

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, May 9, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/05/09

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

At the beginning of this week we ask You, Father, to renew and strengthen in us the awareness of our duty and privilege as members of this Legislature.

We ask You also in Your divine providence to bless and protect the Assembly and the province we are elected to serve.

Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, a distinguished visitor to our province who is seated in your gallery today. Our guest today is making his first official visit to Alberta, having been named as ambassador to Canada from the west African country of Togo. He is accompanied by the honorary consul of Togo, Mr. Gary Tarrant of Calgary, and I would ask that they receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 32
Appropriation Act, 1988

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 32, the Appropriation Act, 1988. This is a money Bill. Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 32 provides for the appropriation of dollars to operate the government for the year ended March 31, 1989. The 25 days of debate on the estimates have been completed, and we're asking the Assembly to approve the expenditures in the amount of \$10,019,802,191.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start with the first of two introductions today. I'd like to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly this afternoon, some 55 students who are from Sakaw school in the grade 6 class in the lovely riding of Edmonton-Mill Woods. They're accompanied today by their teachers Donna Hamilton and Paul Ammann. I'd ask them to rise now and receive the very warm welcome of the House.

The second introduction, Mr. Speaker. Today I'd like to introduce to you and to the other members of the Assembly, Miss Carmen Gloria Quintana. Miss Quintana is a young

woman from Chile who is presently living in Montreal, who has won human rights recognition all around the world for her struggle for freedom and democracy in her home country. Miss Quintana was a university student on July 2, 1986, when she was participating in a demonstration against the dictatorship. At that time soldiers poured gasoline on her and a friend of hers, Rodrigo Rojas, and burned them alive. Fortunately, Carmen Gloria survived, although Rodrigo died, and she is here in Edmonton, invited by the Pablo Neruda Cultural Centre, helping Canadians to better understand the situation of human rights and freedoms in Chile. I'd like to ask Miss Quintana to stand now and receive the very warm welcome of the House.

MR. PIQUETTE: [remarks in French]

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce 56 grade 9 students from école Marquerte d'Youville of St. Albert on behalf of the Member for St. Albert, Brian Strong. [as submitted]

They are accompanied today by teachers Michel Nault, Denise Vanopdenbosch, Aurele Rodrigue, Barbara Fisher, and Jacqueline Rodrigue, and parent Garry Knorr. Would they all please stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today to introduce to you and members of the Assembly, on behalf of the Hon. Shirley Cripps, the Member for Drayton Valley, a group of 28 students from Calmar school, grade 10 class. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Pond and parents Mrs. Cordell and Mr. Olynk. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the house.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Labour Relations Code

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. There is a pattern emerging in the government's new labour code, and that pattern is very clearly that they're tipping the balance in favour of management. This latest flaw that I want to talk about today is no exception. My question to the Minister of Labour is: why is the government requiring each and every trade union in the province to make application to the Labour Relations Board to keep its certificates?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the intention of those consequential amendments is an attempt to have everything that is under way at the time of proclamation of the new labour legislation -- to have all of those items bridged under the current legislation so that there will not be a difficulty of changing the legislation in midstream.

In relation to the ongoing certification of those unions where there is a collective agreement or a bargaining relationship, the intention is that that certification will be bridged as well. I am aware of some difficulties with the wording that is in Bill 22, and if those difficulties caused what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned about -- if they are verified, then certainly the wording will be changed to make sure that the legislation is in accord with what the government wishes.

MR. MARTIN: Well, supplementary question. If we're worried about changes, the labour Act, as the minister is well aware, said:

A trade union certified as a bargaining agent under the former Act shall be deemed to be a certified bargaining agent

under this Act.

My question is simple: why the change?

DR. REID: If the hon. leader reads further on in that subsection, he will see that the Labour Relations Board "shall issue a new certificate." That means they will have to. The difficulty is a little earlier in the section where it may give an indication that the trade union, where there is an existing collective agreement or bargaining relationship, will have to apply for that certification, and that was not the intention of the government.

MR. MARTIN: Well, supplementary. I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker. This is why we have these debates.

Coming back to the previous one, so we can help out the government, then, is the minister saying that section 3 will be changed when this Bill is brought forward to the House?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, we don't always need the assistance, however well intentioned, of the opposition. We were aware of this difficulty and had already indicated that it would be corrected.

MR. MARTIN: Well, supplementary question, then, just to make it clear. Is the minister saying, then, that all the trade unions that are now certified under the previous Act of 1980 will be automatically certified after this Bill becomes law?

DR. REID: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, all of those where there is a collective agreement in place and all of those where there is a bargaining relationship. Now, it is true, as the hon. leader well knows, that there are some extinct certifications where in actual fact there is no relationship because the employer is no longer in business or indeed, in some cases, where the trade union has disappeared. We have other provisions that will allow the Labour Relations Board to deal with those. It is not the intention to use this mechanism to dispose of those extinct certifications. The difficulty with those is that there is nobody to initiate the decertification process to get them off the records of the Labour Relations Board. Those will be dealt with otherwise. But as far as those where there is a bona fide relationship, the intention is that those will be bridged to the new legislation without any applications.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Well, Mr. Speaker, then just to be clear, to the minister. Is it the intention that those who do not have what is considered to be a bona fide relationship will then have to apply for certification under the terms of the new Act? Is that's what intended, Mr. Minister?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, to repeat. Where there is a collective agreement, where there is a bargaining relationship when there is not currently a collective agreement, those certifications will be bridged to the new legislation. The difficulty exists with some existing certifications where the employer no longer exists, where the union no longer exists, or where there is for some considerable period of time no collective bargaining relationship. There are a lot of certifications like that on the books of the Labour Relations Board, and we have to have some mechanism for removing them. But that will not affect those where there is a bargaining relationship and where they currently have got a certification.

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

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Edmonton-Centre.

Health Care Insurance Plan Coverage

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this government, which purports to be so concerned about preventative health care, finally reinsured sterilization procedures after they had claimed that they had listened to Albertans and, we are told also, after they saved several million dollars from Alberta health care. We're not sure which came first. How much more listening to Albertans does the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care still need to do before he reinsures basic eye exams for all Albertans of all ages?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would repeat the question. I'm not exactly sure what he's getting at.

REV. ROBERTS: I'm asking the minister, Mr. Speaker, how much more listening to Albertans he needs to do before he reinsures basic eye exams for Albertans between the ages of 19 and 64 years of age.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I've answered that question so many times in this legislature, but I will repeat myself. It's simply this. We are not making any plans for any reductions in services provided by the health care insurance plan through the coming year, and members already know that we have maintained premiums at the level they're at now. I have said on numerous occasions that we still have under consideration a possibility of some increases in services to our citizens through the health care insurance plan, not unlike what has occurred in this House numerous times during the last two years. The Opposition will hear about it when we've made a decision and not before.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, we've heard a few other things, too, Mr. Speaker.

To the Premier. Will the Premier open the eyes and ears of the minister and tell him, as he told Dr. David Pineau, that deinsuring eye exams was "probably a big mistake"?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in the course of meeting with many Albertans -- I'm not sure where I met with Dr. Pineau, but I was checking my records; I may have had an opportunity to meet him when I spent days at my constituency office meeting with constituents on a regular basis. But in any event, I do not recall the conversation going along the lines as is now being quoted by the hon. member, and he once again performs in the style that he's established in the House: normally incorrect.

I have met with members of the optometric association and citizens of Alberta who have expressed to me comments about various matters that are insured by our health care system. I've always told them that we will look at them individually, and we will consider whether the points they are making are valid, and if they are valid, then we'll adjust to them. But I confirm also what the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care said today and has said many times in the past, and that is that if there are any changes or additions to that plan, they'll be announced when the

decision is made.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, then is the Premier denying that deinsuring eye exams was making a big mistake?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's always a matter of judgment in people's minds. I did not say it to the person that he has quoted. For my part, I don't know. As I said in the House -- I think it was Friday, but it might have been Thursday -- one of the things that is important to do with our superb medical and health system that we have in this province is to make sure that system is the best we possibly can have but within the means of the people, the taxpayers of Alberta, to pay. Anybody in Canada who is looking into the future at all with any sense of responsibility knows that the growth in the health care costs in this country is going faster than taxpayers can afford to support into the future, and at some point the lines cross and the system would no longer be able to maintain.

Therefore, initiatives have to be taken, and the government has to try certain things to see whether we can't in some way restrain that growth, whether it be by the Hyndman commission on long-term care for Albertans, the Member for Calgary-Glenmore's report, other matters. I would hope that all members of this House would take some time to think about the problem that's coming up in the future rather than just following along with the old spend, spend, spend theory that they have.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it's the government's build, build, build facilities that's in question here, if you're going to talk about eye exams, which is .1 percent of the \$3.3 billion budget.

So is the Premier then saying that despite oil and gas prices going up and the lottery doing well and other savings being accrued . . . It's still a big mistake to have deinsured eye exams, which is so grossly unfair and has no preventative sense to it, for so many Albertans between the ages of 19 and 64.

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we've really dealt with the answer to his question already. He refers to "build, build, build." I'm familiar with the NDP position; they do not like hospitals in rural Alberta. I'm familiar with the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods' argument that he does not support the Grant MacEwan College expansion and that they really don't like the building of facilities that are needed for the people of Alberta. I'm familiar with those positions. I'm very pleased to take them to the people of Alberta and explain it to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. We are taking time to review. We just wish you people would listen.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the minister. Has the minister put in place any ongoing research on the consequences of this shortsighted decision -- excuse the pun -- research on the added costs that will accrue to the health care system when other solutions are used and research into what is happening to preventive eye care?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the best advice I can give the hon. member is that the ophthalmologists society of Alberta, which is the professional group in the Alberta Medical Association that provide eye care in our province as far as the medical

profession is concerned, have indicated to me that they in fact are able now to see people in urgent need of eye care at a much faster pace than they did previously when the province was paying for the eye care for everyone. In that regard they actually regard the decisions we made as an improvement in the medical eye care of the average Albertan, simply because the 60 ophthalmologists in Alberta are able to concentrate on urgent eye care that people require rather than responding to an annual eye examination, which they indicate is not necessary between the ages of 18 and 65 more than every two or three years.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. We well know that when a program is going to be deinsured, there's going to be a peaking of the utilization rate, and then it levels off. My question to the minister is: does he have any statistics to indicate what level of utilization has occurred since the program was deinsured? Are there any statistics to indicate what has happened to that level of participation?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we can't keep the information in that regard because the group between 19 and 65 who were deinsured of course no longer appear in the health care insurance plan records. So all that I can go by is what advice I'm provided with from individual optometrists or ophthalmologists or their two associations, and it's apparent that there was a large increase in utilization during the period from May 26 last year when we announced that deinsurance would be effective August 1. During that period of a little over two months there was a very large increase in utilization, and then there was a very large decrease in the months that followed that. I'm given to understand now that there is a gradual increase again back toward previous levels, although it certainly hasn't achieved that utilization yet.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, has the minister ever received any indication from Albertans that there is, in fact, a hardship in paying for this procedure once a year?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, we do get letters from individuals expressing concern about having to pay for the standard eye examination, but the individual letters are very infrequent now. There are still a number that are coming forward that are form letters that are provided by optometrists in their offices.

Premier's Travel

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the main question's to the Premier today. There remains an element in the minds of many Albertans of a certain amount of uncertainty of the appropriateness of the Premier's returning home from California in a Nova jet a few weeks ago. I've no intention of going into details on the thing, but the Premier did say, April 11 of *Hansard*, page 326, "In this case, I had commercial passage there and back." To help put the matter at rest for many who find this matter a bit unsettling, Mr. Premier, would you be willing to table this evidence of this purchase of that ticket in the House?

MR. GETTY: Did I take it from his question, Mr. Speaker, that he would like me to show the tickets that I had to and from California? Is that the way? Oh, yes, I will show it to him personally, but that's a funny question from a grown-up, for God's sake.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I think there are many people in Alberta who are very concerned about the Premier maybe compromising himself a bit. I'm quite surprised. Doesn't he think his sincerity is going to be questioned if he is not able to table the tickets that he said he had purchased?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have them, and I'll show them to him.

Frankly, the idea of being compromised, Mr. Speaker . . . Just thinking quickly and looking about the House, I don't think there's a member in this Legislature who, if they had an emergency need for assistance and help and were given that help, -- I'm looking now not so much at my own caucus but at other caucuses here. I would not expect any one of them to feel a conflict or a compromise. I would think they would be better people than that, and I know them enough that they would be. So I wonder at the line of questioning of the member.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, every elected member is diminished by actions such as this. We're not questioning what the emergency was. I just feel that if I took a free gift from someone . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjection] Order.

With respect to references in *Beauchesne* the minister is really responsible for matters that come within his jurisdiction, and the matter of this issue, as raised before as well as now, deals more with the personal dealings of the individual member. So perhaps the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon could get to the point with respect to some other supplementaries instead of this . . .

MR. TAYLOR: It's my final supplementary, isn't it, Mr. Speaker. Is this my final?

MR. SPEAKER: It may be . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Well, it just depends whether you consider interrupting the other one my third one, or is this the final?

MR. SPEAKER: One more interruption like that, hon. member, and perhaps we'll go on to Clover Bar. Please.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, you're touchy today; touchy, touchy.

Mr. Speaker, then to the Premier. Because of Nova's largesse, is he going to absent himself from voting on whether Nova gets an ethane policy or whether Nova's affiliate, Husky, gets access to government funds to build the upgrader? Is he going to absent himself because of what he has compromised himself to do here?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I've already answered that question, and I make the point again that even the hon. member or any other member in this House -- I would not anticipate, if they received a measure of help when they really needed help, that any one of them would then feel that somehow they were unable to still handle their responsibilities, either in the Legislature or in government, in a way that would compromise their positions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I make it very clear to the hon. member that I'm going to continue to fulfill my responsibilities on those very issues.

MR. TAYLOR: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does not the Premier think it is necessary now, at this late date, to establish a policy not only of what kind of free transportation and perks a cabinet member can accept from someone doing business with the government but also whether or not that cabinet minister can vote on affairs that are coming up involving grants to that corporation granting the favour?

MR. GETTY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I don't in any way consider the kind of problem I was dealing with a perk. But besides that, I will not only not stop them, I will fight for their right to be helped when they need it like that.

Highways Cleanup Campaign

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Utilities. First of all, I'd like to say that I strongly support the program of the highways being cleaned up by our young people. But I have some concerns to the minister. First of all, can the minister report to the Legislature and indicate the success of the cleanup? Secondly -- I can ask that as a supplementary -- can the minister indicate to us how the program went last weekend?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it's a little early to have the exact details of what took place yesterday, because I'm not aware of whether rain caused some delays, and there may well be a need for the use of next Saturday, May 14. When we did announce it, we had the 7th, this past Saturday, as the day, and if there was a need, for inclement weather or whatever the case, there would be an alternate next Saturday. I do expect to have the actual figures of the amount of garbage picked up, and to my knowledge everything went well over the weekend.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when you get sued for just about anything if anything wayward happens, can the minister indicate if we have a liability policy in place in case one of the youngsters is hurt while they are picking up along the side of the road?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, we do have one in place for the young children who are picking up, be they JFW, 4-H, school students, as well as the supervisors.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I know when the youngsters pick up the litter along the side of the highway, there's usually a highway truck coming along fairly soon after. Has there been a change in policy, or were the trucks not available throughout the whole province to pick up the litter that was being assembled by the youngsters?

MR. ADAIR: To my understanding, Mr. Speaker, the garbage that was gathered by the young people was picked up by members of the department, in some cases right as they were doing it in some of the areas. At the one where I happened to be at, they were picking it up as they put it on the edge of the road. Some were a couple of hours later, with the trucks coming back to serve other areas.

DR. BUCK: My final supplementary to the minister. Has the minister had any report of any near misses on the highway, or were the youngsters completely safe, and there were no near misses?

MR. ADAIR: As I said, Mr. Speaker, all the reports I have to date are that the weekend went well on this past Saturday and that there were no concerns raised with me, although I'll have a final report a little later in the week.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Calgary-North Hill, followed by Edmonton-Mill Woods, Calgary-Buffalo, Calgary-McCall, Edmonton-Belmont, Edmonton-Beverly, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Senate Reform

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Thursday and Friday of last week the national conference was held on Senate reform in this city. I understand that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs attended and participated. I would like to ask the minister if he had an opportunity to meet with Senator Murray to determine the federal government's position on Senate reform and particularly with respect to the Triple E proposal.

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did on Thursday evening have the opportunity of meeting with Senator Murray, who is the federal minister of state responsible for federal/provincial relations. Senator Murray, in our private meeting and again publicly at the inauguration of the centre for constitutional reform at the University of Alberta law faculty, indicated that the Senate reform proposals that are being considered by the federal government at the present time are in formulation. But in any event, the federal government is prepared as we enter into this next round of constitutional discussions to agree to an elected Senate. That is a very major step forward towards our goal of Triple E.

He also indicated clearly that he felt that the Senate must be effective in terms of representing the interests of the federation -- and that is the federal state -- which, of course, is something that we have been seeking. He did not go the whole distance in agreeing with our proposal for an equal Senate representing an equal number of Senators from each province, but he certainly did not close the door on that proposal and said that it was something we should be discussing very carefully in this next round of constitutional discussions.

So quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased at the progress we were able to achieve. There's no question that Alberta has taken a lead role in this initiative.

MR. STEWART: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Meech Lake accord has not yet been ratified by all provinces, is there a possibility of an alternative proposal being pursued by the federal government in concert with some other provinces, to the detriment of the Triple E proposal?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, at the present time the answer to that question is no. I have had no indication that that might be done.

The federal government, of course, is proceeding with the objective of having the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord of last year ratified within the federal Parliament now -- and as hon. members are aware, it is back to the House of Commons again for review -- and by all the provinces as well. If that is not successful, of course -- and I am an optimist that it can be achieved within the time limit -- we would then proceed, as the Meech Lake accord requires, with a series of constitutional con-

ferences, with Senate reform at the top of the list.

I would remind the members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that that next priority for constitutional reform is there because of Alberta's leadership role and that of our Premier at the Premiers' Conference which was held here in the fall of 1986.

MR. STEWART: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since it is the Meech Lake accord itself that bills Senate reform as a constitutional requirement, can we anticipate any first ministers' meetings on Senate reform in the absence of the Meech Lake ratification?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly the view of this government: that there is a political accord in existence as part of the Meech Lake accord; that is, that there will be a meeting before the end of this year at which Senate reform will be the number one constitutional priority. As a result of that, Senator Murray agreed and I have agreed that we will commence a process of discussing that matter of the proposals for Senate reform with other provinces. The first opportunity for that, of course, will be when our Premier has the opportunity later this month of meeting with the western Premiers in Parksville, British Columbia, and from then on to discuss it with other provinces. I will be meeting with the ministers of justice before the end of this month in Quebec City, when it will be possible to begin the discussions relative to what other provinces' proposals might be and to build upon the support that we already have from the provinces for meaningful Senate reform.

MR. STEWART: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are there any further steps which the minister plans for the immediate future, other than the ones he's mentioned, to further the interest of Senate reform and the Triple E in particular?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, as I've indicated, there are these immediate opportunities which present themselves for meaningful discussion with the other provinces, and those will be pursued. There are, of course, some provinces which will not be represented at either of the two meetings that I've mentioned, and it will be my intention to visit those provinces and meet with the constitutional ministers -- they aren't all the same in each province -- and to have one-on-one meetings with those other provinces that I'm not able to be in personal touch with before the end of this month. So that I would hope to be able to accomplish before the end of June, but that of course depends upon our legislative timetable here. But it will be a very major priority for our government in the months ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's clear to observers across the country that Meech Lake is in jeopardy, certainly with the New Brunswick government and now Manitoba. My question to the minister: was there any discussion with Senator Murray about a contingency plan to deal with the probability of Meech Lake being overturned?

MR. HORSMAN: The Leader of the Opposition has asked quite an important question because of some degree of uncertainty which has arisen as a result of the situation with regard to New Brunswick, where there is a new government. Certainly it is the intention of the federal government, as it will be when the

Premiers meet in Saskatoon in August, to pursue that issue with the Premier of New Brunswick on the direct basis. By that time it is anticipated that perhaps all but Manitoba and New Brunswick will have ratified the accord.

I should remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the former Premier of Manitoba and the Premier of Manitoba as of today, the Hon. Gary Filmon, will have supported the Meech Lake approach, and the threat by the Leader of the Opposition in Manitoba now -- unless the New Democratic Party opposition repudiates the signature of their former Premier on this accord, it could very well pass through the Manitoba Legislature and in so doing perhaps prove that there is a government in place and that the leader of the Liberal opposition is not in place, in effect, to destroy the work that had been carried on by the previous government and the incoming government.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. It's to the Premier, on Senate reform. We can still elect our Senators even if we do not have Meech Lake, and we did suggest that we could elect our [Senators]. Is the Premier considering holding an election for Alberta's first elected Senate at the same time the next federal election is held?

MR. GETTY: We're considering a variety of options, Mr. Speaker.

Employment Standards Enforcement

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, my questions today are to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. Recently the people of this province have seen reports, including the excellent investigative journalism done by the *Calgary Herald* as well as others, of exploitation of immigrant workers in this province, including firms that have received wage subsidy grants from his department. These appalling situations have been known, apparently, to this government since 1985 in a report at which they were censored out because they were too embarrassing. But I'd like to ask the minister simply this: how much longer is he going to be doling out taxpayers' money to 'scuzzball' employers that exploit their workers before he implements some monitoring mechanism to deal with this?

MR. SPEAKER: In regard to parliamentary language, perhaps the member next time wouldn't bother to use that one phrase that was put in.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, our programs in the department, particularly in my vote that's dealing with job creation, are to enhance and facilitate recent work experience so that individuals can get particular skills through particular jobs. I can assure the hon. member and this Assembly that if there are abuses to those programs brought to my attention -- or through our investigations and follow-ups -- the terms of the contract call for all of the dollars to be returned, and in some cases we have the ability to pursue them through legal means. If they're brought to my attention or the department's attention, we do pursue them on those grounds.

MR. GIBEAULT: I'll be looking forward to seeing those prosecutions, Mr. Speaker.

But let me ask him this: since it's widely known that women often face double exploitation, new immigrant women to our province, can the minister advise the House when he's going to

rectify his gross mistake in not putting a single woman on his immigration advisory services committee?

MR. ORMAN: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is shirking his responsibilities as a citizen of Alberta if he is aware of instances where there are people exploited on the jobsite. If he knows of some, I suggest that he bring them forward immediately, because it's unacceptable that he would not report abuses that he's familiar with. Now, if he is simply globalizing and grandstanding, then that's another matter, and I don't think I'll respond to it.

With regard to the Immigration and Settlement Services Advisory Committee, Mr. Speaker, I have been working with the minister responsible for women's issues for some months now on that committee, and we have recommendations; we've called for recommendations. I don't recall seeing a recommendation from the hon. member, but in any case we'll be appointing those through order in council in the near term.

MR. GIBEAULT: Hopefully it'll be somebody other than orange and blue cardholders.

Let me just ask the Minister of Labour a question here on this, Mr. Speaker, because it applies to the whole area of employment standards. Given this minister's penchant to dismiss employment standards officers who like to enforce the law, could that minister tell us how many instances of exploitation have to be brought forward before he starts prosecuting employers who thumb their noses and defy the labour standards of this province?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is addressing an interesting point, which is addressed in Bill 21, and that is the ignorance of the current requirements of the Employment Standards Act and the regulations thereunder. If the hon. member looks, he will find in Bill 21 the provision for the wide dissemination in the future. In view of that I will appreciate his support when we get to Bill 21.

MR. GIBEAULT: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, to the leader of this government and this province. Seeing as how the Premier has made numerous statements in the House about the value of the province's multicultural heritage, I would like to ask him if he would be willing to stand in his place and give a personal commitment today to bring all the resources of the government to bear to get some prosecutions of these unscrupulous employers who exploit their new immigrant workers.

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time I would also reiterate the challenge from the Minister of Career Development and Employment to the hon. member, who has now made several charges which I think he ought to substantiate.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Yes. This is to the Minister of Labour, perhaps to be supplemented by the Minister of Career Development and Employment. The minister of career development has spoken about a big investigation of this matter by his immigrant advisory committee. I'm wondering whether the minister will undertake to this House to have an investigation of this disgraceful situation and in the meantime to ensure that employees are protected by stricter enforcement by programs of informing em-

ployees and employers of their rights and obligations and by implementing spot checks where information indicates that those would be helpful.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the ongoing function of the department all of the instances that have been discussed are currently under investigation.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've been asked to supplement the question by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo. Let me say that with regard to the story in the *Calgary Herald*, I did take the time on the weekend to talk to the chairman of the Immigration and Settlement Services Advisory Committee, who has met with all of the immigration and settlement agencies -- nongovernment organizations -- throughout the province. He indicates to me that during none of those meetings had worker exploitation of immigrants come to his attention.

I talked to [Enrico] Lazo, member of the Human Rights Commission, Mr. Speaker. He indicated that in his tenure it has not come to his attention in a formalized manner. I should also say that I've talked to the Premier's representative in Calgary to deal with ethnic matters, and it has not come to his attention.

I do find it interesting that the very gentleman that is bringing up this question is also the gentleman that opposes broader roles for the provinces in immigration matters in this country. I think his credibility is exposed by even bringing this to the attention of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Calgary-McCall.

Aid for Refugees

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over 400 Fijian refugee families have come to Alberta and are currently awaiting federal review to determine their refugee status. Until such time as they receive this review, they cannot receive a work permit, and the review process is being delayed as much as one year or more. In the interim many of these people are on welfare in this province despite the fact that they want to work, and they do not have the opportunity to contribute to Alberta in the way they would like.

To the Minister of Social Services. Can she please tell us how much it is costing the province to support these people on welfare despite the fact that they would like to work very much?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that's a question appropriate to the Order Paper.

MR. MITCHELL: Is the Minister of Career Development and Employment aware that we are spending provincial welfare money on people who would like to work, because the federal government is unable to deal quickly with the legitimate concerns of these people?

MR. ORMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this particular matter is certainly under the jurisdiction of the federal government. He may want to talk to his colleague from Calgary-Buffalo, because this is where the line of distinction comes between areas of responsibility. We do not believe that the provincial government should have jurisdiction in the area of refugees and in matters per se with regard to the strict tenets of immigration. However, if there is some way that I could assist the individuals that the

member is talking about, I'd certainly be willing to take it up with the regional director of Canada Employment and Immigration or directly with the Minister, Mrs. McDougall.

MR. MITCHELL: Is the minister then saying that he is unaware that this kind of circumstance occurs in Alberta on a continuing basis, and is he making a commitment now to take it up with the federal government on behalf of these people and on behalf of making this process work more effectively now and in the future?

MR. ORMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the matters of immigration are very detailed. The Act is very complex in many instances, and that's why, in fact, the federal government is reviewing it and making some revisions. I cannot respond on a broadbrush basis to the question by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. If I can look at the specific case and look into it, I'd be pleased to do whatever I could to assist the individuals he's referring to.

MR. MITCHELL: Is the minister saying that he does not look into this kind of matter on an ongoing basis, that he is not working with the federal government on an ongoing basis in an area of immigration policy which affects Alberta costwise, which affects the livelihood of Albertans, people who are in Alberta now, who want to work in Alberta, and who will become citizens of this province as soon as they possibly can? Is he just letting this go and slide as he does so many other . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. We've now had three questions in this supplementary.

MR. ORMAN: No, I cannot say that, Mr. Speaker.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care ensure that these refugee claimants from Fiji, as well as all refugee claimants in the province of Alberta, will receive, as they do in other provinces, full coverage under Alberta health care insurance plan?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, persons who are refugees, until they have gained permanent status as landed immigrants from the government of Canada, do not qualify for full coverage by Alberta health care insurance plan. On the other hand, if people who are in that category are destitute and unable to provide any medical care for themselves, they have the same right, as I understand it, as any other resident of Alberta would have to make application to the Minister of Social Services and that department for assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Calgary-McCall, followed by Edmonton-Belmont.

Construction Industry Collective Bargaining

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct an inquiry to the Minister of Labour. As we know, over the last number of weeks there has been an endeavour to negotiate a general agreement between various trades and the contractors. I'd like the minister to advise us: when is something going to happen with the negotiations presently ongoing in the construction industry to develop this general agreement for the trades?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the hon. Member for Calgary-McCall's interest in this in view of the constituency he represents and some of his constituents. The difficulty is that a system was given to the construction industry that both sides had bought into for negotiating an overall settlement. That has not been very successful. But under provisions that I discussed with the industry some weeks ago, certain trades have gone off on sidebar bargaining. Indeed, this weekend the boilermakers have achieved a memorandum of agreement.

MR. NELSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What effect will this memorandum have on the negotiations with the other trades?

DR. REID: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two factors here. First of all, the boilermakers are a trade which is, in the vast majority of cases, in the industrial sector of the construction industry. The memorandum of agreement is really in relation to that sector of the industry rather than the commercial/institutional sector or the housing sector. For that reason it could well act as a basis for the other trades in the industrial sector of the industry. Whether that would spill over to the commercial/institutional sector is at the moment not known.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Calgary-McCall.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Labour again. Is the minister suggesting he has abandoned the concept of a master agreement for the whole commercial/institutional/industrial part of the construction industry?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, after the discussions of a year ago which led to the proclamation of Bill 53, I myself consider there are tremendous long-term advantages to the construction industry of having a master agreement for all the different trades provincially. The difficulty is that the parties do not themselves seem to have a commitment to that process, and I think the government has to recognize those realities.

The difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is that the two parties on the part of the contractors -- their bargaining agent, the CLR, Construction Labour Relations, have been remarkably successful at putting items on the table which are completely unacceptable to the Building Trades Council representatives. Indeed, last Friday I described some of those suggestions as bizarre.

On the other hand, some of the unions -- not many, but some -- appear to have representatives who are equally bizarre in their suggestions that they can return to the salad days of the late '70s and early '80s during the height of the overheated boom. With those situations, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to see that master agreement being achieved.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, to the minister again. Does the minister expect ratification of the memorandum by the parties on the weekend, and when does he expect that might take place?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the situation with the

contractors' group in this particular trade. The boilermakers' union have a 21-day waiting period, which will take them to the end of the month before the ratification process. In view of what I just said about some of the people involved in the negotiating on behalf of the employers and on behalf of the Building Trades Council, I would hope that those parties will stay out of the situation with regard to the boilermakers and not try to frustrate the memorandum of agreement that has been reached.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Additional supplementary, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The minister has just made a comment with respect to certain parties wanting to return to the salad days of the late 1970s. Since when is it the minister's responsibility or duties to get involved with negotiations by making editorial comments like that?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is inviting debate, and I shall resist that opportunity. On the other hand, I have to indicate that some of the requests put on the table by the employers' representatives, Construction Labour Relations -- Alberta, essentially would gut the agreements of many of the traditional aspects of the construction unionized segment and what has been traditionally in the collective agreements that have been negotiated. On the other hand, some of the unions have not recognized the economic realities and think that they can return to the wild days, the aspects that existed at the height of the boom. On both sides they are being completely unrealistic, and I think the vast majority of Albertans would agree with my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional supplementaries? [interjections]
No additional supplementaries.

The Chair understands . . . Under points of order, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I guess it was last Friday in discussing educational funding in question period that the Premier and I had a different interpretation of the facts dealing with educational funding by the province. As pointed out to me by you, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that came out in *Hansard*, that I acknowledge -- it says, "MR. MARTIN: That's a lie." I would like to apologize for that and withdraw that term.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair appreciates the withdrawal by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and thanks him most sincerely.

Are there additional points of order? Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, it's a point of order under section 23(i) of Standing Orders. The Premier clearly imputed a "false or unavowed motive to another member," being myself, and he clearly distorted and corrupted the whole intent of our position as regards the new campus of Grant MacEwan Community College.

Let it be clear. Our position is simply this: we are glad to see capital enhancements to the infrastructure of the postsecondary college system of this province, but our simple concern is that this government doesn't fund them properly for operating expenses, and that's what we want. We don't want them to open up a new facility and then have a year from there a

press conference being called by the college saying that they can't run the programs.

MR. YOUNG: The explanation of the hon. member has gone well beyond any point of order at all. He's indulging in further debate. Mr. Speaker, there have been, regrettably I think, a number of persons in the Assembly . . . We all need to have regard to the concern about imputing motive, and I think that question should be raised but certainly not in the context in which it was raised in this instance.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the member is so defensive, and I'm glad that the other members representing Edmonton got hold of him and gave him a swat on the side of the head and said, "Stand up for the city." [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Is it to be the Leader of the Opposition or Edmonton-Highlands?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, this is precisely why we have this type of feedback back and forth. Instead of the Premier admitting that he made a mistake or at least being quiet, he has to get up and get the last word in. He's just like a kid at a toy store. If he wants to keep acting that way, we'll continue to have the problems in the House that he talks about all the time.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No, hon. Premier, with due respect. Whether people wish to make comments in the House or not, nevertheless, on points of order our tradition is that we speak once to each point of order rather than have them multiply back and forth. The Chair has looked at the initial Blues that are here, and basically what we have going here is a matter of complaint being raised between various members and not a point of order. I'm sure all hon. members have listened to each other with due care and attention.

MR. TAYLOR: The Premier's turning it into another Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Westlock-Sturgeon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

11. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the messages of Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the 1988-89 estimates of proposed investments of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, and all matters connected therewith be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

12. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly do resolve itself into Committee of Supply, when called, to consider the 1988-89 estimates of proposed investments of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division.

[Motion carried]

13. Moved by Mr. Johnston:

Be it resolved that the messages of Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the 1988-89 Capital Fund estimates, and all matters connected therewith be referred to Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

10. Moved by Mr. Young:

Be it resolved that, pursuant to Standing Order 58(6), the number of days that the Committee of Supply will be called to consider 1988-89 Capital Fund estimates shall be two (2) days.

[Motion carried]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

Bill 1 Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities Act

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to move second reading of Bill 1, Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities Act.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this legislation at first reading, this fulfills a commitment I made and our government made to Rick Hansen last March when he was traveling in Alberta, that we endorsed his view that such a council could play an important role in our province. I'm also pleased that this council has a mandate to get things done and that it can review, recommend, and influence government policy and, I hope, also the views of Albertans regarding the disabled. I think it's important that in our province we have the disabled lead the rest of the country by to the greatest extent possible participating fully in opportunities within our province. And I hope this council and Albertans' response to this council will allow us to dwell not on the disabilities but rather on the contributions that can be made by all people in this province. I'm very pleased that we have been able to get a person of the quality of Mr. Gary McPherson to chair this council. I think he'll do a superb job there.

I also just want to say quickly, Mr. Speaker, how much we as a government have appreciated the people who participated in our steering committee in developing the terms of reference for the council. There were a group of people, but I'd like to just mention them: Mr. Eric Boyd; Mr. David Kelly; Greg Latham, who is the chairman of the steering committee; Donna Martini; Margaret Shone; and also Mr. Dennis Barr. They made a considerable contribution to how the council would be developed and took a lot of time traveling throughout the province, and I wanted to express my appreciation to them.

I now would ask members to support this legislation. Also, to allow the council to get on with its work, I'd ask all members of the Legislature, any members on either side of the House, to provide us with names, suggestions for the nominations to this council. As the members will note, we now have the provision for 15 members to the council, at least two who can be members of the Legislature. So I would appreciate receiving nominations from any members of the House. Of course, they could pass that on their constituents, any interested Albertans.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. members to support

second reading of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar, followed by Edmonton-Calder.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier: yes, I'll support second reading of this Bill. I do have some comments to make on it, however.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this particular council is not just a study group, that in fact it can get into some action. I recognize that in the early stages it's going to take them some time to figure out just exactly where they're going with the immense piece of work that's ahead of them. But I would hope that the Premier will support an action council and that they will be in a position to relate intimately to organizations in parts of our province where we need to bring about change.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased with the appointment of the chairman. Mr. McPherson is well known to most of us who have worked in this field of practice over many years, and I think he is a very competent individual and will do an excellent piece of work and bring honour to the council.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all those persons appointed will be physically disabled persons. My own experience has been an excellent one over some years. To be sure, the custom used to be that we planned for and acted on behalf of and as advocates for disabled persons, and that has now been replaced quite properly by empowering disabled persons to act on their own behalf. They have been most responsible in our province over many years; have developed, using their own resources, housing programs in our major urban centres, immense pieces of legislation or critiques of legislation planned on support programs, and have done credit to the disabled population of our province by their work. I see no reason whatsoever to draw members of this council from those other than the disabled personnel and people in our province. I think it would be quite unnecessary. In spite of our empathy, in spite of the way we feel about it, people who are not disabled simply cannot get into that position, that mind-set. I think it's unnecessary, therefore, to appoint persons to it who are not disabled.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope, too, that this council will be in a position to report directly to the public of Alberta, that it will not be necessary for them to report solely to the Premier and the government, that their ideas and thoughts and statements will be available to the public and to the government simultaneously so that we may all be aware and there is no sense nor any opportunity for their recommendations to be put through any kind of hopper by the government in advance of being known and acted on by organizations and individuals throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, just a few thoughts that I would like to put into some sort of priority about the things I would hope the Premier would ask Chairman McPherson and his council to address themselves to. From my own connections, it is my understanding that the primary -- the primary -- concern of disabled people in our province is their capacity to secure employment and to be able to be productive citizens in the sense of jobs, employment, and productive activity. And they are desperately anxious to find useful employment and employment that gives them a sense of being part of the mainstream of Alberta society. So I would hope that the Premier will discuss with the chairman and the council that whole issue as a first priority they should address themselves to, and along with it the business of the education of disabled people, the training and retraining of disabled people, needs our primary attention.

I was glad to see that the Minister of Education took out that most difficult terminology and clause about "educable" in the proposed education Bill. I think this gives an opening for a very broad and much more open system in our schools across the province, to train disabled students along with students who have no visible disability. I believe that in so doing both groups are endowed with greater knowledge and understanding of the difficulties they each encounter.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

So it's my wish that the Premier will ask the council, as their first priority, to work on employment, productive activity, education -- training and retraining -- for the disabled in our province. Following that, one of the major problems disabled people have is housing options and housing opportunities for independent living. Of course, hand in hand with this go the home support programs, the backup programs, the transportation requirements they have that are different from nondisabled people. There have been some very creative thoughts, including the Sir Douglas Bader Towers, the housing co-operatives for disabled people, the kind of community spirit where we find in extensive housing developments one or two units in every group being disabled accessible. I believe the council should put its mind to how our present system can be revamped in order to accommodate those particular needs.

Mr. Speaker, access is a continuing problem. We like to think that all of our public buildings are accessible, and I'm glad to see the Legislature is now more accessible than it was and that we are now writing into our requirements that all public buildings be accessible. But I think we need a real drive to make sure that all buildings are accessible. Disabled people have enough difficulty in going about their daily activities and their business activities without the additional problems of access. You know, every now and again you see that a municipal councillor will spend a day in a wheelchair, and we learn very quickly what it's like, not just discomforts but the actual inaccessibility of many, many things the rest of us simply take for granted.

Lastly -- well, second last, I guess it is, Mr. Speaker -- I believe we need to keep a constant watch through this council on financial benefits to the disabled, the ADL and the AISH programs of the province, to make sure they are contemporary programs and in fact keep up with the requirements of disabled people as more and more of them are able to get into productive employment. The needs for recreation opportunities and socializing for disabled people are being met in large measure through many organizations in our urban and rural centres. It's still a very difficult process, and I'm sure the council will want to address that problem as well as the others I've mentioned.

Those are just a few of my thoughts on the subject. I look forward to the council getting into operation as soon as possible and would hope the Premier would consider carefully the need for their advice to come to all of us, to the public, and not just to the government of Alberta. Because I believe the citizens of Alberta want and will welcome the actions and recommendations of this council.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to sup-

port Bill 1, the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities Act, second reading. I would like to also make a few comments.

I think the creation of this council for disabled persons is very significant, because this particular council has the potential to improve conditions of disabled people: their living conditions, the services they depend upon, and also the opportunities that are available to them. This council will be able to make recommendations that hopefully would represent the disabled community and disabled individuals. I look forward to those recommendations as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a lot of correspondence in regards to the concerns of the disabled and the disabled community by individuals as well as organizations. They have expressed a variety of concerns when it comes to lack of services or lack of opportunities that are available to them. I'm sure the council will be very busy correlating and gathering a lot of information. One of the issues that was brought to my attention was the need for all types of housing. There is a real concern in this area, and it ranges anywhere from insufficient residential programs for disabled within the Red Deer area to shortage of handicapped housing in the Medicine Hat region. This region in particular was experiencing waiting lists for the residential program. In the Calgary region it was expressed that they have a lack of daytime placement programs for dependent adults, so that was a concern.

Transportation was a concern brought to my attention, not only in our urban areas but also in our rural areas, depending on what type of disability that particular person might have. Support systems or the lack of support systems was a serious concern. Especially when disabled people are returning to the community after they've spent some time in institutional settings, they need those support services so they can return to an independent way of life. Support services to provide parent relief was also a concern expressed. There were concerns expressed in areas of vocational programs, day programs in the Lac La Biche area, the Red Deer area, Wetaskiwin, Calgary, Edmonton, all those areas. The need to improve the AISH program was also a concern expressed.

One area that was expressed consistently throughout the correspondence I have received is the fact that there's a lack of government accountability. There is a lack of consultation between government delivering services and those people that are receiving the services or those people that are delivering the services. Lack of sharing of information also was a concern expressed. The list goes on. I know that the council will be very busy dealing with a lot of these concerns, and I'm quite positive and optimistic the council will be receptive to individual representation and ideas, especially those who are affected by disabilities.

I am looking forward to the recommendations. I am worried, however, that once the recommendations come forth the government will shelve the recommendations like they have done with so many other reports and recommendations. A good example, Mr. Speaker, is when we look at the women's advisory council. What has happened to those recommendations? We've got them, but we have not acted on them. I would sincerely hope the same thing does not happen when we get recommendations from this council. In the Premier's opening remarks he stated that this council will influence government policy. I would really hope that becomes a reality and that we see these recommendations, once the council has developed them, actually come into being and that the government acts upon those recommen-

dations. I would hope the government is sincere in their attempt in setting up this council to improve living conditions amongst the disabled people, to provide all the necessary support services they are now lacking, to provide employment opportunities for them, deal with transportation and the current transportation problems, deal with the housing issue. I think that by setting up the council we certainly have potential in dealing with these problems. Mr. Speaker, I guess only time will tell.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to concur with the two members who have spoken already on Bill 1 before us today, and I have a couple of questions and concerns I'd like to raise now before I bring an amendment at the committee stage. Perhaps the Premier can clarify them for me, because they're not major in some detailed ways but perhaps they're major in a symbolic way. That has to do with the word "disabled" itself. I know the Premier did speak about it in terms of wanting to look at not really the disabilities but the abilities and turn it around so we accentuate the abilities and the potential we as Albertans want to be about. But I'm concerned that in the Act there is no definition of what a disability is or who in fact is going to come under the purview of being a person with a disability. I think it's perhaps obvious, but when you really look at it, perhaps it isn't obvious, that in fact there's a lot of people who may be disabled in some form or other whom this council is not prepared to assist with their status. It is symbolic, and I think the title of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, sets the tone. I'd like some clarification.

I know that with the women's council, it was for women's issues, and I think that sent a clear signal that it wasn't the status of women but women's issues simply. I'm glad to see they've improved the language and the tone of it here, so it's not a council with respect to issues of people who have disabilities but rather the status of persons with disabilities Act. I think that's a very, very good improvement, but still I'd like to get back to just how inclusive or what the meaning of the term "disability" is. I know, for instance, that a group that is very active in the whole area is the Easter Seal Ability Council. They have taken the prefix "dis" off even their title; they're not the Easter Seal disability council but the Easter Seal Ability Council, thereby wanting to stress how the abilities and the potential and the growth of people who may be physically impaired in some form or other can focus on their abilities. I think we should take note of that.

I learned a lot about this whole area from readings and discussions with a very noted Canadian by the name of Jean Vanier, the son of the former Governor General Georges Vanier. I think the Premier and other members should perhaps get a volume of two of some of what Jean Vanier has written. He doesn't use the term "disability" at all; he uses the term "handicapped." Perhaps that's loaded language as well, but at least he gives the sense that when we're talking about handicapped people, we're talking about all of us, because we all have handicaps and we all need to look at what our own handicaps are in various respects. I don't just mean on the golfing greens either. Some of us are handicapped with our various talents and with various physical things as well as mental and emotional, and when we look at "handicap" in that way it's something we can take more to ourselves than that nasty word "disability," which

is what somebody else has. We need, as Jean Vanier did, to live together with people of various handicaps to discover our own handicaps, and to live and to learn to work together is a very important process.

There was a term that used to be used way back. I think some of the Tory dinosaurs here might remember when we used to call these people "crippled." Certainly that's a word that has fallen out of great disuse, and so it should. We don't call these people "crippled" any more -- that's a word without much status at all -- and so we're using the term, I take it, "disabled." I'd like to know, though: as "disabled" is a better term than "crippled," whether in fact "handicapped" is a better word than "disabled," and argue that here and perhaps at committee stage.

The other thing it leaves out, I think, and perhaps the Premier can correct me and those of us who have questioned this, is: in fact, is this council going to be able to assist with those people who have a mental disability? Now, there's a whole category, Mr. Speaker, of people who are given that sort of label of being mentally disabled, not physically disabled. They are people who may have a learning disability, people who may be what we used to call retarded or have some mental handicap and those who are disabled because of chronic mental illness. These are all people whom we're told are somewhat under the label of mental disability, but I don't get the sense that this is a council they're going to be having much voice in.

I know often the lines are blurred between whether the disability is of a physical nature or mental or emotional, that it's often hard to in a sense diagnose or make a label fit or work. But if it is, in fact, a council that is going to be assisting those and be an advocate on behalf of and a voice for those who are mentally disabled in these ways, then I'd like to know about that. If it's not, then I think we should be clear about it. I think we should be clear in the Act what "disabilities" or "persons with disabilities" -- who that is to include. If it is not to include these suggestions that I have, then I think perhaps a better title would be: Premier's council on the status of persons with physical handicaps. If that's more the point, then perhaps we should call a spade a spade and make clear even in the title whom this council is to be a voice for and with.

So, Mr. Speaker, we mustn't confuse these terms, and I think it would be clear, if that's the intent, that it's persons with physical handicaps and avoid the more generic title "disability," which may leave out people with other handicaps, including those who are mentally handicapped or mentally disabled. So I would appreciate some response to those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to participate for a few moments on Bill 1, Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities Act. The bringing forward of this Bill means something very important to me in that I, the Premier, and the Member for Medicine Hat were the three provincial people that met Rick Hansen at the Alberta/Saskatchewan border, as it seems a few short months ago, to welcome him to this province. Then later we saw Rick coming to the meeting in the Assembly and the Premier announcing the intention to form such a committee.

Why this is important to me, Mr. Speaker, is that I have spent about six or eight years as a representative director on the Alberta division of the Canadian Paraplegic Association and have gotten to know Eric Boyd, who is executive director of that

association. In fact, I was one of the people who interviewed Eric when he applied for the job. The Premier has said the tremendous work he has done in the steering committee, coming forward and getting to the stage we're at now, and the announcement we heard a couple of weeks ago announcing Gary McPherson as the chairman of this council. I've known Eric for a number of years and also worked with him with the association and with the Rick Hansen tour when he worked as one of the people involved in that tour in the province of Alberta.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The Canadian Paraplegic Association -- Alberta Division is a unique group of people composed of those with handicaps and those without in a very good mix. There are some very interesting and some very energetic people in that group. It's a group that is funded partly by grants to them for operation and the remainder by the United Way throughout the province and also some fundraising for special projects. It's a group that works very hard, has some very dedicated people in it. I'm sure their influence and dedication and push, if any of that rubs off on those that are associated with this council, will go a long way toward assisting those people intended to be covered and assisted by this Act.

I congratulate the Premier for the introduction of this Act and look forward to the passing of it in the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising to support this piece of legislation. It's a very good idea indeed, and there are many needs of the disabled in our community which need to be addressed by a specific group with expertise. This appears to provide that mechanism. All concerned Albertans have great hopes for this council. One of those hopes which I have is that the council will not be used to deflect the ongoing government responsibility for dealing with the problems of disabled Albertans. These problems do need full-time, concerted attention that no council can manage, and I hope the government will respond to that need.

I do share the concern that was expressed earlier this afternoon with respect to the scope of the council. I understand that the council was intended to deal primarily with the status of persons who have physical disabilities. However, there is, of course, in the community a major need of those who have mental disabilities as well, and indeed those who have such problems are not even protected by the Individual's Rights Protection Act in this province.

So I would suggest that it's important to clarify the scope of the council to determine whether it is to deal with those Albertans who have mental disabilities. I know that we do have mental health councils, and the Alberta mental health council in particular. But this council hardly has the status or profile of a Premier's council. I think we should be asking ourselves whether the problems of the mentally disabled should be of a lower priority in the event that this council is not intended to encompass those problems. These have to be answered. At the present time the Act is so big in this regard as to be almost invisible, and I would appreciate receiving some clarification in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to add my comments of support of the Premier for introducing Bill 1 and say I commend the creation of a council. I think it's certainly a step in the right direction. But it raises some questions, in looking at the mandate of the council, just to what extent it's going to be allowed to be effective.

I recall -- I guess it was a little over a year ago now -- initially when there were cutbacks announced in the city of Calgary through the regional office of Social Services in the area of handicapped children's services. What was interesting about that to me was that actions in one particular department had a ripple effect in other departments providing services to these youngsters. We saw, for example, that through aids to daily living the Department of Community and Occupational Health was involved in providing services to these children. Through the Dr. Gordon Townsend school and the Alberta children's hospital, the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care was involved. And as I mentioned, it was the cutbacks in Department of Social Services that initially got parents involved and concerned about what was happening to their children. Then we found, with cutbacks to the Calgary school boards, that some of their special programs which they were offering to these kids were also cut back. I noticed that the Learning Centre, an independent body in Calgary receiving funding, was another one that found it difficult for them to continue to provide the services they had a mandate to provide.

So what it said to me was that there were at least four identifiable provincial government departments that were all in the business of providing services to this one group of children. Now, if we were to, I guess, look at the other people with disabilities in the province receiving services, there may even be additional departments, whether it be career development or the Department of Labour perhaps, other government departments, all providing services to people with disabilities.

But what I found interesting from this experience was that there seemed to be no mechanism to co-ordinate or to understand the cumulative effect which all these cutbacks were having on this one group of children in Calgary. There didn't seem to be any means to get the four ministers in the four departments together to see how they could better co-ordinate these programs and services. If we have four government departments all providing services, couldn't it be that they could be provided more effectively and efficiently through one or some means or mechanism to co-ordinate them? So when I see that at least a council is being set up that would review the provision of funding services and programs to persons with disabilities, I say, good, that's exactly the direction somebody should be moving in this province, if this group has that mandate and is allowed by government to be effective.

Then last spring the Minister of Education introduced a School Act, and as we know, there was considerable concern expressed over including perhaps in that particular Bill a clause dealing with what was undefined as uneducable children. Well, as a result of their concerns being expressed, we see that that clause has been removed in the Bill tabled last week. But there are still, in my mind, questions that remain about the ability of people to receive educational services, and those questions can be raised in the context of that Bill. But my question would be whether this particular council will have any particular role in the future that they might play in reviewing proposed legislation. I don't perhaps see that specifically outlined in the mandate, but if the Premier could make some commitment that, yes, prior to enacting legislation that affects people with various

forms of disability they would be consulted in some way prior to the introduction of that legislation to make comment to government, then I would appreciate hearing that from the Premier.

The question, though, arises: how proactive can this council be? I notice, for example, that all the members are to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. There's no reference made in the Bill to consulting with those organizations in our province that are bona fide spokespersons, organizations that give voice to the disabled in this province. What commitment is there to consult with them before the appointments are made? And would the Premier consider at committee study of this Bill to introduce amendments to the legislation to ensure that that consultation takes place? Because my concern is this, Mr. Speaker: if all the members are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, there may be a real or perceived reluctance on behalf of those members to in the future be critical of government when cutbacks are made in services to the disabled or when legislation is introduced.

So my main concern has to do with and revolves around the independence of this council, their ability to be advocates, their ability to freely bring these concerns not only to government but to the whole public arena in which we operate. When we see people having difficulty in getting decent housing, when there is discrimination in the workplace, when there is reluctance to hire people with disabilities, it seems to me there is an important role for a council to make that known to the community as a whole. It's not enough for them to meet on a regular basis with cabinet or with the Premier to say there are these problems, and it's quietly discussed behind the scenes. It's important for the whole public education of the province to create an atmosphere where these concerns are brought out, are raised, and are made public.

I hope the council sees this as an important part of their mandate. When we see that they're given a mandate here to prepare communication packages containing information respecting disabilities and persons with disabilities, that's good. But that's not all that it takes in order to change attitudes in the public. If this council is not seen as having a mandate to change public attitudes, then it seems to me it's a very limited mandate. So I would like to have some assurance, and I would have preferred to see it in the form of the legislation in which there is some degree of autonomy created for this council; that it's not seen simply as a very protected group that a government is setting up that does not have the mandate, is not seen to be independent and able to criticize government.

Now, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that no council, no legislation, can make or create a Rick Hansen or a Terry Fox or a Steve Fonyo. Those people, in a way, act very much as a model that no council or legislation could possibly create. That is, I guess, the triumph of the human spirit. Those are certainly people that all of us, disabled or not disabled, aspire to emulate -- those kinds of accomplishments that they have been able to achieve. There are also people out there in our province who with quiet courage are fighting to overcome their disabilities and the obstacles that have been put in their way. And in spite of their courage, they face a lot of obstacles every day, whether it be dealing with bureaucracy, dealing with buildings that have limited accessibility, discrimination in the workplace where people are reluctant to hire. A council can go a long way in keeping those issues at the forefront, in encouraging people with disabilities, celebrating those who make and achieve greatness despite what disabilities they might have.

But it also seems to me that we have to have a government that's listening. And even if you have a council set up that

speaks of the needs of the disabled, it's not enough if that government is not willing to respond and to listen. So that's why I said in my opening comments, Mr. Speaker, that this is a first step, it's a good step that this council is being set up, but it's by no means the last step. I hope that in the future when these problems are raised in the Legislature or in the newspaper or anywhere else in the province, the government will not say, "Oh, we have a council to look after those problems." That's not good enough, and if this council is seen simply as a means to deflect action, to deflect criticism, to absorb criticism or shift responsibility, then it's certainly not good enough.

We need to have a government that's committed to overcoming these obstacles and helping those people in the disabled community who are out there in their own quiet, courageous way, to assist them to overcome those obstacles and to make a fuller life for them and a more equal life for them in the life of our province. If we have a government committed to that, then I'm sure they would welcome the positive kinds of criticisms that would come from time to time, the prodding and the pushing that I would hope this council would undertake from time to time, and would not see this council as simply a means to say, "Well, we don't need to deal with the disabled any more in our province; we have this council set up over here that they can go talk to or that is studying these issues." I don't want to see this as a substitute for action by government to overcome these obstacles that the members of our disabled community are each day grappling with.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by repeating that it's a good step. It's a first step, but it's not the only step or the last step. I would hope that the Premier would give those kinds of commitments throughout the debate on this Bill as it goes through the various readings in the Legislature.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for their contributions, particularly the members for Edmonton-Calder, Edmonton-Gold Bar and, I guess, Calgary-Buffalo. I felt they made some interesting and helpful comments.

I only have one comment. The Member for Calgary-Mountain View -- from my notes, I would only say to him to have a greater respect. I would ask him to have a greater respect, a higher estimation of Albertans who serve on boards and councils and, in fact, the disabled people who will be on these boards and councils, to not put them down the way he does. They are Albertans who will fight for their right to be heard. They will be heard; they will speak. The very matter that they're appointed by order in council, Mr. Speaker, would not in any way cause them to somehow be the type of person he refers to in such a list of negative comments about them, but rather they are Albertans, and they'll fight for the right to make sure their views are heard everywhere in Alberta, not just to the government.

Other than those comments, Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to support this legislation.

[Motion carried; Bill 1 read a second time]

Bill 2

Homestead Lease Loan Repeal Act

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 2, Homestead Lease Loan Repeal Act.

This Bill is, I believe, a noncontroversial Bill. There is a lot of legislation in place with grazing leases, permits, and farm development sales, and this hasn't been in effect for long. For a long time it's not used, so I'm sure everybody would support second reading of Bill 2,

MR. SPEAKER: A call for the question. Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't like to comment at length on this little housekeeping Bill, but I would like to raise a couple of questions that I hope will be answered during the course of debate on this Bill.

Section 2 says that

2. . . . a loan that
 - (b) is not repaid in full when this Act comes into force continues to be payable . . .

I'm wondering if we could learn how many loans fall into this category and how much money they represent

Also, in section 3, where it refers to the transfers of assets:

3. The assets of the Homestead Lease Loan Fund are transferred to the General Revenue Fund.

Perhaps we could find out what the assets of that Homestead Lease Loan Fund are.

[Motion carried; Bill 2 read a second time]

Bill 3

Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1988

MR. FISCHER: It's my pleasure to move second reading of Bill 3, the Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1988.

This Bill includes amendments to both the Livestock and Livestock Products Act and to the Dairy Board Act. The amendment to the Livestock and Livestock Products Act will allow a licensed livestock dealer to claim against the security of another livestock dealer. This presently does not occur as the result of an amendment to the Act which excluded the dealers from the security and the patron's assurance fund. This change will correct the situation and allow a licensed dealer to claim against the security of another dealer while not allowing access to the patron's assurance fund unless the dealer qualifies as a patron.

The amendment to the Dairy Board Act allows the dairy board to conduct a check off from all of their producers used for milk promotion.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, again it does appear to be just a housekeeping Bill, but as always, we would reserve our right to make further comment at committee stage.

[Motion carried; Bill 3 read a second time]

Bill 5

Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Amendment Act, 1988

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to-

day to move second reading for Bill 5, which is the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Amendment Act. This Act takes into consideration and repeals section 13(2)(a) and section 19(5)(a). What it does is give the authority the movement of money which comes from the general fund from the Legislature into the Act, and section 19(5) money appropriated from the general fund Act by the Legislature to be paid into the fund. This repeals the previous two sections.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will support this change to the Act. Apparently the reason for this amendment to come forward has to do with some concerns the Auditor General brought forward in his 1986-87 statement in which he pointed out that the oil sands research authority contravened its enabling legislation by paying into the AOSTRA fund money received from the province's General Revenue Fund. I think it amounted to something like \$37.5 million. Section 19(5) of the current AOSTRA Act is quite specific regarding where the funds for the AOSTRA fund should come from. It spells out that it should come from the heritage trust fund and from technological sales, and clearly not from the General Revenue Fund.

As I understand this amendment, it would comply with the Auditor General's recommendation and permit the transference of funds from the General Revenue Fund into the AOSTRA fund.

[Motion carried; Bill 5 read a second time]

Bill 6

Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to move second reading of Bill 6, which is the Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1988.

This Bill contains a number of amendments. I'd like to touch quickly on three of the more substantive ones. One will establish an advisory committee to provide advice to the Health Disciplines Board, and this will assist the board in dealing with concerns of the various health disciplines. Another amendment will permit the registrar to inspect the business premises and practices of practitioners under the Act. Another substantive amendment addresses the concerns of two particular groups, one being the mental deficiency nurses and the second being the electroneurophysiological technologists. These two groups seek to be designated as health disciplines under the Act, and this amendment will make that possible.

These are the substantive amendments, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to looking at the Act in detail as we move to committee, and would ask the members to support second reading of Bill 6.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, certainly the whole field of health disciplines is one that's expanding at a great rate, and it's good to see some amendments coming along that are helping to keep track of it all.

There are many, many people entering various health disciplines and, in fact, I agree with the government that there need to be better ways to investigate the practice that health practitioners are practising and that we need a stronger, tighter way to do that kind of investigation, both at the board level and at various committee levels. So my initial sense is that it's something we need and appreciate. Certainly I know that a number

of those involved in health disciplines were very angry that their fees were hiked just last year by regulation, and so it might be a way to tell them of something that they've got for the increase in fees: that there's going to be more of a watchdog at work on their behalf, if in fact it is on their behalf, and we hope and are sure that it will be. So again, some other minor things at committee stage, but we're going to go with it.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 6 read a second time]

Bill 7

Tourism Education Council Act

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 7, the Tourism Education Council Act. This council was established in April of 1987 by my predecessor, the Hon. LeRoy Fjordbotten, through ministerial order. The Alberta Tourism Education Council brings together government, industry, and educators to approach the education and training needs of Alberta's tourist industry in a comprehensive and co-ordinated manner.

The purpose of the Bill is to establish the council as a legal identity and provide a mechanism through which private-sector funding may be directed toward the ongoing activities and initiatives co-ordinated through the council.

The legislation does a number of things. It demonstrates this government's commitment as one of three partners to the importance of providing tourism education and training for Alberta's tourist hospitality industry. It legitimizes the council's role in co-ordinating design and development of tourism education and training programs, and it lays the foundation for a systematic approach to the tourism education and training that everyone -- government, industry, and educators -- unanimously supports.

Mr. Speaker, the council, which is ably chaired by the MLA for Red Deer-North, is currently working to increase recognition of careers in tourism, to create the greater range of education and training opportunities for existing or prospective tourist employers, and to make sure these training opportunities are available right across the province. They're working towards enhancing Alberta's image as a world-class destination. As tourism grows, Alberta grows, and all Albertans will benefit from the increased economic activity of tourism.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I move Bill 7, the Tourism Education Council Act for second reading and urge all members to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to lend my support to second reading of the Tourism Education Council Act. Way back in June of 1986 I spoke in the House relating to professionalizing our tourism industry by starting a lot more educational programs in collaboration with the tourism business sector to improve development of educational programs and labour standards in terms of our small business tourist sector, and I feel that this Tourism Education Council Act will serve a very useful purpose in terms of co-ordinating the activities of our tourism industry in Alberta.

However, I would hope that the money that is required to put this Bill into effect is forthcoming in next year's budget. It may be grandiose in terms of making sure we have a council which acts on behalf of the tourism industry to help professionalize it,

but it will be meaningless unless proper funds are given out to the various training programs and to the small business sector to further the development of those programs and resources.

One comment I'd like to make to the minister.

The Council may

- (a) solicit and receive donations;
- (b) with the approval of the Minister, charge fees for any resources provided by the Council.

I was wondering what the purpose was of this section in the Bill -- isn't this, on the whole, a council funded by his ministry? -- and whether he's looking in the future where this council would be funded more by the private sector as opposed to the government, or what is really the intent of this section of the Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to lend my support to the Bill. I think it's a good Bill. Indeed, I had the occasion to be in Red Deer when the Minister of Tourism announced that the Member for Red Deer-North would be chairing the education council. I had, previous to that, spoken to the Education estimates that very year, that fiscal year, and had some concern about the lack of educational programs that were available to those people who wanted to make a career in the hospitality industry. I think this particular Bill goes a long way in recognizing that there are more and more Albertans becoming employed in the service sector and that they ought to be looking at the service sector or the hospitality industry indeed as a career rather than just something that one does for the short period of time to collect enough money to go back and either study a different program or a different service in order to get away from some of the low-paying positions that are seemingly always in the tourism and hospitality industry.

I think that one way to perhaps try and get away from some of the ghettoized positions in the hospitality industry is to look at either a diploma- or a degree-granting program that would allow people to stand in their place and say, "I've got this piece of paper that says I have completed a particular course, and it entitles me to be a professional in the industry." I'd just ask the minister if there is going to be that kind of a tie-in through a degree-granting institution or a diploma-granting institution for people that undertake to go into tourism education, to see if there is going to be that provided to them.

Again, as I said, not wanting to see workers ghettoized into an industry, I have some concern about the kind of training that is going to be provided. I'm wondering if it's going to be on-site training, and if it is going to be on-site training, is it going to be carefully monitored to ensure that people aren't held in certain positions for extended periods of time to take advantage of or to exploit perhaps a cheaper rate of labour?

The makeup of the council, Mr. Speaker, is another important issue. It's something that I think goes beyond the partisan politics of this Assembly sometimes. Perhaps what we ought to be doing is looking at input from other quarters of the House. Because as we change from a resource-based economy to a service sector economy, I think there are important issues to be considered by all members of this Assembly, and perhaps they ought to be contained in the recommendations of the education council. So I'd certainly look forward to the minister commenting on that particular matter.

Thank you.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, to add a

few comments to those of my colleagues. I see from the mandate of the council that it's intended to "make recommendations to the industry on the development of programs." I know that the provincial government funds programs at NAIT and SAIT, as examples, right now that are helping train people for careers in the hospitality industry. They may well be providing programs through the other colleges in Alberta as well. But I'm wondering what mechanism is in place that this council could have as its mandate to make recommendations to those institutions as well on the development of programs. It seems to me that here's a good opportunity that brings these important stakeholders in the industry together in an important area, being education, and, given the important role of government-funded postsecondary institutions, that this council should also be making recommendations to the college network or the technology institute network that's already developed in our province.

As well, I gather that the Tourism department itself has developed a number of education programs. I've heard it expressed to me, as an example, that some of the tourism areas would like to be able to deliver those programs. But the department insists apparently on delivering them themselves, so there's at present, say, a three- to four-month waiting list. I raise that only as an example of another area where government is at present delivering education programs, and perhaps a group like this could give the department itself good advice as to how to more effectively deliver those programs. But I don't see anywhere in the mandate of the council where this council will be able to make those recommendations, other than sort of the catchall area under item (d). So I'm just saying to the minister the government plays an important funding role, our colleges play an important role, the department itself plays an important role, and I think this organization should also have some sort of a mandate to ensure that the government role is an important one, a facilitative one that fits into this overall plan for the province.

I'd simply like to add my compliments to the minister for introducing the Bill. I think that in order to develop professionalization in this industry, education is the key. If we want our people to make a commitment to the hospitality industry, they have to be receiving remuneration at a level that they can support themselves and their families. So if this kind of endeavour is going to lead over the long term to an increasing level of remuneration to people in that industry so it's something that attracts them and enables them to stay, then I concur. I think that's good. We all want to see an increase in the quality of those career opportunities in our province.

So with those comments -- perhaps the minister can address them at this point or later in clause-by-clause study in Committee of the Whole.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister of Tourism wish to comment? Summation?

MR. SPARROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. With reference to the questions from Athabasca-Lac La Biche, the intent of the fund, as I clearly stated . . . Part of the purpose of the Bill is to establish legal identity so that that mechanism which can accept funds from the private sector -- and they are willing to participate in sharing the costs of the council -- can come forward. That will basically give us an opportunity to expand the funding of the needs in that area.

With reference to the Member for Edmonton-Belmont, yes, it

is envisioned that we will have certificates, hopefully in all areas. The council presently is working under the chairman and has nine industry association representatives on it -- six very specifically chosen by the industry themselves and three at large -- three representatives from the educational institutes and three representatives from government departments and one member at large. So there definitely is a broad cross section and a majority from the private sector on the council. Very definitely, more detailed information can be given to you at Committee of the Whole.

[Motion carried; Bill 7 read a second time]

Bill 9

Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of the Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will broaden the responsibilities of the Research Council to include for development and application of technology and will allow the Research Council to enter into the necessary agreements to carry out the duties of the council.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we see an increase in the membership of the board of the council from 14 to 15. We have an excellent board of the Alberta Research Council, comprised of members of the government, representation from the three universities in the province, and excellent input from the private sector. This will give us an opportunity to strengthen the board.

Mr. Speaker, generally, these changes in the Research Council Act will allow the Research Council to continue in its role of providing research assistance in the development of the natural resources of this province, in assisting the private sector, and particularly it will allow us to see the transfer of technology from the Research Council into the private sector.

I urge all hon. members to support this Bill.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, in regards to Bill 9 I can see some value to some of the changes in section 4. But in section 5 I'm a little bit nervous, because the current section in the Act, section 5(2)(c), says that persons appointed shall include two persons nominated by the governors of the universities of Alberta, Calgary, and Lethbridge. In the new proposed amendment here it says that one or more members "may be selected" from persons nominated by the universities. So it seems to me that we're kind of watering down our commitment to university representation here on the Alberta Research Council, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that's a step backward. I leave that with the hon. member who has presented this Bill here for consideration. I would like to hope that before this Bill gets through the Assembly, that is strengthened. I would like to hope that's an omission, because I think it's perhaps a serious change of emphasis in the orientation of the Alberta Research Council.

The second thing I would like to say about that, Mr. Speaker, in terms of selecting the board of governors of the Alberta Research Council, is this. The current section of the Act provides for two members of the Executive Council and one member of the Legislative Assembly other than a member of the Executive Council, so three MLAs on the board. The provision now provides for one member of the Executive Council and another MLA. So that makes me wonder if we're also having some watering down of the commitment at the cabinet level to the

activity of the Alberta Research Council. I certainly hope that's not the case, but by reading this, by reducing the number of Executive Council members from two to one, perhaps that's the message that will be sent out, and I wonder if that's really the message that the government members are trying to send.

Lastly, we have sort of that miscellaneous provision for an additional eight members who do not fit in the above three classes, (a), (b), or (c). And for lack of a better word, Mr. Speaker, we could call that a potential patronage clause, because there's no indication of who these people have to be. I would like to believe our government would never engage in such an activity, but based on past experience, I'm apprehensive. So I wonder if we shouldn't make some better delineations of who those people could be.

I'd like to suggest that perhaps we ought to have on the board of the Alberta Research Council a representative from the Edmonton [Council] for Advanced Technology or the Calgary [Council] for Advanced Technology, both of which are umbrella or cluster organizations for people in the advanced technology sectors of those two respective cities. I believe those two organizations would be very appropriate to nominate someone to be on the board of governors of the Research Council. Perhaps we ought to have someone from the Alberta or the Calgary or Edmonton chambers of commerce, because I'm sure they'd have some ideas. Perhaps we should have some representatives from the Alberta Federation of Labour, because the changes that will be undertaken in terms of technological adjustments by the Research Council will certainly affect the working people of this province.

Perhaps there ought to be other representative people on that board, Mr. Speaker. I'm just too nervous when it's left wide open like that -- another eight people approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council -- because, as I've said, this government has an unfortunate inclination to look mainly at people's orange and blue cards and other characteristics that sometimes are much less important. I think that's a poor way to operate appointment to any board of governors of any institution in the province.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I basically am going to give notice to be looking for those improvements by third reading or be looking at suggesting possible amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question?

Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to also make a few statements here relating to Bill 9, the Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988. I'd like to compliment Mr. Bradley here in terms of section 4, which has been strengthened to a larger extent:

4(1) The Alberta Research Council may

- (a) conduct research in the natural sciences and engineering in subjects that may be beneficial to the development of resources or industry or that enhance the quality of life of Albertans.

Very much something that I've been in favour of. I spoke quite strongly about this need for more research in the natural sciences and engineering in the Alberta heritage trust fund hearings, where one of my resolutions was to set aside \$100 million in endowment funds for the universities to effect this kind of priority that we didn't seem to have in Alberta, which was to enhance research in the natural sciences and engineering. So I would like to compliment that. If that is a new direction in the Alberta Research Council, my hat's off.

However, as the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods indicated, I am not pleased with the composition or the appointments to the new board. I see a possible watering down of the university representation on the Alberta Research Council. I wonder, you know -- out of one plus, we seem to be moving one step back. As well, in your listing of persons nominated jointly by the governors of the University of Alberta, University of Calgary, and University of Lethbridge, why was Athabasca University not included in that list? I'd like that point to be looked after by third reading. Athabasca University is involved very much in research and will be perhaps developing much more in that area in the future and should have at least one or two representatives on that board.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

So with those points taken, I would encourage that before we get to third reading, the whole issue of the appointments to the board should be much more targeted to have a larger representation from universities and less representation from people at large who may not have any interest in that whole topic. I think we need to have a very broad-based representation from applied technology, from natural science areas. And what better people to be appointed to the board than the people who are actually ongoing in terms of those in research programs at the present time in order to make the Alberta Research Council a first-class council to represent the research needs for Albertans?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Comments by the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest will close debate on Bill 9.

MR. BRADLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Research Council is considered amongst the provincial research councils of Canada to be one of the eminent research organizations in the country. It's the oldest, and it's also the largest.

With regards to some of the comments by the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche with regards to funding, it's well known that the province of Alberta funds research on a higher basis per capita than any other provincial jurisdiction in Canada.

With regards to the composition of the board there have been some concerns raised with regards to representation by universities. Currently the Act suggests that there should only be two persons from universities appointed to the Alberta Research Council board. In fact, the Alberta government has been appointing members from three universities to the board, so there's actually one more member on the composition of the board of directors than the current Act provides for. The legislation which is before us reflects that and allows for more representation rather than less, and it would be the practice of the government to continue to ensure that those universities are represented on the Alberta Research Council board of directors. Relating to the composition of the rest of the board, I should state that it's always been the position of the Alberta government to have the broadest perspective of representation on the board. With this Act we will continue to have that to ensure that the Alberta Research Council continues to maintain its eminence in terms of a research organization in Canada.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask hon. members to support the passage of this Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 9 read a second time]

Bill 10

Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like today to ask that the members of this Assembly support Bill 10 in its second reading. In doing so, I'd like to briefly talk to some of the reasons behind the amendment to this particular Act. But first, let me talk just a little bit about the history of the manner in which lotteries dollars have been used, because I want to say and assure hon. members that we are doing nothing other than confirming what has happened with regard to lotteries dollars for the last 14 years in the province of Alberta.

It first came to our attention through the Auditor General that there was some, I guess, conflict between the legal opinion in terms of how lotteries dollars are to be used and the manner in which they have been used; that is, to be able to keep the dollars outside of the General Revenue Fund, as it traditionally has been done in the past and consistent with the way that all of the other western provinces and most of the provinces in this country deal with their lotteries dollars. And in my discussions with ministers responsible for lotteries, the former minister responsible for lotteries in Manitoba and the minister responsible for lotteries in British Columbia, to determine whether or not our concept with regard to the use of lotteries dollars is consistent with the manner in which they deal with them -- I'm here to say that in fact they are, in British Columbia and Manitoba and, indeed, Saskatchewan. The manner in which we're pursuing the use of lotteries dollars and the holding of lotteries dollars in Bill 10 is consistent with those particular provinces.

There is a concern and a belief on behalf of this government that we should preserve the integrity of the use of lotteries dollars as has traditionally happened in the province of Alberta. As I indicated, for the last 14 years lotteries dollars have been used particularly for cultural purposes, recreational purposes, and for our rural fairs and exhibitions in the province of Alberta. It has in the past been basically a fifty-fifty split between the cultural/recreational activities in the province and the rural fairs and exhibitions. We fund all of the class A, B, C, and D fairs in the province of Alberta, together with the major fairs and exhibitions. Obviously, it becomes a very important part of their livelihood, and we certainly want to do all we can to enhance rural life. Certainly rural life, to a large extent, circles around the activities of the fairs and exhibitions in rural Alberta.

With regard to the organizations that receive funding in the province, we basically have taken the position that we collect the dollars, and through a licence -- traditionally it's been a three-year licence -- we fund a wide range of organizations in the province that deal with a variety of issues that are basically focused in the cultural/recreational areas. I don't have to go through all of the organizations, Mr. Speaker, but I'd certainly like to point out a few of the most high profile and the most active ones in the province: the Wild Rose Foundation is one that has become very important in recent years to deal with organizations on a very timely basis; the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation; the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts; the Rick Hansen Centre; the Alberta Sport Council, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, we've always felt that representatives from the community that make up these boards and associations that make decisions as to where lotteries dollars should be spent is the most appropriate -- the most appropriate way is in the hands of these organizations. They are made up of volunteers from one end of the province to the other. They are sensitive to the organizations that access their dollars, and I might say that in

most cases we block fund these boards and foundations, and then the boards of directors along with the administration of these organizations make decisions, based on an application process, as to who should get dollars. This is an ongoing process; it happens daily. Funding is distributed on a very regular basis. And I believe it's important that those individuals make those decisions. They know what is going on in the communities. The Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation reviews applications that come to them that fund that particular area of the community, and certainly with their knowledge of the best organizations that deliver the best programs, the decisions are made as to who should get the dollars and who shouldn't.

I know there has been a concern expressed, Mr. Speaker, by the opposition, and it's almost exclusively by the opposition, that the decisions on how these dollars should be spent should be made in this Legislature. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that all of the best ideas are not contained within the walls of this Chamber, that the community also has a responsibility and an obligation to be a part of the decisions with regard to the allocation of lottery dollars. It's traditionally been the way that it has worked. I believe it has worked very well, and the mail and the calls and the representations that I have made to me and to my colleague ministers and MLAs certainly underline the importance of that process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that possibly individuals in the opposition may say: "Well, we would like to make the decisions as to which organizations get the money and how much. We'd like to have a look at that and pass judgment." Well, I would say that it's worked well in the past, I'm confident it will work well in the future, and I don't believe there are many areas that do not receive lottery funding that fall within the mandate of cultural, recreational, and rural fairs areas. If they are worthwhile organizations, certainly they have the right to make application for funding.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to some other aspects of the Bill where we will be proposing changes to the Act -- and may I now revert to my comments with regard to the Auditor General. We had a legal opinion that the manner in which lottery dollars were being allocated over the last 14 years was in fact legal and within the terms of the Act. The Auditor General, in his legal opinion, had a different one. I think we know that depending on which lawyer you talk to, you may get a different legal opinion. I was not willing to press the issue with the Auditor General. I thought it was appropriate that if he had a concern -- he says that he passes no judgment on the manner in which the dollars are spent, and appropriately so, but just that there be more legal authority or more legislative delineation as to how these dollars should be collected and distributed. This change in the Act simply clarifies what we've done in the past and meets the concerns of the Auditor General.

There are some other areas in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that will be clarified. Let me just briefly touch on them. Firstly, it carves out the jurisdiction of lotteries from within the auspices of the Gaming Commission. Certainly this is consistent with the collateral tenets of the Criminal Code of Canada. We wanted to be sure that the lottery activities were not part of the Gaming Commission but fell under the auspices of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to limit the offshore sales of lottery tickets. It is becoming a very difficult area for governments. As a matter of fact, there are lawsuits pending in provinces in Canada with regard to offshore sales. What is hap-

pening is that there are individuals who are buying lottery tickets here in Alberta and then taking them to other jurisdictions around the world, marking them up, selling them for anywhere in the area of 85 percent to 150 percent over and above the cost of the ticket here in Alberta.

Now, some will say: "Fine; that's a business judgment. If the individuals want to buy the tickets here, sell them in other jurisdictions and make a profit, and the individuals are willing to buy it, so be it." Where the difficulty comes in is in some of these jurisdictions where our lottery tickets are being sold, in Europe and in the United States, where it's illegal to market in offshore tickets. We also must be concerned about the legal status of lotteries per se in that particular jurisdiction. There is a country in southeast Asia, Mr. Speaker, as an example, where it is illegal to conduct lottery operations, and there are offshore operators who are going into those countries and offering for sale our lottery tickets. Now, in countries where they have made a moral and conscious decision not to participate in lotteries, we do not believe in Canada that in fact we should allow our tickets to be sold into those jurisdictions if the government of the day in that particular country does not condone those sales.

Along with that, Mr. Speaker, it is also in the Criminal Code. I don't believe I can cite the section of the Criminal Code that deals with lotteries, but in fact it is illegal in the Criminal Code to be in the business of selling offshore lottery tickets from Canadian jurisdictions. So basically what we are doing is strengthening that particular component and setting out in legislation a reference to the Criminal Code of Canada area that does not condone offshore sales.

Mr. Speaker, basically those are my comments, and I'd be pleased to respond to the comments of members of this Assembly with regard to Bill 10.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am rising, it will be no surprise, to oppose this piece of legislation. I consider it to be an insult to the democratic process. It is a long-standing tradition of parliamentary government that supply is granted through and by the Legislature and that all expenditures are presented to and debated by the elected representatives of the people. The effect of this legislation is to have decisions with respect to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of public money made in the back room of the Tory caucus. These amounts are never brought before the Legislature for debate or for review, and it is not, I emphasize, a trifling matter. We have had a recent decision with respect to \$113 million of lottery expenditures for this year. We have, I would estimate, a \$200 million bag of lottery chestnuts reposing in the vault in the Minister of Career Development and Employment's department, an amount which is growing at the rate of approximately \$50 million per year.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

In essence, what we have is government by press release. The elected representatives of the people of Alberta hear about these expenditures through press reports. It is my contention that all expenditures, Mr. Speaker, should be brought before the Legislature for debate and approval. Let me emphasize that I am not challenging here the use of the expenditures, but it is the

process that is offensive. When we're dealing with granting bodies such as the foundations in issue here, let me make it clear that I don't believe that it's necessary to review and decide on each specific grant. These are best left to those granting bodies and foundations. But it does mean that the basic decision as to whether or not to provide the initial seed money to these bodies should be brought before this Legislature. When we make a decision as to whether or not to provide \$2 million, \$3 million, or \$5 million to the Wild Rose Foundation or the Foundation for the Literary Arts or the Foundation for the Performing Arts or other foundations, those are basic decisions that should be brought before this Legislature for decision. Now, I emphasize once again that I'm not in any way suggesting that the individual granting decisions made by these bodies should be brought before the Legislature. Once they're given their seed money, those granting decisions are properly made independently. But the funding of the foundations themselves must be brought before this Legislature.

As it is, the process provides for a political slush fund to be disseminated by the minister and his cohorts. It's an open invitation to influence peddling. I might note that recently there are reports of the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism writing to the head of the Foundation for the Performing Arts directing as to how new funding is to be allocated. I only today asked the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism's department for a copy of that letter and was told that it's a private matter. Well, can you believe that, Mr. Speaker? Yes, I'm sure you can: the government dealing with public funds as if it's their own private largess. That is, I believe, wrong in principle, and it's fraught, of course, with the great danger of political interference, which is already happening, as we've seen through that letter of the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

I would like to point out one particularly odious provision of Bill 10, and that is that section 6 gives the Minister of Career Development and Employment the power to pay money for, and I quote, "any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest." This gives the minister carte blanche to use the money for whatever political benefit and advantage he considers to be in the public interest, and I consider that to be totally wrong.

Now, let me emphasize that I respect the role of the community and the role of individuals to have a voice in the decision-making with respect to individual grants, but there is also a very fundamental role that we have to respect of legislators and the democratic process. What we see here is a total misconception of this role and an imbalance operating in the direction of closely held ministerial power and in favour of potential pork-barreling.

The minister says that this has been done for many years. It points out the benefit of a healthy and robust opposition that we are now pointing out the error of the government's ways for these past 14 years for very clear reasons that any reasonable person can well understand. So the government should recognize the errors of this legislation and not proceed with this undemocratic piece of legislation, for which it will no doubt have to answer at the ballot boxes.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my voice of opposition to this Bill as well. The minister has tried through clever political language to imply that there is nothing wrong in the government disseminating lottery-generated funds in this fashion. He's implied that after all, the communities that are to be the recipients of this money, they come directly to the

government. You know, they're legitimate, and they're able to ask for money when they need it. And why shouldn't they get it? No problem, Mr. Minister.

On the other hand, it seems to me that there's about, oh, \$10 billion, \$10.5 billion, sometimes \$11 billion worth of funds discussed through this Assembly through the general budget estimates on an annual basis, during which we contemplate many such individuals and organizations and their needs. Funny thing, Mr. Speaker the system works. We get to debate who gets money and for what purposes, whether or not it's being funded appropriately. Often the debate centres between money that's going to capital projects as opposed to money that's going to ongoing operations.

It seems to me that this Bill enables the minister legally to conduct what can only be described as a slush fund. I point out to you as an example the news statement from the Alberta government on March 21, 1988, in which the government announced through several ministers that while they were increasing by somewhere between 40 and 50 percent this current fiscal year's allocation to the several foundations which are funded by the lottery funds, they also gave money to various other organizations which ordinarily would not get money through the foundations. But I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that ordinarily they would be entitled to money under provision of the various departments whose budgets we debate in this Assembly on an annual basis.

Now, it seems to me that the matter at hand is really one of political expediency. In the first instance, lottery funds are not a steady source of income. So as any artist in Alberta can tell you, it's no fun hoping and wishing and praying that there are going to be a few extra bucks in the pot next year, not that the arts in Alberta are pretty heavily funded to begin with, around \$8.6 million. That ain't very much for what is Canada's 10th largest industry and for what is now understood to be Alberta's fifth largest industry. So what we have here is, first of all, funding bodies through an unstable source of revenue. The artists say to me, "Would the hospitals or school systems like to operate on that sort of funding?" They don't think so, and I think they've got a good point.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to make a good Bill out of this, if you want to avoid the charges that the political slush fund is in fact validated by this Bill, what you do is make the Bill responsible so that it sets out in, first of all, policy orientation and, secondly, percentage contributions from the lottery revenues to the individual foundations which exist because of the lottery revenues. What I'm getting at is: the smart thing to do is to say X amount or X percent of this annual income shall be spent specifically on or given over to the foundations, which themselves shall determine the allocation of the expenditure thereafter.

But a problem comes from that too, because the foundations are appointed and not elected. So you can have a foundation for any one of the arts disciplines, for instance, that has one or maybe even no members, if the government so decides, whose activities are directly related to the interests of that foundation. That point then needs to be made: those people should be elected to the foundations, not appointed.

I recall that a few weeks ago, when we were in consideration of the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism budget estimates, the minister introduced recent appointees to a few of the foundations. Just after he did so, the hospitals minister said -- although I'm not sure this was picked up, we all heard it certainly in the opposition benches -- something to the effect of:

yup, and they're all Conservatives. Now, that scares me, Mr. Speaker, because not only is this government . . . [interjections] Oh yes, he did. I hear some of the backbenchers crying, "Ah." But it's true, Mr. Speaker. Several of us heard it and shouted back something to the minister to the effect that he ought to be ashamed for having made that comment.

In any event, now you have an instance where a government has decided that it will control these funds behind closed doors; that is, by determination of the minister and his cabinet buddies. Secondly, even when they do give the money out to the foundations, they seem to be inclined to want to give it to people who will exercise their will as opposed to exercise an independent will. Hence my bid for election of members to the foundations.

Now, the minister as an excuse will say, "Ah gee, the opposition doesn't like the fact that we gave money to certain hospitals for particular advanced medical equipment and diagnostic equipment." That's not the case, Mr. Speaker. I counter with the purely logical argument that this money or a portion thereof could be assigned to the General Revenue Fund on an annual basis so that its allocation thereafter would be debated by members of the Assembly. Now, I'm not concerned that all the money that goes to the foundations doesn't come through this Assembly. That is not such an important point. The point is that artists in Alberta are not getting very much funding from the Alberta government. They're expected to beg every time they do get something and then caress the hand that only ever so reluctantly bothered to feed them every once in a while. I don't think that's a fair position to put Alberta artists in. We certainly don't put the big oil and energy companies in that position, do we, Mr. Speaker? But the Alberta government evidently wants the people who receive funding from these foundations to do just that.

You can correct the fault of this Bill by stating that a certain percentage of that annual fund generated by the sale of lottery tickets will be allocated specifically and exclusively to the foundations, Mr. Speaker. Then you don't have any further discretionary spending by government from behind closed doors, and that's ultimately the point here.

While I'm on the subject, it seems to me that the current system is already rather arbitrary. Those people, the foundations, only know once a year what their allocations are going to be. They are prescribed exclusively by the government. In other words, they don't have any sort of policy commitment to an ongoing level of funding that would, for instance, at least match the previous year's level and perhaps be expanded, first of all, to accommodate cost of living -- that is, inflationary increases -- and secondly, growth in the activities that the foundations are sponsoring.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is going to be a fund by which the government walks around the province and conveniently drops \$5,000 here on one organization and \$5 million there on another organization; in other words, allocates political favouritism. Any responsible government would avoid doing that, in the first instance, out of a sense of sheer self-preservation. By that I mean that for every time you arbitrarily give one person or one organization money and ignore all of the others who have also been asking for money, you've just made an enemy out of all those other people.

But in the second place, Mr. Speaker, it is my fundamental belief that this notion that they can disseminate these funds on an arbitrary basis determined behind closed doors of cabinet will backfire, because people in Alberta are sick of secrecy. I know that. People respond to Bills like the opposition Bill of a few

weeks ago, the freedom of information Act, sponsored by the New Democrat caucus. People are intrigued by that. They hear about secrecy all the time. They find out about decisions that are a fait accompli. They also find that they can't get to cabinet ministers to make their case on a sufficiently frequent basis. Therefore, they are entitled to some power of decision-making, Mr. Speaker. They don't get it through cabinet. They're being told they're not entitled to it through legislation or through the Legislative Assembly. In the long run, those people who this government believes it is buying votes from will in turn reject this government for the very reason that it now pursues under the auspices of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont to second reading of the Bill in principle.

MR. SIGURDSON: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker: a Bill with no principle.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read recommendation 48 from the Auditor General, because I think that recommendation 48 and the order of the recommendation has a great bearing on this Bill. The recommendation says:

- direct that the proceeds from the Province's lottery operations be paid into the General Revenue Fund as required by the Financial Administration Act, and that administration costs, prize monies and profit distributions be paid therefrom pursuant to the authority of appropriations of the Legislature; or . . .

And it's the second one that the minister regrettably has adopted in this Bill.

- seek an amendment to the Interprovincial Lottery Act to allow lottery proceeds to remain outside of the General Revenue Fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the order of the recommendation is significant. The order of the recommendation is, first, to general revenue; second, a Bill that amends the Interprovincial Lottery Act. The reason for the order is that the legal opinion coming from the Auditor General -- and I heard the minister in his opening remarks state that he disagrees with that legal opinion. But the reason is that the legal opinion coming to the operations of the Auditor General is that this is public money. The profits from lottery sales in Alberta are public money. Nowhere in the report of the Auditor General does the Auditor General say that this is the government's money. Nowhere does it say that this is the minister's money. But it says that this is public money. What the minister has done by introducing Bill 10, the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, is say, "It's ours to do with as we please." It's not going to go into general revenue and then be disbursed from general revenues out to Albertans, but it's going to come into the department, the minister will maintain the fund, and perhaps upon the advice of his colleagues in cabinet and from other members of the government party, they will then be able to send that money out to deserving groups.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we saw the last press release that distributed I believe it was \$113 million, we quite agreed with most every group. In fact, I don't have the release in front of me, but I would be surprised if we disagreed with any of the lucky recipients of those funds. We think there are a number of very deserving groups in Alberta that ought to be receiving those public dollars, but we disagree with the nature of the government just handing it out arbitrarily. The reason for this disagreement is that it invests too much power in the cabinet and not enough power in the Legislative Assembly. All we will be

able to do in the future is come back and ask why certain moneys did not go to certain other worthy projects. We may get an answer, or we may have the minister advise us that it's a question more naturally suited to the Order Paper, and we know the record for responses to that.

The Legislative Assembly is the body that clearly ought to be scrutinizing the spending of public dollars, and this amendment usurps members of the Legislatures' responsibilities to their constituents and to all Albertans. This takes away our responsibilities to look at the spending of those public dollars, and it puts all of the responsibility, all of the potential for patronage into the hands of the minister of career development and maybe some of his colleagues. That's regrettable; that to me, is clearly and truly regrettable.

As my colleague from Edmonton-Highlands stated: you know, why make all of the other groups mad at you when you make an arbitrary decision to fund one group a certain amount of money and another group a different amount of money? Why have the groups mad at you? Collectively we could all share in that anger, if anger is to be directed at anybody, rather than just at you. It invites questions later on that will no doubt come from members of the opposition about: what special recognition did a particular group have that gave the Minister of Career Development and Employment the willingness to give certain dollars to that group?

Now, if it comes through the budget of the Provincial

Treasurer, we all have the opportunity to debate. We all have the opportunity to say, "Not enough money here; too much money there," and to make recommendations to oppose or to support the recommendations of the Treasurer. That's not going to happen here with this Bill. Admittedly it's a percentage of the overall budget of the province, but nonetheless \$50 million a year, mounting up, adding up year after year. It adds up to a substantial amount of money, and that money ought to come before this Legislative body, this Legislative Assembly, so that we can all participate in the debate and the disbursement of those funds.

In light of the hour I would move that we adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion, those in favour please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the business this evening will be to continue with Bills for second reading and then, if there is time, to commence estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m.]