is given by way of notice on the Order Paper, I'm sure his questions will be answered very shortly.

Perhaps it would be useful if I repeat in the House today what I've said on several previous occasions both in the House

and outside the House. With respect to the health care insurance premium plan, it's essential that 100 percent of the residents receive coverage under the Canada Health Act. That is what the amendments are all about. In essence we're bringing in amendments to revert more or less to the system that was in effect prior to the changes we made last October, which were initiated in order to collect escalating arrears.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister confirm to the Assembly that people who haven't paid their medicare premiums will not be cut off medicare, as has recently been reported in the press?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I can say that all residents of Alberta will receive coverage under the Canada Health Act, as is required by that Act. The premium system will remain in effect, and people with premiums in arrears will be followed by the usual collection methods to get those arrears brought up to date.

Alberta Wildlife Park

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I would like to continue with the line of questioning dealing with written questions and answers. The government information listed a \$35,000 loan from the RPW Foundation to the Alberta Wildlife Park for a project described as: to assist in offsetting payroll deficits. That was in reply to my Motion No. 148. We now have word ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member could come to the question.

MR. MARTIN: I have to explain it first, so he understands it. We now have word from Mr. Jerram ... [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could we please have the question.

MR. MARTIN: Many people are asking questions, and I will continue to do so. Thank you.

The government information says that ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member come directly to the question, please. It is not permitted to have a long preamble to a question.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order. I'm trying to explain a written question that was given in this House, in 148, and trying to explain that some people think that information is wrong, so the minister knows who I'm talking about.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member could direct his question in such a manner as to elicit the necessary information.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Mr. Jerram says that this information is wrong and that payroll deficits were really for animal feed. My question to the minister: is Mr. Jerram correct? In this case, has the government filed incorrect information to an opposition written question?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the question as put, because I can't quite understand it. The answers I provided to the question were those provided to me by the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, which is a Crown

corporation and answers to the department in an annual report. I'd have to check further to see if that was correct or not, and I don't know the answers Mr. Jerram is contesting. I wouldn't have any idea whether it's factual or not, and I'd have to check it out.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. It deals with information from the *Alberta Gazette* of September 30, 1982, which lists two AOC loans totalling \$570,500, for the purpose of refinancing existing debt. Mr. Jerram says these were for construction purposes, linking the loans under question with earlier AOC loans.

My question to the minister: is Mr. Jerram correct, and is the government filing incorrect information, in this case public information through the *Alberta Gazette*?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the information that was filed was information that was gazetted, as were the terms of the loans made by the Alberta Opportunity Company to the client, in that case the Alberta Wildlife Park.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Then the minister is saying that Mr. Jerram's information is wrong.

MR. ADAIR: I'm not necessarily saying that. But I'm not sure what question was posed to the hon. member whose name was mentioned, and then how it was reported. I assume you're talking about the report that was in *The Edmonton Journal*, and they're not necessarily always right.

MR. MARTIN: It's a very serious matter if we're getting incorrect information in this House.

My supplementary question to the minister is, will the minister look into this and report back to the House?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'll confirm again the information that was in the *Gazette*. I read it back in 1980, I believe, and again when it was filed.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, back to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. The reply to Motion 148 also advised that

... the Alberta Wildlife Park received no "concessions, privileges or financial benefits" ... other than what is afforded every other big game farm through the current programs or operations.

My question to the minister is, has the government received any complaints from other wildlife operators about alleged favouritism to Alberta Wildlife Park by this government?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation is not part of government. What they do in their day-to-day operations is outside the purview of the minister or the government, so I don't know how I can respond to that. I've had no inquiries from anybody that we were dealing with one firm in favour of another.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. What assessment has the minister made of the statement of Mr. Al Oeming, who runs the rival Polar Park, that he has received absolutely no money from the government and that he can't understand why the other park gets this money?

MR. TRYNCHY: I guess the hon. member isn't listening, or he doesn't understand. The government did not provide any

funds to the Alberta Wildlife Park through Recreation and Parks.

MR. MARTIN: It's taxpayers' money.

MR. TRYNCHY: No, it's not taxpayers' money; it's funds from lotteries. There's quite a little difference. If Mr. Oeming would make the same request as these people did, he might receive consideration.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sure we'll pass that on to Mr. Oeming. He will be glad to know that he will get this money too.

My concern is the total amount of government money apparently used to develop Alberta Wildlife Park, through a combination of roadway expenditures, AOC loans, recreation grants, and the like. It now totals over \$5 million. My question to the minister is, has the government made this expenditure on the basis of extensive study of the tourist potential for a wildlife park in Bon Accord? Or was any independent study at all made to guide the government on this development, especially a lot of money in a time of restraint?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on Transportation or the Alberta Opportunity Company.

I want to say again that the government provided no funds to that wildlife park through the Department of Recreation and Parks. I want that very clear. The funds were provided through the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, which uses lottery funds for distribution. So it's not public funds or government funds.

The question by the hon. member in regard to transportation should go to the Minister of Transportation.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to respond. The road in question was built not just for the Alberta Wildlife Park. In fact I believe I outlined in the return the amount of traffic that travels on that road, the other industries it serves, and the people it serves. It's quite ridiculous for the hon. member to suggest that all the cost of developing that road should be tagged to the Alberta Wildlife Park. This government builds roads to all kinds of industries and for all kinds of people throughout the province, and the utilization of that road is similar to many that are utilized by other industries. There are examples all over the place in that regard.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, possibly I could supplement some of that too. It may take a moment to refresh some of our memories about the time when the owner of the then wildlife — I'm not sure what it was called at that time; Mr. Oeming's park before it was Polar Park. He was trying to sell it because he had reached the stage of operating a park when he was no longer interested in that. He wanted to sell it to anyone, outside the province or the likes of that.

At that time we as a government suggested we were prepared to help someone in the private sector, whoever that might be, who would come forth with some suggestions. The two gentlemen that now own the Alberta Wildlife Park came forward, put up some of their land, put a great deal of their own money into that particular operation, and purchased a great number of the animals from Mr. Oeming. Unfortunately, in the long term, you now have a Polar Park which is still being operated by the gentleman who at that time said he was not interested in continuing; who in essence did receive some of the wildlife of this province; who, if my memory serves me right, at that particular point in time was also provided with a quarter section of land for a very nominal sum of money, as long as it was to remain

a wildlife park. Should it not remain that, it reverted to the county, I believe it was at the time. Those things should be taken into consideration when you're talking about what is out there.

In essence, the Alberta Wildlife Park received some funds in December from the Department of Tourism and Small Business to assist in winter feed. In the process, we also conducted a study to help and ensure the transition of that park from the owners as they are now to a foundation. That has been public knowledge for some time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to either the Minister of Tourism and Small Business or the Minister of Recreation and Parks, whichever one feels like jumping into the breach. I'm trying to figure out what kind of small business we have here. The AOC loans list the kind of business as Red Barn dine and dance/wildlife park, while the RPW Foundation loans cite the recipient as only the Alberta Wildlife Park. Is primary business development, for which loans total \$5.6 million, being directed to a dine and dance or a wildlife park? What are we into specifically?

MR. ADAIR: Just to show how confused the hon. member is getting ... [interjection] You've got to uncross your eyes.

Mr. Speaker, the \$5.6 million is a total of everything. I stand to be corrected, but I believe the Alberta Opportunity Company loans are — I'm not sure whether it's \$2.1 million or \$2.2 million. I believe those loans were initially made to the Lily Lake Ranch — and I stand to be corrected on that — and the Alberta Wildlife Park. That can be substantiated, and I will do that and bring it back to this House.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the hon. member that reading government propaganda is enough to uncross anybody's eyes. I can assure you of that.

Agricultural Assistance

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture is a follow-up to questions on May 22 with regard to the production credit arrangement, and the minister's reply: we are looking at it. I am wondering if the minister could indicate what the time frame is with regard to that program. Will there be introduction of the program this spring? Or are we looking at the fall or, say, 1985 before a program such as that could become effective?

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty in assessing just what the time frame will be. First of all, there's no model within Canada, to look at how effective it would be. The department, in co-operation with the Alberta Cattle Commission, has been working to develop the production credit concept to see what merit it does in fact have. Before it could go further, it has to have an accurate assessment to see whether or not that proposal would meet the challenges we feel it must. There would also have to be consultation with other farm organizations in the province to be clear on whether that is the vehicle we want to support. In addition to that is the agribond concept that is now being worked on with the federal government. That may or may not change the time frame.

But by the fall, I hope to have a clearer assessment of how this would work and if in fact we have an intention to do it or not.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In terms of the needs of farmers, a lot of assistance

is needed at the moment. I am wondering whether, in the interim, while this other program is being developed, the minister is considering extension of the interest shielding program.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that answer has been clearly defined in the House by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and I refer the question to him.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the program itself has not been extended. The basic reason was that the interest rates were lower than the protected rate in the interest shielding program, although we did extend original applications until May 31; in other words, a person who is eligible and has not applied for the first time for one of those four quarters. That still applies; it's extended till May 31.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture, with regard to the small business equity program. I am wondering if the minister has had discussions with the Minister of Tourism and Small Business with regard to that type of program being extended into the area of agriculture.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I refer that question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Initially I would say, yes, we had discussions on that subject. To an extent, agriculture is in fact covered in that program. I ask the hon. minister to respond.

MR. ADAIR: I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question, please?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It's with regard to the small business equity program announced on May 15 by the minister. Could the minister indicate what parts of that program could apply to the field of agriculture, in terms of assistance to a number of farmers who need help now?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, what we've done — hopefully with the approval of this Legislature, and we're now at second reading of that Bill — is provide as broad a base as possible, to include agriculture and agribusiness in the broad sense. There are some restrictions, and I don't have them at my fingertips. Relending funds, speculation or purchasing land for speculative purposes, investing outside Canada: those are ineligible areas. But from the standpoint of eligible areas, agriculture and agribusiness are eligible.

MR. R. SPEAKER: For clarification, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister saying that through the small business equity program, a farmer in the province could have funds available for operating an agricultural venture as well as for capital expenditures?

MR. ADAIR: Getting back again to the operation of the fund itself, basically yes. In the one broad sense, the funds could be used to stabilize the business, in this case the farm business.

I should point out that it's equity, new share purchase. It's a maximum of 49 percent that an equity company or corporation could purchase in a farm business in this case or, for that matter, any other business that's eligible. It has to be at arm's length. In essence, if any member of the equity corporation has a share in that particular company or farm business, they would not be eligible to purchase up to 49 percent of that particular business. It's new equity, new shares — equity rather than debt, to relieve the pressures of the debt situation we have — and

in essence, the maximum of 49 percent plus the arm's length provision.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying the farmer would have to be registered as a company in order to qualify for the benefits under the small business equity program?

MR. ADAIR: The qualification under the small business equity program — if I can just take a moment, Mr. Speaker. First of all, as either an individual or a group of citizens within the province, you must raise a minimum of \$100,000 in capital for reinvestment in small or medium-sized businesses in the province. Once that is done, you register. Once you register, we require you to put 30 percent in a jointly held trust account in the Crown's name as well as the corporation's name. Then the shareholders of that small business equity corporation, will receive the 30 percent incentive by way of a grant if you're an individual, or a tax credit by way of a document that is an indication you have purchased the shares. I haven't got that term with me right at the moment.

Once you have done that, then obviously where the incentive goes is to the corporation and not to the business. The incentive is to the corporation to then look at investments that may be of a lesser, longer term investment return than the normal, because they would be getting the 30 percent incentive to invest in Alberta's small or medium-sized businesses. So the thrust is to the corporation, to assist it in making corporate decisions as an equity corporation to invest in the business, be it agriculture-oriented or, in the sense of small business, business-oriented.

The maximum amount that can be invested by a private corporation is \$5 million, and by a public corporation \$10 million. The minimum investment in any one year is 40 percent in the very first year and 70 percent after that. I'm getting into some of the detail of it, which becomes somewhat confusing.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on these small business equity companies. I wonder if the minister could comment. I notice that press reports a couple of days ago indicated that, through this strategy, small business development corporations in Ontario had created about 11,000 jobs in Ontario. Does the minister or his department have any projections as to what kind of employment might result from the new initiative on the minister's part?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I have that figure in my office; I don't have it with me. It was prorated down to our population, based on the Ontario situation.

To give you a bit of an aside on the Ontario one, the investment capital that was put together for reinvestment in small and medium-sized businesses in Ontario was roughly \$210 million that was put into the corporations. They then had reinvested about \$200 million of that in small and medium-sized businesses over the last four or four and a half years.

MR. ALEXANDER: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me the Ontario experience also was that the jobs created by this program were at something less than half the cost of jobs created by publicly funded programs. I wonder if the minister might have any comparable statistic. Has he had any indications from his department officials about the efficiency in job creation?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that figure with me, but I would be delighted to get it.

Chiropractic Profession Legislation

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Education deals with Bill 54, the Chiropractic Profession Act. I would like to ask if there is any doubt in his department with respect to getting this legislation under way as soon as possible.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, there has certainly been extensive discussion within the chiropractic profession about some specific sections of the Act, and clearly there has been some disagreement within the profession itself about some specific sections. But it is important to emphasize that the disagreement is found among members of the profession; it is not between the profession and the government.

As sponsor of the Bill, my information is that the vast majority of the practising chiropractors in the province favour the legislation. Clearly the government would not proceed with the legislation if we had reason to believe there was significant opposition to the Bill, either in terms of the number of practitioners opposed or in terms of the opponents identifying any substantive defects, deficiencies, or limitations in the legislation. I don't believe there's a problem.

In any case, the government deals with the association. The association has the means of resolving internal disagreements. The government would only be concerned if it appeared that a minority of the members of the association were being denied any opportunities which the bylaws of the association grant to them. In other words, at the present time I expect we will proceed with the different stages of the Bill this spring.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the question and the motion for a return on the Order Paper stand and retain their places.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

204. Moved by Mrs. Koper:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to review the current phenomenon of one dollar home sales and foreclosures, and undertake legislative action to eliminate this problem.

[Adjourned debate April 3: Mr. Anderson]

MRS. KOPER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise and speak on a point of order to Motion 204, introduced in the Legislature on Tuesday, April 3. As hon. members are aware, since that time the Attorney General has introduced Bill No. 50, an amendment to the Law of Property Act, which is intended to reduce the incidence of dollar sales of homes. I wish to commend the government for the introduction of this Bill, and hereby request unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion, as the intent has been realized.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to give unanimous consent?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

218. Moved by Mr. Woo:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to consider the implementation of a preventive medicine program.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Motion 218, I would like to begin by making a number of observations. Firstly, I think all hon. members recognize that the motion itself reflects subject matter that is fairly complex and certainly provides a very wide-ranging view. The second observation I would make, Mr. Speaker, is to the effect that for purposes of this particular debate, members take into consideration that the use of the term "preventative medicine" is synonymous with that of preventative health services. In that regard, I think it will afford hon. members a greater opportunity to talk about the differing dimensions involved within the context of the motion. Hopefully this will not be perceived as constraining them in terms of the types of issues they would like to raise.

Mr. Speaker, we as Canadians and Albertans are constantly praising our health care systems and our highly sophisticated and efficient delivery mechanisms for health care and hospital services as the best in the world. I personally have no quarrel with what is being said, simply because I happen to be in total agreement with such statements. We do in fact have one of the highest levels of health care services of any of the industrialized nations of the world. It also happens to be one of the most costly.

I think it is important to recognize that those glowing statements about the state of medical care in this country and in this province represent what may well be a very narrow way of thinking. When we consider these statements within the general context of the health of Canadians and Albertans, it sort of reminds me in many respects of Nero merrily fiddling away while Rome burned. What these statements and the bills that come with them mean to me, Mr. Speaker, is that perhaps we have our priorities a little backwards in terms of the health care system in this country and in this province. It suggests to me that the positives of our otherwise excellent health care systems really reflect the negatives and deficiencies in the manner in which we deal with the health of people from a philosophical point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I read with considerable interest an account of the public proceedings concerning the new Canada Health Act during its early stages preceding enactment in the House of Commons. There were a number of points raised by witnesses testifying on this Bill. I would like to share some of them with hon. members, because I believe they are relevant to this motion.

Firstly, the point was raised that hospitals throughout Canada were jammed to overflowing and that patients often faced lengthy waits for elective surgery, which is operations that are vital to health but do not have to be performed immediately. Secondly, the health care system is still centred almost exclusively around doctors. Nurses, public health nurses, and community services in the field of public health and welfare are not fully utilized in terms of their potential. The third point I raise is that health services provided by governments do indeed vary greatly from province to province. It is interesting to note that all provincial medicare plans cover visits to doctors and hospitals but that not all provide coverage for the lesser costs of alternative services. The last point I wish to raise with respect to these public committee hearings, Mr. Speaker, and the one that I think is most important to this debate, refers to our health care systems being preoccupied with sickness and paying only lip service to wellness. Yet getting people to stop smoking,

lose weight, exercise regularly, and watch their diets were needs that were cited most often.

Without question, the federal Minister of Health's statements regarding the new Canada Health Act boil down to one purpose; that is, to discourage or eliminate balance billing by doctors and the use of hospital user fees. I'm not about to reopen the debate on that particular issue. But in many ways I can't help but think that this sort of action removes any incentive on the part of the general public to look at alternatives to its own health and well-being and say to itself: hey, maybe this perfect health care system of ours isn't all it's cracked up to be; it's getting costlier to get sick than to stay well. And there's a lot of truth in that, Mr. Speaker.

At the conclusion of the committee's hearings on the Canada Health Act, the Ontario Minister of Health made the remark that this may be the very last time in this century that governments have the opportunity to shape the health care system for the future. That may well be, and it is all the more unfortunate that the Act does not contain any of that stated reference to preventative medicine or preventative health care.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that government programs in the areas of health care services are somewhat similar to some of the commercial advertising that we hear on radio and see on TV and in our local newspapers. At times they are perceived to be a contradiction in terms. On the one hand, we present health care programs as accessible and as all-encompassing as possible, and suggest that because of that, don't worry too much about yourself: we'll look after you free of charge, whether you get sick or have an accident. To me, this removes the incentive for many to do exactly the opposite. In that respect we have another government department that comes forward with a program to encourage people to do the opposite: keep fit, keep healthy, and keep the doctor away.

When I made reference to the manner in which we speak about our health care system, I initially made the statement that perhaps we have our priorities backwards. There was a time when physicians — and I think of the general practitioner, the image of the family doctor that I remember best — used to put prevention of disease, relief, and cure of disease in that order. Somehow or other it seems to me that we have our priorities reversed today. Now the emphasis is on the costlier end of the scale of our health care system, and that has to do with curative medicine, remedial, and rehabilitative aspects of health care.

The reversing trend has occurred in a very subtle way and over a long period of time. I think we can argue the pros and cons of our system in terms of the broader benefits it provides to our citizens, and certainly a lot of that argument would be on very specific and technical terms. But I suppose two questions remain. What is a preventative medicine program, and how do we reverse the present trend, our priorities? And perhaps a third question: why? The last question is easy to answer, Mr. Speaker. All one has to do is look at the billions of dollars attached to all government health care plan budgets and ask oneself the question: who pays for all this? The first question is also fairly simple to answer. A preventative medicine program would place the prevention of illness and disease on a level parallel with the treatment aspects of sickness and disease. The ultimate aim is to keep people healthy and out of hospitals. The second question will be a bit harder to respond to. I think it has a lot to do with attitude and a shift in philosophy in our present life-style, and that covers a lot of territory.

An overriding concern that I have when I talk to people about preventative medicine or health care is the perception that the subject matter deals only with hospitals and medicine, sickness and disease. Certainly these are central elements. But if one were to equate preventative medicine to personal health

and well-being, I think one can get a broader picture of what is meant here.

I mentioned attitudes and life-style as being a couple of aspects which contribute to a preventative medicine program's success or failure. I'd like to give you a couple of examples. They have nothing to do with being sick in the sense that we understand the meaning of the word. But just as surely, the final destination will be a hospital. For the majority of us, our present-day life-style and attitudes are shaped because we find it easy to be told what to do, perhaps because in that way we feel we don't have to take responsibility for what happens.

As a first example, let's take the image of the macho Canadian male. Generally speaking, he is between the ages of 25 and 35, at the peak of his health and in top-notch physical condition. One of the first things he does is go out and plunk down \$16,000 for a sports car, because the ads tell him that's the Canadian way of life and the way to do things. Once he gets into the car, his next stop is the local candy store to pick up a couple of dozen brews and a bottle of rye, because the ads tell him this is the in thing. So off he goes, totally disregarding belting himself in. It's while trying to light his favourite el ropo and popping a brew in the other hand — that's something else the ads said he should do — that he has his accident. Who comes along but a chap in his jogging suit and jogging shoes, doing his bit to keep fit, keep well, and stay out of hospital. He's the Good Samaritan. His first thought is, I'm my brother's keeper. But sometimes I wonder if, as our brother's keeper, we are supposed to pay his hospital bill also.

When you look at this in terms of a balance sheet, I don't believe there are any winners. Yet there is the other side of the picture, the ads that say to us: keep fit, ride a bicycle, jog, run, drink milk, and so on. But I think our commercial priorities tell us that it is better to drink such and such a brand of beer or liquor and that this brand of cigarettes or tobacco is better or best. Certainly such commercials far outweigh all the others in terms of numbers and the amount of dollars behind them. We spend more on promoting those things which will put us into hospitals than those which will keep us out of them. Alcohol and drug abuse, for example — and by drugs I include all the pills we pop, from aspirins to what have you — and tobacco usage account for more deaths in North America in one year than the total casualties in any one of the major theatres of operations during the Second World War. Cigarette smoking alone was cited by the United States Surgeon General as the cause of 90 percent of the 60,000 deaths associated with lung disease in the United States in 1983. Mr. Speaker, I will admit that in this instance, I suppose I am one of the worst offenders.

A Toronto report indicated that weight lifting would improve the breathing of smokers, so I went out and bought myself a set of weights. It sort of makes you wonder at which end of the arm is the real dumbbell.

Speaking of weight lifting, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many members of this Assembly or of the general public have at one time thought of purchasing a set of weights to keep fit, stay in shape, get muscle-bound. Six months later, I wonder how many of us and how many of the general public have yet to take those weights out of the cartons they came in, I think simply because it is much more fun — and our attitudes tell us that rather than waste our time on lifting weights, we should run down to the corner pub and join the rest of our friends.

Then there's the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker. How many of us have indeed taken those weights out of their cartons and spent about half an hour reading the instructions and putting them together? Then because we couldn't lift them, we shoved them aside and let them gather dust. How many of us in this Assembly have gone out and bought a brand-new pair of Adidas

or jogging shoes? We take them out of the boxes and the wrapping, put them up on the shelf in our closet, and look at them for 364 days of the year, waiting for that 365th day when we have our annual MLA/media ball game. That's the only time they come out of the closet.

Mr. Speaker, I chose this way, perhaps in a lighthearted manner, simply to get a point across; that is, when we talk about preventative medicine programs, we are indeed covering an extremely wide range of some very serious considerations. This includes not only the areas of disease and medicine. We are talking about safety in the work place, the use of seat belts, proper nutrition, accident prevention, how to deal with present-day stress, and general hygiene. We are talking about promoting physical well-being, healthy life-styles, exercising, guarding against everything from the common cold to malaria, alcohol and drug abuse, and so on.

We are also talking about attitudes, not only of the general public but also of the professionals in the health care field, from the role of the public health care units to a reaffirmation of the philosophy of the general practitioner, the family doctor whom I know best, whose first priority is prevention.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the next member enters the debate, I wonder if the Assembly would agree that the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation might revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce a class of students from the constituency of Edmonton Beverly who, because of the interest in visiting the Legislature, could not come in at 2:30 but are here after the first shift of students has left. I want to welcome them here, and ask the members of the Assembly to welcome them after I've introduced them.

They are a grade 6 class from Rundle elementary school, accompanied by teachers Mrs. Anne Sadelain, Mrs. Stephanie Kyselitzia, and Mr. M. Edwards, and by parent Mrs. Dorothy Massey. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the usual warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**
(*continued*)

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, in rising this afternoon to make what I hope will be a contribution to Motion 218, I have some thoughts on it that may be contradictory to what I'm going to say and contradictory to the intent of the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park.

We know that today our leading health hazards are heart disease, strokes, cancer, accidents generally, motor vehicle accidents, and then mental health. They don't necessarily go in that order.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about senility?

MR. PURDY: That's the last step.

In all the information that has been gathered over the years, there are many statistics we can look at regarding health problems of many individuals and what could have been done to prevent those health problems. A lot of health problems are brought on by the individuals themselves, such as heart disease, strokes, accidents — because there are no preventative measures out there — and motor vehicle accidents.

I look at the resolution and I say to myself, how much further can this government and other governments become involved in preventative health matters? In various areas of the province right now, many, many health units have been set up to look after our preschoolers, children in school, and adults, right down the line. All children have to be immunized now before they start school or when they get into the system. The health units also help mothers who are expecting children. They will come in and spend time with them. We also have a preventative dental plan through the health units, and I think that preventative dental plan has worked quite significantly in this province since its inception a number of years ago. Other programs, such as Meals on Wheels and others, are there for our senior citizens.

We talk about the individual in society, what he or she can do for preventative medicine, and how much further government can get involved in it. We have a health care system in this province and in the Dominion of Canada that is the best in the world as far as I'm concerned. It gives people the privilege to visit their medical doctor whenever they wish. There is no particular limit on the number of times you wish to visit a doctor. Maybe one problem with our health care system is that we allow so many visits, and then have to start charging for other visits unless it's a continuing disease or a continuing problem.

The famous thing our doctors do right now is, you can go to them with a bit of a cold. They'll look at you, give you a couple of pills and say, come back in five days and see me again. I have gone to a doctor a number of times for those types of things. But when he says to come back to him in five days, he doesn't see me. I don't believe in the system that each and every time I visit a doctor, I have to go back to him for another checkup or follow-up to see how well the medication has worked. If it continues, then I think the individual should return. But if it has cleared up, I don't think we should be adding that extra cost to our health care system and the extra dollars to the doctor's pocket just because I want to make a return visit.

There are a number of items that could be more vigorously put forth in this province and in this country. One of them is smoking. We say that smoking is hazardous to health. Canada Health also has small printing on packages of cigarettes, saying that smoking is hazardous to your health. However, we are still not going into the wishes of the non-smokers in this country. Sure, we've set up places in restaurants and other facilities. There might be 15 percent of that restaurant for people who don't smoke. I look at the members of this Assembly. I think that probably 15 percent of the members of the Assembly smoke, and 85 percent don't. What I'm trying to get at is that there should be a larger area available for nonsmokers than for smokers. Maybe the word would get out that smoking isn't that conducive to good health. Why don't the individuals who smoke think of quitting and helping their health out? I thought the prices we have with the taxes on tobacco — looking at some of the vending machines. I understand that a package of cigarettes is \$2.25 — would be a deterrent, but they haven't been.

The member moving the motion is one of the 15 percent I talked about. If he was going to put forth a motion with real

confidence in it, he should have made the statement during his presentation that he was going to give up the habit of smoking and start there. But I don't think the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park will take that challenge. I think he enjoys the weed too much. He's told me that.

Another cause on the system is excessive drinking. Some people will say that drinking any drink is hazardous to your health. However, I don't see any warning saying that on any bottles of liquor that are available. At the same time, many of our senior citizens have been told by their doctors that they should have a shot of brandy or whatever they choose before retiring at night. I guess overindulgence in drinking is bad for you. But in moderation it may help you; it may not. That's a person's own conclusion.

Another area in preventative medicine that can be looked at is stress, and it's one of the largest killers we have right now in this country. It causes heart disease, and it also causes strokes by having high blood pressure and the like. I don't know how we do it with the society that we have today, where people are always on the go. You look at downtown Edmonton, downtown Calgary, or Toronto, or wherever you want to look. Everybody is always on the move all the time. People are rushing here to do this and that and doing various jobs. They aren't, in many instances, taking time out for themselves. I look at this particular job that I fulfill as the MLA for the Stony Plain constituency. The other 78 hon. members of this Assembly are in the same predicament I am. We put in a lot of long hours, and the stress is there. Anybody that says it isn't is definitely wrong, because we know it. I think something's got to be done in the overall long term to cut down on the stress that is evident in many different occupations in this country right now.

Another preventative measure is occupational health. Under the department of Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, I believe there has been quite a redirection in occupational health. We've seen some new directions in that. We've seen new directions at our worksites, which have a lot fewer hazards than they did a number of years ago. Having grown up with the industry, I can see the substantial changes in occupational health that have been made over a number of years to benefit the worker. I reflect on the particular role I play as an employee of TransAlta Utilities, some of the directions taking place in our own company, the expansion through the safety branch of our company, and also the expansion taking place through the department of Workers' Compensation. It appears that there are various elements in the occupations that are hazardous to your health. We heard a while ago about the asbestos scare. Many of these areas are now being cleaned up, because we know asbestos is a real health concern.

Another area the government could certainly become involved in — and I think we've done some work on it, but as far as I'm concerned, not enough. I'm going to get disagreement on this statement from many hon. members in this Legislature, but many of them know where I stand on the compulsory use of seat belts. We know that in the province of Alberta alone, there could be a substantial health care saving not only in dollars but in hospital stay time, recuperation, and physiotherapy time if we had compulsory seat-belt legislation. I estimate — and these are figures I have from various sources — that there could have been in excess of 300 lives saved in Alberta last year, out of the 600-plus that were killed in automobile accidents, if they had been buckled up. Statistics show us that 13 to 15 percent of Albertans are now wearing seat-belt restraints. That's not high enough, Mr. Speaker.

If seat-belt legislation were introduced, the total saving to the province could be in the neighbourhood of \$40 million in one year. If we had brought in mandatory seat-belt legislation

last year, I think it would have been a substantial contribution to other government departments that had to cut back their 1984-85 budgets. We discussed this on many occasions, but the discussion hasn't gotten very far. As a director of the Alberta Safety Council and the Canada Safety Council, I maintain that we should be moving for compulsory seat-belt legislation in this province. You would certainly see a real change in the attitude of individuals regarding seat belts, and it would certainly help in the preventative measures we're talking about today.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I think there are a number of ways individuals can help themselves to attain a better physical condition. In many areas, I don't think we have to worry about preventative medicine programs. One is jogging. I must say I do quite a bit of that, and I do a lot of walking. I think I feel better for that. What we have to look at generally are good health habits, the correct amount of sleep, and the correct eating habits. I think a person can attain a better preventative medicine program with those than with any legislation this Legislature may pass.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for initiating the motion on the implementation of a preventive medicine program. Prevention has not always received the greatest priority from people in our country and our province. Specifically the medical profession has concentrated on the curative aspects of medicine and, I think, hasn't given a great deal of consideration and support to prevention. Obviously the structure we have in place now does not place a lot of emphasis on prevention. We simply have to look to public health, which has sometimes been termed by others the Cinderella program. It has not been fully accepted by the medical profession or by many people within the medical community.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

One of the difficulties in any preventive program is almost the impossibility of assessing results. Unless there are strict, controlled studies that would take one group of people and compare them to another who received a certain treatment or were influenced by a certain advertising campaign or an influence in some other form, it's most difficult to try to assess the effectiveness of prevention. Yet common sense tells us that many things we could do in our life-style, in our communities, would be preventive, effective in reducing health care costs, and effective in serving us as individuals in having a better life-style, in that we would remain healthy for a longer period of time. There are many things we could do, yet it's very, very difficult to prove.

We have some very effective programs that would fall in the category of a preventive program. Those that stress prevention in every community in this province centre on our health unit programs, which are basically preventive medicine. It initially started with immunization programs and has grown dramatically to a large variety, a host of programs that are offered across our province. I think we could be justly proud of the accomplishments we have made in the preventive health field. Diseases that in our grandparents' days wiped out entire families are now barely to be found in our society as a whole. Diseases such as smallpox have been eradicated in real terms from our society. Other diseases, such as tuberculosis, that have been identified and treated in past years no longer run rampant or take the toll of entire families as happened just two generations ago.

We have made dramatic strides in preventive health. In fact there are some studies and some comments from medical professionals that say we have extended the life of members of our society more through effective public health programs and education than we have through any curative programs. There have been some effective treatments, but they have not substantially contributed to the longevity of our human race. Yet the improved statistics related to infantile mortality and the deaths of young children have primarily been improved by preventive health and a few very significant discoveries such as antibiotics. Public health has to take very large credit in the improvement of health conditions in our country.

Even with the benefits that have accrued through preventive health programs, public health still remains a Cinderella and is still the subject of cynical comments by some who feel that maybe it's just the do-gooders and maybe it's not really effective. I think it's imperative to look back at the history of public health to see how successful we have been and to take that as an example and a building block for the future.

Other areas that contribute to programs in this area have been touched on by the Member for Stony Plain, who covered a wide range, and by the mover of this motion. There are other programs that have been effective but for which we still have a distance to go before we reach an acceptable level. Areas in occupational health and safety have been the subject of study by members of this Legislature in a number of select committees. Those of us who have participated on that committee realize that it's not just the impact on the worker and the savings of the cost to the taxpayer but also the contribution to a cost-effective program that benefits industry, the economy as a whole, and the life-style of each person who is involved in a workplace.

We cannot legislate people. We know that. But we can provide effective leadership. Some of the leadership has been provided by the Member for Lethbridge West through the AADAC program which, in my opinion, has provided extremely effective leadership in influencing the attitudes of our young people in this province. We just have to think back over the years when we grew up and the ads we saw. It was macho, brave, and the in thing to smoke. You were with it if you smoked, you were really with it and cool if you drank, and you really had arrived if you drove a big, fancy car. Obviously if you drove a big, fancy car, it was really cool to speed. These are attitudes that are built in over a number of years and over the decades till finally it becomes like gambling. I can smoke, I can drink, I can drive fast, and nothing will happen to me. You know that the odds maybe aren't that great that you're going to die young or be smashed up in your car. It becomes a risk, and that becomes part of the game.

I think what's happening with AADAC is that the ads are turning some of that around. Maybe it isn't so macho to have a smoker's cough, and maybe it isn't so great to be drunk and lying down in the street. I hear some of the young people saying, that doesn't look like so much fun. They see the results of someone who has had alcohol poisoning or is lying on the park bench with no future. Those are the other sides of the things that at one time were accepted as being the in things. I think a lot of young people today have a lot more sense than maybe some of the young people of my generation. I guess I include myself in that group. I think my kids are smarter than I am, and they are influenced by the turnaround.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. FYFE: That's right; great genes were passed on from the other side.

I think they're influenced, that they're more realistic, and they see that life-style and their attitudes towards some of these factors that affect our health are things they want to seriously consider. By accepting that moderation will give them a happier life, I think they will have a happier life.

As I said, we can't provide leadership, but we certainly can provide funds. We can legislate programs that will assist in providing that knowledge and information. One of the things I think the federal government has done well — and they've probably done the odd thing — is the PARTICIPAction program. They've done the PARTICIPAction program with some humour. People who previously didn't think about running, jogging, walking, swimming, or exercising — you just have to look around, and you see it's a trend that is growing and changing.

We went through an agrarian society where most people exercised either in the house when they did their housework or out on their farm, or they were labourers. There weren't many sedentary jobs. But today we have a very sedentary society. Unless we become involved in the PARTICIPAction program, we are probably all beneficiaries. I'm still working on myself, but I now know I can walk a block. I have managed to make that level. In fact I participated in a bike-athon last week and didn't disgrace us too badly by representing our Assembly. I found out I could do just a little bit better than I thought I could. I guess that's a stepping stone, but it's attitude and it becomes habit.

It's like wearing seat belts. It's not so bad to buckle up. You find that when you go to another province where there's a law that says you have to buckle up, after a few days you stop thinking about the fact that maybe you are uncomfortable. You just do it, and you don't think about it. Usually for a few days after I get back to our province, I continue to buckle up just because it's a habit. But it's one of those things we have to continue to work on. That is the area government can influence. As I said, I don't think we legislate, but we can influence and provide the leadership.

I consider all of these aspects a periphery to the intent of the specific motion today, the implementation of a preventive medicine program. One area where I have specific knowledge of a preventive medicine program was a project that was funded through Health and Welfare Canada in the city of St. Albert. It was a project whereby the two medical clinics involved hired a counsellor and a nutritionist, as I recall. I think they had different professionals involved. These people were to work with the physicians, so if a physician had a patient whose main problem was not medically oriented, if the pains in the legs or arms or chest really couldn't be treated medically but could be treated by a better diet or by counselling, the physician referred the patient to that person, who could then spend time. With the fee schedules in our system of remuneration, a physician doesn't have as many precious minutes as often are required to sit down with a patient and give some guidance, assistance, counselling, a diet, and some of the things that may be required.

I believe that at first this project was resisted by the physicians involved. I don't think they were too enthusiastic about it. But by the time the three-year period finished, they were extremely enthusiastic, and at that point the funding ran out. It was most unfortunate, because it's the kind of thing we can do through our private medical practitioners. I know they can be motivated to work with other professionals, and I think they could be incorporated into a program that could be designed in co-operation with government and with private practitioners in the field. I think we can incorporate many medical professions, not just the physicians. There are other medical professions that are also concerned about the treatment of people, not

just the broken legs and the curative aspects, and are interested in participating and providing leadership.

I know some work has been going on. I know there has been an interdepartmental study between Hospitals and Medical Care and Social Services and Community Health for some time, looking at the possibility of implementing a program. Any preventive medicine program would have to be interdepartmental and would require a great deal of co-ordination between the departments. But I think it's something that should be considered carefully and seriously. I think it makes sense economically. I think it's an investment we can make in our future. I commend the member for bringing this forward, and I urge members of this Assembly to seriously consider this motion and to give it support.

Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to participate in the debate with regard to Motion No. 218. I'm very pleased that the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park has raised it. I think it's very timely and that we should make citizens of Alberta and all of Canada aware of health care and what it is.

After listening to the previous speaker in particular, the Member for St. Albert, with her expertise as a nurse, I wondered what I would have to do in participating in this particular motion. I don't have any expertise. I've not been a doctor; I'm certainly not a nurse. I'd much rather have her nurse me. But I think back to some of my habits in past years. I guess I'm what's called a convert, Mr. Speaker. I'm a nonsmoker and nondrinker, not for religious factors but by choice.

I have to go back a couple of years again. [interjection] I chew gum. About two years ago, my doctor said to me: Norman, you have a problem. I'd gone through a series of tests. I used to have a problem with lack of sleep, interest, health, tired, things of this nature. I found out I'm a borderline diabetic. Mr. Speaker, I like to attribute those tests — and I thank my doctor for taking the time to go through the extensive testing process to diagnose me as a borderline diabetic. I think I'm more aware of it. I believe in the preventive cure now. I accept the fact that proper eating, good diet — unfortunately, sometimes our hours in the Assembly prohibit the proper rest one should have for their body. But I believe that things can be done. My doctor has shown me the way; it's up to me to prove I believe in it and believe in preventive care.

I wanted the opportunity as well to say a few words about the particular motion. I believe it's very timely because, as I said earlier, we must make people aware of health care. People say health care is free and that it's part of a basic system that we should have throughout Canada and North America. It is free to a degree, but everything is free if we want to pay for it through our tax dollars. In particular, I'd like everybody to know that health care is big business. It's in excess of \$30 billion a year, both public and private. That's the number of dollars spent on health care in Canada, Mr. Speaker. Those are 1982 figures. I'm sure if we were able to update that to '83-'84, we'd find it's much more than \$30 billion a year.

The proportion of total health care expenditures financed out of the private sector in Canada was about 26 percent in 1981; that's down from 75 percent in 1960. Those are Health and Welfare Canada statistics. Some 40,000 physicians and 400,000 health care workers practise in Canada. Alberta alone spent some \$3.2 billion a year, in both the public and private sectors. Once again, Mr. Speaker, those are 1982 figures. In Alberta some 23.3 percent of Alberta health care costs were financed out of the private sector in 1981. Expenditures include funding for general care and allied hospitals, mental hospitals, facilities for the aged, physically handicapped, mentally hand-

icapped, alcoholics, drug addicts, unwed mothers, and emotionally disturbed children. Professional services are provided by physicians, dentists, chiropractors, osteopaths, optometrists, podiatrists, physiotherapists, and nurses. Drugs and other goods and services, such as through the public health and capital expenditures, all cost money. These are the various agencies and departments that all contributed to the total expenditure. The single most expensive category in the health care field is institutional funding. Some 50 percent is attributed to the funding as well as the balance broken down into professional fees.

Our health care system has had many successes. Canada's standard of health, when measured by the usual yardsticks of life expectancy and infant mortality, rates very well internationally. It should be noted that Canada is very high in the life expectancy at birth with regard to males and females. In Canada 70.2 is the age factor for males and 77.5 for females. Just compare that to Sweden, the highest of all, with an average of 73 years for males and 79.1 for females. The infant mortality rate, measured before the first birthday per 1,000 live births, rates us very high as well — some 9.6 in Canada. The lowest is Sweden at 6.8, and the highest mortality rate is in the United States at 11.3. Life expectancy at birth for the population as a whole has climbed more than 10 years since the early 1930s, from 60 years for males and 62.1 years for females.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's primarily the result of the more effective control of many diseases through medical science. For example, 69.4 of every 100,000 Canadians contracted tuberculosis in 1931. By the end of the 1970s, the TB rate was 11.8 per 100,000. Looking at it another way, some 7,675 Canadians died of TB in 1924, while the number has been reduced significantly to some 220 in 1978.

The interest in preventive medicine is rooted in three objectives of improving cost control, efficiency, and equity in the health care system. The cost — very, very costly. Health care costs remained fairly stable through the 70s at about 7 to 7.5 percent of the gross national product. From '79 to '82, costs surged from 7.1 percent of gross national product to almost 8.5 percent. In Alberta alone the costs rose from 4.87 percent of the provincial gross domestic product in '79 to 5.63 percent in 1981. In dollar terms, expenditures on health care in Alberta increased from \$1.7 billion in 1971 to \$3.25 billion in 1982. This is why we are concerned, Mr. Speaker.

Possible reasons for the current cost could relate to such things as inflation in certain medical practices. They have risen perhaps much faster than general inflation. The population is aging, and the aged and the very young consume more health care services. I believe we all are responsible and should be responsible. The ratio of doctors to citizens, particularly in urban areas, has increased. The demand for their services seems to have increased as well to match supply. There has been a tremendous expansion in the number of expensive and new clinical technologies. People are consuming more health care services than before. Hospital boards have lacked proper incentives in the past to control costs. Greater numbers of the aged and dying are being institutionalized than previously. I say "than previously", because of course when we think back many years ago, they were being cared for by the family or the family unit. It is more than likely that any one of those instances I referred to helped relate to the push in the costs.

A number of solutions have been proposed. Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that some of the following could be used. I suggest that turning the management of hospitals over to the private firms could be explored; user fees, the hospital incentive; extra billing, the utilization control; working with professionals to control use of expensive tests, admissions, and duration of stay in acute care hospitals. In particular, I'd like

to note that the Saskatchewan government estimates each new doctor adds about \$500,000 a year to the provincial health care budget. I believe that emphasized that there should be more emphasis on preventive medicine. I believe the key is efficiency. The cheapest cure is prevention.

Despite increase in expenditures, some diseases have declined. The seriousness of others has increased, particularly those related to life-styles. For example, the rate of venereal disease has increased from 81.9 per 100,000 persons in 1931 to some 231.5 per 100,000 persons in 1979. The rate of hepatitis has increased from 1.1 per 100,000 persons to some 7.1 per 100,000 persons in this same time period. The rising causes of death as measured by potential years of life lost tend to be chronic, degenerative, or partially self-inflicted by life-styles. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I note that the years of life lost per 1,000 population was some 84 percent for all causes in 1950; in 1978 it declined to 56.9. If we relate that to the reasons: motor vehicle accidents, for example, in 1950 were some 6 percent and rose in 1978 to 8.7; heart disease has declined significantly due to research, from some 10.3 to 8.4. Some of the other factors increased: suicide at 1.9 is now up to 4.7; lung cancer, from .9 to 2.4; cirrhosis of the liver, from .6 percent to 1.6.

Very conservatively, some 30 percent of total health care costs relate to alcohol abuse and smoking. If we added such others as obesity and poor eating habits, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we'd find that this list would be much higher. It's interesting to note that low-income, less educated Canadians have poorer health and shorter lives than high-income, more educated Canadians despite universal and accessible medicare. Smoking is more common among lower income persons and less educated groups. Physical activity and fitness tend to be more common among upper income, better educated Canadians. Regular medical checkups, Pap smear tests, and breast examinations are among the better educated and higher income groups.

I'd suggest then that we have a job as members of this Assembly to see that all Albertans, all Canadians, are aware of what can be done to help improve their health care and prevent health care costs from rising astronomically. Preventive medicine will not eliminate the need for hospitals and health care professionals dedicated to curing disease. Considerable effort is already being put into preventive medicine in Alberta by government, health care providers, and individual citizens. We have many, many areas — such as the Provincial Board of Health, the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, doctors, and nutritionists — working very hard in the communities. I like to think of one particular community, Fort McMurray and Lac La Biche, where they've had health fairs showing very responsible aims at trying to educate people and make them more aware of the need.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention that I support the motion and believe preventive medicine should be rooted in the ideas and minds of every individual, showing greater responsibility for his or her own health and for the health of his family or their families. At a minimum, as a government we have a legitimate role to play in making sure the individual is adequately informed and unnecessary impediments don't exist to the individual making rational choices in the medical marketplace. There are no quick fixes or cure-alls, but I believe that as legislators we should make more people aware. I commend the member for bringing the motion to the Assembly.

In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn debate.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: There's no constraint on the time today until 4:30.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I then wish to sit down and allow another member to participate in the debate.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the previous speaker for permitting me to carry on the debate, although I'm sure other members may not agree once I've concluded. I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this important debate on an important motion. I too would like to acknowledge the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park in his sponsorship of this motion. The hon. member has presented many very stimulating, challenging concepts to this House, and I believe this is one of them as well.

Mr. Speaker, the case for preventative medicine is quite clear. Any delays by our society are surely only forestalling the inevitable, for preventative medicine is an idea whose time has come. It is interesting to note that only 4 percent of the \$18 billion spent on health care in Canada each year is spent on prevention, despite the fact that the leading causes of premature death and disability are no longer infectious diseases but are related to where and how we live.

Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate, I particularly want to make reference to the fact that I had the honour this morning of representing the provincial government at the opening of the swimming pool at the Alberta Children's hospital. Many members were asking me about this T-shirt I was wearing. It was kind of hard to read, but I want to assure all members that it reads: "ACH — Alberta Children's Hospital — Honourary Lifeguard". Here we have an example of a facility in Calgary just opened today, thanks to the sponsorship of the Minister of Recreation and Parks, the Alberta Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, the downtown Rotary Club in Calgary, the Children's Hospital Aid Society, and many, many other community groups. All have come together to ensure financially that this pool could be created. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it will be a very important part of the community for the next 20, 30, or 40 years. Here we had a group of citizens who said, here is a practical way that people can remain healthy by continuing to exercise. Whether they're elderly, disabled, or young, it doesn't matter; regular exercise is a very important part of prevention.

Mr. Speaker, two of the leading causes of premature death are motor vehicle accidents and heart disease. In both these cases the maxim "one ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" is proven out. Rather than deal with the aftereffects, it makes much more sense to prevent either situation from occurring in the first place. In the case of motor vehicle accidents, studies have shown conclusively that the use of seat belts greatly reduces the incidence of fatalities and serious injury. In the instance of heart disease, the link between nutrition and diet and heart disease is very well established. Proper diet could reduce the incidence of heart disease in Alberta.

Both these causes of death cost society a great deal of money and the victims and the families a great deal of pain and sadness. For example, a coronary bypass today costs in the neighbourhood of \$20,000. Last year over 800 Canadians had these operations, yet in only 15 to 20 percent of these cases will the patient live any longer than would be expected if they had not had the surgery. I don't wish to make a case either for or against coronary heart bypass operations. But I wish to simply point out, by that one small example, the incredible cost of health care today, not a subject that is strange to members of this House, I'm sure.

Another leading cause of death in Canada is cancer. To treat a person with cancer is very trying both on the patient, in terms of suffering, and on the health system, in terms of cost. For example, take smoking. Each year in Canada, there are 270,000

deaths directly attributable to smoking. Again, I am sure it's a subject that we're all aware of.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I too once had that habit. In fact I didn't smoke cigarettes; I smoked, of all things, cigars. People used to complain to me about this disgusting, smelly habit. In fact I remember my girlfriends would get in my car and wonder if it was a hearse, because it always smelled like a dead body. I can recall that during those years, my secretaries would close my door so they wouldn't have to detect the odour. Some members of this House complain about people smoking cigars. I used to hear it from everybody. Never mind that; I had to put the thing in my mouth. For years I could never understand why I did it, until I quit. Then it felt so darn good after all those years. I recall attempting to go back on one or two occasions after I had started jogging, and I could really feel the effect. You know how every once and a while, you like to have a good cigar after a good meal. Well, the next morning I could feel it. So I've left that behind.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that smokers today are in a minority. We have always thought of it as being the in thing to do, but nonsmokers are in the majority. Isn't it interesting that as the male sex is giving up smoking and as women are beginning to take their rightful place in society, ascend the ladder in the areas of management, earn greater incomes, and take greater charge of their lives, they are beginning to smoke in greater numbers, as men are leaving it behind? Isn't it interesting that to be truly liberated, they are smoking in even greater numbers? A very sad commentary on our attitudes and beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, to give some perspective to this figure of 270,000 deaths a year, it's interesting to note that this figure represents more deaths attributable to smoking than Canadians who died in World War I and World War II. Smoking costs about \$2 billion a year in health care spending. A recent study done in Massachusetts determined that each smoker costs the public \$525 dollars a year in extra health costs. Every member of this Legislature who smokes is costing every other member \$525 a year. That has been estimated at roughly 5 cents for each cigarette smoked.

I saw an even more recent study that demonstrated that if you added up the lost income from not being able to work, the cost of purchasing the cigarettes, the cost of the shortage of your life — all of the costs associated with smoking — it costs every smoker \$2 per cigarette. If we were all clearly aware of that, how many smokers would continue at a cost of \$2 a cigarette? I wonder. I see I have the attention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It's interesting how some people relate to these dollar figures. If only the rest of society could relate to those figures.

Mr. Speaker, strictly from a financial perspective, preventative medicine makes a whole lot of sense — dollars and cents, I might add. With the increasing financial drain of medical services on taxpayers in Canada, preventative medicine looks to reduce those costs by making us all more healthy and therefore less dependent upon expensive health services. Scientific and medical advances in surgery and chemotherapy have centred attention and resources around medicine's curative powers. The question which must be asked is whether some of the resources presently utilized in curative medicine could not be put to better use in preventative medicine. While curative medicine has a great deal of glamour surrounding it, preventative medicine programs are somewhat more low key. Who can get excited about preventative medicine? It really doesn't have that sex appeal that complicated new machinery, new processes, and famous surgical experiments attract. But in an area where financial resources are at a minimum, results and not appearances are what are most important.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, preventative medicine is the key to a new approach to health care in Canada. This is not to discount the need for the curative element in medicine, but rather to emphasize the need for a twin focus: the effective utilization of curative and preventative strategies. Because many causes of death are life-style or behaviour related, the domain of preventative medicine is in changing or modifying people's attitudes. How many of us have given speeches on various subjects and said: if only we could change people's attitudes, if only we could get people to take a look at their beliefs. Attitudes and beliefs play such a very vital role in our lives. Based on our attitudes and beliefs, we decide everything about everything we do. Based on my beliefs and attitudes about what I want in life, I determine who my friends are, where I wish to work, what political party I want to be associated with, what kind of furniture I want to have in my home, the size of my house. My attitudes and beliefs aren't related just to those things. They relate directly to our health.

How interesting to note that when people start missing work, they're unhappy with the work they're doing. When they end up in the hospital, how interesting it is to note that they're attempting to avoid a difficult time they're having in their private relationships or in their occupation, or their financial resources may be limited. Being ill, being sick, is a very effective form of avoidance. There is no greater way of avoiding anything than dying. But what great lengths people go to, to miss or avoid dealing with a particular problem in their life. One very quick way is to believe that you're not well. I guarantee that if you believe you're not going to be well, you're not going to be well. The hospital is full of people who have beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, our mind is very much like a computer. We are living in an era of computers and high technology, and we now have these massive computers. We can take the work that used to be done on a computer that was produced 10 years ago and combine it into one little chip the size of a fingernail. But there isn't one computer of all the computers in the world that compares to the power of the brain and our beliefs and attitudes. Isn't it interesting how often we hear of the very sad case where an elderly person dies, a husband or a wife, and a month or two later the other spouse dies because they've lost their reason for living. Their beliefs are so strong that they've simply given up. Perhaps our whole focus and debate really ought not to be on the mechanics of preventative medicine but on our attitudes and beliefs about ourselves.

While the arena of curative medicine is in the doctor's office or the hospital, Mr. Speaker, the battleground where preventative medicine will be fought will be in community health centres, classrooms, health clubs, spas, the community halls where jazzercise takes place, and the streets where people go out and jog every day. I've heard so many doctors say to me that jogging isn't healthy. I think it's unhealthy if you don't wear proper shoes, don't exercise beforehand, or don't stretch and properly get ready. But I know many doctors who say it's healthy because it gets people out physically exercising; it's a form of preventative medicine.

I recall that I took my own personal interest in jogging about three years ago as a member of the Calgary Police Commission, when the Calgary police came forward and said they would like the police commission to agree to sponsor a 13-mile half marathon. I said: that's a great idea; in fact I'll even run in it — not realizing what it would take to properly prepare and exercise. Mr. Speaker, during the next four months — the first thing I did was go down to the police station and take a half-hour physical. I have never been so physically exhausted in my life, just doing the physical. That's how bad a shape I was

in. Thanks to the advice of the local phys ed officer in the Calgary police department, I began to exercise and to slowly walk. Then I began to walk and run. I began jogging, and by golly, if I didn't actually enter and finish a 13-mile run three years ago. During that process of getting ready for it, I was never so well. I didn't get ill, catch a cold, or get sick, because I was actively participating and exercising. So I began jogging and began to enjoy it. Some people say jogging's kind of boring. I agree — boring. But do it with a friend if you don't like your own company.

If you're interested in learning a little bit more about jogging, drop by the University of Calgary this weekend. Beginning at 6:30 Friday night, Edmonton will be hosting the first annual Molson's 24-hour marathon run. I'm really excited about the prospects of a team called Team Alberta, comprised of some five members of the Legislature and 15 members of the Legislature staff, that has entered this competition. We have researchers, interns, executive assistants, pages, MLAs — what a team. For 24 hours we're going to demonstrate our varying levels of physical fitness and, I suppose, our commitment to preventative medicine. I'm looking forward to that. If you haven't participated in this before, come on down and join in the party. I understand there's going to be a dance Saturday night. It'll be interesting to see how well people dance, having been up for 24 hours.

MRS. CRIPPS: Brian, you said University of Calgary.

MR. LEE: Did I say University of Calgary? I guess that was just a Freudian slip. The University of Alberta in Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, it never fails to amaze me how people tend to neglect their health. People take better care of their cars than they do of their own bodies. If they hear a noise in the car, they take it to a mechanic, because they know that if they wait too long there's going to be an expensive bill. Yet we as human beings fail to recognize those same signs our bodies are telling us, and we shrug it off.

Mr. Speaker, we boast of the best health care system in all of Canada. I'm convinced the future of health care lies in preventative medicine, so it follows that as a province we should be on top of this trend toward preventative medicine. To some extent we already are. I believe one fine example is the excellent work being done by the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission in their drug and alcohol education programs. I'm sure the Member for Lethbridge West would concur with me in saying that their programs are of the highest calibre.

I want to close by saying I support this motion. I commend the member for introducing it. I believe there's a need for a radical change in our attitudes and beliefs, because if people started believing, picturing, imagining, and dreaming that they're going to be well, they would be well. We wouldn't need this massive health care system to constantly fix people up and repair them when really their attitudes are a major source of illness. In some respects, I've often thought we should pay doctors when their patients are well and not pay them for treating them when they're ill. Wouldn't it be interesting if we gave medical doctors an annual fee per patient, and they'd get the same amount whether they're sick or well. I wonder how many medical visits there would be in a case like that.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion. I invite all members of the Legislature to support it, and I look forward to continuance of this debate.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to begin a small part of my talk today on this very important subject. I

do commend the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for bringing this before the Assembly. Unfortunately I'm afraid time is only going to allow me to start making my comments. I hesitate actually to bring out a couple of my concerns with the motion before I can, first of all, quickly assure everybody that of course I am very supportive of preventive health, particularly since I am a health professional.

As I said, I want to commend the member for bringing this motion before the Assembly because today, more than ever, it's extremely important that we spend as much time as possible in this Assembly debating health care issues. There are so many concerns before us that we must consider. Primarily with the passing of the Canada Health Act, we're going to need to look very seriously at all the issues that confront us. Of course ironically a lot of those have to deal with dollars and cents.

One of my concerns with this resolution — while everybody has certainly stated that they support the intent of the resolution, I really ask the members of this Assembly to look at the resolution as it's worded. I suggest we will have to consider very seriously whether or not we can pass this, primarily because the resolution should really read "urge the government to continue" with the preventative health programs. I urge the member to consider amending it. I think there's been a serious lack of recognizing how much is actually being done at this time, not by one department but by so many departments in our government. We've had some identification of the odd program that has been available with regard to preventative health. But at another time, I certainly want to go into a lot more detail on how many departments — I haven't listed them, but I'm sure there are at least eight or 10 — are spending thousands and thousands of dollars already. Hopefully there's a lot more that can always be done. There's no doubt about that, but I think we should look at rewording the resolution.

First of all, I really want to ask what our primary goal would be. Would it be to simply prevent premature death, or do we really want to promote health? If health is defined by a fairly acceptable definition in the past — complete physical, mental, and social well-being — what actual measures do we have at this time to identify what is complete physical, mental, and social well-being? Because of the concerns before us in regard to our health care system, I think it's such an easy panacea for us to all stand here and say, let's do more in the preventative field. If you look back over the last 100 years — and in two minutes, I'm obviously not going to be able to identify many of the things we have done over the last 100 years. I think it's worth looking back a little, particularly for the Member for Calgary Buffalo. Being a young member of the Legislature, he obviously isn't aware of what preventative programs we have had, why a lot of people have not been able to concentrate on their attitudes and change them.

First of all, there was actually not a lot of knowledge on what it takes to change attitudes. Over the past many years, a lot of people have been busy just trying to eke out a living, to earn enough money for the basic human needs: food and clothing. So they haven't always had time to sit around and contemplate their attitudinal changes, which of course should happen.

One of the most common causes of death in Canada is what is known as ischemic heart disease. This causes 30 percent of all deaths; cancer, 14 per cent of all deaths; cerebrovascular disease, 9 percent; and accidents, 6.7 percent.

Basically there are three kinds of prevention. In this discussion, I think we need this basic background information before we look at what programs would be appropriate in preventative health. The three kinds are primary, secondary, and tertiary types of prevention. Of course under primary prevention

is what has been alluded to so often in the Assembly today, and that's primarily helping patients quit smoking. The secondary prevention is detecting presymptomatic disease. This is a much more controversial type of primary prevention. In this particular case, it would be the detection and treatment of hypertension, which members probably realize can ultimately result in stroke. The last kind of prevention is tertiary prevention, and this involves managing established disease to avoid or limit disability and handicap. The long-term management of diabetes and chronic respiratory and cardiovascular disease are examples of tertiary prevention.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Next order.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)**

**Bill 218
Hospital Elections Act**

DR. CARTER: With regard to the Bill before us this afternoon. Bill No. 218, the Hospital Elections Act, I must confess that I put the Bill forward so we might have dialogue and discussion with regard to the whole matter of whether or not hospital trustees should be elected. I have put the Bill forward hoping to hear, in the course of the debate in the next hour, of the experience of other members of the Assembly who have at one time or another functioned as hospital trustees, either by way of election or by appointment. I assure all members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much interested in hearing the pros and cons of the argument with respect to election of hospital trustees.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

The purpose of the legislation as put forward is to require all members of a district hospital board; an auxiliary hospital board, or a nursing home district board to be elected. By requiring all these said persons to be elected, this would then be dealing with three very fundamental principles. Firstly, it would further entrench the responsibilities of the boards. Secondly, it would hopefully make the board more aware of public opinion, public issues and pressures with regard to the whole matter of health care costs. Thirdly, it would loosen the perceived control the provincial government may have in some hospital districts.

I'm sure members have read through the Bill. The Bill itself calls for amendments to the Hospitals Act, the Nursing Homes Act, and the Local Authorities Election Act. The Bill has certain ramifications for various departments of the provincial government — obviously the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care and the Department of Municipal Affairs — and also with respect to all hospital boards across the province and municipal councils themselves. I'm given to understand that a number of hospital boards and also some of the municipal councils have had some discussion with regard to Bill 218. So they themselves are having to examine whether or not it would be a step forward or a retrograde step to call for the election of all trustees for these various boards, as mentioned previously.

I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that Canada as a whole, and Alberta in particular — because we're here in Alberta — are faced with the real issue of what is happening to health care costs throughout the country and the province. I believe this provincial government has been very much concerned about

the whole issue of the excessive use of the system and also the matter of the terrifically escalating costs of health care. And so it is that I would define what is happening to the system at the moment as really being a financial hemorrhaging.

We indeed have a very fine health care system throughout Canada. I also believe that within the province of Alberta, we have probably the best health care system in Canada. By way of example, that can be illustrated by the tremendous commitment this provincial government has given to the construction of very fine hospital facilities throughout the province. Again, the province has not seen fit to concentrate new hospital construction in the large urban areas but has indeed developed the very innovative architectural concept of modular hospitals in rural areas of the province. This modular concept of hospitals is such that they have the central core of a very efficient operating theatre and also have the capability of having one, two, three, or four wings added to that central core. So if perchance the particular community does indeed grow, the ability is there to add to the existing hospital without having to go to tremendous, unwarranted expense in terms of having to redesign and construct a complete new facility.

The usage of the system which is in place: I know that other members have the statistics with regard to how much the system is in use. It has been interesting to listen to various comments and to hear the stats supplied in the previous hour this afternoon by colleagues in the Legislature. Along this line, the provincial government again has made the move whereby hospital boards, if they so desire, may indeed implement user fees as an effective means of cost control or an effective means of raising additional funds which they deem to be absolutely necessary for the functioning of their facility. But it is also very interesting to note that to date none of the hospitals in the province has seen fit to make use of that provision of user fees.

With respect to the financial hemorrhaging of the system, it is also interesting to note that following the lead of the provincial government with regard to zero budgeting as a means of pushing back responsibility upon hospital boards, in actual fact a considerable amount of fiscal reality has taken place, especially in terms of the last year. Various Members of the Legislative Assembly have come forward with information that for the first time in some areas, the medical advisory boards have finally gotten around to adding to their agendas the whole issue of just how much the hospital facility is indeed costing and how that operation can be deemed more fiscally responsible, rather than just talking about sending a list of articles or a list of names they would really like the provincial government to give unlimited funding to. So I believe that in the course of the last year, Mr. Speaker, the responsible attitude of this provincial government has been seen and worked to great effect with a considerable number of the hospital boards, so they in turn are indeed dealing in a much more fiscally responsible manner. It is interesting to note that a number of hospital boards throughout the province will now be reporting the fact that they have balances in their bank accounts. They are obviously working in very innovative fashions; nevertheless they are working in a very responsible way with respect to the horrendous costs that are involved with the medical system.

The present situation with respect to the election or appointment of hospital trustees is this. Throughout the province there is a total of 103 boards. On those boards there are 629 members; 354 are appointed and 275 are elected. For the sake of the record, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to break down the five categories so hon. members may be able to allude to that in terms of the debate. There are 41 municipal and general hospital districts. Nine of these have appointed boards only, nine have elected board members only, and 23 have a com-

bination of appointed and elected members. In total, in these 41 municipal and general hospital districts, there are 239 board members, with 140 being appointed and 99 elected.

In the second area, general hospital and nursing home districts, there are nine. Of these, five have appointed board members only, none have elected board members only, and four have a combination of appointed and elected board members. In total, in these nine general hospital and nursing home districts, there are 52 board members, of which 44 are appointed and eight are elected.

With 41 general and auxiliary hospital and nursing home districts, five have appointed board members only, eight have elected board members only, and 28 have the combination. In total, there are 269 board members, with 117 appointed and 152 elected.

In the fourth category, which includes 10 auxiliary and nursing home districts, six have appointed board members only, none have elected board members only, and four have the combination. There are 60 board members, of which 49 are appointed and 11 are elected.

In the final category breakdown, there are two nursing home districts. One has appointed board members only; one has elected board members only. In total, there are nine board members, with four appointed and five elected.

So you can see that throughout the province, we certainly have all manners of permutations and combinations. But it works out that, in effect, there are more appointed board members, in a ratio of approximately two-thirds to one-third, the one-third being elected. In all of this, the basic issue is whether accountability to the electorate or accountability to the taxpayer is really of prime importance. In terms of the operation of the hospital boards or the other nursing home districts or what have you, how is that dealt with or how is that served?

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that in November 1983, the city of St. Albert proposed a resolution to the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association annual conference. It had a fair number of whereases in terms of the preamble — and I would like to briefly cite two or three of those — and then there was a resolution which was carried by the Urban Municipalities Association by a vote of 98 to 65.

WHEREAS a Hospital Board is a governing Board which has full control over its hospital and absolute and final authority in respect to all matters pertaining to the operation of the hospital, subject only to [the] Act of the Legislature and regulations thereto; and

WHEREAS the most effective, efficient, and responsive hospital operation requires direct accountability of the trustees of the Hospital District to the citizens thereof; and

WHEREAS the accurate measure of such accountability is the election by these citizens of their trustees ... and

WHEREAS there are Boards in Alberta composed of trustees representing more than one municipality, some of whom are appointed and some of whom are elected ...

WHEREAS the result of such a mixture of appointed and elected trustees is that the Board in total is still not accountable to the electorate, particularly if the elected trustees are in the minority compared with appointed trustees.

... BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Alberta be requested to make it mandatory that all Hospital Board trustees be elected in accordance with the Local Authorities Election Act.

As mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that resolution was carried 98 to 65.

It is interesting and certainly not surprising to discover that the Alberta Hospital Association conventions passed a series of motions in the years 1971, '75, '76, and '78, which take the exact opposite approach. Of course that makes for part of the dialogue. The urban municipalities have their perspective on this matter. They don't like to have hospital boards passing certain resolutions that call for financial obligations which the municipal officials in turn have to carry out, in terms of the collection thereof. I'm given to understand that in April of this year, Wetaskiwin hospital district No. 81, having examined Bill 218, the Bill we're discussing at the moment, decided they would put forward to the Alberta Hospital Association convention a resolution which basically calls for maintenance of the status quo in the province, whereby there is the option to have either elected or appointed officials. So there is that kind of dialogue.

That brings to this debate a certain element of considerable interest to me, to see what the background experience of colleagues in the Legislature is, what their preference is from their experience in the rural areas or in the larger urban centres. I find there is considerable attraction to the concept that all the trustees should be elected. I realize that brings into play a number of other technical difficulties. The technical difficulty of course is that some municipalities put forward the argument: we've sometimes had the experience that people won't stand for election, and therefore we have to maintain this stance whereby we can appoint hospital trustees. That may well be true, but the difficulty with that argument is: does that also apply to election to a municipal council; does that also apply to Members of the Legislative Assembly or to the people who would like to represent in the House Commons? At any level there is always the question as to whether someone will file papers, whether there will be acclamation, or indeed whether there will be an election contest.

I think one is more persuaded by the fact of having persons seek election because of the accountability factor, the instance where you, Mr. Speaker, or other members of this House have to stand on the hustings and are accountable, people can challenge us, especially at election time. They certainly challenge us all the time, but at election time they can challenge us as to what the programs have been, what our input has been, and where we really stand. The electorate can take that into consideration come election day.

With respect to this issue of having appointed trustees or people who go in for election, other people make the case that oftentimes with some of the boards with appointed members, the council which makes the appointment can reach into various professions, various areas of expertise throughout the community, and request certain people who have that expertise to take their places on a hospital board and thereby give a better balance to the administration of that board. That is an argument which has a certain attractiveness as far as I'm concerned.

Other jurisdictions throughout the country have situations similar to ours. That's pretty well the same in British Columbia. In Saskatchewan, for example, only Crown hospital board members are appointed, and the remainder throughout the rest of the province are elected. In Manitoba the situation is very similar to ours, where you can have either appointed or elected, and in Ontario that is pretty much the same situation as well.

With regard to Bill 218 and the technical requirements, if the Bill were to pass — and I think all of us in this Assembly are realistic enough to realize that the passage of this Bill is not really too likely, especially this afternoon — the changes would really take away the power of the municipality to nominate members of the first district board. At the same time, it would take away the authority of the minister to appoint members to a hospital district board.

The Bill raises other technical questions that would come into force on proclamation, if the Bill were to pass. That would raise another question which is: what effect would this new legislation have on incumbent members who were nominated or appointed to a first district board? Would immediate elections have to be called in order to meet the new provisions requiring elected boards? At the present time, of course, municipalities have the option to appoint or elect. So would all vacancies require replacements by election only? What would happen at election time if, as we mentioned earlier, no one decided to run for office? There would have to be the provision that if no one ran, we'd still have to have an appointment made.

There is one thing to keep in mind, and it takes us back to the fiscal responsibility of boards. If local requisitioning for deficits does indeed have to be put into effect at some future time to be able to deal with the escalating costs of health care, then it may well become a requirement for us to have hospital district boards elected.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to bring forward Bill 218. The basic philosophical issue with regard to the Bill is simply this: what is the most effective, efficient, and responsive method of the boards' representatives with respect to the issues? Perhaps the most accountable way of dealing with fiscal responsibility is to let the trustees know that they, like Members of the Legislative Assembly, members of municipal councils, or Members of Parliament, can carry out programs, make requisitions, and deal with the issues. Nevertheless that difficult hour comes when one still has to face the electorate to determine whether one continues to hold the responsibility of the particular office, in this case a hospital trustee.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to take part in Bill 218, the Hospital Elections Act. I served for between four and a half and five years on a hospital board — not a big hospital, the local hospital in Bow Island. During that time, I also served for a couple of years or more as one of the executive members of the southern Alberta regional hospital association. I'm going to speak in support of this Bill, in support of elected board members for hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly review the hospitals in my constituency and the makeup of their boards, the Bow Island General hospital and nursing home has two county appointees, both of whom are elected councillors; two town of Bow Island appointees, one of whom is an elected member of council and one of whom is appointed from the public at large; one elected member from Burdett; and one elected member from Foremost. In many cases in small towns, they seldom receive any opposition for these positions, but in some cases they are open for election.

When I was on town council, we decided at that time to have one of the councillors appointed to the hospital board all the time. We felt that previously, when the council hadn't appointed somebody from their own, there was no way somebody could come back and report to council on what has happened. Mr. Speaker, that was back in the days prior to 1972-73, before the provincial government took over 100 percent of hospital funding and the boards were allowed to put a four mill maximum requisition, I think it was, to the municipalities. We thought there should be a tie-in to the community council so someone could come back and explain why that money was needed.

At that time, we started appointing one member of council to the board, and the other member was a member of the public who was interested in health care and interested in serving on a hospital board. I should say that for many years that additional

member from the town was the chairman of the board of the hospital. I think the situation I used as an example, Mr. Speaker, of the reason we on council at that time decided to put a member on the board, is really the reason we should consider passing this Bill. We thought there should be a tie-in to the general public, a tie-in of explanation when one could explain and answer to the public for one's actions on such a board and in support of such a board.

In the town of Redcliff, they still hold an annual meeting. The school board and the town generally hold this meeting co-operatively, and they invite members of other bodies to attend this meeting and answer questions. Normally the elected member of the Medicine Hat hospital board attends these meetings. If there are questions on health care or the hospital in the Hat, which he's responsible for, he is there to answer them, to answer to the people. When you have directly elected people or elected people appointed to boards, I think they take an interest and they answer to the people. I think this is a necessity of such an Act.

I realize there will be problems in some areas where you may have provincial hospitals, and it may get a little tricky to design areas for board members to run in when you get to major regional hospitals, such as some we have in the province. I realize there may be problems with this, but they may not be insurmountable problems, Mr. Speaker. They may be problems that can be worked out, whether it's a combination of elected or we have to consider partial appointment for these to make sure certain areas are represented. Or maybe we need to design some sort of ward system that may overlap municipal boundaries, et cetera, in order to attain proper representation in these areas. But with the members we have in this Assembly and the many civil servants, local municipalities, and others that could become involved in designing these boards, I'm sure somebody would be able to give us a system or a map of how this sort of situation could be overcome.

I also realize there may be problems in the larger cities, where there are many hospitals and many areas overlap. I guess anything we do creates some problems in certain areas, but some of these problems, as I said previously, may not be totally impossible to overcome.

When I started, Mr. Speaker, I used just one hospital in my constituency, the board I myself sat on. That is really the only hospital inside the boundaries of my constituency, but there are other hospitals that serve the constituency. There's a hospital in Taber. The member that serves the board from Taber is elected. There's a Medicine Hat hospital board that has, I guess, three members from my constituency. One is the councillor appointed from the county of Forty Mile, another is a person who is elected from the improvement district, and the third is the one I mentioned before, one elected person from Redcliff. The fourth hospital that serves part of the area is the hospital at Milk River, and I believe that member is appointed. So as you see, there is a mix of appointed and elected members in the constituency.

I noted that in his opening debate on the subject, the Member for Calgary Egmont made note of the resolution of the Urban Municipalities Association relating to the election of hospital board members and the passing of that resolution by a substantial margin, and then of course the resolution being turned down at the Alberta Hospital Association's annual meeting or convention, whichever you wish to call it. One can ably see that the voting members of the Urban Municipalities Association are totally elected people from the province of Alberta who are used to answering to the public for their actions, who have to answer to the public every three years, if not sooner, when they stand for re-election. They obviously feel there is

nothing wrong with that system. But when you get into an association like the Alberta Hospital Association, where your voting members are not only board members, be they elected or appointed, but are also certain administration personnel of the hospitals, you get a different vote. You get resolutions and a vote that reject the question of whether members should be appointed or elected.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the vote would be if it were just hospital board members voting on that motion or even just hospital board members that are elected personnel, whether appointed from boards or elected directly. I really wonder what the result of that motion in that organization would be then. I think these people would take their responsibility differently. That is not to say that those presently are not taking their responsibility seriously. Probably they are taking it seriously, but they are not prepared to explain to people why they feel there is a problem with their being elected to that position.

As I remember when I was on the town council in Bow Island, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that had to be done by a certain time was that council had to pass a motion saying they wanted the election of their hospital board members. If this motion wasn't passed, according to the Municipal Government Act, after the fall election you'd automatically be in a position of having to appoint the hospital board members of that area. I suspect that power is now probably in another Act, maybe even in the Local Authorities Election Act, where there is that direction. So I think the first thing that would have to be done would be to change that Act to say that hospital board members would be elected, period. Another approach that might be tried would be to have the wording changed to say that hospital board members would be elected unless a motion or a bylaw of the local municipality were passed.

Mr. Speaker, the latter suggestion might be a move halfway between the present situation and the desire of the mover, in bringing this Bill to the Assembly, to put on the local municipal body the emphasis of what they want to do with the election. I believe the only way to do that would be to change the Act to require them to pass a motion saying they would be appointed, rather than the existing legislation saying that if you don't do anything, then automatically something will happen. I think the key would be to trigger that something needed to be done previously, instead of having it done automatically. That might be a middle-of-the-road approach one might look at.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read part of a little verse. Maybe it's applicable to the content of my speech this afternoon. I'll try reading it. If you decide it's not in order and I get cut off, so be it.

The little cabbage in the field was consulting its mother about life.

"Life," said the mother, "is a gamble; you've got to withstand storms, drought, wind, animals — not to mention bugs, lice, mold, rot. But, if you don't give up, you'll thrive and grow."

"Life certainly is a gamble," agreed the little cabbage, "but there's one thing you haven't quite made clear: when do I quit growing?"

"As in any other gamble," said Mother Cabbage, "quit when you're a head!"

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to make a few remarks about Bill 218, elected hospital boards versus appointed hospital boards. There are some pros and cons on both sides of the argument.

My first experience with this type of service was an appointment by the county council to the Brooks nursing home board.

At that time there was a requisition to the municipalities for both nursing homes and hospitals. After the province took over the total cost of funding, the Brooks hospital and nursing home became amalgamated and known as the Brooks hospital and nursing home board. At that time the town of Brooks had some of their trustees elected and some appointed. The county I represented appointed all their trustees, but all were not necessarily elected county people. Some of them were from the general public. Because the boundaries were not coterminous, there were people that sat on the Brooks hospital and nursing home board that were not in the Brooks hospital district. So they only represented the nursing home portion of the committee.

In my opinion there's some merit to this kind of appointment. First of all, the municipal councils hear a direct report of what is happening in the hospital; secondly, as Alan suggested, at the annual meeting of the town or council, there was always a report about the operations of the hospital. It generally brought as much interest as the report on agriculture or the road program. Without them being involved in the municipal districts, they wouldn't be required to have a hospital report at the annual meeting.

It's agreed that when the hospital took over the total cost of health services, the hospital trustees tended to take a little less interest in the budget and were more inclined to leave it to the administrator to run the budget. There was still some merit, though, in having some municipally elected people on the hospital board. Quite often all levels of government are criticized for the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing. In this case, there's a kind of collusion between the services that are supplied to people.

In the time I spent on the Brooks hospital and nursing home board, there were some elected people that were members of the health centre and also the Brooks ambulance association and the senior citizens' home association, which are interrelated. I spent several years appointed to all three of those boards and was able to relate the problems between the hospital board, the ambulance association, and the senior citizens' association. As a matter of fact, to give you an example, we had husbands and wives, and one was in the nursing home and the other was in the senior citizens' home. Of course they always compared their monthly charges in those institutions, and it sometimes took some explaining to get them to agree that there should be a difference in the cost.

Another merit is that while I was on the Brooks hospital and nursing home board, we built a new hospital in Brooks. During the planning stages of the new hospital, it became quite evident that we were going to need some funding for improvements to the grounds and the parking area. Some two years before the hospital construction started, we were able to go to the county we represented and say: look, there's going to be quite a little requisition for grounds and parking area: maybe we should set up a budget two years ahead so this won't take place all in one year. As a result we budgeted our share of the costs of the grounds and the parking area over, I believe, four years, which lessened the impact for that kind of requisition. Not to say that, had we not had a representative on the hospital board, it might not have been brought to our attention. But in our particular case that's the way it worked out.

Our ambulance association started out as a municipal ambulance service that was administered by one member from each contributing municipality. Those [municipalities] picked up the deficit on the ambulance service on a population basis. In 1979, the ambulance service in Brooks was taken over by the Brooks hospital board, but it was still funded by the municipalities on a population basis, the same as it was under the municipal

ambulance association. The municipalities that pay for that service presently have some people appointed to the hospital board, and of course they have some input to the hospital budget.

The senior citizens' lodges deficits are also funded by the municipalities. This is done on an equalized assessment basis, which was just slightly different. There was always some liaison between the happenings of those boards, and I might even include the health unit, the home care program, et cetera. There is always some interaction by those services.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree that an independently elected hospital board also has some merit. We do have some dedicated people who are interested in hospital operations, who don't feel qualified to be municipally elected people, and we might be losing their expertise or their dedication as hospital board members. However, I am aware of people who get on all kinds of boards, who have one ax to grind and, once they have accomplished what they started out to do, they generally lose interest. Quite often the total aspect of the service is not within their interest. However, we find that in all kinds of elected people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would say that under the present funding program there is not a lot of reason for municipally elected people to necessarily be needed on hospital boards, if they are connected with an ambulance service that is municipally funded, there is some merit in them being there, but it is really not a lot different from a school requisition. I guess I would say that I support hospital boards being elected, but I will certainly be interested in the rest of the debate on the subject.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, before speaking in support of this Bill, I would like to thank the Member for Calgary Egmont for bringing it before this Assembly. As I understand it, this Bill would require that all members of district hospital boards be elected.

There are two hospital districts situated wholly within the constituency of Highwood and at least one other whose jurisdiction overlaps constituency boundaries. These two hospital districts — the Turner Valley municipal hospital district No. 66, which will be known as the Oilfields General hospital, and the High River General and auxiliary hospital and nursing home district No. 11 — are presently composed mainly of elected board members. There is in fact only one appointed board member, and she enjoys the same respect, rights, and privileges as the elected members.

I took the liberty of contacting a few of my constituents about the implications of this Bill, and everyone seemed to think it was a good idea. The two boards that I am familiar with have been operating very efficiently and effectively for a number of years. These people are elected and feel a responsibility not only to the functioning of the hospital but to the public in general. An appointed member may not feel that same type of responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the feedback I have received is that there may be problems getting enough people to run for election, and the people who do run may not be representative of all the district's interests. Still, there is no better way I know of than the democratic elective system that provides everyone with the opportunity both to run and to vote. Even if a candidate wins by acclamation, at least everyone had a chance to run.

Coming from a rural constituency, I know that convincing people to run for elected positions is sometimes a difficult task. It really shouldn't be that way, but it is. You probably won't believe this, Mr. Speaker, but even in my own election, they

had a difficult time getting me to even become interested in running as a Progressive Conservative candidate.

AN HON. MEMBER: In running, or as a Progressive Conservative?

MR. ALGER: Either way, Mr. Speaker. Having done so, I can't express to you clearly enough the effect it has had on my whole well-being and on my family's care and interest in the political system now, and the responsibility that I feel to some of those 14,000 voters — indeed to all of them — who came out to the election and helped put me where I am. The only way I can see to avoid the problem is to let people know they have a great deal of responsibility not only to themselves but to others as well.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are a pretty decisive group, and last October 17 they pretty well proved it. For instance, in the hospital system we have an overburden of, I would have to guess, some \$1 million that we can't seem to come up with. The people are quite annoyed about that. In the education system, we had to change our municipal taxes rather radically to pay for what you might call overspending in the educational planning that was done down there. Therefore the trustees were up against it, you might say, during that election, and indeed several were turfed out. In fact, many of the municipal councillors were changed for the same reason. But that is the democratic way: if you don't like it, we'll change it.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 218, the Hospital Elections Act, is not a complicated piece of legislation. It gives this Assembly the opportunity to reflect on the electoral system, a system whose basic philosophy is one of the reasons Albertans have survived and prospered. In my opinion there's nothing wrong in requiring hospital board members to be elected throughout the whole province, not just in the constituency of Highwood. Therefore I support the passage of this Bill, and I urge the Assembly to do the same.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate briefly in this debate on Bill 218. Initially I would like to say that it is not my intention to support this Bill. However, that is not because I don't believe there is merit in the suggestion the hon. member has made by presenting this Bill to the Assembly. Indeed there is no question that in our society at this point in time, we have to look seriously at the system that governs our health care in the province and ensure that it is efficient and accountable in all ways. There's no question whatsoever that with the spiralling costs of health care in the province of Alberta, as with other jurisdictions, there is a need to make sure that those who run our hospitals do so in the most effective way and do so taking directly into account the needs of the citizens.

In introducing his Bill, the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont lauded the virtues of the democratic process. I think very few of us would be able to disagree with the points he made in his introductory speech. We're all creatures of that democratic process, all people who have been through it, all people who must believe in it, or we would not be here today. Yet in the city of Calgary, I have experienced what I think is the negative end of the democratic process. Mr. Speaker, I have to underline that I make these comments from the perspective of a citizen in Calgary or Edmonton. Indeed I think the specifics of the Bill might work very well in smaller communities in the province of Alberta.

In Calgary, however, every civic election time we have a choice that has to be made by the citizens in terms of their evaluation of a number of mayoralty candidates, aldermanic

candidates, and then a myriad of school board trustee candidates, up to some 35 in number, depending on which slate they pick from. These individual candidates have to run campaigns in a city of some 600,000 people, make them aware of their particular platforms, and do so by competing with the aidermanic and mayoralty candidates.

It's my personal opinion that despite the fact that we often get excellent people running for that particular position, school board elections in the city of Calgary have become nothing more than lotteries where people pick from a very sparse information base the people who represent them on school boards, and where individuals run through the list and very often pick a name on the basis of how attractive that particular name is or the occupation of the individual involved. I was a candidate in one of those elections and was very frustrated in trying to communicate. So if you add to that the election for hospital board trustees, if you add a number of slates of people who might be interested in representing the people of Calgary, even if you were able to unite all the hospitals into one board and elect only one, I think you would have a difficult time. Perhaps another system can be evolved. Perhaps there's some way of regionalizing it within the two major metropolitan centres, but at this point I have been unable to think of one.

I'll be interested in discussing those possible options with the author of the Bill in weeks to come. But at this point, with those difficulties for the two major urban centres, I would be unable to support the Bill as it's currently drafted.

Thank you.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time and because I have many remarks I'd like to make on this Bill, I would like to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the hon. member may adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening it's proposed to deal in Committee of Supply with the estimates of the Legislative Assembly and to continue thereafter with Education, and Hospitals and Medical Care.

I propose a motion that when members assemble this evening, they do so in Committee of Supply and that the Assembly stand adjourned until such time as the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You've heard the motion by the Deputy Government House Leader. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:29 p.m.]

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

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

Legislative Assembly

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Administrative Support [\$4,277,968]

1.0.2 — Members' Indemnities and Allowances

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could we have some order please. Would members correct the Legislative Assembly appropriation, Vote 1.0.2, to read \$3,518,322, showing a 9.8 percent increase. It has been corrected because of Bill 8, that was introduced in this Legislature.

Agreed to:

1.0.2 — Members' Indemnities and Allowances	\$3,518,322
1.0.3 — Speaker and Deputy Speaker — Office Services	\$216,667
1.0.4 — Government Members Services	\$881,374
1.0.5 — Opposition Members Services	\$535,088

1.0.6 — Legislature Committees

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, on the Legislature committees vote, does this include the Committee on Senate Reform?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. Member for Calgary North West to respond to that.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't quite hear the member's question. Was he referring to 1.0.5? Oh, 1.0.6. I'm sorry. Yes, that includes not only the legislative Committee on Senate Reform but also the legislative committee on the Ombudsman.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I've gone on record as saying that I oppose the establishment of the Senate Reform Committee, so I would like to find out from the chairman of that committee what the agenda is, what they propose to do, and how long this thing is going to go on. Maybe that's a good place to start. I'd like to have a report from the chairman.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to respond to the hon. member's question and thank him for the opportunity to report to the House, on an interim basis, with respect to the activities of the committee. As the member knows, the committee was formed in November of last year and, from then until the session started again this year, proceeded to define its initial objectives, meet in a number of sessions to look at objectives and at how to proceed with the mandate it has been given and, since then, followed through with initial meetings, part of the committee travelling each time to meet with members of the legislatures, both opposition and government, in other provinces.

To date, the committee has visited the legislatures of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and the territorial councils in the Northwest Territories and Yukon, as well as having spent a week in Ottawa, meeting with Members of Parliament on both sides of the House, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Mark MacGuigan, a number of ambassadors and high commissioners from different countries to discuss with them their systems of government, as well as with the federal Joint Committee on Senate Reform, the Macdonald royal commission, a number of senators including the government leader in the Senate, the opposition leader in the Senate, their deputies, and a series of other senators during those meetings as well.

Part of the committee briefly visited Washington to look at that particular system of government. It met with parliamentarians from both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and a variety of other individuals involved with that parliamentary system and, I believe, was able to get a real understanding of the differences between that system — the effect of the move in the United States from an appointed Senate until 1913 to an elected Senate after that time.

Since that time, the committee has held a number of meetings here in Alberta with individuals whom we hoped would help give us an understanding of the issue and its various dimensions. That included a representative from the New Democratic Party caucus in this Legislature, and a former senator and premier of the province, Ernest Manning. As well it had the Hon. Jim Horsman, Minister of Federal and intergovernmental Affairs, and next Wednesday will be meeting with him again on his trip to Germany.

The schedule of the committee from here on is essentially that we will complete our discussions with other provinces — that is, Quebec and the Atlantic provinces — in the month of June. In order to save funds, we've been sending only some members of the committee to the various jurisdictions. Then we will return to begin public hearings throughout the province of Alberta through the summer months. We put one advertisement in newspapers covering all parts of the province some time ago, and have received somewhere in excess of 220 responses to that. We're now finalizing discussions with those individuals, groups, and organizations who may be interested in making presentations, and will then determine the specific schedule, place, and time for the summer months. At the end of that process, I anticipate that the committee will want to spend a number of days discussing and evaluating the material it has gathered.

We are considering, although there has been no decision made by the committee, the possibility of an interim report to the Legislature about November, and sending out that interim report to the groups and individuals who made presentations as well as to the other governments and oppositions in the country, to gain their thoughts on the interim report so that we might have a better idea of how we can serve the needs of Albertans and, at the same time, move to try to achieve that formula, which is seven out of 10 provinces representing at least 50 percent of the population and the federal government, which you have to achieve for agreement on any Senate change. It is the feeling of the committee that we need to try both to represent the views of Albertans and to be practical in the final recommendations of the report.

We will then look at what further information the committee might require, determine if there are further discussions or travels required, finalize the recommendations, and report to this Legislature, I would anticipate, in the spring sittings of 1985.

Essentially, Mr. Chairman, that is a report on the general and anticipated activities of the Senate committee to date. I'd be happy to answer any further questions on that issue.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the chairman of that committee. Can he just give me a little bit of background on who dreamed this up? How did this thing ever get off the ground? I know in speaking ... [interjections] If the hon. Member for Vegreville would like to make a speech, fine. I heard in coffee row that half the cabinet were not in favour of this cotton-picking committee when they struck the thing, but nobody seemed to have the gall to kill it before it came to birth.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know the background of how this thing ever came into being and what in the world we hope to

accomplish with this kind of committee. We have Senate reform committees ... [interjection] I spoke against it. Where were you, Batiuk?

MR. BATIUK: I've been here.

DR. BUCK: Were you looking after your people's dollars? Did you care? In other words, you're supporting this waste of half a million dollars.

I'm upset, and I think we can do a lot better than run around finding out something we already know. You don't have to have meetings in this province to find out that everybody in Alberta wants an elected Senate.

MR. OMAN: Aren't you on that committee?

DR. BUCK: What's your problem, Oman? Are you going to make a speech, or are we just going to have these quips?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member direct any comments he has through the Chair. [interjections] Order please.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, tell those yahoos to be in order, then.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. With respect, I think that everyone knows that select committees are established by a resolution of the House. The hon. member is casting aspersions on a decision of the House, which it is certainly his prerogative to do, but I suggest that he do it in the Assembly rather than in a committee of the Assembly.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Speaking on behalf of some of my colleagues, I'd like a ruling from the Chairman whether the language used by the Member for Clover Bar is parliamentary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It's not in *Beauchesne*, so I cannot rule on it. I would ask the hon. Member for Clover Bar to continue.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, this thing blows my mind, it really does. It blows my mind how we as responsible legislators can just go ahead and blow half a million dollars. That's what we're doing. We know, everybody in Alberta knows, that you need an elected Senate if that thing down there is going to work. Everybody in Canada has known that for years and years, except that the people who get into power want to have some place to stick their old political cronies, so they put them in the Senate. And the same thing will happen — I'm sure that if the present leader of the federal Conservative Party gets to be Prime Minister, he won't have enough jam to get rid of that Senate or make the Senate functional.

Mr. Chairman, we have a federal Senate committee running around the country right now, have we not? They seem to have ongoing ones, because they've been running around for the last 50 years trying to talk about Senate reform. I want to know how this thing came to be and who was responsible for it. Was it the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, or was it something the chairman dreamed up, went to caucus, and said it would be a great idea? Well, it's a great way to waste money. I want to know what it's going to accomplish. What are we going to do after we get this information? Who are we going to lay it on, and who's going to look at it? Or is it going to go on the shelf and collect dust?

I told my colleague the Member for Little Bow that I voted against this before and I'm going to vote against it now. I think we needed this committee like we needed a spare head. All other legislative committees have some function; they have something to do and they do something. But this one, somebody got carried away to the tune of — I don't know what the budget of that special committee is; maybe the chairman can tell me. But, boy, it's just a waste of taxpayers' dollars, and I've got to have more information than that before I vote on it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to enlighten the hon. member. First of all, with respect to the background of the establishment of the committee, the topic of Senate reform was one of the original topics in the constitutional discussions that came to a conclusion in the 1982 accord, it was one of those that was left for further discussion. Immediately after that, the Prime Minister of the country, one Pierre Elliott Trudeau, established a House/Senate committee — which is what the hon. member was thinking about — which in fact reported. It's not travelling the country at this time; it's dead. It reported in February to the House of Commons.

The purpose of the committee as defined by the Prime Minister was to develop the federal position with respect to Senate reform. He suggested that all the provinces would need to develop their specific positions. That was one of the reasons why this provincial Legislature took that challenge on a vote in this Legislature, though I don't believe the hon. member was actually here for the vote.

DR. BUCK: I was here. I voted against it, too. You've got a short memory.

MR. ANDERSON: In any case, I won't debate what I recall as fact. The House did establish this committee in order to deal precisely with the topic, which is now nearing the top of the discussion stage in the constitutional discussions, in their second phase.

In fact this morning, the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and I met with the Hon. Mark MacGuigan, the Minister of Justice, who has been delegated by the Prime Minister to be here to discuss Senate reform with all the provinces. This province has led the other provincial legislatures in establishing the committee, putting forth a position, developing some sort of dialogue with our fellow provinces, and indeed trying to define the position with respect to Senate reform in this province.

The hon. member may well think it's a simple elect or appoint situation. However, if he would investigate the issue to any extent, he'd find that none of the answers in our governmental form is anywhere near that simple.

DR. BUCK: So let's just get rid of it then. It's simple; get rid of it.

MR. ANDERSON: The hon. member suggests, get rid of it. He's talked about the expense of the committee, which I might add is nowhere near half a million dollars but rather the budget is in the neighbourhood of \$290,000. I expect us to come considerably under that budget, I might add. The budget for this year is some \$290,000.

In any case, with respect to the end result of the committee, we're now at a stage where the federal government is initiating interprovincial discussions on it. We're the first province to begin dialogue with our fellow provinces on this issue. Through the efforts of the committee, we are developing in-depth dia-

logue with our citizens on this committee. The hon. member may not think that dialogue with citizens is important, that he has an all-knowing truth about what all citizens believe on all aspects of Senate reform. I don't know how he plans to reach a consensus with the other provinces on the issue, but perhaps he has some immediate solution to that as well.

In any case, I believe most Albertans feel that had there been a mechanism by which federal decision-making had Alberta input in a very solid and definite way in the past, we may not have had some of the negative federal programs that didn't do as much as one might expect to help Alberta. The hon. member may or may not believe that Alberta has all of the say it needs in our federation and in federal decision-making. He may agree with federal decisions as they affect Alberta. If not, I suggest that he would be with the majority of Albertans who feel there has to be some option, some way in which we can make our feelings known in Confederation. One major possibility of that is to go back to the original purpose of the Senate in Confederation, which was to represent the provinces in the federal decision-making process. I know it's our committee's feelings — and I believe that of most Albertans, though we'll find that out through the public hearings — that it's time we scraped the cobwebs from Confederation, got under way with these discussions, came up with a set of recommendations and conclusions that we could sell to our fellow Canadians and that were acceptable to Albertans, and finally have that say in Ottawa that Alberta rightfully should have as an equal partner in Confederation.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I have to indicate to the hon. members that the hon. Member for Clover Bar was indeed in the House that day. He and I were here, and he was the only one to vote against it. I remember it clearly. At the time, admittedly, I voted for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. MARTIN: I'm getting heckled by the opposition. This is a new experience.

I would like to say in my defence that at the time I thought, well, there isn't a lot for a lot of backbenchers to do; this is constructive work; maybe they could get together, do some useful philosophizing, and come up with a position, even though the Alberta government had a position. But I think what struck me later on is that we weren't given an idea of the scope of it. When we started to find out — and I'll ask the member this, because I understand there have been some changes. When we started to find out the possibility of going to Germany, the possibility of going to Australia, the cost was much higher than I expected. When we talked about it here, we did not talk about all this travel. As a result of that, the expense was much higher than I expected it to be from that discussion we had here in the Assembly, Mr. Chairman.

I understand now. I know what the budget is. I think it is hard to justify, whether we think a committee in this Legislature to study the Senate is a good idea or not. I think it's very hard to justify a \$290,000 budget in a time of restraint, when we hear all sorts of people saying, we have to cut back. We see the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care telling us we have to cut back, and we hear all sorts of tales of woe about cutbacks. It becomes hard to justify that type of budget.

Frankly, I think we could have a committee studying the Senate, Mr. Chairman, and getting information if they want. They can send a letter to Australia. They're very friendly people now that they have a Labour government there, and I'm sure they'd be glad to send over the mechanisms. The same with

Germany, the same with some other places — and come up with a position for the Alberta government. I have no objection to that. But I think the amount budgeted is much too much, especially in this day and age.

I've heard via the grapevine — I don't know this for sure — that the committee has had second thoughts. It isn't going to be as far-ranging as we originally thought, that the \$290,000 will not be spent. I've heard that; I don't know whether it's true. I guess my question to the member is, what is the idea that they're going to go in the future? What is the travel in the future? I know what has happened in the past. At this point what does the hon. member at this point feel will be the actual money spent on this committee?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member raises a couple of important points, primarily with respect to the possibility of committee travel outside the country. In its original development of a budget, the committee was in the unfortunate position of needing to establish, for the Members' Services Committee, a budget without having had the benefit of a number of meetings of the committee to determine what the planning would be. Even at this juncture, I can't inform the hon. member as to what the committee's plans or decisions will be with respect to travel outside the country.

I might say that the committee is very cognizant of the need to look at funds in a very scrupulous way and has addressed the question of costly travel by cutting back considerably on, for example, the whole committee going anywhere outside the province. We have had a policy of no more than half the committee travelling to any one place. The exception was Ottawa, where we felt there was a need for an orientation of the whole committee to the Senate itself and to the issues that evolve from there, so six members ended up going to that particular centre. It is because of some of those cutbacks that I believe the budget will be considerably under what it is currently, though the decision on whether or not the committee travels outside the country will very much indicate whether we will be able to cut it back radically.

The only way I believe committee members will make a decision to travel outside the country is if we first got all the material that has been available in this country. As I mentioned to the hon. Member for Clover Bar, when we were in Ottawa we tried to obtain all that information in both person and writing. For example, we met with the High Commissioner for Australia and the Ambassador for Germany while we were in Ottawa. We've requested a number of other papers with questions that we have on those systems. We met with Senator Roblin, who had been to Australia, and Senator Manning, who has studied that as well. We're trying to accumulate all we possibly can in this country.

My personal feeling is that the only way we would be able to justify an expenditure for travel outside the country would be if we come up with a set of conclusions that suggest a system which looks somewhat similar to another nation that may be there and we can't find the answers we need. For example, if we went the route the Member for Clover Bar roughly suggests when he talks about an elected Senate, Australia is the only British parliamentary system in the world that has an elected Senate. From my discussions with the various people who've been there and from reading — I have read probably 14 or 16 reports myself on that particular system — I haven't been able to answer a number of crucial questions, including: does the elected Senate, because of the proportional representation system of election and the control from the central parties out of the capital, first serve the central parties in that capital or the

state? There are varying opinions on that. I'm hoping we'll be able to find those answers here.

It may be that we may not need those answers in any definite way. We may conclude on a system that is very much unlike that. But if we are making recommendations to this Legislature and we have not been able to conclude whether or not those recommendations in fact are practical in any other way — and we will explore all other ways — that would be the only basis on which I could see the committee making a decision to travel elsewhere.

Just in closing, I might say I agree completely with the remarks of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood when he opened his part of the debate on the motion establishing the committee, when he said

At this particular time, some people might say it's costly, but I happen to agree with the government this time. I think it's appropriate that we look into the role of the Senate, because if we keep the Senate going as it is, it's costing all taxpayers a lot of money for no value at all.

So I'm going to support this resolution.

I thank the hon. member for that statement.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up, I'd already admitted my sins earlier on.

Again, I'm not questioning the need. I think the Senate is costing all Canadian taxpayers a lot of money. This party for one has said we should have abolished the Senate years ago, that all it is is a rest home for retired politicians, mainly Liberals because they've been in power longer but there are also a few Tories from when they were in power. Certainly when Clark was in government, they pushed in a number at that time.

No doubt about that; I wasn't objecting to a committee here coming with a recommendation to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that the Alberta government would have a position. But I would also remind the hon. member that the travel plans were not discussed. I would point out to him that our party, as he well knows, has a position, whether he agrees with that position or not. I can assure you that the party members didn't fly all over, to Germany and that, to come to that position. But there's a lot of good research done in it and, I think, a useful exercise.

So I'm not complaining about the committee as such. But I really do think that in terms of priorities — there are different times now. We are clearly saying a lot of things to Albertans, and a lot of things might be desirable. It might be desirable that we go to Australia. It might be desirable that we go to Germany. But in terms of priorities of what's now important to people, I really would suggest that the symbolism of that is going to be very difficult to explain to Albertans, that we have a committee from Alberta studying the Senate over in Germany at a time when we're talking about cutbacks in other areas. That symbolism is extremely important right now,

I really would suggest to the member that we take a look at this. I'm still not disagreeing with the need for the Senate to be turfed out. I wish we could do it tomorrow. It would save us all a lot of money. Nothing would be better than what we have right now. I have no objection to this group of people from this Legislature advising the Alberta government on a position and having the committee studying it. What I am objecting to is what would be perceived by the public to be unwise spending, especially at this time of restraint. That's the point I'm trying to make at this point.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could respond briefly to the hon. member's comments. I agree with him that at this point in time, the public of Alberta wants government

to restrain its expenditures, wants us to be very detailed in terms of how we go through expenditures on their behalf. Many Albertans have suffered and want to know that their government is expending money in the best possible way.

I might just say, though, that the parameters he outlined for the committee are probably slightly more limiting than the committee itself saw those parameters. At this juncture in the history of Canada, for the first time, we have the amending formula which tells us how to change that Senate, and we have to be in a position to achieve that formula, that seven out of 10 provinces representing 50 percent of the population, plus the federal government. So that necessitates those discussions with other provinces and the federal government.

My opinion would be that indeed the committee would be a waste of money if we didn't have a possibility of having Albertan's views have influence on the eventual outcome of the decision on the Senate, from just sitting here making a determination as to what our own feelings are about Senate reform without any basis of reality in terms of the feelings of the other provinces. Indeed, I feel the same about the people of Alberta. We assume — and I know the Member for Clover Bar makes a specific assumption — that we know what our constituents feel on the issue. Until we've developed that dialogue with them, I'm not sure that there will be a full understanding.

As I mentioned, I know that the member's party does have a position. I find it a position meriting some definite thought on the part of the committee. We had an opportunity to discuss that only a couple of weeks ago. But it's not just the position we have to look for; it's what Albertans want and how that fits into being salable in the nation as a whole.

So we will indeed be careful to safeguard the funds of the public of Alberta in the most possible way. I'm sure as well that the member, and I'm sure Albertans, wouldn't want us to save a penny here for a pound lost there by recommending a set of solutions that either would be impractical or that wouldn't be salable in any possible way elsewhere, with Albertans on one hand or with other Canadians on the other.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity. I haven't had a chance yet to say anything on this particular committee. Let me begin by saying that I have a good deal of personal respect for the hon. Member for Calgary Currie. I would say that if he plays his cards right, guesses who is going to be the heir apparent and the eventual Premier, some day he will be sitting in the front bench and playing a major role in the government. But what troubles me, Mr. Chairman, is that if we're going to consider this important enough that we're prepared to spend \$300,000 assessing the Canadian Senate, it strikes me — and I say this not in any disrespect to the hon. member who chairs the committee — that it would be such an important item that we would have a minister of the Crown on the committee.

Before people get too exercised, let me point out that the select committee which has reviewed the Workers' Compensation Act is chaired, quite properly, by the minister. I recall when I sat on the foreign investment committee, which was chaired by the now Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs at the time, Mr. Getty, sat on that select committee of the Legislature. It seems to me the government can't have it both ways. If they are saying to the people of Alberta that this is such an important matter that it merits \$300,000 expenditure, with great respect to the members on the committee, I think it is incumbent to demonstrate in this House why the minister responsible — in this case, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs — is not a

member of the select committee. I'm not suggesting that ministers have to sit on every committee. We know there are many committees that ministers don't sit on. But as a general rule, we are not talking about committees that have a budget of \$300,000. That's the first point I'd like to make.

The second point is that I suggest — and I say this in as gentle a way as I can, always being positive — that at a time of perceived cutbacks in personal objectives by Albertans as a whole, right across the board, it would be inopportune, to say the least, for the committee to commit themselves to go to Europe or Australia. Indeed, I think it would go some distance to improve the credibility of the committee in terms of dealing honestly with the views of Albertans if the chairman of the committee were to say tonight that we are not going to Europe and we are not going to Australia, given the present economic circumstances. I know the member attempted to argue, as he does quite well, the sort of ifs, ands, or buts. But at a time when you've got 150,000 people out of work, when we have cutbacks in shelter allowance, when we have cutbacks in various perceived necessary public expenditures, I don't think the ifs, ands, or buts satisfy the people of this province, hon. member, nor should they satisfy the people of this province.

As a person who has at least some knowledge of the second Chamber, because I've spent a lot of time working on it, I frankly doubt that a group of MLAs from this Legislature would learn enough to justify that kind of expenditure, whether they go to Europe, Australia, or wherever. I honestly suggest to members of the committee that the information on how these second Chambers work is available through the massive public funding of our universities. We have people at the University of Alberta who have a grasp of constitutional law which is unequalled by any member of this Assembly. Frankly, whether we send opposition or government members around the world 50 times over, we're not going to command that kind of competence, not even the member from whatever it is up there — Belmont; yes.

DR. BUCK: The expert on irrigation.

MR. NOTLEY: The fact of the matter is that if you examine the data base that is already available in this province and talk frankly to the man who used to be deputy minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, whose knowledge, I might just say, is awesomely superior to the new incumbent — nevertheless, a person of enormous ability. The fact is that we will learn very little by sending a group of MLAs on a junket to Europe or Australia. Of course it is going to be of some marginal value. To the member chairing this committee: at a time of restraint, at a time of cutbacks, we have to be able to justify beyond any reasonable doubt that there is legitimacy to that kind of pursuit.

Mr. Chairman, we know what the options are for a second Chamber. They've been discussed in this country for a long time; as the Member for Clover Bar said, 50 years or perhaps even longer. People have debated what the options are. I think it's perfectly legitimate for the committee to hold hearings in Alberta; that's sensible. I think they should hold hearings throughout the province. One of the things I think our heritage trust fund committee should do is hold hearings so people could tell us what they think about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I have no quarrel with the Senate committee holding hearings to get feedback from Albertans, but what concerns me is this business of looking to foreign trips at a time of economic restraint.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to be a little clearer in our objectives. I would say to the member that if there were no

other option to the members going abroad, then I suppose we would be prepared to look at it in a somewhat more favourable light. But we know the pluses and minuses of the Australian Senate. The data base that is available at the universities in this province on the Australian Senate is really quite impressive. The information that we can obtain from the High Commissioner of Australia is really quite impressive. The information we can obtain from the Parliamentary Association is extremely impressive. We know what the experience is in the Federal Republic of West Germany and, again, that information is committed to paper. The pluses and the minuses, the major cases in both these examples, whether it's the case of Australia, whether it was the resignation of the former Labour government, when the Governor General stepped in ... [interjections]. If I could have just a little bit of attention here, Mr. Chairman, so I can carry on and continue my educational process with government backbenchers. I simply say that we have that kind of information.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought it was the member's colleagues in the opposition who were interrupting him.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, whether it's the opposition or the government that are interrupting me, my appeal was for silence so all could hear the wisdom of my words, including the Chairman. I certainly wouldn't want anyone to miss these comments because, since we're dealing with this weighty matter, history may record this debate, and perhaps we'll all be judged on the basis of the things we say tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move from those comments to say that even though I think the \$300,000 expenditure is vastly overestimated and we don't need foreign trips, there is some merit in our provincial government sensibly exploring, in close co-operation with the universities, with people who have technical and professional knowledge, and making provision for input from the people of Alberta, a process by which we can take the position we've already had tabled in this House on a second Chamber — or if it wasn't tabled it was presented, I guess, just before the last provincial election campaign, a quickie thrown together by Dick Johnston, sort of a Johnston special, so we could have it just before the election campaign.

In any event, we can perhaps update that position on the second Chamber, because I for one believe, as my colleague has already pointed out, that the present Senate should be abolished. It isn't serving any useful function. It isn't an effective representative of regional interests. It has no commanding respect on the part of the electorate. Every public opinion poll I've seen that has ever been conducted on the Senate shows that the Senate as an institution is not ranked very highly. But in saying that we need Senate reform or a second Chamber — and let me be extremely serious now — I think we have to be extremely careful lest we jump on this bandwagon of developing parallel power, which has a seeming electoral base, that will simply be a parallel agency to provincial governments.

The fact of the matter is that Canada is different from the United States. Provincial governments have more power than state governments. Senators in the United States are far more influential, far more important than a state governor could ever be. But in Canada that's not going to be the situation. One of the concerns I have with the notion of an elected Senate is that you will simply have unrepresentative people in terms of not having the levers of power. They may have an electoral base, but they're not going to have the levers of power.

As I view constitutional difficulties today, the problem is how we mesh people who wield power at the federal level with people who wield power at the provincial level. Unless you

can reconcile those two things, you're simply not moving toward greater national unity. This country can only exist on the basis of as much consensus-making as possible. One of the reasons that Trudeau, a brilliant man, will perhaps not be recognized in history as a great prime minister is that he did not build consensus. One of the reasons that Pearson or St. Laurent, who perhaps didn't have the obvious credentials of Trudeau, will go down in history as some of the great men who have led this country is because they understood the need to get Canadians working together.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition could get back to whether or not there should be an expenditure.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm coming right back to that issue, Mr. Chairman. That's why I think the point I began to make a few minutes ago, and I won't promise to close on it but the point I want to hammer home — and I realize it may be a bit difficult to do that in this House — is that we have to look at a second Chamber in this country from the Canadian perspective. I think the chairman understands that, if other members don't. We can't duplicate in Canada the West German, Australian, House of Lords in Great Britain, or American experience. We will only make a second Chamber work if we set aside a lot of this theory from other countries and say: what can operate in Canada in a functioning, practical sense to reconcile people who actually wield the levers of power. That's why the input we get from Albertans is important. That's why the input we get from academics in this province who have an understanding and a grasp is important. That's why it's perhaps even reasonable to meet other provinces and other oppositions in the country. But I fail to see, bearing in mind that stricture, what possible advantage there is in flitting around the world when the Canadian experience must surely be the overwhelming yardstick on which to make to our decision.

MR. MARTIN: There's the point.

MR. NOTLEY: Exactly. There's the point, Mr. Chairman. I think the point has been made. It's a very good one. If we all accepted it — and I'm sure the chairman would agree — we'd be able to dramatically reduce our estimates at a time of restraint.

So, Mr. Chairman, I leave those words with the members of the committee. I hope that tonight we get from the chairman a little more definitive position on no travel than we've had to date.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could briefly respond to the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He dealt with several points, though one predominantly, but mentioned first of all that perhaps the committee was less than it could have been because it lacks a minister. It may be a particular philosophy of that side of the House that some members are more equal than others, that indeed it wouldn't be representative of the House without a minister. That's not the philosophy of this side of the House. We have a caucus that makes decisions jointly, one that works together in trying to achieve some ends.

DR. BUCK: Don't try to snow us with that nonsense.

MR. ANDERSON: While the member may have a different approach on his side of the House, we feel it's all equal. I must admit that I'm somewhat surprised. I would have thought he

would not want the government dominating the committee with a minister but want a wide open discussion of equal members.

MR. NOTLEY: No minister is going to dominate a committee.

MR. ANDERSON: In moving to the hon. leader's second and dominant point regarding travel of the committee, he's asked for a commitment from the chairman that there will be no out-of-country travel. Again, I don't know how he works on his committees, but mine, by virtue of the rules established by this Legislature, is a democratic body which will make decisions for itself. Its chairman, albeit that he might want to from time to time, does not lay down what will happen in committee or rules by which it will operate. The member well knows by such rules that I couldn't possibly make that commitment on behalf of members.

I can say that I know every member on the committee, opposition and government, is cognizant of the need to expend money in the most reasonable way possible. I'm confident that all the members will make any decision to expend any amount of money with a great deal of thought and scrutiny.

The member went on at some length about the ability to find out all in-country, from academics and bookshelves, the details of how Australia, Germany, and the British system works. Indeed there is a great deal of information on how the wheels will turn and how organizational charts are structured, as I imagine there was on the workers' compensation committees when the member chose to travel to other places to look at it and didn't choose to just sit here and read the books and talk to academics on the issue. I don't question that decision. I think politicians have to be able to understand the inter-relationships. That isn't always possible from the books and from academics and those who have been there. It may be in this case; it may be unnecessary for us to travel. I'm certainly not going to be put in a position where I'm defending a travel scenario that the committee has not made a decision on. I'll be happy to debate that issue with the member should the committee make that decision, but it has not. As its chairman, I know not whether it will choose to do that. I can only say again that members are extremely cognizant of the need to expend money in the wisest possible fashion, and will make decisions on that basis.

Just one last comment. The member commented on an elected Senate and falling into another system automatically. I agree with the member's comments in that respect. The hon. leader I think has correctly identified that any nation has to define its own roads, though it might find examples in parts of the system elsewhere. It might pattern itself after aspects of other systems that might be beneficial. Indeed we have to be very careful as a nation to accept the easy answers, be they an elected Senate, which seems so popular at the moment, or another form that might become popular at a given time without a base. One of the things the committee is doing is studying in some detail all the effects of those. I look forward to discussing those with the hon. leader and others in the House when the committee reports to the Legislature.

MRS. CRIPPS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There is a minister on the committee, the Member for Calgary Egmont.

MR. NOTLEY: I think he's going to have to do a lot of praying.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the chairman of that committee has given me the background and how, as part of the constitutional changes and bringing the Constitution back, the federal government wanted to review the Senate, but he has not indi-

cated to me who dreamed this up. Was it the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs? Was it the Premier? Who got the brain wave to set this committee up? Was it the chairman? Did the chairman say, we need this, Mr. Premier, or Mr. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs? Somebody had to give the chairman the permission to go ahead with this ill-founded committee, and I'd like to know who was responsible for that decision.

MR. ANDERSON: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, the authority to proceed came from this Legislature in the passage of the motion that was established. In terms of the background as to whose idea it was, this caucus works in concert.

MR. NOTLEY: It came down from heaven.

MR. ANDERSON: It was discussed in our caucus and approved. I can't even really tell the member which person it originated with. It was an evolution of the constitutional discussions that happened a couple of years ago and a need that was obvious to many of us in the House, on both sides of the Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the chairman. Was this under the guidance of the ministry of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, or was this a bolt out of the blue? Somebody had to be responsible for this ill-conceived child of a committee. I'd also like to know from the chairman, in that Alberta is the first to set up a committee such as this, what stage the other provinces are at now. The chairman has been to several provinces. Are we going to have every province going through this exercise? Are all 10 provinces going to get together, have a big convention, and then advise the federal government? Is that the way the system is going to work?

Mr. Chairman, we look at this budget of almost \$300,000. That's almost as much money as the Leader of the Opposition has to administer and to ride herd on 79 Tories in this Legislature, and do the same work those people are doing with ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Seventy-nine?

DR. BUCK: Well, how many they've got. There are so many: 75, 79, 62. I know they're upset; they'd like 79 out of 79.

MR. SZWENDER: Next time.

DR. BUCK: Next time? Szwender, we're going to do everything to make sure you're not back; I'll tell you that.

MR. MARTIN: The Tory Party is going to do that.

DR. BUCK: They can do all the gerrymandering they want, but they're not going to get 79 or 83 out of 83; I'll tell you.

Mr. Chairman, that is almost the same budget the Leader of the Opposition and his office has to ride herd on this government. It's interesting. We passed that vote, but we can get back to it when we look at the whole appropriation. That was quite a tricky little move to raise the government members last year, and then freeze everything this year. That's a cute little system.

I also want to know from the chairman what he and the committee found out when they went to Washington. We're talking about the presidential system they have in the United States as compared to the parliamentary system. Are they going to marry these two together? What did we learn in Washington?

When we went to Washington as members of the trucking committee, we were there for a specific purpose. We were trying to find out about regulation and deregulation of the trucking business. Out of that committee, the Minister of Transportation — we're looking at deregulation of the trucking industry. But these world tour Mickey Mouse committees — that's \$300,000 the taxpayers of this province should never be spending.

So I want to know, number one, are the other provinces going to be setting up similar committees? If they are, when? What's going to happen after all the provinces have gone through this exercise? And what did we learn in Washington?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The three questions asked by the hon. Member for Clover Bar are strictly out of order for this committee, because they have no relevance whatsoever on the amount we're looking at tonight. We're not involved in the budgetary process of other departments throughout Canada. We're only interested in our own.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I beg your pardon. This committee has expended funds. Can you not understand that's the taxpayers' money they're expending? They are responsible to answer in this committee how they spent that money.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question, as I understand ...

DR. BUCK: Did they just go on a holiday, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

DR. BUCK: Or did they get some information?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The question that I understand the hon. Member for Clover Bar asked was, what is being done in the other provinces for expending of funds for a Senate committee? It's strictly out of order as far as we're concerned in this Legislature.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, why did they go to the other provinces then? Maybe the chairman could tell me why.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In any debate on supply, I think the Member for Clover Bar is quite within his rights in asking for information. This committee is asking for supply. The chairman of the committee — the chairman's nodding his head: I think he agrees — is in the same position as any cabinet minister. He must answer questions on both what the committee has done and what they propose to do. That is the whole purpose of the supply debate. No one is asking the pluses and minuses of what they're doing in P.E.I. But if the committee has gone to P.E.I., we want to know why they went to P.E.I., who they met with, and for what reasons. We are voting for supply in the same way as when any of the ministers come to the committee for supply. They have to be able to answer questions not only as to past performance but future plans.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, without wanting to establish any precedent you might consider unparliamentary. I'd be happy to try to respond briefly to the Member for Clover Bar. However, his initial question is a repeat of those that have been asked previously. I don't know how else to answer how the committee was formed or by whom, except to say it was an obvious need expressed by a number of us. I'm sure he's aware

that the motion was sent to the Assembly under the sponsorship of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and was duly passed by this Assembly.

With respect to the United States system, I could go on at some length regarding what the committee learned and experienced there. It particularly wanted to look at that system because of the obvious push on the part of a number of our citizens to the elected Senate concept and suggestions that equated to the American-style Senate. In meeting we did find a number of things that I suppose committee members were not previously aware of. First of all, it was apparent to those of us who were there that the American Senate has indeed become the most powerful legislative body in the world. There's no question that that power has accrued to it, essentially since 1913, when it went from an appointed system to an elected system. The power has come largely from the House of Representatives but as well from the American states, in taking over that. When the states appointed their senators, which was until 1913, the states had a considerable amount of control. We knew that before we left.

In talking to a number of individuals involved with the American Senate, it is obviously a body that also requires a great deal of funds on the part of individual members if you're going to become a member of it. At least 55 of the senators are multimillionaires. I guess that taught us that if you're going to go to an elected system, as the hon. Member for Clover Bar would suggest, we have to be very cognizant of the fact that that's going to require a great deal of funds on the part of individuals running for election on a provincewide basis. In that kind of system, some method of dealing with that would have to be evolved or you would have to just assume that those people with funds would have an advantage over most of us who don't.

In the American system as well, we learned firsthand from discussion with people in the House of Representatives and people working with the Senate of the conflict that exists between those two Houses and the executive branch and how very different that system is from our Canadian parliamentary system. We do have transcripts, notes actually, from all the meetings we had there, as we do for all other parts. The committee will be perusing those notes in some detail when it looks at the recommendations it must make to this Legislature.

I could go on for some time. I suppose it would be more appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to report in more detail on that system as it's applicable to the recommendations we will eventually make to this Assembly. But the overall impression of members who attended — and in that respect he might want to talk to his colleague who was with us on that trip as well — was that it's a very different system, one that has evolved very differently and has aspects to it that we may well learn from but that would take a great deal of chiselling if we wanted to inject it into our British parliamentary style of government.

In terms of the other provinces, we're the first province to initiate a committee on Senate reform. I can't speak for the future intentions of even those we've travelled to, though a number of caucus members in various caucuses — I could specifically say Saskatchewan and Ontario — indicated they would like to establish a committee somewhat like ours. My assumption is that each province will determine on their own how they want to approach the topic, with perhaps different directions. In some provinces, I've no question the government will simply decide on a direction and they'll go into negotiations on that basis. We hope to help them evolve their thoughts. Many provinces indeed have not looked at the issue to the degree we have. Others, like British Columbia, have been involved with the issue for a number of years and have a lot

to teach us from the information they have. Hopefully there can be mutual benefit on that as well.

I mentioned the specific provinces we've travelled to. I could go over them one by one, but to answer the member in a general way, we are the only province to establish a committee. Others are talking about establishing committees; others have established some sort of position. Prince Edward Island, which we haven't yet met with, has established a position and put out a booklet on Senate reform. Most others, though, are open at this point and are looking forward to evolving their position in concert with the evolution of a position from this provincial Legislature, we hope.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that generally answers the questions the hon. member asked. I'm happy, as I'm sure other members of the committee would be, to discuss with him or any other member details of those trips and perceptions we have. At this point it has been very beneficial background for the committee, both in terms of our own understanding of what may be acceptable in the other provinces and in terms of establishing the contacts which will help us in discussions with provinces as we evolve our position in the coming months.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just to follow up on this scintillating debate, that I know the hon. member is enjoying. Some money obviously has been spent. We now know that we've been to Washington. The hon. member says he's not sure what the next steps are in terms of travelling. I have two or three questions for clarification. At this point I believe the only place that has been out of country is Washington, United States. Could the hon. member update us on which provinces they were at, who they met with, what the response has been, and the relative costs that we have spent to this point? I'm not asking to the nearest dollar, but I'm sure the hon. member has a rough ballpark figure at this point.

The other question I have — I'm a little worried that we might have an ongoing committee here. I forget — I'm sure the member can update us again — when this is going to come to a climax and something will be presented to this Legislature. Could the member update us on when that will occur also?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, the member may have been out of the House — I'm not sure — when I did in fact indicate the provinces we have visited. But for his information, to date they have been Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and the two territories. We plan to meet with Quebec and the Atlantic provinces in June.

In terms of the expenditures to date, the last printout I had from the Clerk's office was the end of April. Expenditures to that point were approximately \$66,000 for the travel, advertising, and other costs associated with the committee from its inception in November.

The impressions from the various provinces — again, I could go on for some time. I should say that in each province we asked to meet with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and members of the government and opposition caucuses of all parties, in cases where there were more than two represented, as well as the Speaker of the Legislature. The other person I should mention is the minister of intergovernmental affairs, or equivalent, in the province. In the province of Saskatchewan, where we visited first, we met with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and with members of both opposition and government caucuses. I met with the Premier on a one-to-one basis that afternoon. Essentially I can say that Saskatchewan as a government hasn't evolved a specific position on Senate reform. They have some of the same concerns about having a useful and effective voice in Confederation, an effect

on the federal decision-making process. I think we had a lot of common ground with that province in that respect.

The same can be said of British Columbia. They've gone through a number of positions. The latest one, which they as a government took before the joint House committee, was somewhat a repeat of their position during the constitutional talks, but they are still open to a number of ideas. We found the same kinds of feelings in British Columbia about what Canada should be like and why there was a need for a Senate. So in our two neighbouring provinces, that was quite evident.

The opposition in Saskatchewan had taken the point of view of abolition, if I recall correctly, although they were open to further discussions on what would be replacing that. In British Columbia there was no position on the part of the opposition caucus indicated by the opposition member, and there was only one who met with us in that case.

In Manitoba the government very firmly says that they believe in abolition of the Senate. They do not believe in reforming or replacing it with anything in particular. They believe in reforming the House of Commons and going to a system of proportional representation in its election process, and feel that that would suffice. They are very absolute in that opinion at this point. If we begin to evolve a position in the rest of the country, I have hopes that that province still might consider what we evolve to be better than what exists today. But at this point their position is very firm on that, as the member may know. The opposition caucus has not evolved a firm position; again, had a number of similarities with the people of Alberta in terms of feelings of needing to have a stronger voice in the decision-making process.

I should mention that in all these meetings, without exception, there's no question that all have agreed that the Senate needs to be reformed, that the current Senate is an historical anachronism that should not exist in the future the way it is now.

In Ontario we had very good meetings with all three political parties, and with the Premier of the province for a good hour and a half, as well as his Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Attorney General. As the member knows, the province of Ontario is crucial in any formula, because the 50 percent possibility means we have to have either Quebec or Ontario. You can do without one or the other in the formula, but you have to have one or the other to in fact have constitutional change. We found the government party, the Premier, open and willing to look at possibilities for change. We talked about a number of options and possibilities. He and the government representatives perhaps didn't go as far as we would like to have seen them go in some cases. But I was encouraged by their willingness to talk and their suggestion that they realized there was a need to recognize western Canada more in that process and deal with the alienation that had taken place in past years. We were treated very well there.

I could say the same for both opposition parties. On a personal note, I might say that the NDP caucus representatives we met with in that province were among the most knowledgeable people in the country on the issue. We had a useful discussion. I had met the individuals before on the constitutional talks, so had some relationship. The Leader of the Opposition in the province had a specific proposal which he had presented. It was much along the lines of the former federal Bill C-60, which was essentially that the provinces appoint half of the senators and the federal government appoint half. He had some mixture of powers and so on. He was open to discussions of other options, but that was the inclination.

In all cases, with all parties we met with, I asked them for the commitment to allow us to talk to them in the future and

made the commitment that we would be, hopefully at least, calling them again as we evolved our position and testing with them what might be acceptable in their various provinces.

Mr. Chairman, that's a very cursory glance. I couldn't comment specifically on the Northwest Territories and Yukon from personal experience. As I mentioned, we're only sending part of the committee both places. The hon. Member for Calgary North West, who is vice-chairman of the committee, chaired that tour of those jurisdictions. I understand that both, as well, were fairly successful in their discussions and direction.

All in all, I've been happy with the reception and with the openness of all the governments, with the exception of Manitoba, which originally did not want to discuss it because of their very firm position on Senate reform. We finally met with the Government House Leader. In all other provinces, both government and opposition parties had a very open willingness to discuss the issue, as did the opposition in Manitoba.

MR. SZWENDER: Question.

DR. BUCK: Don't get so anxious, Szwender. You've only got two years left.

Mr. Chairman, to the chairman. In the discussion in Washington, in comparing the presidential system and the British parliamentary system that we operate under, can the chairman indicate a little more to the committee? Is there any part of their system that we could use in Canada, or did we find out that there's nothing that system can provide to our system?

Also, I'm still not sure about the mechanism. The chairman said that this was a response to the Prime Minister's request that we look at this. As far as the chairman understands it, what will the mechanics be, as to when all the provinces have these committees set up and they've all studied the same thing about Senate reform. If we project this thing, every province will be going through the same exercise. The people from B.C. will be coming to visit Alberta; Saskatchewan, Manitoba, right on down the line. Then Manitoba will visit Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, the territories. Then Newfoundland will start there, and they'll visit Alberta and B.C., and on and on. You know, that could provide an awful lot of politicians with an awful lot of time.

MR. NOTLEY: Good for Air Canada and CP Air.

DR. BUCK: Good for Air Canada. That's right. We hope deregulation has really set in by that time, so we can save the taxpayer a lot of money.

MR. NOTLEY: [inaudible] ... Max Ward.

DR. BUCK: Max Ward, that's right.

MR. NOTLEY: He will give us a cut rate on the whole thing.

DR. BUCK: But you know, this thing really blows my mind, because it's got so many possibilities to keep backbenchers employed for the next 50 years. [interjections] This is something. This is probably the worst struck committee. There's nothing wrong with the concept, except we really know all the answers already. You have to go into some books, and you get some experts on constitutional reform, Senate reform, and you can find that out. If we had taken these members, especially these government backbenchers, because they've got nothing else to do ... The opposition boys, they've got a little bit to do, because we have to ... [interjections] Okay, that's fine.

MRS. CRIPPS: Come on, Walter.

MR. SZWENDER: That's why you're away so much.

DR. BUCK: You know why I'm away, Szwender? Trying to get rid of you, buddy, and a few others. You're number one on the hit list. Anytime you want to know what's going on, come on over and I'll tell you. I'll tell you what's going on later in the summer. That'll make you even more interested.

Back to the point, Mr. Chairman. This is a symptom of this government not having any respect for the taxpayer's dollar. We have passed hundreds of millions of dollars in these estimates. But it's a thing like this that the man on the street can understand. He cannot understand deficit budgeting. He can understand the Provincial Treasurer's 13 percent personal income tax. He can understand the white sand in the sand traps. He can understand artificial snow on Mount Allan.

So what we're trying to say to this committee is that this is a symptom of this government not showing any respect for the taxpayers' dollars. [interjection] What's your problem? Stand up and let's hear from these yipping little backbenchers. The Premier is away tonight; you might be able to get up and make a speech. There's nobody up there to report on you, so you've got your day in court. That's what you're here for, to represent your constituents, so you can go to those public meetings and say: I stood up when they were trying to blow \$300,000. Because one of these days the press in this province is finally going to wake up to this government, and they're going to become a little bit more partisan. They're not going to be so beholden to this government. They're going to start telling the people of this province what goes on in this Legislature.

MRS. CRIPPS: They'll wake up to the fact that the only time the four of you are here is when you're going to have a standing vote. We know that. Let's get it over with.

DR. BUCK: Do you want a standing vote? [interjections] We'll get a standing vote for you. As a matter of fact, you may not even get to go to the other provinces, because if we don't pass this budget before June ... Of course, they always bring closure in. They can bring closure in. [interjections] Why don't you guys leave me alone, so I can try to make a point or two to the chairman?

Mr. Chairman, to the chairman: I want to know the similarities, what we can use from that presidential system. Did we learn anything down there for the airfare and the good times? There must have been a reason to go to Washington. Maybe if we took the NDP position and got rid of the Senate ...

MR. NOTLEY: It would be cheaper.

DR. BUCK: It sure would be cheaper. These other provinces are going to set up the committees. That's going to cost a lot of money. There are one or two things I'd like the chairman to answer, and then I have some other questions for him.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the member for giving me this opportunity to explain in detail what the committee is doing. I've been waiting for that chance, and he's provided it this evening.

With respect to the American system, in addition to the comments I already made, first of all I guess I have to underline that these are my opinions, my impressions. He will have to ask individual members of the committee for their own additional impressions as to what parts of the American system

could potentially benefit changes in Canada. I think there are a number of areas worthy of consideration. At this point, I am not in a position to reach a conclusion on it, as we would not be with any aspect of this issue until we've had an opportunity to discuss those in committee — to further evaluate the American system, for example, vis-à-vis the others.

There are a number of aspects that could be considered for implementation here. They include the Senate's right to authorize appointments of Supreme Court justices and other federal officials that may in fact affect the American states in their situation and, comparably, could affect the Canadian provinces. As well, we gained some understanding of the United States Supreme Court and its relationship to the American government, and got an indication of possibly the kind of effect of a more presidential-style system in Canada, with a Senate that has power that is equal to or greater than, or at least approaching, that of the lower House. As well as I think I mentioned earlier, the American system taught us that their electoral system is far different from ours and that if we move to elections on a provincewide basis, we'd have to look at various means of dealing with that.

Again, if the member wants, this evening I'd be happy to elaborate further from a personal perspective, but in the interests of the time of the House, it may be best to do that when the committee reports to this Legislature.

The member commented that this is the kind of committee that the public sees. Indeed, to the hon. member, I hope it is the kind of thing the public of Alberta sees. I believe the public does want, above all else, Alberta to have a rightful position in Confederation, to influence those federal decisions, and it wants its representatives in this Assembly to ensure that they are pushing for this to happen.

The member went on with a number of potentially inflammatory descriptions of members of various legislatures travelling to visit one another. I don't know how other legislatures will choose in the end to develop their final position, but I might say I'm convinced that Alberta will help to lead many of the opinions formulated in other provinces, as it did during the constitutional discussions. Much like the constitutional discussions, when we had another select committee and some very effective negotiation on the part of government ministers, we did manage to change and have Alberta points of view implemented in that new Canadian Constitution. I believe it's the right time in history for us to be doing this with Senate reform. Indeed we've taken this first step, and this Legislature in total has acted wisely in moving in this regard.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Again, expenditures will be looked at in the most scrupulous way possible, and we are as cognizant as is the hon. member of the need to expend public dollars in the best and most effective way possible. I know that people, in my constituency at least, believe quite firmly that Alberta's position in Confederation will affect their pocketbooks perhaps more than any other single aspect that's under our influence here in this country that we can deal with. I believe our committee is committed to trying to assist Alberta to further gain that influence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Okay, I'll ask some questions. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to pursue this matter in a little more detail, so we're all satisfied how well we're spending the taxpayers' money travelling hither and thither across the country to discover the Senate.

I have two or three questions I want to pursue with the hon. Member for Calgary Currie. First of all, as he mentioned, we recently had the federal government flying across the country studying the Canadian Senate. As he mentioned, they of course came back with a report. My question is — I know the member is up on this — did the Alberta government make a presentation at that time to the Canadian Committee on Senate Reform? If so, what was their position at that time, and why is it now necessary to change? If they didn't — I'm not sure of this, Mr. Chairman — then I'm surprised that we now have to set up our own because, as the hon. member said, there was a very good example where the Alberta government could have taken the lead, when the federal government was studying that.

To come after that question, to come into what I'm talking about, I would ask when the public hearings will occur. Maybe the hon. member said that; I did skip out for five minutes to get my book. When are they? I would like to know a little bit more about the public hearings. Are they going to be throughout the province, in the smaller centres? Can anybody appear before these hearings? If somebody from Fort Saskatchewan decides they have an interest in the Senate, can they come? Do they have to give time ahead? In other words, what's the format and the time frame of these public hearings?

If I could ask those two questions, Mr. Chairman, I'll await with interest the hon. member's answers to them.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm always happy to oblige the hon. member on both those points, although the first one — I'm not sure if I'm in my proper area of jurisdiction. He's asking about the government's approach to the federal committee. Of course I'm representing a legislative committee, but I do know the answer so I'll give it to the hon. member. The government, as such, did not present a paper to the joint House/Senate committee. Government members did meet over an informal dinner with the committee when it was out here. I suppose the reason it did not is twofold. The first was that the government had not established a position, and indeed had in mind this particular committee as a way of evolving that position, so it would have been premature. The other was that the federal government clearly announced, when they formulated it, that that was the process by which they would develop their position, clearly implying that we also had to find a process for evolving our position.

With respect to the public hearings, we've gone through a several-stage process on this. About a month ago we put an advertisement in papers that covered all of the province of Alberta, indicating that any people who had an interest in the issue and in possibly making presentations should contact us and we would send them out a small kit we've prepared, with a chronology of Senate reform and some articles to give them some basis for thought for any potential proposals. We have now sent letters to all those people who responded. I'm not sure of the exact figure today, but as of the end of last week, 228 had responded.

We've sent to those, plus all organizations that we can think of in the province who might have an interest in it, including those who made presentations to the federal joint House/Senate committee and to the Macdonald commission — which also has a mandate to look at government institutions, including Senate reform — a letter asking if they'd be interested in making an oral or written presentation to the committee, and if so, where the preferable spot would be. If I can recall from memory, we outlined Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie, and Fort McMurray, and said: are these places convenient, or if not, could you name another centre? As soon as we have a response to all of that, it is our intention

to determine specifically where we will visit. If there is obviously a good number of people in any given area of the province who wish to make presentations, I believe the committee is committed to going there. At this point we haven't restricted any presentations. We are awaiting exact response as to the number of people who will be interested in making those presentations. It's my hope that we won't have to make restrictions because of time, but that will depend on whether we have 400 potential presenters or 30. Those decisions will have to be made in the next few weeks, as the responses come in.

Roughly, I anticipate the public hearings taking place between mid-July and the end of August. Those are summer months; they're most convenient for the members. If there is any significant number of people who are unable to come at that time, the committee may consider, although it hasn't made a final decision in that regard, other possible times as well for those members. In terms of time of day, in the letter we sent out we asked if they had a preference for a meeting time, morning, afternoon, or evening. We'll try to accommodate that as much as is possible. The committee will meet over the next couple of weeks, once we have all that data back, to define the specific locations. I'll undertake to distribute those, as well as the times, to the members.

There will then be an additional advertisement for people in that area. I hope that we might even be in a position to take spontaneous briefs from people that hadn't previously submitted briefs. Again, those decisions will have to await an evaluation of the number of people who are interested. I might say I am quite happy so far with the original response to the ad that has been in the paper. The in excess of 220 is, frankly, considerably more than I anticipated.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up with the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. I would make a comment, and I think it appropriate. Surely the member — and I know he can't be blamed for everything the Alberta government does. But with this new-found fervour for the reform of the Canadian Senate, it seems to me that the provincial government — and it wouldn't have cost \$300,000, if they had any influence at all — should have tried to use its influence to present Alberta's case to that committee on Senate reform. Frankly I think the government was somewhat derelict in its duties at that time. It seems rather ironic that we're now going to spend \$300,000 and run around trying to develop our own position after we had what I believe was a very appropriate place to make our case, and make a strong case. I would point out to the hon. member that that's precisely what this party on this side did. We saw an opportunity to make the case. Whether you agree with our position or not, it certainly was a position that I think is not that far from the Alberta government's position in terms of Senate reform, and we took the opportunity to try to do that. Obviously we didn't have the clout that, say, the government of Alberta would have had. In talking about showing leadership, I honestly say to the member that that would have been an appropriate place to do it, and it wouldn't have cost as much.

The other question I want to come back to deals with the committee. I understand that as we go around the public hearings, obviously the MLAs are going to be involved. What other personnel will be with the committee? Are there any specialized personnel or people they're borrowing from Intergovernmental Affairs, for example, that have some knowledge of the Senate, or is it just going to be the MLAs? Could we have an update on who will be part of that committee as it travels around the province?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one or two things. The chairman can answer who the support staff and so on will be. I'd

just like to say that I will keep opposing this vote. When you see a report like this, the Northern Alberta Development Council, you're getting some money's worth out of a committee such as this. The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray is to be complimented, because these people are really serving Albertans. This committee will be doing something for Alberta. If this Senate Reform Committee meets for the next 50 years, it won't do as much for Albertans as this people's committee is doing. So we have to make sure the government doesn't get sloppy, because I think this government is getting sloppy. It's setting up committees to keep some of their backbenchers almost fully employed.

AN HON. MEMBER: And your own leader.

AN HON. MEMBER: Turn the page, Walter.

DR. BUCK: Turn which page? Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. He hasn't heard this story often enough about how this government is setting up ...

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, could I raise a point of order? I find all this very entertaining. We've sat here now for an hour and a half while the four members of the opposition have ...

AN HON. MEMBER: What's the point of order?

MR. ALEXANDER: The point of order is entertainment. Section 62(2) says:

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

We've heard a number of eloquent presentations by the members, and there's no objection to that. We've heard their questions and comments, and we've heard the Leader of the Opposition tell us that supply is a wide-ranging discussion. We have no objection to that.

Mr. Chairman, there's an element of repetition here that strains the element of relevance. In other words, when we have heard the same question in different dress, the same point five times, relevance is lost. I don't know what relevance the Northern Alberta Development Council report may have to this discussion, and I don't wish to raise it for that point. I only want to say that in terms of relevance, I do not question any member's right to raise any question. I do, however, suggest that the Chairman might inform the committee whether the repetition of the same thing four, five, or half a dozen times, over and over again, meets the test of section 62(2). If it doesn't, then I suggest to hon. members that while all this may be very entertaining to go on and on, it does not meet that test. So I appeal to the Chairman to enlighten me on the subject. I'd be more interested in his opinion than that of some others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has raised quite an interesting point dealing with relevancy. Although our *Standing Orders* do have this interpretation, when you come right down to deciding how relevant the remarks or comments may be, and if you look into various authorities like *Beauchesne* or *Erskine May*, you'll find it's very, very grayly defined or kind of nebulous in those sorts of authorities too. I have to admit that listening to the discussion this evening and following it here in the Assembly, sometimes it's difficult to relate to the topic at hand. But eventually it seemed that most of the members who participated in the discussion would finalize their

remarks by asking something specific or making some specific comment that deals with the particular vote we're on.

So I would have to say that there's no clear definition for relevancy in any of the authorities we have. In that respect, I'd ask the hon. Member for Clover Bar to continue.

MR. ALEXANDER: On the point and on the clarification given by the Chairman, for which I am grateful — I appreciate that. I've heard that before, and I understand that *Beauchesne* and *May* both do not clearly define the matter of relevancy. On the other hand, if the matter never becomes defined, then it should be presumed not to exist. In other words, a gray area is not nothing. A gray area must be something. So while we have heard in the House on previous occasions, and I'm very sympathetic to the problem, I do not think that either *Beauchesne* or *May*, while necessarily defining clearly what it means, they do not at the same time say that there is no such thing as a meaning.

MR. MARTIN: What's the relevance of this?

MR. ALEXANDER: So I plead one more time for that clarification, that relevance does have a meaning somewhere and while it's difficult to define, there must be one. If that's all there is to be said about it, that's all there is to be said about it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, very briefly on the point of order the Member for Edmonton Whitemud has raised. I think you have quite correctly pointed out the difficulty. Citation 299 from *Beauchesne* says:

Relevancy is not easy to define.

I think you've made that point. It then goes on to say:

In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can appreciate the fact that the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud would like to have a clear definition, but I don't think I have the necessary background. When other parliamentarians have attempted for many, many years to make this definition and have not been successful, I wouldn't be presumptuous to say this evening that I'm going to make a definition that will be held up as a precedent in the future.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to my impatient friend the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, it's too bad that tonight is his duty night. Maybe if it were tomorrow afternoon, he wouldn't have to listen to this. [interjection] Okay, next Monday; whenever his duty roster demands that he be here.

If the hon. member, or anybody, has the right in this House to start from the day of Confederation and go year by year through to now, which is 100 and some years, and then tie in how the Senate came into this system, he could go for three or four hours, three or four days, or three or four weeks and still be relevant. That's how far back the history of our country goes, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Once would be plenty.

DR. BUCK: Once would be plenty.

What I and members on this side of the House are doing here is objecting to the expending of \$300,000 for a committee that we don't feel is really going to prove anything to the people of this province. The only point I was trying to make to the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud and the members of the committee is that this expenditure of funds, the Northern

Alberta Development Council, is going to do something for Albertans, whereas this \$300,000 is going to provide employment for members of the Legislature and is not going to prove anything. That's what I object to. Surely the impatient Member for Edmonton Whitemud should be able to understand that if he doesn't care about the wasting of the taxpayers' money, I care. That's the point. [interjections] It's fine, Mr. Chairman, that we have all these government backbenchers on committees. I remember so well when we started the vote we're on ...

MR. PAPROSKI: Canada is not important?

DR. BUCK: Pardon me?

MR. PAPROSKI: Canada is not important and keeping it together is not worth it?

DR. BUCK: Canada is not important. What a bunch of utter nonsense coming from an elected member of this Assembly, a servant of Her Majesty the Queen coming up with that kind of statement. Shame is all I can say.

DR. CARTER: You know full well there was a question mark.

DR. BUCK: I'm beholden to the hon. member. I know he needs the employment. July and August are slack times in the teaching business. It's good to be running around in committees. But, Mr. Chairman, that's just not good enough.

In every department there are some good things, and there are things we should be questioning more than we can. But this is something, as I said before — and this will be repetitious, but maybe some of the members were out or some of them were sleeping. This committee is going to spend a lot of dollars that I don't think should be spent. It's just that plain and simple. The chairman, Mr. Chairman — Chairman to the chairman; that's a little hard to handle — is going to have to keep telling us why we need it. If we don't need it, this may be the first time in the history of Alberta that we've removed a vote from the budget. Now wouldn't that be a great precedent? That's a precedent we could be proud to set.

If the chairman really wants something to do, he could recommend that we have Alberta legislative reform so that we could strike some of these useless expenditures from the budget. Then he would really have a committee that was going to the people of this province a favour. But no, we don't set up that kind of committee. We set up a committee to find out something we already know. The House of Commons is the governing body of this country. Maybe the committee wants to find out — we should set up a Senate in this province, because the Tories have so many friends they can't get rid of all these defeated candidates and all their friends onto boards, commissions, and all these other gravy train things. Maybe they want to set up a Senate here so they've got some place to elevate their friends to. Who knows?

MRS. CRIPPS: How many defeated candidates?

DR. BUCK: How many defeated candidates? Over the years there have been a few, hon. Member for Drayton Valley. Your day will come. I hope it's two years hence; we're going to try to arrange that for you.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has not convinced me of the need of this committee. The chairman has not convinced me that we need these out-of-country visits. The chairman has not convinced me that they have been locked and cloistered in a room with all the experts that we have on Senate reform in this

province and in this country. Maybe if that committee were cloistered to find out all the legalese and some of the pertinent background on what direction we're trying to move in, in looking at Senate reform, and then go out and listen to what the people are saying — become experts in their field, locked in the law library over at the university or in the library in this building. Then go to the people. Without spending any money, I can almost tell the chairman what they're going to find out at these public meetings. That's what I said when I opposed the resolution last year. They're going to find out something they already know. But it's going to cost \$300,000 of the taxpayers' dollars.

So I'm going to keep questioning the chairman, and I humbly apologize to the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. I know this is an imposition upon his valuable time, but that's the way the ball bounces. That's the way those four-foot putts are missed. You just have to put up with that, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Edmonton Whitemud. It's just too bad that it doesn't move as quickly as the member would like to see it move.

MR. ALEXANDER: You can only miss so many four-footers in one round.

DR. BUCK: That's right. That's the difference between 72s and 82s; you miss nine or 10 of those.

Mr. Chairman, I'm waiting with bated breath for some more input from the chairman as to what we're really going to accomplish. Until he convinces me, he knows that I'm not going to vote for the spending of the money.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I've listened to the discussion with some interest. I certainly have some sympathy with the feelings of the hon. Member for Clover Bar. On the other hand, I think a word of explanation is due him as a respected Member of the Legislative Assembly, because he is the subject of some impatience by the hon. government members.

I guess our problem is just that we have a different idea about the proper management of time and resources, because we're somewhat surprised that the hon. members opposite have spent almost two hours discussing an investment of \$300,000, which is half the time that has been spent in estimates discussing the investment of \$1.2 billion in Education. Given the fact that Education is next to be called in the estimates, I suppose that some members on this side were inclined to think that the \$1.2 billion investment, touching as it does 450,000 children in the province, was more deserving of time than the \$300,000 investment. But that is of course a matter of judgment, and I respect the judgment made by the hon. members opposite.

MR. NOTLEY: I gather the minister was attempting to make a point of order, because he obviously wasn't speaking even within shooting distance of the relevancy provision. So I assume it was a point of order. Therefore, I will attempt to respond to the point of order.

MR. MARTIN: You can bring Education in every day you want, Dave.

MR. NOTLEY: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the opposition has an obligation to scrutinize the estimates of this government. As far as I am concerned, [interjection] I want to make it very ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has an obligation to allow the Leader of the Opposition to continue with his remarks.

MR. NOTLEY: I would like to make it very clear to the Minister of Education and to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care that I consider their estimates so important that I serve notice tonight that tomorrow I am going to ask for unanimous consent to set aside the stricture this government brought in by changing the *Standing Orders* to the 25-day limit, so that the estimates could go on for whatever time is necessary — next week, the week after, or the week after that — so that the Minister of Education, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and all the other departments will have all the time they need. With the minister issuing the challenge he has tonight, I know that when I request that unanimous consent tomorrow I will have the wholehearted support of all members of the Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: You probably won't even be here.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address the issue that's before us, if I might. That's simply whether this Legislature should be voting on and approving an expenditure of funds for a committee of this Legislature which is involved in assessing the important question of Senate reform in Canada and what in fact the Senate should or should not be like in the views of the Alberta legislators. I think hon. members have a tendency to forget that this government and this Legislature, over the course of the 12 years that I've been a part of it, have been involved almost every year in some extremely important question involving our place in Confederation. Even the year before I was a member of this House — I believe in June 1970 — I recall the previous Premier of this province, Mr. Strom, and other members of his cabinet and that government involving themselves in the constitutional discussion in Victoria.

The questions have arisen from time to time as to what we can do as a minority group, if you like, of 2.3 million people in a population of 25 million, to protect our heritage and our resources and achieve our aims and objectives in Confederation. On many, many occasions when we've addressed that matter, we've had to address the very difficult problem of the larger population areas of central Canada and the power that develops in the House of Commons by the way the elected representatives there are put into place.

I refer to the many discussions and problems we've had with respect to the ownership of natural resources, oil and natural gas pricing, the court battles we've had. I refer to the very lengthy discussions on the Constitution that, as I say, began in earnest, as far as this Legislature was concerned, in June 1970 and went on for about 12 years before they were finally concluded. They were concluded on the basis that was, to a large extent, satisfactory to this Legislature and the people in this Legislature that represent all Albertans, because we were well prepared. We came to each one of those meetings armed with all the information we possibly could have with respect to the position Alberta needed to take to ensure our continued presence in a meaningful way in Confederation.

When the hon. member leads a committee of this Legislature in travelling throughout Canada — around the world, for that matter — trying to find out the nature and form of senates, surely what it's all about is arming ourselves as legislators with the most information we can possibly have relative to a discussion that's going to go on and on and might someday come to a resolution of what the Senate should be like in our country.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I don't begrudge for one moment the time we're spending tonight discussing whether that committee should exist,

whether it should be allowed to do its work. Quite frankly, I don't believe there are very many subjects we've discussed in this session that are more important over the longer term than our place in Confederation and whether it can be maintained by the parliamentary system that exists in Canada with the central powers that exist in Ontario and Quebec, as opposed to some major change in the makeup and form of the Senate. With all due respect to my hon. colleague for Clover Bar, I think that's the issue.

Now, we can quibble about whether the members travel far and wide. I've heard from the hon. member who is chairman of the committee that he doesn't intend to spend a lot of funds unless it's necessary, and I hope he doesn't. But I want to emphasize in concluding that if there's one single matter legislators in this province, whether they be on the opposition side of the House or on the government side, ought to consider as an extremely important matter to the future of our province, our children, and their children, it's the makeup of the central powers that will govern our country for years to come. Assuredly, that includes the knowledge we all need to have about the Senate.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, that's fine and good. Nobody on this side of the House argues with that point. But as stated by the Leader of the Opposition, we have a minister of the Crown, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. If this is such a highfalutin committee, such a high-profile committee, Mr. Minister of Transportation, why is that minister not chairing it?

MR. NOTLEY: Exactly.

DR. BUCK: Why is he not chairing it? Why, when he and his entourage tour the world, going to our different — I was going to say embassies. But as the Prime Minister of Canada said to the Premier of this province, if you want to run this country why don't you try to run it out of Alberta?

We have this entourage touring the world. Why is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and all of his staff not looking at that? Or are they? Is this a duplication? Or did the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs set up this committee to give the chairman and the backbenchers a job? Is there duplication? What is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs doing when he's touring the world? We have the Minister of International Trade; he's also touring the world. The Premier is touring the world. Everybody is touring the world. Good gravy, when is it going to stop?

Maybe they need a committee, Mr. Minister of Transportation, because they were talking about the house of provinces; they were talking about an appointed Senate; and now they've done a 360. Because the WCC said it should be an elected Senate, now they're back to an elected senate. Does this government know what it's doing? I don't think it does.

To the hon. Minister of Education. He must not have been listening when I said this is a symptom of the disease that's afflicting this government. The man on the street can understand when you squander \$300,000, Mr. Minister of Education. He can understand the white sand in the sand traps. He can understand the snow-making in Kananaskis and on Mount Allan. The man in the street can understand that. If the Minister of Education doesn't understand that simple principle of politics, maybe in two years we can do him a favour too.

I would like to say to the hon. members of this committee, the Tory members of this committee, that their days are numbered, and I'm going to do everything I can to help them along. The people of this province are getting sick and tired of this

government. So, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Education, the reason we're belabouring this point is because I don't think we need to spend \$300,000 on this committee. I don't think we have to spend that \$300,000, because we can get that information — I don't disagree with you, Mr. Minister of Transportation. I know the problems we have with the small population in the west, the small population in Alberta. But the hon. Member for Calgary Currie is not going to solve that problem. If it's that important — and I think it's that important — then let's get the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to earn his money. He must have expertise at his command, people in his department, or what have we got the department for? Good gravy. We're dragging red herrings all over the place, and we're blowing money. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's not good enough.

I appreciate what the Minister of Transportation said; he meant it, and it was well said. But I'm not arguing about the problems we have, east versus west or large populations versus small populations. That certainly has to be rectified, but that's not what we're talking about. We can run around Alberta. Mr. Minister of Transportation, and have these public hearings. That's fine, but the minister well knows that what we're going to find out is what we already know. He knows that.

Mr. Chairman, it's fine for the minister to make an emotional appeal, but that's \$300,000 we don't need to spend. To the Minister of Transportation: when we compare that to some of the other budgets — the Leader of the Opposition, who in his responsibility has to shadow 30 ministers, 10 of them that aren't needed, gets a budget of \$330,000. Boy, are we ever serving the democratic process in this province, I'll tell you. What we need is fiscal reform so that those two people can do their jobs, because they have a job to do.

I think some of my Conservative friends are not listening to what's going on out there. They're not listening. They go to these \$250 a plate dinners. Everybody pats each other on the back and says, gee, we're great guys, guys. But those people walking the breadlines, those people that are unemployed, are not happy when we squander money.

Mr. Chairman, I just have this in my craw, and it does upset me. Sure, it's not going to break the bank. But the Premier tells us: I spent \$220,000; that's only point zero percent of the budget. But that's \$220,000; this is \$300,000; Mount Allan is \$25 million; Kananaskis was \$200-plus million; the front of the Legislature — we needed it, but we didn't need \$60 million worth. Where do we draw the line? All these 10-bed hospitals — did we need them? We don't have doctors. Where are the priorities? There's 25 here, 200 there, and pretty soon you're up to \$500 million. Maybe the Minister of Education would like to have that additional \$500 million. I know the Minister of Transportation would like to have some more money. They all add up — 300 here, half a million there. So I won't support it.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to briefly respond. First of all, the Member for Edmonton Norwood asked one specific question. He commented on the government's non-presentation to the federal House/Senate committee. I'm not in a position to respond to that, not being the minister who was responsible for that decision, but I disagree with the member on a personal basis. That should be dealt with elsewhere.

With respect to the staff travelling with public hearings, I'm not in a position to tell the member what that would be at this time. The committee hasn't made that decision. I anticipate two individuals, one in a secretarial role and another one in an organizational role, but that decision has not been made.

With respect to the Member for Clover Bar. I think he merely reiterated most of his comments previously made, which indicate personal preference. I could perhaps refer him to the *Hansard* comments I've already made this evening on that. I'd only like to say again on this issue of money that the committee intends in all ways to look at the \$300,000 as if it's our own money, and spend it that way. We indeed believe that although it's a small amount of money in comparison to the budget, every dollar of taxpayers' dollars is crucial. I might just say to the member that \$300,000 is approximately one-seventh of the \$2 million it's going to take just to pay for the lifetime appointment of one senator appointed to the Senate from the citizens of Canada. So any move we can make toward alleviating that situation will save Albertans, and all Canadians, a great deal of money.

MR. NOTLEY: As I see that we are probably coming to the conclusion of this particular debate, although I wouldn't want to prejudge that, I do want to make just a couple of comments. I don't think it is at all accurate to throw out figures such as what a great saving \$300,000 for trips hither and yon by MLAs is to the taxpayers of Alberta, and that somehow that's justified because there may be a change in the Senate and we will save \$2 million in a senator's lifetime salary and pension.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some small interest over the years in the question of Senate reform and know that the member across the way or the Minister of Transportation or the Minister of Education or yourself are not the first people to express interest in Senate reform. We've had people who have made proposals for years, both as individual members, as Canadians, and from time to time in the different legislatures and the Parliament of Canada. But we still have the Senate. We still have a body that is not operating very well.

I suspect that whether or not the second Chamber as we know it continues to slumber and creak along, it will occur whether we pass this appropriation or not. I really do not think that if the Legislature passes this vote of \$300,000 for the committee, it is going to be the lightning rod for constitutional change. I don't believe that politicians throughout Canada are sitting on the edges of their chairs waiting for our committee on the Senate to come. I do not believe the constitutional scholars are going to be writing treatises in the years ahead on the basis of what this committee is going to propose.

That doesn't mean we shouldn't look at it. Of course the Minister of Transportation is perfectly correct that the division of powers in this country is fundamental to the country. If we can grapple with changes that will accommodate the concerns of not only the west but of Quebec and other parts of the country, then as good Canadians we must press on. But that's not the point the Member for Clover Bar is making; that's not the point my colleague or I have attempted to make.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can play that useful role on the basis of the vast amount of information which is already available. I think we can gain input from Albertans. Where I draw the line is on the question of extensive trips outside the country. As I mentioned before, but it bears repeating, the only possible value to this whole process of reviewing the second Chamber is if we do it in light of Canada's needs, an understanding of Canada's problems, not what happens in other countries in the world. We can glean what happens in other countries of the world from textbooks, visitors, and sources that are available, but we don't need to send people there. I say that quite frankly to the Member for Calgary Currie.

Mr. Chairman, I think the only other observation I would make — and I think it's important in the context of this debate — is that we should not kid ourselves that changes in the Senate

or the second Chamber will solve the major problems that face this country as far as division of power. Constitutional change is much more significant than the question of a second Chamber. A second Chamber is a part of the process, but just a very small part. Before we begin patting ourselves on the back and saying that this committee is somehow going to be breaking constitutional ground that our grandchildren will be quoting and reading about, I think we are perhaps taking ourselves a little too seriously.

For those reasons, while recognizing merit in a review of the Senate, I think \$300,000 at this juncture is an unreasonable budget, given the current economic difficulties most Albertans face.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, can the minister — or the chairman; I have to be careful with that.

Hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry — I'm really glad to see he's here, because he's such a good fellow.

MR. SZWENDER: Are you going to knock him off, too?

DR. BUCK: No, Rollie will be around for a while. The hon. member will be around for a while. We'll get him in the election after.

Mr. Chairman, to the chairman of the committee: I still have a little difficulty in relating the expenditure of this money to what the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs' staff does. Do we have a duplication here? The minister does travel the world quite extensively. Does the chairman of that committee have any input into what some of the people on the minister's staff are looking at in these other countries as far as Senate reform goes? If the chairman has not made that recommendation, we're wasting an awful lot more of the taxpayers' money. Junkets to London, Hong Kong, and these places are quite nice. What really frightens me is that every time we change the minister, that minister is going to have to go the circuit. Hopefully there will not be a minister of this Tory government the four years after that, because I think the people of Alberta are going to look after that. Then the Minister of International Affairs — maybe his entourage could do some of the homework for this committee and save the taxpayers some money.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what liaison there is between the chairman's committee and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in looking at Senate reform in other countries.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to respond to that question from the Member for Clover Bar. There is very close co-operation between the minister and his office and the committee. In fact, there is a person from Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs delegated to the committee for our use, as we see fit, in accumulating information that might have been gathered by the department. In addition, we have once had the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs before the committee to discuss his trip to London and his perceptions of the British parliamentary system and how it might indeed reflect upon our Canadian Senate and potential changes. Next Wednesday, I believe — I'm not sure it's finally confirmed — we will be having the minister back to appear before the committee to discuss his relatively recent trip to Germany and give us some outline and understanding of the government in Germany, how it operates, and how it might be applicable to the points we're discussing. Indeed, that co-operation is ongoing. From time to time the minister also sends me material he's gathered or collected that he feels may be of benefit.

I can't of course answer to his schedule. Those questions obviously should have been asked during his departmental estimates. However, I can speak of the co-operation, which has been excellent, and of the person from Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs who sits in on all our committee meetings and has been with us in many of our meetings. We have that constant and continuing liaison so that we can benefit from all the material that department gathers, recognizing of course that we are a legislative committee, which therefore consists of both sides of the House, and don't take direction from the department or any sort of inclination as to where they want to go but do benefit from the material they have available.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, to the chairman of the committee. Is the member in a position to indicate if the new deputy minister was appointed to Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, being an expert possibly in this field of Senate reform? I'm asking this very seriously. Was the reason for the appointment because this would be a good liaison with this committee on Senate reform?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would have to indicate to the hon. member that that question would be most appropriately asked of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I have nothing to do with the hiring of departmental staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Okay, I'll ask a question. I have a few comments first of all, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the importance of the estimates. I was rather interested in the Minister of Education's analysis of the estimates. We look very much in favour of bringing back the Education estimates again. There are many new things that we want to discuss with the minister. It's not to say that this isn't important. We think the Senate is important. We think \$300,000 is important. I want to get that \$300,000 over to Education, because I think it's being underfunded. We'll talk about that, I hope, in the weeks to come.

The point I would like to come back to, though, is to the very important issue on hand and to continue the particular discussion of the committee. One of the areas I'm concerned about has to do with the time frame. I know the minister has indicated that we have almost \$300,000 possible in this budget. After this discussion tonight I hope the hon. member will go back to his committee and say that in this time of restraint, we will continue with the public hearings and cut off any future travel. I think they can still come up with a very good document, because I know the hon. member is very capable and has done a lot of study himself on this. This is one of the points we're trying to make. We know that at a certain point, closure will drop and he will probably get his estimates and can probably out-vote us. I've learned enough in this House, Mr. Chairman, that it's fairly easy for the government to out-vote us. Even if the flu wiped out three-quarters of them, we'd still be out-voted.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's called democracy, Ray.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, it's called democracy. This is called democracy right here, too, going over the estimates — precisely.

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. I hope they take this evening very seriously and that one of the recommendations . . . I will ask this of the chairman, because he said — and I respect the fact that he is a chairman; he can't make unilateral decisions for this committee. But will the minister

personally recommend to the committee that there be no more travel? I'm sure what he recommends would carry a lot of weight with that committee. I'm not talking about the public hearings in the province, but I'm talking about flitting off to Germany or wherever. I would ask the hon. chairman if he would make that recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, the other question I want to come to is simply this. In my short time in this House, I've seen that one committee leads to another and to another. Maybe the job isn't quite done after next year. There's that temptation that maybe we'll come back to Members' Services and want an extension of some more money. We've all seen in this Legislature how one committee can go on to another year and end up costing us more and more money.

I guess what I'm saying is that I want assurance from the hon. member that they will not be coming back in the next budget year, asking for more money on this legislative committee. I think that's important. We can talk about government bureaucracy and government spending. That's where we've lost control on a lot of spending in this government. I would like assurances from the hon. member. One, will he recommend that there be no more travel, recognizing that the committee doesn't have to accept his recommendation and that they could out-vote him? I'm asking specifically if the hon. member will recommend that, and an assurance that in this budget year this is the end of it in terms of dollars and cents and there won't be any extension into the next budget year. I would like answers to those two questions, if I may.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to ask the chairman of the committee a couple of questions. I have been listening with great anticipation to the wise and knowledgeable words of the Member for Clover Bar. I always listen keenly when he speaks, because it may be the last time we hear his voice in this Assembly. We never know when he will take early leave of absence.

I notice that the hon. leader of the Independents is somewhat conspicuously absent at this time, and I'm just wondering whether the comments made by his sidekick have been somewhat embarrassing to him this evening. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the Member for Little Bow, who I believe is serving on the committee, at any point refused to serve on the committee, whether he indeed shares the views of his cohort in the Independents. I'd also like to ask the chairman whether the Member for Little Bow offered to forego any payment for serving on this committee. I'd also like to ask the chairman whether the Member for Little Bow refused to participate in any of the travel that has taken place so far with the committee.

I look forward to the answers from the chairman of the committee.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps in the interests of time I could ask if other committee members have questions, that I might address all at one time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, while you're jotting these little things down, maybe you can jot down a point or two so you can inform your colleague from Edmonton Belmont that we're not discussing the makeup of the committee. We haven't heard anything from members of the committee, and I could care less if I hear from members of the committee. The committee is there, hon. rookie Member for Edmonton Belmont. The committee is struck. What we're trying to do is not give them any money. Can't you understand that simple procedure? What we're saying is that the committee is here. I'm not arguing

about the membership on the committee. I think they're all honourable, excellent members. They'll do a great job, if we give them some money. But we don't want to give them any money. Can't you understand that? Because I don't think they're going to tell us anything we don't know. It's that simple. I'm not going to canvass the members of the committee to find out if they're going or they're not going. They're not going to go if they don't get any money.

What we are asking the chairman is how he's going to spend the money, not who is on his committee. I don't care who is on his committee. The Legislature has asked these people to serve on the committee. This is Committee of Supply. It's the Committee of Supply that supplies everybody with money. But so far this committee has not voted any funds. That's what we're trying to do here tonight, hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont. It's too bad you will never reach retirement pension, because you have to win two.

MR. NOTLEY: He's thinking about that, Walter. You've got him worried already.

DR. BUCK: Well, we're going to have him more worried.

MR. MARTIN: And they're cutting back on teachers too.

DR. BUCK: Chairman, to the chairman — I like that term "Mr. Chairman, to the chairman".

MR. GOGO: Don't get personal, Walter.

DR. BUCK: "Chairman to the chairman" is not personal.

MR. GOGO: You were personal with the Member for Edmonton Belmont. Come on, now.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking to the chairman. I'm trying to tell the chairman to tell his colleague the Member for Edmonton Belmont ... I'm not getting personal with him.

MR. GOGO: Yes you are.

DR. BUCK: I'm not.

MR. GOGO: You were talking about his pension.

DR. BUCK: He's elected, and I'm trying to make sure he doesn't get re-elected. It's our duty as senior members to help

the younger fellows, hon. Member for Lethbridge West. I like the Member for Edmonton Belmont, but I'm trying to get him knocked off.

MR. NOTLEY: Back into education.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Can we get back to the business of the committee.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I like the Member for Edmonton Belmont, and I like the Member for Lethbridge ... [interjections] East? West. Fifty percent. Regardless of what our politics are, the people of this province, as the Speaker always reminds us, elect us. I have no argument with the member, except he doesn't understand how Committee of Supply works. That's the only problem. I'm trying to help him along. I like the guy.

Mr. Chairman, I have no argument about who wants to go where, except that I don't think they should go anyplace. I think the committee should be put to rest, because it's not going to tell us anything we don't already know. I just want the chairman to tell us why this committee is essential and why we're going to pass that budget. It's that simple.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You've heard the report and the request for leave to sit again. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the government to call Committee of Supply tomorrow. Tomorrow being the 25th day of consideration of the estimates, the rules provide that the estimates will be voted on at 12:45.

[At 10:31 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]