

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, April 2, 1987 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 87/04/02

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

### PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

As Canadians and as Albertans we give thanks for the precious gifts of freedom and peace which we enjoy.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we rededicate ourselves to the valued traditions of parliamentary democracy as a means of serving our province and our country.

Amen.

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, distinguished visitors to our Legislature today. I would ask that first His Excellency and Mrs. Breman, the Ambassador of the Netherlands to Canada and his wife, stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly, together with the Consul of the Netherlands in Edmonton, Mr. Jacob Koster, and his wife. Will the members please extend the usual welcome.

### head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### Bill 31

#### Alberta Hospital Association Amendment Act, 1987

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Alberta Hospital Association Amendment Act, 1987, Bill 31.

The purpose of this Bill is to make provisions for the Alberta Hospital Association to operate a self-administered liability insurance plan for hospitals throughout the province.

[Leave granted; Bill 31 read a first time]

### head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file four copies of the government's announcement on a new program which provides for support for business incubators in the province of Alberta.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm filing a response to Question 150.

### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the House, 46 grade 6 and grade 10 students from Bawlf school. Bawlf is a village in the Camrose constituency, undoubtedly the best constituency in Al-

berta. The students are accompanied by two teachers, Mrs. Piro and Mr. Erga, and two parents, Mrs. Thiessen and Mr. Albers. I'd ask that the guests please stand and receive the traditional welcome from the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Banff-Cochrane, without comparative research as to constituencies.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, nine students and their principal, Mr. Dallas Weis, from the grade 10 of the Calgary 7th Day Adventist school located in Banff-Cochrane.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that two years ago this school burned down. Thankfully all of the students, the staff escaped without harm to themselves, and it has been quite a tremendous achievement for the group to see their school now rebuilt and officially opened last week. They're sitting in the members' gallery. Would they please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the Member for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. BRASSARD: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, 33 students from the grade 9 class of the Cremona school. Cremona is one of the prettiest little villages in our province. They are accompanied today by their teacher, Mr. Len Hovanes; 10 parents, Mrs. Barbara Bergmann, Mr. Ben Grainger, Mrs. Sandra Herbert, Mr. Carmon Herbert, Mr. Ron McKinnon, Mrs. Lynn Russel, Mrs. Mary Thompson, Mrs. Gabriell Grainger, Mr. Ken Wigg; and their bus driver, Mr. Mike Johnson. I wonder if they would stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I have the pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the other members of the Assembly, the deputy head of the international department of the all-union Central Council of Trade Unions, which represents 140 million organized workers in the Soviet Union. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Igor Yourgens has acted as the Soviet Union delegate on the United Nations International Labour Organisation, and today he sits in the members' gallery. I would ask that he rise and receive the warm and traditional welcome of the Legislature.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and to all the members in the Assembly, 32 library information technology students from one of Alberta's finest advanced education institutions, that being the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, in one of Alberta's very finest constituencies, that being Calgary Mountain View. They are accompanied today by Mr. Borden McLeod, their teacher, and they're seated in the public gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Social Allowance

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, a study conducted in 1985 by the Edmonton

Food Bank, called *Hunger in Our City* and endorsed by 91 churches and agencies in the city of Edmonton -- I quote from page 10. It says:

During meetings with Alberta Social Services representatives the question was asked as to how social assistance rates are determined. The answer was given that several years ago... a "market-basket study" had been done to establish a base rate. Since then the rates have been adjusted periodically with one eye on the Consumer Price Index and the other on what other provinces provide.

In view of the recent arbitrary cuts, will the minister take this opportunity now to reveal the so-called objective standard that the \$4.80 is based on?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will harken back to my comments over the last while in the House and also back to last summer, in the previous session, the hon. member will recall that I have also noted that on average the cost per case, the amount of dollars going to eligible recipients, has gone up about \$60 per month.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question. The minister would be aware that this was after the first cuts that they did this study. I want to come back to the minister, because I think it's important we talk about this. There must have been some basis that they've come to the \$4.80 figure. Will the minister tell this Assembly what that basis is and table it in the Assembly so we can make a judgment on it?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to note that the major item under discussion with respect to the cuts is to the single employables and it is in the shelter area.

MR. MARTIN: Well, there was a cut in food also. The minister might be -- but obviously we're not going to get an answer. I'm told that these rates that we talked about in the study were based on a study by the Alberta Department of Agriculture that was 16 years of age. I believe the Member for Little Bow was the minister at that particular time. But Canada's Food Guide, Statistics Canada, the Canadian Council on Social Development all provide research and information on nutrition and household budgets. I want to ask this minister, from the answers to questions she gave yesterday, will the minister identify which professionals told her that an objective study of personal budget needs is not possible?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is suggesting that every household in this province has to consult with a professional to know what it is that can be purchased with X number of food dollars, I think that that is quite an incredible suggestion. The hon. member will surely be aware that in looking at a food guide, there are also many substitutes that really do achieve the same amount of protein, carbohydrates, and so on.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister's word is frankly not good enough. We're asking for where she came to this particular analysis. The minister said -- and I saw her on television -- that her experience on a farm in Acme when she was poverty stricken is how she came to the results that she's talking about. Now, I feel very sad that she had a rough childhood, but my question to her is: when is this minister going to address the situation the way it is in the inner city, in Ed-

monton and Calgary, rather than the way she would like to see it in some nostalgic time in the past?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that... I quote here: "experience on a farm in Acme." And that is about as accurate a comment as the hon. member's questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister. The minister has increased the allocation to single parents by \$21 a month. I'm curious to know how this was decided. This surely didn't come out of thin air. I hope it was based on something. Why are members of this House and the public not entitled to know what it was based on?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the amount was based on a judgment that the minister made as a result of consulting with many, many people and, in particular, the comments about the difficulty of single-parent families in their quest for bargains and so on. They do not have the same freedom to shop as, in particular, single employables do.

Mr. Speaker, I might add just for the record, to reiterate once again, that the add-on that single employables have for food allowance was 20 percent beyond the other adults who are part of a family component. What we did was reduce that to 15 percent over and above the other adult allocations, which amounts to \$5 a month.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question, Leader of the Opposition.

### Fiscal Policies

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct the second question to the Provincial Treasurer. The Conference Board of Canada recently indicated, and I quote:

There are signs the economy is losing momentum. Forecasters see weaker consumer demand, [and] business investment...

Now, we're talking specifically about all of Canada.

My question, Mr. Speaker: in view of the possibility of a further economic slowdown at this time, has the Treasurer decided to reconsider the billion-dollar gouging of average Albertans in this budget?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's an answer that I'm sure many Albertans will like to hear. To follow along though, the Treasurer, as I understand it, based his revenue projections on \$17 a barrel for oil. I think the latest that I've seen is about \$18.60. The Minister of Energy is saying he's expecting by the end of the year \$20 a barrel. In view of that, why then would the minister -- when all the projections from that minister are about \$20 a barrel and you're basing on \$17 a barrel, why then are you gouging the taxpayers for the billion dollars? Surely the revenues are going to be higher than the minister is talking about.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, more and more of the questions become convoluted, and what of course you see is that the

Leader of the Opposition really has very little understanding either of the economics of the energy industry or of the fundamentals of fiscal planning.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question. I sure wish I was as intelligent as the Treasurer, to give an answer like that, Mr. Speaker. To this arrogant Treasurer with an answer like that: I've raised a question -- I hope he's had time to think about it -- on retroactive taxation, the double whammy coming back on June 1. Is the Treasurer now prepared to wait to bring in the individual tax increase and postpone that until June 1 so people aren't getting a double hit at that time?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, when you lay before the people of Alberta a plan which deals with the size of the deficit which this province has, which provides a long-term plan to work out on a balanced-budget basis the current situation which we're facing, and have the kind of response which we have from the people of Alberta, it is in fact he who is arrogant to suggest that we are not being candid and open in this discussion.

MR. MARTIN: Well, supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. He better check down in Lethbridge, in his own riding, because I certainly got an earful about this minister's budget.

The Treasurer has been quoted recently as saying this government may add 18 percent in income taxes if the federal government brings in their taxation reform. My question is: what consideration did the Treasurer give to the effect of his speculations regarding further tax increases on an already fragile investment outlook following his earlier budget announcements?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I've said before in discussing the implications of this budget, there is a significant amount of expansionary impact in this budget on the economy of Alberta. Now, if you look at the elements which are in fact in place in this budget, both in a very strong initiative for capital formation, new capital investment in this province which multiplies very rapidly when government expenditure does take place, you will see that the \$2.4 billion in capital projects, coupled with the \$1.8 billion deficit which we're already running, by many economists' views is in fact an expansionary economy which in fact will deal with some of the concerns raised from the member. That is, it is job stimulating; it is providing jobs in the private sector. It's providing real economic growth and, on balance, the balance of the budget itself, some \$11 billion of spending, essentially goes to job creation in this province.

And so what happens is that the consumption side of this province -- the very strong retail sales, the high per capita income, the very high disposable income which exists in this province and compares to others -- together with the very low tax regime, the lowest tax regime of any province in Canada, obviously protects the income of this province. And it is that kind of optimism, Mr. Speaker, which will take place, coupled with low interest rates, which will make this economy grow and strengthen over the next year and a half. And it's too bad the doom and gloom from the member from Norwood doesn't continue...

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by the Member for Little Bow.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the Leader of the Opposition's second question, if I may. It's to the Treasurer. Could he

tell us whether or not the unconscionable raise in personal income taxes to the citizens to Alberta, nearly a billion dollars, is due to an agreement that he had with the federal government that in order for us to get the latest oil grant, they would not do it unless the personal income taxes of Albertans were just as high as those in Ontario?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that ranks very high in order of fallacious reasoning. I've never seen such an illogical connection in my life. What we're trying to do for the people of Alberta is to present the case that this government has a balanced plan, that this government is in fact going to work out of the situation before us, and we have an optimism before us. It is true that the federal initiative in the energy sector was long called for by my colleague the Minister of Energy and by the Premier and by others in this government, and it is positive they in fact did respond. The member does not like to know about the 20,000-some jobs that are going to be generated by that federal government initiative.

MR. TAYLOR: Did you have a deal?

MR. JOHNSTON: And we have argued all along, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the budget speech here just two Fridays ago, that in fact we should have that kind of assistance.

MR. TAYLOR: Did you have a deal?

MR. JOHNSTON: We need to have the federal assistance to help a Canadian industry which happens to be located here in Alberta, and I think that the long-term self-sufficiency of Canada is dependent on saving that industry. It's a very proper move, and this government also has complemented that move by an amazing \$1 billion initiative for the energy industry. That's performance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, you had a deal.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon persists in this repetitiveness of "Is there a deal?", perhaps the member and I might not have a deal about who has the next question. Nevertheless, Member for Westlock-Sturgeon on the main question.

MR. TAYLOR: I tried to simplify the question, Mr. Speaker: did you have a deal?

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Treasurer made the following statement in the House in response to a question on the North West Trust, from me. I quote from page 507 of *Hansard*:

They know full well that this was a major success story, not using any...

I underline "not using any"

of the provincial government money and in fact strengthening once and for all a significant enterprise which is a valuable tool in the diversification of this economy.

I would like to table a copy of the approved special warrant dated February 26 which includes a special warrant, 102/87, for \$5 million to provide funds for the financial restructuring of North West Trust.

Now the question to the Treasurer: in light of this evidence, would he withdraw his remarks or statement that no provincial money is involved in the restructuring of North West Trust?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that in fact is the case, that there was no money at all involved in North West Trust. There was, however, a \$5 million amount, which the member talks about, which was to save the questions on the Heritage Savings & Trust Company. It was not at all to do with North West Trust.

MR. TAYLOR: I've heard of splitting hairs, Mr. Speaker, but I just saw a hair going into four pieces that time.

Mr. Speaker, a second question. Would the Treasurer also inform the House whether or not the \$275 million contributed by the CDIC, Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, was money that was already committed to under its obligations for insuring the deposits in North West Trust?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the member over the last two days has made some strange analysis about this not being a deal at all. We know what has happened here, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has provided to an Alberta incorporated corporation, an important part of the financial system of this province, \$278 million -- so it's \$275 million plus interest since the end of January -- and that money was to restructure North West Trust. And the result of the deal was that the existing shareholders ended up losing their equity. The province ended up owning the corporation itself, and we received \$275 million-plus to strengthen that organization, and we ended up with \$300 million of the real estate. As I've said before, this is a good deal for Alberta, and I make no apologies at all for taking a tough line in negotiations, and the money did in fact come from the CDIC, the Canada deposit investment corporation.

MR. TAYLOR: It's an insurance company.

And then you hired back the people that brought the corporation to its knees. Can the Treasurer tell the House how much Mr. Kipnes and Mr. Rollingher are now being paid for their services to North West Trust?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've tried to make it extremely clear for the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon that the existing shareholders of the corporation have been eliminated from North West Trust entirely. I don't know how clear I can be. They have nothing to do with the corporation, and therefore any other statements of that order are in fact misleading.

MR. TAYLOR: How much are they being paid?

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary question. Was that the question [inaudible].

MR. TAYLOR: A final? No, that was question number three, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry you didn't hear that ...

MR. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] people throwing questions around.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, I thought you wanted me to repeat it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. TAYLOR: Number four, then, Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary.

Can the Treasurer tell the House whether the appointment of

Gary Campbell to the board of directors of North West Trust is related in any way to his services to the Conservative Party as chief financial officer?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, you can see the attempt here, an attempt to castigate good people of Alberta who want to get involved in saving an industry, who want to become part of the financial sector of this province. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, it's comments of that order that detract.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, please be seated until there is some measure of decorum in the House, and then I'd like to hear the rest of your answer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it is the very point.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, I still haven't recognized you. I'm waiting for decorum in the House. Thank you.

The Provincial Treasurer, please.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the point I'm making is that from time to time we call on many Albertans to volunteer for boards of governors, for hospital boards, to serve in a variety of capacities. I asked several Albertans to take part in working on this financial institution, North West Trust. They have agreed to do that. They have made personal sacrifices. They are contributing their own management skills to ensuring this entity succeeds, but they've been castigated. And we wonder why people have had some hesitancy about getting involved in the political process when you see that kind of a comment coming from across the way. It is just that kind of notion which will drive the private sector away from the Liberal Party, I can assure you of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Kingsway with a supplementary.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Treasurer aware that the Kipnes and Rollingher management team took some \$1.5 million out of North West Trust last year while you were stalling and waiting to get around to taking over North West Trust?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the member knows that, he should table the information right now, because it just isn't true. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Very serious charge in the supplementary question; it stretches the immunity of the House, as a member. The Member for Little Bow, followed by the Member for Bow Valley.

### Natural Gas Marketing

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy. Last Tuesday the Ontario Deputy Minister of Energy visited Calgary to discuss Ontario's natural gas needs. The minister has also made the comment that if Ontario goes ahead with their enactment of new regulations governing natural gas, we producers could lose some \$200 million. Could the minister indicate at this time whether direct conversations have gone on between him and the deputy minister or the Ontario minister that may lead to steps that can bridge the gap between the consumer

and the producer demands?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a luncheon in Calgary earlier this week where we had good representation from across the country expressing their views, including reference to the deputy minister from Ontario. I did not at that meeting indicate any numbers with respect to dollar value that would be lost if the markets are eroded. When I say "if the markets are eroded," I'm referring to the concern that we have that contracts that are in place between Alberta producers and the utilities in Ontario -- long-term contracts at higher prices. And if municipalities or small industrial, commercial operations bypass the trans-Canada system in those contracts with the short-term contracts, we are eroding the core market situation that we do not want to see eroded. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that through discussions we will be able to resolve the difficulties we have.

As the hon. member knows, with the process of deregulation going over a period of two years there have been many obstacles along the way, and we've overcome many of them. There are still more to overcome. This is one, and I've had conversations with the Ontario Energy minister recently and expect to be talking to him very soon again, and likewise with a counterpart in Quebec.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister. I understand there are meetings scheduled for tomorrow. Could the minister indicate what strategy will be used to protect Alberta's royalties and, as well, some of the producer revenues, in terms of those discussions? What strategy is being established by the Alberta government to protect those two areas?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's almost a different question in that the meetings tomorrow are not directly related to the Ontario Energy Board decisions and discussions they're having with the Ontario Energy minister. My discussions tomorrow are with the gas committees of the Canadian Petroleum Association, the Independent Petroleum Association, the small producers exploration corporation, and also others from the industry to discuss a real concern we have, that with the erosion of the core market and with larger volumes of gas going at the lower prices, our own gas royalties are being eroded. And so we're looking at ways in which we can overcome that particular problem, and that's the reason for the meeting with those people tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will one of the items of discussion be the Ontario market, as such, in terms of the guidelines the minister just established?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the intent of the meetings when I asked for these groups to meet with me two weeks ago was to discuss the situation of eroding prices, but more particularly with respect to our own gas royalties. Obviously, there is an interconnection in all of that, and I expect that we'll be discussing other aspects of deregulation besides any concept that we've put out to them as to how we can stop the erosion of our gas royalties.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. One of the possible policy decisions would be with regards to a border price. Is that one of the items still on the table, and will that be discussed tomorrow, relative to this situation that could occur in terms of the relationship between Al-

berta and Ontario?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the whole question of gas deregulation is a complex issue. I think the hon. member is confusing the concept of Alberta border price, the process that was in place prior to deregulation, with the concepts that we're discussing with the gas producers tomorrow, and that was one of a par value for royalty calculation purposes, as just one concept, an option, along with other options that I expect to hear back from the industry, to see how we can prevent the erosion of our royalties.

The Alberta border price, if we establish that again, that would be going completely back away from deregulation to having a regulated gas system in this country, which we really don't want to do. However, in view of the obstacles that are before us in going to complete deregulation -- and we're hopeful to be able to clear those obstacles away -- that is a possible option down the road that one could always resort to.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question... All right. Supplementary question, Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister. The Alberta government supported the Energy Resources Conservation Board decision to protect Alberta's core gas market for 15 years. Does this mean that the provincial government is prepared to accept the National Energy Board ruling protecting the national core market for 15 years, which would be a total capitulation of the government's long-standing position that there has to be total deregulation and no protection for the market?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously we don't know what's going to happen with respect to the National Energy Board hearings which start very soon, so I wouldn't want to be so bold as to presume what they might come out with.

However, with respect to the ERCB decision, I think it was a very balanced decision, and I think if the hon. member will read it carefully, and I'm sure he has, he would recognize that the contractual route is a route that is the most desirable way to go in terms of securing long-term supplies of gas. The surplus test requirements of 15 years were basically for the core market -- residential, commercial, and a small industrial area - and it was a reasonable area for a 15-year supply, because the contracts in place today are for almost that same period of time. The contractual route is the way that we want to see these securities of supply go, and the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission will be making representation at the NEB hearings and that will be the emphasis that they'll be putting forth to that body.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question or main question, Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy. Given that the gas pricing agreement and the removal of the Alberta border price will cost the Alberta Treasury approximately \$700 million over the next year, is the minister now prepared to admit that the Western Accord is a disaster for the people of Alberta?

DR. WEBBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Member for Calgary Forest

Lawn, followed by the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

### Toxic Waste

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister of the Environment. One of a number of environmental assaults on the residents of southeast Calgary is the former refinery site which has necessitated blood testing of children who may have been exposed to lead levels 42 times greater than the federal regulations allow. On March 20, in reference to a site in Nisku, where the minister could find no polluters to pay, the minister said:

We were simply not going to leave something sit there forever . . . while the debate raged on to get dollars . . .

We accepted a responsibility to move and we did it.

What significant differences in circumstances have kept the minister from accepting responsibility in this instance and initiating an immediate cleanup and reclamation of the refinery site? [interjections]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, this matter is a very serious one. And it's a very serious matter for the citizens of Calgary, who have some degree of anxiety, those who live very close to the old Imperial Oil refinery site. I would sincerely ask those members of the opposition not to deal with it as a flippant matter but as a matter of extreme importance to the residents of the city of Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important at this point in time that some additional information might be provided to the members of the Assembly, seeing as the interest has been shown on this matter. I received a copy of a report issued by the Calgary Health Services dated March 16, 1986, which I think is rather pertinent to this particular matter. The Calgary Health Services board, dated March 16, 1987, indicated that:

Residents in the area can be advised that just passing through the area would not be a health risk nor would living above it.

In a situation where a child or an older sibling played extensively in the area, the child should be assessed of their position and the child's lead level measured. Then the board of health also indicated that perhaps it would be important that an area below Lynnwood might be fenced off. And I would draw to the attention of all members that on March 16, 1987, I issued a news release, dated the same day that I'd received the report from the Calgary board of health, in fact, ensuring that the city of Calgary fence off a restricted access area and take any necessary reclamation work.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, a task force was set up at the time composed of representatives of the city of Calgary, the Calgary board of health, Imperial Oil, and Alberta Environment. That task force has met on a regular basis since that time and last evening in the city of Calgary held a public information meeting with citizens in the Lynnwood Heights area to clarify concerns.

MR. PASHAK: I was at that meeting. There was a lot of concern about contamination on that site. Does the minister really think that high levels of lead are not a health hazard to young children? Why isn't he acting on it?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt at all whatsoever that there are located on the Imperial Oil site two small areas within that site that I've already identified in this Assem-

bly in recent weeks - one site of approximately one acre in area, which is approximately equivalent to the size of three, I guess, city lots, and another small site of approximately 500 square feet in area, which is approximately half the size of a modest urban home -- that do have higher than normal levels of lead contamination. That matter has been identified. In fact, it was identified to the city of Calgary last fall by an environmental consulting group by the name of O'Connor Associates. And when we took our initiative to the Help Eliminate Landfill Pollution, a program last fall, letters were sent to industry throughout the province, and Sprung Enviroponics responded back to us a concern and asked us to investigate, which of course we did. Now, the two matters were brought together.

Since the issuance of the report from the Calgary board of health and the initiatives of the task force, the area in question has been fenced off. It is not an easy area to access by anyone, a child or an adult. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, the matter can be reclaimed very, very easily. I've already given the area dimensions of the area in question. It can be reclaimed in a matter of days or weeks, and it's my understanding that the city of Calgary has asked this one firm, O'Connor Associates, to identify for them the plan as to how this might be done. It is my understanding that this matter will be done and resolved very shortly.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you. Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister table the results of any and all tests conducted on the site by the Environment department over the past 20 years?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to determine if such studies do exist.

Please recall that in 1975 the particular piece of property was transferred by Imperial Oil Limited to the city of Calgary. My understanding is that at that time everyone in the city of Calgary was aware that this had been an old refinery site, one that had been established in the 1930s, and that one had existed as an old refinery site for something like 45 years. It's also my understanding that after 1975 a rather substantial amount of money was invested by the city of Calgary itself, as the owner of the property, and a smaller amount was provided by Imperial Oil Limited to drill four or five wells that were gathering wells. Over the years surplus hydrocarbons -- and by hydrocarbons I mean gasoline and diesel fuel -- have risen and have been collected. The most recent information given to me is that in recent years the amount of hydrocarbons collected is very, very minimal in place and practice.

Alberta Environment has been very, very much aware of the site. I will undertake a review of our records, Mr. Speaker, to ascertain what particular studies and reports we have on this matter, and I'd be delighted to provide that information.

MR. PASHAK: To the Minister of the Environment again. Will the minister clarify his statements of March 20 that "reclamation and cleanup of the lead-contaminated areas would not be an onerous expense for the owner of the land today"? Is the minister going to put aside the question of financial liability and get on with protecting the health of local residents?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think, Mr. Speaker, that one would once again put this into perspective. It's my understanding that ownership of the land was transferred in 1975 from Imperial Oil Limited to the city of Calgary. I do not have it confirmed, but I believe that the land was transferred for the sum of \$1. Along

with the transfer came a transference of rights to the land, and with it responsibility to the land. At the time, the city of Calgary invested public money raised from the ratepayers and the taxpayers in the city of Calgary to undertake certain situations with respect to it.

If the hon. member is suggesting to me that the city of Calgary, with a budget that approximates nearly \$2 billion a year, is unable to undertake a land reclamation project that covers the size of approximately three city lots and another site that covers the approximate size of half a modest urban house in the city of Calgary and at the same time the city of Calgary owns one of the most sophisticated landfill and waste disposal systems in the country of Canada, then I would really ask the member to provide me with more information about the financial status of the city of Calgary.

MR. SHRAKE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I, too, was at the meeting last night, and most of the questions that were asked earlier here were answered at that meeting last night, by the way. But my question to the minister: is not a program already in place to test the children that live in the area which is known as Lynnwood Ridge for any problems with the lead?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, there is such a program, and I already alluded to that earlier in the question period today when I indicated that as of March 16, 1987, the Calgary board of health indicated to all of the citizens in the area that if parents were concerned about the possibility of their children having had access to lead contamination, a blood testing program would be set up to test those children.

Now, having said that, Mr. Speaker, it should also be pointed out that there's also a little problem associated with that. In order to verify what the test contamination might be of those children in the Lynnwood area -- and there's no evidence to suggest at this moment that anyone has any impact of contamination -- the Calgary board of health would also have to find a group of children in another part of Calgary who have lived in homes built at a similar time, in similar circumstances so that they would have a check group that the two comparative groups would be evaluated with. And that's a scientific, medical principle that has to be followed if we want to get a scientific conclusion with respect to this matter.

The Calgary board of health has a program in place, and I would encourage any parent of any child to take advantage of that very important program.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. In the minister's department that's accumulating the potential sites across the province, has the minister identified any sites that may have the potential to cause the same problem that has been caused in the Lynnwood area in Calgary?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, it should also be pointed out that in the Lynnwood area in Calgary when the developer went in in 1980 to undertake a subdivision development at that time, it was identified to the developer, the owner of the subdivision, that this had been a former tank holding site used by Imperial Oil. But it was also identified to the developer at the time that no dangerous or hazardous materials were stored in that particular area. Be that as it may, it's my understanding that at the time of the subdivision, the developer excavated a certain amount of top soil, and before any housing construction started, it was evident to all people concerned that there were

really minimal or no environmental concerns or problems.

With respect to the specific question that the Member for Clover Bar has raised, there have been 15 sites that have been identified. And on the Order Paper is a motion for a return, a question that's been put on the Order Paper that I understand the Assembly will be dealing with later this afternoon, and we will be making available the spots that have been identified throughout the province of Alberta. I've also indicated before that phase 2 of the help eliminate landfill pollution program would have our scientist investigate each and every one of those to get a specific response to the member.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Since in his own words the dangerous lead contamination can be restricted to areas as small as 500 square feet and also, as you know, lead is still used in modern refineries, can you share with the House what the concentration is of testing done by the Environment department in areas, for instance, around Refinery Row and Sherwood Park? Would they catch a sample as small as 500 square feet?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly have to believe so. It would be my unsubstantiated opinion, not as a scientist but as an individual who does read, that essentially every service bay in the province of Alberta, every service station that has gas pumps would probably have around it a lead-contaminated area. If people pour gas into their automobiles the same way I do, they invariably try to get that last ounce of that miracle energy into the car, and invariably what we do in getting that last ounce is have two or three ounces overflow, that flow down onto the base where the pump is. And certainly after having this done on a day-to-day basis on a week-to-week basis over a number of years, I would just simply have to believe as a citizen of our province that virtually every gas pump site in the province of Alberta has lead contamination.

MR. SPEAKER: The answer was yes. The Member for Bow Valley, followed, if there is time, by the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

### Health Care Payments

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my questions is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Due to the amount of telephone calls that I've been getting lately, there seems to be a conception in Alberta, particularly in southern Alberta, that payment to chiropractors for their services is going to be taken out of medicare. Has the minister given any indication to the chiropractors that their services will no longer be covered by medicare?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated to the chiropractors and to a number of other professional groups -- podiatrists, optometrists, physiotherapists -- that the matter of the payment by the Alberta health care insurance plan for their services is under review. All of those professional groups fall outside the mandate of the Canada Health Act that requires that the province pay 100 percent of the costs, and we're looking at some patient participation in those costs and, in some cases, some additional participation over what occurs now. As I've indicated to other members of the Assembly, we would hope in a few weeks to be in a position to finalize that and let all of those professional groups know what our final decision is.

MR. MUSGROVE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any one do a review of the public's concept of where chiropractic services would rank in those areas that are presently not covered by the Canada Health Act but are paid for by medicare?

MR. M. MOORE: I haven't asked for any review exactly along those lines, but I've had strong representations from all groups that I spoke of with respect to their view of the value of their particular services as medical services to our population. I recognize the validity of most of their comments. I think that chiropractors, physiotherapists, other professional groups indeed do provide health services to our population. We are not suggesting at all that those services be withdrawn or that they are not beneficial, only that our citizens may have to, during these economic times, share in some of the costs.

MR. MUSGROVE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If there are some adjustments made to the payment to chiropractors, would the minister consider leaving senior citizens and those on social services completely covered by the medicare payments?

MR. M. MOORE: Of course there are two questions there, Mr. Speaker. People who are receiving social assistance generally speaking are provided with the necessary medical care through the offices of the hon. Minister of Social Services. The member's comment with respect to other age groups, including senior citizens, is one of the matters that are presently under consideration with respect to services provided by optometrists, podiatrists, physiotherapists, and chiropractors.

MR. MUSGROVE: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister given any consideration to putting an addition on their health care premiums for those people who will be using chiropractor services?

MR. M. MOORE: That suggestion, Mr. Speaker, has been made to me by some members of the profession, but at this point in time we are not considering any changes to the health care insurance plan that would have benefits of a specific nature for a specific profession added by way of a supplementary premium. The short answer is: that's not under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister, in studying this matter, considering all of the consequences of the potential reduction of the chiropractic service; for instance, the cost of alternate care if people can't afford it, the cost of institutionalization? How cost effective is such a reduction in the final analysis with all of the factors, including the potential cost of the loss of a taxpayer if the person is taken out of the work force?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yes, all of those matters are being considered, including whether or not it is desirable, as is the case with physiotherapists, to create a situation where individuals would not be paid for services by a chiropractor from the health care insurance plan unless they were referred to that chiropractor by a medical practitioner. That's the case now with respect to physiotherapists and some other professions. So all of those things are certainly being taken into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we complete this set of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Member for Edmonton Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the minister's comments about the patient sharing the cost, is the minister contemplating a coinsurance plan, where the patient pays for part of each particular service, or insurance that would cover all services over and above a capped amount of, say, \$200?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, recently members of the private-sector insurance company who have been looking at Bill 14 and considering the possibility that they might provide additional insurance coverage for those items not covered by the Alberta health care insurance plan have said that they would only be interested in coverage on a group basis. There's very little interest in the private sector in medical care coverage because of the extensive coverage provided by the Alberta health care insurance plan. So we're not looking at any changes at all there that would reflect any increase in private-sector insurance that I'm aware of.

#### head: Statement by the Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. The Chair would like to make a few comments to the House with respect to the administration of the House and its business as it relates to procedures.

First, I believe some if not all members of the Assembly are aware that Michael Clegg, our Parliamentary Counsel, is away because his mother is seriously ill in England. So we have as Acting Parliamentary Counsel Mr. Michael Ritter, who comes to us from the University of Alberta, department of political science. [applause]

The Chair would like to make a few comments with respect to purported points of privilege. I'm sure hon. members are fully aware -- I will not take the time to read all of chapter 2 of *Beauchesne*, which relates to the matter of privilege and goes on for some number of pages. However, the Chair invites all hon. members to indeed peruse that document. It's 16 pages as to what privilege truly is, and one of the points to be made there is subsection 17, which relates in turn to our own Standing Order 15.

A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.

A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House.

Elsewhere within that chapter we come to the matter of privileges of the House, also the matter of reflections on the House as a whole, freedom of speech, freedom from arrest, extensions of privilege, procedure on a breach of privilege, raising a question of privilege and the role of Speaker as it relates there, all before we get to the matter of punitive powers of the House.

So when it comes to a matter of privilege, all hon. members of the Assembly must bear in mind that it is indeed a very serious matter. And what has transpired is that most of the so-called points of privilege in this House have really not been points of privilege at all. So most of the things that have been happening have related either to points of order which do indeed



relate to procedures, or they are nothing more than one interpretation as to how events have transpired in the day and really most of the time have been differences of opinion as to veracity of information and so forth.

It is quite clear that the role of the Speaker is brought forward in *Beauchesne*, subsection 84, and two subsections of that relate:

(1) Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a *prima facie* case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved [in terms] to justify him in giving such precedence . . . that there is a *prima facie* case . . . and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity.

I pause here to say, parenthetically, that indeed the House has been dealing with it at the earliest opportunity.

(2) It has often been laid down that the speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question, whether the case conforms with the conditions . . .

And then to jump on a bit.

[It] does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed -- a question which can only be decided by the House itself.

Then the last one that I will quote from *Beauchesne* with regards to privileges is this.

85 A complaint of a breach of privilege must conclude with a motion providing the House an opportunity to take some action. That action is normally the reference of the matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for examination.

Now, with respect for our own Standing Order 15, this is what the Chair will deal with, and the Chair finds itself constrained to do this. Under Standing Order 15, especially subsection 2:

A member wishing to raise a question of privilege shall give a written notice containing a brief statement of the question to Mr. Speaker and, if practicable, to any person whose conduct may be called in question, at least two hours before the opening of the sitting. . . .

So it is that future purported questions of privilege must be dealt with in that formal fashion and be brought to the office of the Speaker two hours before the sitting on the following day; the practical thing to stand up and say that you believe you have a point of privilege, but then for the formal notification to work its way through the system.

Now having gone on at great length with that, gone on with a great deal of reluctance, the Chair then wishes to point out briefly that with respect to points of order, yesterday probably was indeed a very historic day in the life of this Chamber. I have not done the research, but it would strike me that there have been few other days in the life of the Assembly that we have had to deal as a combined group of legislative colleagues with about nine purported points of order in order.

The Chair is now constrained to say that in future, while points of order are indeed part of the give and take of this Assembly, the Chair wishes that other members of the House will indeed follow the example of some members who are here and who did indulge yesterday, that when standing to cite a point of order the Chair will respectfully request you to cite which section in *Standing Orders* or which section in *Beauchesne* rather

than standing up with a complaint and going on at some length to try to justify one's position.

The final comment is this: about two days ago one member very skillfully brought an exhibit into the House and quickly flashed it up and down. That will not be tolerated in the House. *Beauchesne* 333: there will be no exhibits allowed in the House.

The Chair respectfully thanks the House for its kind consideration.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions 180, 183, 186, 190, 191, and 192 and Motion for a Return 176 stand.

[Motion carried]

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS

140. Mr. Mitchell asked the government the following question:

In respect of every contract for consulting services entered into by each department of government and the Executive Council during the 1985-86 and the 1986-87 fiscal years, what was the purpose of each contract, the name of the party with whom it was concluded, the name of the individual consultants working under the contract, and the total amount paid under each contract?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to 140, the government cannot accept that question because it does not on a routine basis keep registry of contracts provided by the government either for consulting services or for other contractual services.

142. Mr. Mitchell asked the government the following question:

What is the name and salary range classification of every management person involved in each of the six investment divisions of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, again the government must reject this question. A question similar to this was asked in 1981 under a motion for a return, but Question 142 is in fact so broad that it would be essentially impossible to deal with the detail required to provide that information because of the wide number of people, agencies, and departments that are affected under this question.

151. Mr. Hawkesworth asked the government the following question:

For each of the fiscal years 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86, in each instance where the Treasury Board has approved a "hosting" expenditure occasioned by an event organized at or by an Alberta government office maintained outside the province, regardless of the departmental budget out of which the hosting expenditure was paid, what was, where known, and itemized for each such event:

- (1) the meal, reception, or other entertainment provided;
- (2) the number of persons attending;
- (3) the names of those attending and their respective titles or offices;
- (4) the names of any groups officially represented by

attendees;

- (5) the number of bottles of spirits, wine, and beer served;
- (6) the brand names of the spirits, wines, and beers served, and the costs per bottle in each instance; and
- (7) the total costs of the meal, reception, or entertainment provided?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to 151, the government will also not accept that question. It is a matter of course that in the normal process of controlling the expenditures for the area outlined in the member's question, these are routinely provided as hosting expenditures through Treasury Board minutes, and these, of course, are published on a routine basis in the *Alberta Gazette*. Therefore the information is provided in another place in an orderly fashion.

I should note, Mr. Speaker, that the controls are effectively in place, that there should be no suggestion that these are not at all controlled either by ministers or by those people in responsible expenditure officer positions. In fact there is a very considerable and detailed Treasury Board minute which sets out the way in which these expenditures are controlled -- setting forth limits, setting forth approval processes -- and these, as I've said, as a matter of routine are published in the *Alberta Gazette*. Therefore we cannot accept this question.

153. Mr. McEachern asked the government the following question:

Is it the intention of the government to return to the practice of publishing Treasury Board approved "hosting" expenses in the *Alberta Gazette* on at least a quarterly basis, rather than one or two times yearly that has been its consistent practice for the last several years?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we accept this question, and the answer is no.

160. Mr. Wright asked the government the following question:

With regard to the trip by the hon. Dr. Reid, then Solicitor General, to the United Kingdom in the summer of 1984, the announced purpose of which was to inquire into British practices of dealing with young offenders:

- (1) how many persons accompanied Dr. Reid at public expense, and what were their names;
- (2) what was the total cost borne by the government for the trip, and what was the cost in each of the categories of travel, accommodation, meals, entertainment and hosting/hospitality, and "other"; and
- (3) when will any reports prepared as a consequence of the trip setting out the findings occasioned by the trip be tabled in the Assembly?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, we reject the question because it has been answered in Question 154(1), which was recently filed by the Attorney General. Portion (3) is internal documents; they weren't included in the other question, and we are rejecting them.

181. Mr. Hawkesworth asked the government the following question:

- (1) What is the government's best estimate of
  - (a) the dollar value of the sales of goods and services outside the province, and
  - (b) the dollar value of equity and portfolio investment

in Alberta enterprises

in each of the 1983-84, 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87 fiscal years attributable primarily to the efforts of Alberta's offices maintained outside the province and exclusive of the federal/provincial entrepreneurial immigration program; and

- (2) on what bases are these estimates made?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the government is not prepared to accept the question in the form presented. It is not customary to give best estimates, and furthermore it is impossible to answer in the form that it is presented relative to the words "attributable primarily to." It's impossible to answer. Many factors go into the sale of goods and services outside Alberta, but in order to give primary, secondary, tertiary, or other aspects of how they are arrived at is just impossible to achieve.

182. Mr. McEachern asked the government the following question:

For the period February 1, 1986, to March 31, 1987, in each instance where a certificate of eligibility, as that term is defined in the Alberta Stock Savings Plan Act, was issued by the Provincial Treasurer, what was

- (1) the name of the person to whom the certificate of eligibility was issued;
  - (2) the date on which the certificate of eligibility was issued;
  - (3) pursuant to section 4 of the Act
    - (a) the classification of the corporation determined by the Provincial Treasurer in accordance with subsection (5),
    - (b) the date of the certificate of eligibility set by the Provincial Treasurer in accordance with subsection (6), and
    - (c) the nature of any information required by and provided to the Provincial Treasurer in accordance with subsection (7);
  - (4) the number of eligible shares covered by the certificate of eligibility;
  - (5) the total value of the shares covered by the certificate of eligibility;
  - (6) the nature of the business in respect of which the corporation issued or proposed to issue the eligible shares;
  - (7) the address of the head office of the corporation issued the certificate of eligibility; and
- was the recipient of the certificate of eligibility the holder of or prior recipient of a certificate of provisional eligibility issued in anticipation of the coming into force of the Act?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this question. I note that for the record this will be a lengthy reply, and accordingly we would reply in a written form as per Standing Order 36.

184. Mr. Ewasiuk asked the government the following question:

What was the total cost of all advertising purchased by the government in each month from April 1, 1986, to March 31, 1987, inclusive, in each of the following media:

- (1) television,
- (2) radio,
- (3) daily newspapers,
- (4) weekly newspapers,

- (5) periodicals and magazines,
- (6) other print publications, and
- (7) billboards?

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to 184, I request the unanimous consent of the House to alter Written Question 184, standing on the Order Paper in my name, to combine categories (5) and (6) in the question, resulting in a single category including periodicals, magazines, and other print publications.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent of the House?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Thank you. Carried.

MR. RUSSELL: We accept that question, Mr. Speaker.

185. Mr. Ewasiuk asked the government the following question:

With regard to foreclosure actions undertaken by or on behalf of the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation against Albertans between April 1, 1986, and March 31, 1987, inclusive, what was

- (1) the number of such actions commenced,
- (2) the number of such actions that reached the stage of solicitor's formal demand for payment,
- (3) the number of actions that reached the final order stage, and
- (4) the number of such actions in process on the last day of the fiscal year?

MR. ROSTAD: We accept that question, Mr. Speaker.

187. Mr. Piquette asked the government the following question:

Noted individually for each of the fiscal years 1979-80 through 1986-87 inclusive and shown separately for

- (a) each primary highway on which funds were expended out of the vote equivalent to vote 2.2.1 in the 1987-88 estimates,
- (b) each secondary highway on which funds were expended out of the vote equivalent to vote 2.3.1 in the 1987-88 estimates, and
- (c) each rural resource road on which funds were expended out of the vote equivalent to vote 2.7.1 in the 1987-88 estimates,
  - (1) what was the total actual expenditure on construction for each road, and
  - (2) how many kilometres of each road were constructed?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, we reject Question 187 for a number of reasons. The span within the question is eight years, dating back to 1979-80, and almost all of the information that is requested is public in some fashion or another because press releases are issued as the projects are awarded for the successful tenders for any of those particular projects. The '86-87 year that just finished two days ago will probably take two to three months to finalize, and we wouldn't be in a position to provide that. It might be that the mover of the question might consider a motion for a return for the last year, which may be possible. However, I again state that the information is public. We issue press releases that identify every road and every project that has

been tendered throughout the province and therefore, Mr. Speaker, reject Question 187.

188. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:

With respect to all travel paid for by public funds for Members of the Legislative Assembly -- excluding travel to, from, in, and around their constituencies -- members of the Executive Council, Executive Council staff, staff of the office of the Premier, and the personal staff of all ministers, including ministerial assistants, for the period April 1, 1986, to March 31, 1987, inclusive, what were, in each instance of travel:

- (1) the itinerary and dates of departure and return;
- (2) transportation used, if it was commercial or charter aircraft, train, or bus, and the class of fare paid;
- (3) total costs in each of the categories of transportation, meals, accommodation, entertainment, hosting/hospitality, and "other";
- (4) the names of the persons accompanying the principal traveler at public expense, and their expenses itemized as in clause (3); and
- (5) the purpose of the travel?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to reject Question 188. First of all, with regard to the question under rule 390(2)(g), this speaks to the voluminous nature of the material and the work that would be required to compile it. We do as a practice and did in fact accept Motion for a Return 142 in 1986 which sought material not as inclusive as this, and perhaps the hon. member who placed the question would examine the manner in which the former motion was phrased and amended. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this question seeks material dealing with all expenses and travel apart from that relative to constituency, including in Alberta, and a distinction has always been made in that manner.

189. Mr. Hawkesworth asked the government the following question:

In respect of the grants or certificates of corporate investment, as those terms are meant in part 4 of the Small Business Equity Corporations Act, approved under the small business equity program between April 1, 1986, and March 31, 1987, in the case of each grant or certificate of corporate investment, what was or were, where known:

- (1) the name or names of the person or persons to whom the grant or certificate of corporate investment was issued,
- (2) the nature of the business in respect of which the grant or certificate of corporate investment was issued,
- (3) the amount of the grant or certificate of corporate investment, and
- (4) the date on which the grant or certificate of corporate investment was issued?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the government is unable to respond to this question. I would refer the mover to *Hansard*, July 8 of last year, where a similar question was put, amended, and the information provided. Perhaps the hon. member might wish to amend his question, place it on the Order Paper as a motion for a return, and the government would respond.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

161. Mrs. Hewes moved that an order of the Assembly do issue

for a return showing a copy of every study prepared for or by the government on the number of permanent jobs created in 1985 or 1986 as a result of job-creation programs operated by the Department of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to Motion 161, I would like to reject that motion. It's internal memoranda provided to me in the course of my duties of minister of the Crown, and I believe that my position is consistent with *Beauchesne*, section 390(2).

MR. SPEAKER: Concluding debate on the motion?

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I object to the reasons provided by the minister. There's hundreds of millions of dollars of Alberta taxpayers' money going towards so-called job-creation, job-finding centres, you name it -- STEP, PEP, LEAP, FLIP, as they say -- and I think the people of Alberta have a right to get this information. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that Sessional Paper 150-87, filed today, shows that the government wasn't able to come up with information about the usefulness of the job-finding centres.

I think it's incumbent upon the people who make sure that that money is spent -- that is, the government members and the government ministers -- to guarantee that the money that is being spent on these programs is being spent in a useful and economic fashion. The minister's explanation about the private documentation and his right to have private documentation is not good enough. It's taxpayers' dollars. It is not the minister's individual money being spent on these programs. We have a right to know. Taxpayers have a right to know. And if you're not going to give it this week, we'll put it back on in another form on another occasion. The Alberta public is spending a lot of money on the minister's department, and maybe a lot of those programs aren't working. It's about time we found out.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Norwood, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that this would give this minister an opportunity to show what a great job his department is doing, because I've sat across here, question after question, and listened to this minister brag about all the jobs that were created. Now they're not prepared to show us the studies about where these jobs are created. I really have to question if there is even a study. I think they're talking through their hat, and that's why they can't produce anything and that's why they say they're rejecting it on some flimsy excuse. I think it says loads about the so-called jobs that have been created. You can't document them, you're unprepared, you've been talking off the top of your head, Mr. Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Gold Bar's concluding debate.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm certainly disappointed in the minister's answer. But I suppose I shouldn't be surprised, having been treated to the litany of responses of noes in requests for information for the last 10 or 15 minutes. None of us should be surprised. It's another mark of this government, the mystery that surrounds what's happening in government departments that really puzzles the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, for the last three years this government has extolled its great job-creation programs. They appear in every throne speech -- all the merits of these wonderful programs, and the Alberta citizens have spent millions of dollars on job creation. Now, does it work? That's what we're asking for. Does it work? Because, Mr. Speaker, the facts of the matter, the evidence, are quite to the contrary.

Now I realize that there are a number of other variables in the present situation, but the facts of the matter are that unemployment is rising and is predicted by this government to stay at 11 percent till the end of the year at least, or perhaps even higher. So we have on the one hand a government that says, "Look, we have created these wonderful job-creation programs," and we have evidence that says it's not working.

Mr. Speaker, we need to know. We need to know if there are jobs. We need to know if they are permanent jobs. We need to know how long they last. What the taxpayers want to know is: did we get value for money expended in past years? Because right now before us we have the labour market strategy, yet another one, with all kinds of goodies in it. How on earth are we supposed to judge a \$143 million program -- which incidentally includes some others that we've heard about before, not new money -- how are we supposed to judge whether or not it will work when the government steadfastly refuses to tell us anything about their past experience in hard detail? I believe that the people of Alberta, the working people of Alberta, the unemployed people of Alberta, have a right to know where that money's going and whether we're getting value.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Gold Bar has moved Motion for a Return 161. Those in favour please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Hewes	Roberts
Buck	Martin	Sigurdson
Chumir	McEachern	Speaker, R.
Ewasiuk	Mitchell	Strong
Fox	Mjolsness	Taylor
Gibeault	Pashak	Wright
Hawkesworth	Piquette	Younie

Against the motion:

Adair	Fjordbotten	Osterman
Ady	Gogo	Payne
Alger	Heron	Pengelly
Anderson	Horsman	Reid
Bradley	Hyland	Rostad
Brassard	Johnston	Schumacher
Campbell	Jonson	Shaben

Cassin	Koper	Shrake
Cherry	Kowalski	Sparrow
Clegg	McCoy	Stevens
Crawford	Mirosh	Stewart
Cripps	Moore, R.	Trynchy
Day	Musgreave	Webber
Dinning	Musgrove	Weiss
Downey	Nelson	West
Elliott	Oldring	Young
Elzinga	Orman	Zarusky
Fischer		
Totals	Ayes - 21	Noes - 52

[Motion lost]

166. Mr. Mitchell moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of an expense claim, charge, or other record to cover every expenditure included under "Ministerial Miscellaneous Expenses," in statement 1 of the Supplementary Information to the Public Accounts for the 1985-86 fiscal year.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would commend to the Assembly that they vote against Motion 166.

Mr. Speaker, the request here is for a copy of every expense claim, charge, or other record to cover every expenditure. This would be a very voluminous set of documentation and very expensive to prepare. Again, I cite *Beauchesne*, rule 390, subsection 2, section (g), which reads specifically:

Papers of a voluminous character or which would require an inordinate cost or length of time to prepare.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the information requested by this motion falls into that category.

Mr. Speaker, the general information concerning each one of the causes which gave rise to an expenditure and the amount of expenditure is already tabled and available to all members of the Legislature and, for that matter, to any member of the public. Without reviewing it, the balance of my argument in support of the position I am taking can be found on page 366 in *Hansard* of March 6, 1987, one week ago from today.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, speaking in favour of this motion, I find it very difficult to understand the hon. minister's point that it would be difficult or extra voluminous to handle. The very fact that we say "under Ministerial Miscellaneous Expenses," from a statement that was in the supplementary information to the public accounts, would indicate in this modern day and era that supplementary information to the public accounts was all computerized, so it's not as if we're asking for something that is not already in a heading somewhere else. So all it is is a question of asking whoever in his department is familiar with the techniques of computers to push the right button and it should cough out. It's only for one season.

Let's just do a little bit of perambulating and mathematics. Suppose there are 25 or 27 cabinet ministers for one season. Suppose they had one whole page -- and mind you, it's possible, the way this government used to spend money -- one whole page per minister per month of supplementary expenses. That is still only around 288 pieces -- maybe make it 300 pieces -- of paper. Three hundred pieces of paper: well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Treasurer goes through that in two *Hansards* in answers, so it's nothing. So here's something that a computer can cough

out. That would be the very, very extreme, Mr. Speaker.

I feel that the hon. minister is doing a bit of gobbledygook and stickhandling that's worthy of the game we're going to witness tonight, and I don't think there's any reason whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that we should be denied this information, because I'm sure that might be some of the best bedtime reading citizens of Alberta could have: ministers' miscellaneous expenses. It would be interesting indeed just what they use their credit for over there.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional comment? Summation, Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is not a frivolous question. It is not a question designed to burden the research staff of the government. It is a motion for a return that was put to this government in light of developments that we have seen from this side of the House that are very, very disturbing in what they reflect to be the lack of management control, the erosion of good and responsible government on the part of this particular government. We are driving at a very important management point.

Small things. Mr. Speaker, add up to large things. This is a recurrence of the denial of open access to information that we saw last week. Travel expenditure in this government is \$35 million more than what was spent by the government of B.C., which spent \$29 million last year. If you add up -- and small things trip after trip add up -- over the last five years what this government has spent on travel compared to what the government of B.C. has spent on travel -- and I direct this particularly at the Treasurer, who is responsible for this kind of cost control -- this government has spent \$100 million more than the government of B.C. in five years, almost 75 percent of what we're spending on job creation programs this year in this government. Small expenses add up to large expenses. Miscellaneous expenses, however small, can easily get out of hand.

A second point that is critical to this debate is the fact that these kinds of expenses -- travel expenses, automobile expenses, \$2,000 increase last year, M.L.A. pay raises -- demonstrate a profound lack of leadership on the part of this government. This government has asked, has demanded that Albertans make . . .

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, on a point of order.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were talking about the motion, not ministerial miscellaneous expenses, not M.L.A.s' pay.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order is indeed correct. Hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, please continue.

MR. MITCHELL: I know I'm making my point, Mr. Speaker, when we get points of order.

MR. SPEAKER: That point is erroneous, hon. member. Please continue.

MR. MITCHELL: The fact of the matter is that this particular Order for a Return is premised upon a desire to find out what kind of leadership this government is demonstrating in cost cut-

ting, in cutting services to itself. Miscellaneous ministerial expenses are a grab bag of expenditures which represents services to the government itself. We require leadership on the part of this government to cut costs, leadership on the part of this government when it asks Albertans to make sacrifices in order to restrain, in order to balance a budget that this government has got out of control -- nobody else. You can't manage if you can't measure. This government refuses to be managed, it refuses to be measured, and it refuses to be held accountable. This is simply one more example of a government's headlong effort to avoid accountability at a time when the people of this province need to have a government that is held effectively accountable.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion lost]

173. Mr. Sigurdson moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all bylaws and motions adopted, approved, passed, or otherwise agreed upon by the members of the board of directors of the Wild Rose Foundation for the period April 1, 1984, to March 31, 1986.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Wild Rose Foundation is an independent foundation, an organization outside of the government, and therefore I would reject Motion 173 in that it would be therefore inappropriate to comply with the request.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary Mountain View wishes to comment?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this is surprising to me. I'm wondering if this group doesn't in fact receive funds, through lotteries, which are raised in this particular province. And does the provincial government have no policy reflecting lotteries and how that money is allocated and then not have any interest whatsoever in where those moneys are directed and how they're applied and used?

MR. ORMAN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you citing a citation that the Chair forgot to [inaudible].

MR. ORMAN: You allowed it, the last point of order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three hundred sixteen.

MR. ORMAN: Three hundred sixteen. That's called teamwork, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair respectfully requests which part of 316? [interjections] Member for Calgary Mountain View, continue with the...

MR. HAWKESWORTH: The point of order was... [interjections] Okay, I'll carry right on while we wait for...

MR. SPEAKER: Speak to the motion for a return.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's simply a request.

MR. ORMAN: *Beauchesne* 316, subsection (e). How are we doing?

MR. SPEAKER: "Impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to a Member."

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's important that the hon. member knows -- and if he was in the House last week or within the last two weeks he would have seen that we tabled the annual report for the Wild Rose Foundation, which in fact delineates every nickel expended within that foundation. As a matter of fact, his discussion has nothing to do with the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed. Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Information has been given to the House that the records were indeed tabled. Continue, Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes; thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point is that just because a body quotes, in the opinion of the minister, independent of the fact that they table financial records, and because they also implement various types of government policy, doesn't then entail that they're outside the scrutiny of this Legislative Assembly -- quite the contrary. They're acting as an agent of the provincial government, and therefore the Assembly has every right to request this kind of information from that particular board of directors, in terms of motions adopted, bylaws approved, passed, or otherwise agreed upon. The business of that organization -- while it may be made up of a board of directors outside of the direct appointment of this Assembly, it nevertheless enacts and carries forward government policy and therefore it ought to be considered an agent of the Crown.

Therefore this Assembly, in my opinion and in the opinion of my colleagues, believes we have every right to ask that that particular organization provide the information requested in this motion for a return. It's not independent, quite contrary to what the minister said. It's not outside government; quite the contrary, it's an agent of government. Therefore this Assembly has every right to request the information in this motion.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker. I'd like to add to what my colleague the Member for Calgary Mountain View said. The Wild Rose Foundation is a creation of this government. It's audited by the Auditor General and it reports to the Minister of Career Development and Employment, who files their annual report. Now he's in charge of that money which is or isn't spent from lotteries. And as a matter of fact, whatever goes on through the Wild Rose Foundation, which is appointed by the government, ought to be a matter of public record.

The purpose of this motion is not to determine information that's already contained in the annual report. Everybody, I'm sure, in this Assembly can read. The purpose of the motion for a return is to obtain information about what came under consideration; in other words, what parameters do they believe they are operating with, and what is the conclusion of the motions that they deal with. What happens to applicants who are looking to the Wild Rose Foundation for funding on an occasional basis is something that, as far as they can see, goes out to limbo. They have no ability of determining the basis upon which their applications have been judged.

The point here is to have a look at the motions and what hap-

pened to those motions, whether or not all those applications come up under motions in their meetings, and what's happened to them as a result. If the minister doesn't have anything to hide, then I'm sure he'd be happy to table the information.

MR. STEVENS: I would like to refer members of the Assembly -- and perhaps to assist, Mr. Speaker, yourself -- to section 380 of *Beauchesne*, which clearly defines what production of papers and in what cases the House may call for them. And there are two cases where the House calls for production of such documents. One is for public papers from a department of the government. Clearly, the Wild Rose Foundation is not a department of government, and the statute establishing it will identify that. Secondly, the other is for communications made by government as a whole.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Member for Edmonton Belmont wishes this information, then he should direct his request to the responsible officers of the Wild Rose Foundation, and they would consider his request as any other citizen's and no doubt respond directly to him. It is improper for that to be requested of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Lethbridge West and then the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to the motion for a return, I have no difficulty at all when an hon. member of the House requires information to enable him to either better represent his constituents or, if he's in the opposition, to recognize the basic principle that government proposes and opposition opposes. I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. Speaker, I do have some quarrel, however, with the fact that we have two private member days a week, and we're into one of those days now. And where do we draw the line? Who's next? AGT? ALCB? Are we going to be into the minutes of those motions? Are we going to tie up this Assembly? And I'm not at all denigrating the hon. member, but if the business of this House is to administer the laws of this province and to expend some \$10 billion for the betterment of Albertans, I've got to seriously question whether the interests of this House -- if this is carried, we're going to have a continual Order Paper full of motions for returns dealing with matters that, quite frankly, I think the boards on those agencies are quite competent to handle. I for one, Mr. Speaker, would certainly oppose it on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't often see myself disagreeing so fundamentally on principle with the hon. member for Lethbridge, but I do in this instance.

MR. SPEAKER: There are two members: Lethbridge West . . .

MR. CHUMIR: Lethbridge West. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The contention he makes is that the House has no business investigating and inquiring into the decisions of entities which are funded and are creatures of the provincial government. These would include not only the Wild Rose Foundation but, indeed, the ALCB. And I would suggest very strongly that what the Alberta Liquor Control Board does and how it does it is a matter of fundamental importance and of interest to this House and to the people of this province.

We have to understand here that insofar as the Wild Rose

Foundation is concerned, what we're asking for is the bylaws and motions. And these are things that are normally dealt with in open entities in public sessions. And this raises the issue of whether or not in this province public business is or is not going to be conducted in public.

Now, I have raised in my motion with respect to greater access to information and more open government in this House the fact that in a number of jurisdictions, particularly in the United States, they have what are known as sunshine laws, and the concept of those sunshine laws is to let the sun shine in so that the people can see what's happening. And that's really what's at issue here in respect of this motion: is this sun going to shine in on what is happening in the Wild Rose Foundation and the Alberta Liquor Control Board and in other entities which are creatures and part of government?

The reality is that the government is out of step with the direction of production of information in North America. The justice committee of the House of Commons on dealing with freedom-of-information legislation has just reported, and if he refers to that legislation and to the report of that committee, I'm sure he will find that the practice in the federal Parliament, and indeed in other provincial Legislatures, is to provide far more information than does the government in this instance. The committee in that instance, the justice committee of the Parliament, provided a recommendation, Mr. Speaker, that Crown corporations of the government be specifically subject to freedom-of-information legislation. There are over 50 of them. Many direct agencies and creatures of government are already subject to their legislation.

The government continually refers to *Beauchesne*, and while that is a revered authority on many areas, it has certainly not kept pace with the trend of modern thinking in respect of information. We have to remember that we've entered into a new era in which government is involved far more extensively than it ever was in the affairs of the community. It collects far more information than it ever did, and it's far more important that the citizens of this province, through their elected representatives, have access to that information.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion, I do from two areas -- much as I've been able to say amen to my hon. colleague from Calgary Buffalo but in addition to indicate the trend that public information is moving, particularly for this particular government, who values so-called free enterprise and business almost as a god. There are now on the stock exchange trading rules for any listed company, for any wholly-owned subsidiaries, which in effect you would call the Wild Rose Foundation to be, full disclosure rules. You cannot run a public business today, and I think plenty of the members over there may have had some association with it, that has a wholly-owned subsidiary without publishing -- or at least, even if you do not publish it, having to give to anyone that wishes to write in; that is, a shareholder -- and let's face it, the taxpayers of Alberta are certainly shareholders in Alberta -- without giving them the full details in the minutes and copies of meetings.

So like my colleague from Calgary Buffalo said, this government lags far, far behind the times if indeed they think that just because they have set up an organization that is one step away from the cabinet, it can operate in secret and can operate without reporting or, if it does report, to report only to the cabinet. I think that's a complete fallacy.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it was quoted by the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane -- he took article 380 out of *Beauchesne*.

There it does say that in two cases the House calls for production of documents. One is for public papers from a department of the government. But, and I think that possibly, Mr. Speaker, you might be in better shape to interpret this than many of the rest of us, it says the "other" -- that's the second -- "is for communications made by the Government as a whole." Well, the government, as I've sat here -- we're in the Second Session now -- has passed out reports. In other words, it's a communication from the government, sponsored by the government, and circulated through the MLAs. In other words, it was a communication of the government, maybe not with a capital C but, as *Beauchesne* says, with a small c. I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I would check to your superior understanding of the rules and maybe with counsel, that the word "communications" in 380 does cover this type of thing; in other words: communications from anything that the government sponsors. In fact, by distributing that report under their wing and mailing it out from the their departments, in effect it is a government report.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Other members? The Member for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion is quite appropriate and clearly in order. The Auditor General in his most recent report noted some very serious concerns about the Wild Rose Foundation, and that's the reason for this motion.

Mr. Speaker, the motion asks that we receive copies of bylaws, motions adopted, approved, passed, or otherwise agreed upon by the members of the board of directors. And the reason we ask that is because the Auditor General in his report found that the foundation paid grants which contravened, or appeared to have contravened, the limitations imposed by the very Act.

Mr. Speaker, the foundation is prohibited from funding services for a number of areas: the Alberta Sport Council; the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation; the Alberta Art Foundation; the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation; the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts; the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts; the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation; and any organization that receives grants from the Western Canada Lottery Foundation. In his report the Auditor General found that grants were paid to fund services or programs to one or more of those foundations or clubs that I have just outlined.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General also revealed instances where the foundation members had not complied with some of the Alberta regulations. Specifically, that

Unless otherwise provided by a term or condition of any gift, bequest or devise, the Foundation shall not give a grant to an organization

- (a) that exceeds the amounts received by that organization through community fund raising activities undertaken by the organization, or
- (b) that exceeds \$30,000.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the foundation perhaps did on occasion pay out that amount of money. In fact, the foundation, the members of the board of the Wild Rose Foundation, attempted to pass a motion, and that motion reads:

The Members of the Wild Rose Foundation construe the wording of item 2 of the Wild Rose Foundation Regulations to mean that no grant shall exceed \$30,000 and that the matching principle be not necessarily applied.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General goes on to suggest that members do not have the authority to ignore or alter a restriction im-

posed by the regulation.

Mr. Speaker, the board reports to the minister. The minister has responsibilities, and some of those responsibilities are to make sure that the regulations are not contravened. And perhaps the opposition ought to have the opportunity to look at the motions, to look at the bylaws, and anything else that might be passed, so that we can determine whether or not certain regulations have been contravened.

I would urge all members to support the motion.

[Motion lost]

175. Mr. Sigurdson moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of those studies, reports, and other documents on the basis of which the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment stated on March 6, 1987, *Alberta Hansard*, page 16, "the job creation program that the Premier talked about just a minute ago created 60,000 full-time jobs in this province in 1986."

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious, I would suggest that we reject Motion 175 for the exact same reasons as delineated in our discussion and debate on Motion 161.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for St. Albert, followed by the Member for Edmonton Highlands if there is time.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again this government demonstrates a significant arrogance, indifference, and contempt for Albertans. We as a government have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on job creation programs that this government suggests created thousands of jobs. And I believe that Motion for a Return 175 alludes to the creation of 60,000 full-time jobs in the province of Alberta in 1986. This is the perfect opportunity for this government to turn around and demonstrate to Albertans that they really do care. And I'll quote the Speech from the Throne in regards to employment. It says:

My government will continue its priority commitment to job creation... by providing major funding to employment and training programs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this government, through this motion, has the opportunity to prove and demonstrate to Albertans that indeed they do care about creating employment opportunities for Albertans.

This motion for a return gives this government that very opportunity to prove that they indeed did create 60,000 jobs. Now, why can't they table this information? Why can't they do that? Are we grasping numbers, grasping figures out of the air on the job creation, on the opportunity for a job here for Albertans when we're spending those millions of dollars in those areas? Where is the proof? And I have asked for the proof in this Legislature on various occasions. Where are these "jobs, jobs, jobs" that we're creating? Those jobs don't exist. We're dealing with the illusion created and offered to Albertans by this government -- illusion when it comes to the numbers of employment opportunities that are being created at the expense of the taxpayer and the province of Alberta on how many jobs we are creating. Again, where is this proof? Where is this proof? Where are, indeed, the jobs? And this government doesn't choose to answer -- not only this question but a previous question that was [asked] -- to demonstrate that proof to this Assembly. And how these government backbenchers and this government, these members here, can sit by and idly vote against a motion like



this, I guess you . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Order. Standing Order 8(3) takes effect:

On Thursday at 4:30 p.m. Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders shall be called and debate thereon shall be governed by the standing orders that are applicable to private members' motions.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Kaput. It just ends it.

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

**Bill 210**

**Alberta Palliative Care Foundation Act**

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise today to speak to Bill 210, the Alberta Palliative Care Foundation Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill has a long history in this House. I would like to point out that the major objects of this foundation would be to able to "receive . . . bequest, devise, transfer or otherwise, property" and to advance public awareness and understanding of palliative care. This foundation would also make grants to organizations that fund research into palliative care, make grants to organizations that provide training for people that work in the field, and assist volunteer organizations to obtain financial and professional assistance for programs that develop understanding and provision of palliative care.

Mr. Speaker, palliative care is something that we very often postpone talking about. No one likes to talk about death or dying, and yet everyone accepts the inevitability of their own death along with life and living. All of us and the medical profession -- we celebrate the trauma of birth, and it is a trauma. In our families and communities there are other traumas, and we have built in support systems for such experiences as the first time you go to school. Leaving home: we have many, many support systems for that. But we're reluctant to accept our own mortality. We try to ignore the very natural fact of death and dying because it represents, really, a failure of us, the ultimate failure of those who are left behind, including not only the families of the loved one but of the medical profession, to care for the person that dies.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is important to me in another way. It is the result of significant research and effort on the part of the former Member for Sherwood Park, Mr. Henry Woo. On May 24, 1983, he introduced a motion to this House urging the consideration of palliative care as part of the health system. Because of the present realities of the time, expansion of the health system was not economically feasible. On March 22, 1984, Mr. Woo again came back to this Legislature with Bill 201 to amend the Hospitals Act. At that time Mr. Woo said:

I hope the minister of hospitals might give consideration to the establishment of a palliative care foundation. This would allow hospitals with palliative care units the ability to raise and receive funding, in addition to gov-

ernment funding, through individual bequests and donations from both the private and corporate sectors. This sort of initiative will allow Albertans to further demonstrate their support.

This was well debated in the House. And in the interim, if my memory is correct, the home care program was expanded and extended by some \$10 million to further provide care at home for those who needed it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in the debate of that year there were extremely moving speeches given in this House by the present Speaker and the Member for Calgary Egmont -- those of you that were here I think will remember these -- also, the Member for West Yellowhead, now the Minister of Labour, and the Member for Highwood, presently the chairman of the Senior Citizens Secretariat. Anyone who was present at that time I'm sure will recall that.

Again, Mr. Woo introduced the present Bill in April of 1986, prior to the election. He had made it known at that time that he was not returning to the Legislature; he was returning to his career. And at that time he shared with me his very deep commitment to recognizing the need and asked me if perhaps I would carry this on. During the last session of the 20th Legislature he placed this Bill on the Order Paper, and in the First Session of the 21st Legislature I also placed the Bill on the Order Paper. It did not reach the Assembly at that time, but I had made a commitment to try to carry this forth, and with the support of my colleagues we are here today to debate a topic that is very important to this House.

Mr. Speaker, palliative care is the active and compassionate care of the terminally ill at a time when their disease is no longer responsive to traditional treatment aimed at the cure and prolongation of life and when control of symptoms -- physical, emotional, and spiritual -- is paramount. It's multidisciplinary in its approach and encompasses the patient, the family, the community. It is dependent on a competent and caring staff rather than on buildings and expensive technology. It provides what is necessary to make the last act a truly humane one: to relieve pain, to listen, and to provide a space in time for all of those things that have so much meaning to the dying person and the family and permit him or her to make the major decisions about his life.

We procrastinate in those. For those of you that are listening today, I'm sure there are those among you that are thinking now, "I should be making out my will or having another look at that." I know that in my household, I, in one sort of fell swoop, circulated to my family a list of all of the paintings and my jewelry, so that there would be no arguments after my demise. They were not the least bit interested in talking about that. So I think we do postpone this, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think there is a need to. I think we should be thinking about that.

The trend toward institutional care in our society is changing. People do not want to spend the last days of their lives in institutions; they want to be at home. However, the phenomena that is appearing is, although most people want to be at home, over 70 percent of deaths do occur in institutions. Because of medical technology that has become very sophisticated, however, it makes it difficult to treat people at home.

But I'd like to go into a few things that are happening here in Alberta that show great potential for making this a possibility. There are a number of different palliative care programs in Alberta, and usually they consist of a palliative care unit and a team of a doctor, a nurse, and a social worker, and consulting services of many volunteer agencies: clergy, physiotherapists,

and psychiatrists. The one with which I am most familiar, Mr. Speaker, is Hospice Calgary. And if I may just briefly describe Hospice Calgary, it's a community-based program and it emphasizes education for both professionals and individuals. It began in 1978 when Dr. Peter Geggie of the Tom Baker Cancer Centre set up a committee composed of a number of physicians, and they were all interested in palliative care.

I think when we're thinking about this we should also, and I'm just inserting this as an aside, remember that the Tom Baker Cancer Centre was totally built with heritage fund dollars, and I feel that's very important in this discussion today.

At any rate, the committee's interest took on a really more different direction when it received a donation through Mr. Al Kahanoff, a very good friend of mine, who was administering the estate of his brother, who had been a cancer patient at the Tom Baker Cancer Centre. Hospice Calgary was founded at that point in time. It provided the funding for a part-time doctor and nurse for palliative care teams in the General, the Holy Cross, Rockyview, the Colonel Belcher, the Bethany Care Centre, George Boyak, and Sarcee Auxiliary hospitals.

Now, the hospitals assisted very much in this cost-sharing program, and some hospitals even were able to fund a full-time nurse and social worker on their palliative care units. Calgary Hospice funding to these hospitals, however, in the near future will be examined because the Kahanoff Foundation had a term stipulation on their grant. Palliative care programs have been so successful though, Mr. Speaker, and the need for them so great that hospitals involved are doing their utmost to find further funding for them. And this Bill, I believe, perhaps best exemplifies this thrust. The focus of the program is on education, educating both the public and the professionals. Through public education and awareness the rest of Bill 210's objectives can be met; that is, the raising of funds and resources towards research training of staff and further public education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hatfield is another person that has worked intensely in this area in Calgary, as well as formerly Dr. Lamers and Mrs. Elva Mertick, Ms Shandra Albert. And if we think about home care in the city, there is a constituent in Calgary Foothills named Dawn Wigmore who has been very active in this area. There is a similar program existing in Edmonton, and of course in Edmonton we have the Cross Cancer Institute program. In 1981 Dr. Neil MacDonald of the institute developed a very special supportive care program utilizing the existing multidisciplinary patient support programs within that institute. Presently Dr. MacDonald's work has led to improving the care of patients with advanced cancer, and he believes that a lot of work in the palliative care field is applicable to patients with other advanced chronic diseases. Dr. Eduardo Bruera and Ms. Carlene Brenneis are also very instrumental in the research that is being conducted now into pain and other symptoms which contribute to the suffering of patients with advanced cancer. And the work being done at the Cross is just outstanding -- again, made possible at this time by the heritage fund.

So this is one model, the Cross Cancer Institute program and, again, the Edmonton palliative care co-ordinating council program. The other model I think is most easily illustrated by referring to the Youville pavilion at the Edmonton General hospital. In Montreal 200 years ago a 29-year-old widow, Marguerite d'Youville, opened a hospice. She later became a nun and founded the order of Grey Nuns who in turn founded the Edmonton General. So the name "Youville" carries a long history with it. It's a 15-bed unit there. I don't think any of you need any description of it, but it does consist of one full-time

and two part-time doctors, a nursing staff, a social worker who also does bereavement follow-up, and a part-time occupational therapist. The volunteers are trained in specifically designed programs for this hospital, and while the unit is funded primarily by the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, it too stands as what this Bill can do for palliative care. There was a shortfall which was covered by public donations. Mr. Speaker, Albertans really care.

The medical community works very closely with this palliative care unit. There are many names that would be familiar to people in Edmonton, such as Dr. Helen Hayes and Mary Ann Legrif, who gives workshops throughout this city, and I feel their work is outstanding and certainly indicative of what can be done.

Mr. Speaker, in proposing this Bill to the House, I feel that we can contribute a great deal to what is already happening in this province. Since the time when Mr. Woo first introduced this motion to the floor of the Assembly there has been a shift in our method of treatment, there has been a great increase in the kind of research and treatment given to the dying. And I feel that this comes at a time when the economy of our province says, "We can no longer expand the system; we must get the greatest value for our health care dollars." It offers an opportunity to Albertans to show how much they really care.

Mr. Speaker, I hope other speakers will address this idea in the House this afternoon and support it, as I think all of us will some day benefit by this move.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with real pride that I take part in the discussion this afternoon on Bill 210, the Alberta Palliative Care Foundation Act, and I wish to thank the Member for Calgary Foothills for bringing this Bill back to us. Even though the title is slightly different, the topic is still very important.

When I first heard this word "palliative care" -- it goes back quite a time now -- I went to a senior nurse in our little community of Beaverlodge and I said to Mrs. McFarlane, "What is this palliative care that they're talking about?" She said, "Oh, Bob, that's a big city word for something we've been doing in the little log hospital in Beaverlodge for the last 60 years." That's about when the homesteaders arrived. In rural Alberta the palliative care process is not new; it has been going on forever. But as the former speaker just said, changes in technology, changes in approach, changes in life-style have forced us to take a different look at how we approach our palliative care.

I think many of us have our own personal experiences with the issue of death. I soon became involved after arriving at Beaverlodge, in my work there, where people would, through their organizations, take turns and band together to work with people in the small hospital needing this kind of assistance and working with, of course, the families. I know I was part of an organization which shared with another organization; the two organizations got together, and there were enough members that we were able to establish -- on a two-hour shift basis we provided a 24-hour sitting, you might say, in the hospital with a gentleman who needed that kind of care, and we kept that up for over two weeks.

Some time later, working in Calgary, I had occasion to have a close experience there with a family member, again in the Foothills hospital, the Tom Baker clinic that the speaker for Calgary Foothills made reference to, and there the patient in

question was suffering from Alzheimer's. And the tiling that fascinated me about the program there was the attention that was paid to the family, how family conferences were conducted right in the facility. The family came, along with the patient; there they were involved in the discussion, the planning, and all general aspects that would influence not only the patient but the family and friends because this person had this kind of illness.

Similarly, we had friends in the Youville hospital here in Edmonton, and we had occasion to visit there too and watch how family had received the major portion of the attention and the care that was provided by the professionals there. The wife and the daughter of the gentleman in that instance will always be forever grateful for the attention they received at the time of the husband and father's death. These experiences I think are extremely important because they tell us the importance of the beauty and the joy and the value of life but they also tell us something about the real meaning of death and the importance that death of those among us has in our lives and how we can live with it.

Bill 210 clearly demonstrates the responsibility that this Legislature should have with respect to establishing procedures that could help bring the people of the province closer together on an understanding of what palliative care means and how they can use it.

In Grande Prairie constituency today we have a relatively large hospital, the Queen Elizabeth II hospital, relatively new, but it does not have a palliative care unit. But that hospital and the board of directors of that hospital do very strongly support the concept of palliative care, and they are putting major effort into promoting the concept within the community. While they are unable to handle the cases in the current inpatient facilities, they are working with this concept in order to bring the patients from the hospital into the fullest service possible in the community. And even after leaving the hospital, they provide some follow-up assistance.

To this end, the committee that has just been formed -- and again referring to the presentation of the Member from Calgary Foothills, I recognize that the Grande Prairie program is following in the footsteps which were already described to us. A new committee has been formed in Grande Prairie -- it's chaired by the hospital chaplain -- involving medical staff, involving church people throughout the community, and involving the health unit, which sponsors the home care group. And this committee has been conducting some initial reviews of the situation as we understand it in our constituency today in light of the new programs and new facilities. They have concluded that the home care program that we have in Grande Prairie area already has a very heavy caseload of terminally ill patients.

They've also determined that there is a real priority need for an education program to develop the philosophy to meet the patient needs as we see them today. They've also determined that the hospital has a major role to play in co-operating with the patients and the rest of the community, because they are directly involved with these patients as they move in and out of the hospital and some cases back in and back out again as they move between home and hospital throughout the various stages of their last days with us. So the hospital cannot be set aside and be separate from this process. They think that the objective is to have the hospital involved in a program that has a follow-up with the patients as they go through all of the final stages in their life.

The hospital board is currently of course concerned about the necessary funds to support the various aspects of their involve-

ment. The committee is also rapidly establishing an evaluation program in the community to find out where the gaps are in the Grande Prairie area at this time in having an adequate community palliative care program. In finding the gaps, they are able to set their priorities and establish a plan that will provide the service they think is required.

They have also in their final observation in their review determined the major importance of the volunteer. As in all smaller communities, such as the one which I just described in Beaverlodge many years ago, the role of the volunteer is absolutely vital to a program in our community today. And volunteers are there; they're ready. All they require is some training. This is why I'm so pleased to support this Bill today, because all aspects of the Bill fit the Grande Prairie scene. Just from the few comments of the review of the committee that has been working on a study of the palliative care issues in Grande Prairie today, we notice under section 4 of Bill 210 that there are the four major objectives, and the first and the fourth in that area apply specifically to the recommendations at this stage of the initial committee to review the process in Grande Prairie.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of the Assembly to support Bill 210.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the hon. Member for Edmonton Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, welcome this Bill and commend the Member for Calgary Foothills for bringing it forth and, having not been in the Chamber in the past sessions, appreciate the background and the history concerning the discussion and debate that has brought us to where we are today.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that palliative care and care for people who are living and dying is indeed a profoundly important and yet often overlooked and undervalued aspect of human caring. Certainly we need to see it not just as a matter of the final stages of life for those who are dying but also as part of the ongoing process of life itself. I'm pleased that the people in Calgary in fact don't call it death and dying anymore but rather the care that's involved in living and dying. And I think that's a very important aspect, because it in fact springs also from my own personal experience. I don't know how many times in the Anglican prayer book I've had to say at funerals that in the midst of life we are in death and am constantly reminded from those words that, as the hon. members have said, we just can't escape our own limitations, our own finitude in this existence.

Further to my own experience, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to share with members the experience of my own mother's death. When she was dying of cancer, we as a family decided that she with her own consent wanted to live her last days in the home with the family. In fact, that's what happened; she died so peacefully at home with family members and myself all around her bedside. I think it had a profound effect on me, insofar as she taught me more about life in her death than she ever did in her own life. She taught me more about what it is to care and to have courage in a very personal way that I will never regret. I would have, however, regretted if it happened in a hospital setting where I didn't have the more personal aspect and dimension of her death at home with the family around.

Certainly as well, I have pastorally, as no doubt with Dr. Carter's experiences and others who are in the clergy, that experience of being with parishioners and people in their last days. It is an experience that to me is not one that's depressing or one

that is defeating, but one that rather gives a sense of courage to life and living and the real meaning and value of life as we can share it in community day by day.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I continue to feel a great irony and sadness that still, despite these kinds of experiences of mine and of others of us here, there seems to still be an incredible amount of time and energy and money that is spent in denying death; incredible amounts of time and energy and money spent in the curative aspects, not in care as such; incredible amounts of time and energy and money in the institutional setting and not in the community and the home setting, where so much of this needs to go on. It's incredible to me that we spend still so much time and energy and money in prolonging the quantity of life without really looking, as both legislators and people in the health care professions, as individuals, at what is to improve the quality of life.

So fundamentally I feel that this effort is long overdue. I hear that it continues a very noble tradition that is implicit in much of the care that is currently going on in the province, but it seems to me that we need to make that care much more intentional, much more explicit, much more human, because also it has cost-efficient sides to it. We need to develop that caring tradition much more intentionally in the health care system as we know it.

With the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned that there is in a sense no definition of palliative care. I know from other conversations that hospice care or care of the dying in the hospital or Calgary's hospice care model or home care -- palliative care takes indeed many forms. In fact, I'm surprised that in this day and age many people still don't know what the term means. I'm hopeful, though, that section 4(i) of the Bill, which says that it's intended to promote public awareness and education, will be one of the first results of it.

Yet I'm also a bit disappointed that still in this day and age this Bill and this foundation, the efforts and the objectives of it, are not government policy, that this in fact is not a government Bill. I feel a great frustration and sense that it does a disservice to not be adopted as government legislation, because it really only asks for a foundation to be set up to garner funding and to appropriate funding for what we agree to be very important human aspects of care. So the frustration that I feel, that in a sense it's not government policy explicitly, is a frustrating one that we're perhaps not even at first base. And I regret that. In fact, I would even like to go much further and see the whole aspect of palliative care being an integral part of core funding programs in the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, and Community Health yesterday, and that they're not, again, distresses me.

As I said, I haven't been part of discussions in the Chamber, but I have read the 1982 policy paper on palliative care services that was prepared by the Hospitals and Medical Care department five years ago. As I've looked through it, it's a very excellent policy paper, Mr. Speaker, yet the recommendations at the end of it still have not been implemented in any explicit way. There are here very fine statements about the nature of palliative care, admission criteria, hospital-based services, hospital-based programs, and then also mobile team units that would go around, as well as home care. It talks about legislative implications and then financial and administrative implications. And to my knowledge, though I may be corrected by hon. members, these recommendations have still not been implemented in government policy five years later, and I regret that.

Further, mention has been made already of the palliative care unit at the Youville Memorial wing at the General hospital,

which is in my constituency and I've visited it several times. Again, I find it most frustrating to think that so much of the time and energy of the people there is spent in raising money for the program and away from the real hands-on care which they want to provide. It seems to me that it should again be core funding as part of the hospital system.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, in my proposals for the redevelopment of the downtown site, I called for a doubling of the number of beds, from 15 beds to 30 beds, which would be devoted primarily to palliative care in that new geriatric care centre. I was very disappointed and frustrated that as the board and the department came down on its redevelopment, there was in fact a keeping of the palliative care unit with the status quo, the status that it has, at 15 beds. Again, it would seem to me that the program was working well. The program needs to be expanded and, as a model, provides all kinds of both meeting of real human need as well as research opportunities and could well be expanded to 30 beds, as they have both in Winnipeg and in Montreal, in hospitals there.

Then I'd like to just for the record remind hon. members of the work of the Victorian Order of Nurses. I was very honoured and privileged to be able to attend a session by the president of the VON, Dr. Dorothy Pringle, who talked about a program that they had looked at in Hamilton, Ontario, I believe, where there was a palliative care interest project. They just developed a real assessment tool for how nurses who do provide palliative care in the home could really evaluate and assess where the patient was in terms of the needs of their care and what could be brought to bear on their care and, in a very excellent and farsighted procedure, were able to come up with this assessment tool. I think it would be highly, highly valuable for the home care aspects of our palliative care here. Yet as we know, or at least I'm told, the VON is really feeling cut out of the system here and they really feel they're taking a backseat to home care as provided by the boards of health and by others in the system. It distresses me somewhat that in this area of real concern we couldn't be somewhat more collaborative and bring the resources together instead of trying to compete for who's going to be able to be -- what should I say? -- the real ones to set the agenda.

Moreover, I'd like to also just read into the record -- I'm trying to finish a book that was recently written by June Callwood of the *Globe and Mail*. Her book, *Twelve Weeks in Spring*, a very moving account of how a dying woman didn't want to be in hospital and yet had no family around, recalled how nearly 50 of her friends, I believe, delivered 24-hour-a-day palliative care as this woman died in her own home. To have it documented in such a poetic and profound way I think is very important.

But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as you open the book -- after I bought it I couldn't believe it -- there was a little card in the front that said that some of the profits from the sale of this book would go toward the cost of setting up a hospice for AIDS patients, I believe in Toronto, called Kelsey House. And I was quite struck by that, that unknowingly I had just bought the book, that some of the money was going to go for an AIDS hospice. As we know, there is no cure for AIDS, and the epidemic proportions of its growth are distressing all of us in terms of the care. But part of the real care is, no doubt, palliative care, and there are movements to have hospice programs for people who have AIDS who are dying. And I just wonder how caring is our community. I'll be interested to know, in Alberta when the call for more funding for AIDS hospice programs comes forth, just how responsive we will be. Will we really extend palliative care to those people who sometimes we don't

understand and yet who continue to need the presence of human compassion?

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with some mixed feelings that I speak about this whole area and the Bill that's before us, because it does get us moving along the real dimensions that we need to be moving, but it is frustrating that with government cutbacks in the hospital sector, palliative care and other newer programs might well be the ones to be cut back. I've heard -- and perhaps in discussion later I could be told if in fact the people who run Hospice Calgary are quite distressed by the cutbacks, that it may mean that their own program will not be able to continue. I heard that about a month ago from some of them in Calgary. It's ironic that with the high cost of health care today, more quality programs like this aren't made more explicit, aren't being talked about more programmatically by hospital boards, by medical staffs, and indeed by government policy. As I say, I certainly will support, as our caucus will, this Bill, but why is it not government policy? Why do we have to bring it forth as a private member's Bill?

So, Mr. Speaker, I know I'm an enthusiast; I know I sit in the opposition benches, but I do feel a great frustration, a sense of disappointment that Bill 210 is moving the system along but just not fast enough for what I feel from my own experience and from my survey of the health care system really needs to be moved along in a much more profound and much more intentional effort.

So with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just take a few moments. I, too, want to thank the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills for bringing this most important Bill to us. At the outset I would just like to ask -- and perhaps the member will answer before we bring this to a vote -- about section 9 of the Bill. I'm puzzled by 9(a), which refers to the board, and I'm not sure I understand what that is. I have not read any place in the Act that there is a board, and perhaps that could be explained. It's a little undetermined as it sits there in the printed Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the member has described the various elements of such a program of palliative care: education, institutional care, teams of professionals, community services, and so on, all working together. I would like to say that I don't see death and dying as a failure, but I do see a continuing and great need to expand our thinking on the subject and our understanding and our individual and collective capacity to deal with the subject and with those who are most intimately involved with it. The development of palliative care services is but one component, one part of the whole, and it's a most important one. This type of activity would obviously stimulate and provoke the rest to fall into place.

I believe that we as a society should undertake to do what we can to ensure that we can give confidence to all Albertans, that the circumstances that frequently surround the terminally ill and the understanding of them will be available to all people. Of course, as one member put it, we've been doing it in a sense for many years. But we are learning many new things, and we are learning them quickly: new techniques in pain control, new ways of teaching how to reach out to one another, new means to help families to share love and to express love and happiness, new ways of dealing with anger and turning this energy of anger into more positive forms of release, new understandings of fear.

There is a great new body of theory and understanding about all these kinds of things that will be enormously helpful here.

I'm glad to have seen the hospice development movement and the support in communities throughout the province. I think that's a very important component. We must understand, however, that not all palliative care is institutionalized. We've been fortunate in the Edmonton area to have the Youville at the Edmonton General, and I'm pleased to see the new moves of the government to turn this institution into a world-class geriatric centre. Hopefully it will have a continued component of training of professionals and volunteers -- professionals and volunteers in all categories -- and they will also receive training in palliative care, because I think that will be helpful to the rest of the province.

I would like to see the regional development of programs as well so that patients can experience the kind of tiling we now have in existence in our major cities in the smaller centres and within smaller institutions as it's necessary. The minister has announced that he will be studying the health and hospital system, and hopefully this will be an important component, Mr. Speaker, because it certainly should be integrated with other health care systems in society.

Mr. Speaker, for some decades we've been encouraged to institutionalize the dying. Increasingly now that is changing, and we're learning to accept that people in many ways will be a lot more comfortable if they can be allowed to be at home in familiar surroundings and with their family beside them. Certainly we've developed methods to provide professional services, volunteer services, friendship, and support to allow this to happen. I was struck by some wonderful records that Margaret Atwood had written, and I would commend them to all hon. members because they are indeed very comforting. We are, I believe, a very caring people, and we need to rethink our role and to learn how to accept death rather than avoid it, rather than try to pretend that it won't happen. Hopefully this Bill -- and I, too, regret that it is not a government Bill; I'm puzzled by that -- and what results from it will stimulate and provoke Albertans, in their communities and in their institutions, in our community organizations and family life, to develop a comprehensive system that will deal with this increasingly important issue in our society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Highwood.

MR. ALGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, am ready for the question, but what I'd like to do first is encourage, if you like, the Member for Calgary Foothills with the fact that I believe a foundation can be established for palliative care, should be established for palliative care, and probably will be established for palliative care. There's no real reason in my mind why this can't be accomplished.

I'm going to speak more to the mechanics of the motion rather than what it's really designed for. The simple tiling is that when a foundation is established, it's usually established for a blessed good reason, and obviously that reason has been stressed more than enough this afternoon. The object in a foundation, therefore, is to gather up some money to manage and control this style of care. Now, the way it works generally speaking -- and we're in a rather pleasant position to help this out in that we do have extra money from time to time kicking

around, and we could actually design the foundation with a fairly substantial donation to it and then let the foundation grow from there on.

I belong to an organization, Mr. Speaker, that has a foundation that I hate to describe. It is quite a bit similar to our own Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and it was designed in 1922 for the care of crippled children. Since that time, the work these people have done has been so magnanimous that whoever has been helped invariably gets some support from the people who belong to this particular crippled child. And when I say some support, it can run from a five dollar bill to a five million dollar bill depending on how much good that child accomplished.

What I'm getting at I think, Mr. Speaker, is that this should be established and it could be established and I know that people would consider this. You don't have to be a senior citizen to leave this world, as many of you know, and some of us suffer very strongly as younger people leave. But if that care was provided and provided properly, I'm sure the people succeeding this person would be glad to contribute to such a foundation were it properly established.

The logicalness of it is there. I've been on this track and kick since 1982 with regard to senior citizens in particular, but as I say, the care itself or the palliative care is not confined to them alone. And I would, as I say, encourage the Member for Calgary Foothills to carry on with this Bill, and perhaps we could even make a government Bill out of it pretty soon and accomplish just what she has set out to do.

Thank you for your time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to stand to close debate on Bill 210. Hon. members who have had the opportunity to speak to this Bill have shown their support, and it's indicative of the support of many people in the public and in the profession.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a timely initiative for an aging population. There's possibly a decrease in family support. I feel it's an opportunity to co-ordinate the palliative care programs of this province and ensure a more consistent and quality care. And I feel that it will benefit the patients for which palliative care is designed.

The clarification requested by hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar for section 9 (a) can be done at committee stage of this Bill, and I therefore plead that we vote for this Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 210 read a second time]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, given the hour, I would like to move an adjournment motion in a moment, but before doing that, for the information of members planning, I would like to indicate that this evening it will be Committee of Supply with the Department of Culture and tomorrow after Orders of the Day it will be the Department of the Environment. In Committee of Supply on Monday next it is the intention to call Tourism in the afternoon and Career Development and Employment in the evening, and on Tuesday evening to call the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and not . . . Well, I think I should stop it at that. It's likely to be the Attorney General on Wednesday in Committee of Supply.

[The House recessed at 5.22 p.m.]