

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, May 20, 1988 10:00 a.m.**

Date: 88/05/20

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 41**Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1988**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce Bill 41, the Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides greater flexibility in dealing with gas removal permits; it allows greater ability to deal with the removal of gas from the province contrary to conditions in a removal permit by, number one, getting a court injunction, a restraining in contravention of the Act and, secondly, issuing an order to stop Nova or pipelines delivering gas to Nova to cease transporting gas intended for removal from the province in contravention of the Act; also, to provide for the cancellation of a suspended permit if the permittee does not request an inquiry; improves confidentiality provisions for information filed under the Act; and stronger penalties for offences under the Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 41 read a first time]

Bill 38**Pharmaceutical Profession Act**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 38, the Pharmaceutical Profession Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for the licensing of pharmacies, setting standards of practice for pharmacy and disciplinary procedures to enforce those standards. The Bill includes a new, regulated category of high-risk nonprescription drugs. There are new regulations reflecting the high standards for conduct of licensees, and it provides for their relationship to proprietors. Generally, Bill 38 contains many changes which reflect the modern status of the important profession of pharmacy.

[Leave granted; Bill 38 read a first time]

Bill 23**Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1988**

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 23,

the Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1988.

The principles of the Bill are to repeal section 25 of the Maintenance and Recovery Act, which imposes a duty upon the director of maintenance and recovery to ensure that maintenance payments obtained in favour of unwed mothers are in fact extended for the purposes specified in that agreement or court order.

[Leave granted; Bill 23 read a first time]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 38, the Pharmaceutical Profession Act, and Bill 23, the Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1988, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders for second reading.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Alberta College of Art as required by statute.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to table today the annual report of the Office of the Ombudsman, volumes 1 and 2.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, Albertans can be very proud to have been the first province to have had the office of Ombudsman installed. We're fortunate today in the tabling of this annual report to have our Ombudsman with us. He is seated in your gallery, Mr. Aleck Trawick, with his associate Dixie Watson. I would ask them to stand now and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Legislative Assembly, two bright and energetic school groups from my constituency who are on a tour of the Legislative Assembly today. These 48 students are grade 6 classes from J. E. LaPointe school in Beaumont. They are accompanied by their teachers Dianne Hutchison and Pam Yearwood. They are seated in the public and members' galleries. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to introduce to you and to the Assembly, 16 grade 9 students from the Glenwood school some 340 miles from here. We're happy to have them here today to tour this great facility, and it's a highlight in their school year of activity. They are seated in the public gallery, and they are accompanied by their teachers Doug Smith, who is principal, and Helena Blumel. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I also have the privilege to introduce another group of students from my constituency: from the Hillspring school, 14 grade 9 students. I'd like to introduce them to you and to the Assembly today. They, too, have traveled a similar distance to be here and enjoy touring this great facility of our Legislature Building. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Jamie Quinton, parents Mark and Diane Smith, and parents Monty and Aileen Gibb. I'd ask them to rise then and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, today I'm pleased to be able to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, Mr. Ron Schuster from Falher. Mr. Schuster is president of the Alberta Pharmaceutical Association. Accompanying him is Mr. Larry Shipka, registrar of that same professional association. Bill 38, the Pharmaceutical Profession Act, introduced earlier today, has taken a great deal of diligent work from these gentlemen and from the presidents and other members of the council for the past several years. I would like to commend them for that work. Mr. Speaker, they are seated in the members' gallery and I would ask them to now stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague the Member for Chinook, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this morning to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 32 fine, eager young people from the Coronation school, grade 5 students. They are accompanied by their teachers Donna Tupper, Tony Selzler, and parents Karen Horn, Lidwina Stenberg, Heather Twa, and their driver Melanie Robertson. I would ask that they rise in the members' gallery and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, seven guests and friends from the city of Red Deer. They are teachers, and some might suggest they're taking Friday off to have an extended long weekend. But being the dedicated lot that they are, they are here assessing some of the tours and projects that students from the city of Red Deer might want to visit in the next little while. I would ask Mr. Klaus Opatril, Mr. Robert Reed, Mr. Russ Gray, Jean Cameron, Roger Ward, Marilyn Ganger, and one of the most important people at G.W. Smith school, the secretary Brenda Friedrich, to all rise in the members' gallery and receive the warm reception of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Community Schools

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. Schools are the lifeblood of inner-city neighbourhoods. If they are closed, frankly, they help spell the death of some of those communities. On the other hand, functioning community schools can breathe new life into aging neighbourhoods. The decision by this government last year to chop the funding for community schools has had tragic effects in some of our inner-city neighbourhoods, and I would point out and remind the minister that community schools in the long run can save money because they act as a preventive social service. My question to the minister. What follow-up has the minister done in the last year to find out about the problems that were created by the draconian 50 percent cut in community schools?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I have met with the Community Education Association of Alberta and have expressed to them the concerns that have been outlined in at least one report, the Anne Harvey report, with respect to community schools. I have suggested to them that with a budget of about \$3 million, if my memory serves me correctly, in terms of

support from the province over and above what is given the other 1,600 schools in the province, there may well be ways in which those dollars can more appropriately be spread amongst those schools, particularly to recognize those who are operating as full community schools in the province. The Community Education Association I know is looking at alternatives in which that proportionate funding can be spent, and I look forward to their recommendations.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's well and dandy, but the minister is well aware that the Harvey report hasn't been released. We don't understand why.

My question, Mr. Speaker: the community schools -- if the minister has been following up, she should be aware of this -- have virtually shut down weekend operations in compliance with the funding cuts. They had no choice. Is the minister satisfied, then, that the small amount of money that was saved by these cuts is worth it in terms of the community programs that have now been shut down in inner cities?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, our Leader of the Opposition is wrong when he suggests that community schools only operate in the inner-city areas. Certainly there is no question that the inner-city areas deal with different sets of circumstances in their young people than do other parts of the province, but that's not restricted to community schools. The community school budget last year was reduced by 50 percent but gave to those schools about \$37,000 more than every other school in the province gets. That grant has been increased this year by 2 percent. I am of the view, and I believe others share that view, that there may well be a better way to be apportioning that funding, and I look forward to suggestions from the community to deal with it.

In terms of the weekend use of schools in this province, that is not something that is restricted to extraordinary funding to community schools. There are a good number of schools across this province who use their facilities in a far broader range than simply the traditional 8:30 to 4:30 time frame, without having a cent of extraordinary funding through community schools from this government.

MR. MARTIN: That's very nice, but the minister didn't answer the question. So she doesn't care that they've shut down. That's the only logical answer we can come to.

We're talking about the inner cities, not some dream world that the minister may think about. But weekend closure of the community schools has also led to an increase in vandalism in those particular schools. My question to the minister then: what consideration has the minister given to this problem in reaching funding decisions?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to see some of the direct correlation between the additional \$37,000 given to community schools and the Leader of the Opposition's contention that that has increased crime as a direct result. I would be happy to look at that.

In terms of community schools and their future I think there is a very important review that can be made. I think there may well be a better way in which those \$3 million can be spent to meet some particular needs, and I would welcome some suggestions not only from the Community Education Association, with whom I have met, but certainly from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the simple suggestions is put the funding back that you cut last year. That should be self-evident.

Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that not all inner-city schools are community schools, but they have more and more parent involvement. But the 50 percent cut has in fact put a freeze against establishment of any new community schools that are working well. I just say this to the minister, and I ask this question: isn't it unfair that the communities that could use this type of program will not have any opportunity in the future without cuts?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. To say that these schools that receive an additional \$37,000 over and above what other schools are getting have had all of their support base broken away is simply erroneous. And parent involvement in education in this province is something that we as a government feel very strongly about. Believe me, parents don't need community schools in order to get involved in their community. They're doing it right across this province.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. As Nicholas Sheran community school in Lethbridge is the first community school in Alberta, they are deeply appreciative of the fact that it's funded at \$37,000. Has the minister given consideration to the matter of perhaps seeking support from within the community, particularly with the corporate sector, whom I know have a very deep interest in education within the communities?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think one of the important points that has to be made about education in 1988 is that there are more and more partnerships that can be struck with community, with business, with support groups, that perhaps traditionally were not seen as being supportive of a basic education system. Those opportunities are there. The community school program focuses on some of those, but I'm not convinced it focuses on the learning environment in those areas. There may well be some ways in which there can be some supportive corporate and other opportunities to draw into how we all feel about education and how important it is to the advancement of our society.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Lower income groups have been particularly hard hit by government policies, as shown by the elimination of the equal opportunity funding programs in the Minister of Education's 1987 budget, which programs helped inner-city and low-income schools. I'm wondering whether in light of those cuts the minister can explain what her department is in fact doing or planning to do to help such low income schools and schools in areas which have special demographic problems requiring special assistance.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess one of the things that we're doing as a province is working with school boards, an important theme, particularly as we move through a new School Act which recognizes the very key role that school boards play in recognizing that what local community must be is an important input.

The equal opportunity funding was indeed reduced last year in the budget considerations. There were some remedial funds

which were reduced, but there were also some funds with respect to special opportunities for learning, in particular for native education projects. Those dollars have been retained and in fact increased by the 2 percent in order to recognize some of the key learning difficulties, particularly in urban settings though not restricted to them, that native children have.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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-Strathcona.

Daishowa Pulp Mill

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Attorney General. It concerns the Daishowa prosecution, or non-prosecution, which was stayed for want of evidence. Will the Acting Attorney General confirm that at no time after the issuing of the summons by the justice of the peace on this matter did the Attorney General's department or anyone on behalf of the Attorney General's department consult the justice of the peace to see what the evidence was that he had gotten on the basis of which he issued the summons pursuant to part 14 of the Criminal Code?

MR. ROSTAD: Not being privy to any conversations that may have taken place, Mr. Speaker, no, I can't categorically confirm that. In fact, I do believe there was evidence -- photographs, as mentioned yesterday -- that was produced, but evidence that would not with specificity be able to determine who, if anybody, was breaking the law.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, will the Acting Attorney General confirm that at no time between the issuing of the summons and the staying of it did anyone from the Attorney General's department or anyone on its behalf consult the informant Mr. Wylynko as to what the evidence was that he wanted to bring, or in any way get in touch with him during that period?

MR. ROSTAD: Again, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm whether there were any verbal conversations. I do know that there were written communications spelling out very clearly to Mr. Wylynko the procedures that he has to take before the prosecution can be continued with. We're still waiting for that procedure to be taken.

MR. WRIGHT: Will the Acting Attorney General not agree that if the Crown insists on taking over a private prosecution, which appears to be their policy, Mr. Speaker, that either the private prosecutor should be allowed to get on with it or the Attorney General's department do something more than sit on its beam ends?

MR. ROSTAD: I'm not sure what end that is, Mr. Speaker.

But the Department of the Attorney General Act does not allow the Attorney General's department to have an investigative role. The investigative role in any prosecution is in the realm of an enforcement agency such as the police department. In this particular instance it would be the RCMP -- it's in their jurisdiction -- and/or, in this particular instance also, the Department of the Environment in the special . . . I forget the designation. The evidence that the person laying the information has is

given to them. They investigate it; then that evidence is forwarded to the prosecutor. As I mentioned, there are two main prosecutors in Alberta, one in Calgary and one in Edmonton. From there the prosecution takes effect.

In this particular instance, Mr. Wylenko has not produced that evidence so that a prosecution can take place.

MR. WRIGHT: Then why, Mr. Speaker, did the Attorney General's department not take advantage of the thorough investigation stated to have been made by the Department of the Environment before the case was stayed, according to the letter of Mr. Lack of standards and approvals, a copy of which I supplied you with yesterday?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the investigation by Mr. Lack or his department did not provide the evidence sufficient to go with the prosecution, and we're waiting for additional evidence. If the hon. member feels that the investigation wasn't adequate, I'd suggest they take another avenue and still provide the evidence.

The Minister of the Environment may wish to supplement it, as that department is part of his department.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I would just quote one line from the evidence provided to the Attorney General's department by the investigators from Alberta Environment: "There was no evidence of any permanent structures or foundations being constructed on this site." Dated May 4, 1988, that information was provided to the Attorney General's department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, it's sounding more and more to me as though we need an independent opinion as to how this matter has been handled. I'm wondering whether now the Acting Attorney General will provide some comfort to the public in this matter by agreeing to commission an independent legal opinion on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: No, hon. minister. Those are exactly the same words that the member used yesterday in a supplementary question. Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Are you ruling the question out of order?

MR. TAYLOR: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did you rule it out of order?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Is that a heckle or a ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Westlock-Sturgeon, main question.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, was that a heckle or a rule? Is it ruled out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. A point of order then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been duly noted.

Water Supply Assistance

MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

This question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Agriculture. Drought has reached epic proportions in most of the province except parts of the Peace River and south, and it seems quite easy for the government maybe to forget this, surrounded with reflecting pools and water from all directions here. Meanwhile, though, the government solutions that they have proposed have been very narrow and, I think, in many areas not available. Now, would the minister be able to tell us when the pipe that has been purchased or is in the act of being purchased plus the carts to transport it are going to be available to the farmers?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we were very reactive, recognizing that there could be a serious problem as it relates to the dryness within the province, and that is why some time ago the Premier announced our \$20 million program as it relates to water supplies. He also established under the chairmanship of the Minister of the Environment an ongoing committee so that we could assess it on a daily basis as to the seriousness of the problem within the province. In addition to that, we've got a number of interdepartmental committees working, plus a committee that is working in conjunction with the federal government, to make sure that in the event that the seriousness does continue, we will be ready there to take corrective measures.

I should share with the hon. member as it relates to his question on the additional pipes that we have ordered for our dugout pumping that to date we've met with a considerable amount of success in filling those dugouts. If anybody has experienced a severe water shortage, we do give them a priority, but we have had no complaints to date whereby we could not service those individuals who required them. The trailers are the holdup to some degree because they have to be made, and the tendering process was quickened. We are hopeful that we will have all orders completed by mid-June, but we already have taken delivery of sufficient quantities so that we can meet the demands of those who are requesting our pumping equipment.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like a government that's proactive rather than reactive, and the middle of June may be too late. Could the minister inform the House as to whether or not the forms for aid or forms to apply for pumps and rentals are available in all sections of this province? I've had a number of complaints that the agricultural people in charge in different areas do not have the forms and, therefore, no forms, no water.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The question has been asked.
Hon. minister.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has individuals who are experiencing difficulties, we're more than happy to walk it through the process for him or for them, because we want to make sure that those individuals who are experiencing water shortages are taken care of, and that's the purpose of the program. We're doing our level best. As I indicated earlier, we haven't to date received any complaints as it relates to our delivery of that program.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I must have a selective phone system.

Mr. Speaker, also there's a problem, as I'm sure the minister knows and many of the other rural members, that hay prices have gone out of sight in the last couple of weeks. Is the minister willing to commit his government to some sort of a short-term subsidy that would stabilize hay prices in order for the farmers to keep their herds going?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the areas that does receive ongoing consideration under the committee of the hon. Minister of the Environment, and he may wish to supplement my answers. It is something we will give due consideration to. But there's also another side to that whereby in the event that a program is implemented, we've seen in the past whereby hay prices have escalated to a greater degree. So there are two sides to it. But we are very open to any suggestions the hon. member does have, and they will be assessed on an ongoing basis under the chairmanship of the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of the Environment, supplementary information.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It was my intent to supplement the previous question that the hon. member raised in terms of the application forms. Well, heck, at least two weeks ago I provided to all Members of the Legislative Assembly pamphlets and documents and everything else. Gee, if the leader of the Liberal Party hasn't read his mail yet, then it's shocking to me. Those application forms are there. They're available. Everybody in this Assembly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Okay; they got that.

A final supplementary, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. I'm not the one that's out of water. I mean, the farmers are the ones that want to have the farms. [interjections] Nor are you out of words. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please. Two days ago we went through this exercise with respect to more succinct supplementaries. I'd like to listen to yours now, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay, Mr. Speaker. The supplementary I have -- besides getting the rather jocular answer that the Minister of the Environment is in charge of anything over there except shutting down Daishowa . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: . . . has this government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Sorry. Okay, now we are into the supplementary. No more wisecracks, just the supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's hard competing with you at times.

MR. SPEAKER: All right; thank you, hon. member. Thank you. That's sufficient. You've lost your . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the people of this province have a right to know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. If the member refuses to listen to the admonition of the Chair with respect to supplementaries, you will do what has just occurred: lost your final supplementary.

Additional supplementaries?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I refuse to go without the last supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order, order.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I refuse to go without my last supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

The Chair recognizes Vegreville.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I refuse to sit down. If you want to throw me out, you can. But the public of this province have a right to know what that incompetent department is doing with respect to drought.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please, hon. member.

The Chair recognizes Vegreville.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Order.

MR. TAYLOR: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I haven't done anything wrong here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Take your place.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Take your place, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I will not. I have a supplementary, and the people of this province have to know what that bunch of incompetents are doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member, for your solicitous advice.

The House stands adjourned till 20 minutes to the hour, and the time will be taken from question period. [interjections] That's fine; the House is adjourned until 20 . . .

[The House recessed for nine minutes]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Chair recognizes Vegreville. Vegreville, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have my supplementary question, and I don't believe I have any right to be deprived of that supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. Order please.

On a number of occasions in this session, but especially within this past week, the House has dealt with the matter of having more succinct supplementaries. Throughout the course of the sitting there has been ample leeway given to supplementaries. But indeed two days ago and again with some reference yesterday this was brought to the attention of all hon. members, and it's in that light that the directions were given to the hon. member today by the Chair. In addition to that, the Chair gave some admonitions with respect to this one particular supplementary at least twice, and that was ignored by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. Therefore, on the third time of extraneous information being put in, the Chair then ruled that the member does not have the right to a third supplementary. That is indeed clearly within the direction of the Chair in question period.

The Chair now recognizes Vegreville.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker; I believe I have a democratic right to ask my last question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member . . .

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order in the press gallery, please. Mr. Speaker is standing. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon would like to take the matter under further consideration rather than have the Chair have to deal with the matter of Standing Order 24.

Member for Vegreville.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the responsibilities, and I believe that it's far enough. I have the democratic right on behalf of the people of Alberta . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Take the place please, hon. member.

Once again the Chair refers the member to Standing Order 24, subsections (1) and (2). The Chair has to assume that the hon. member has indeed read those Standing Orders and is aware of the full effect that takes place. This now is the first full time -- but more than one -- of warning the member, so the member would hopefully take that advisement and not have the rest of the time of the House in question period be marked away but also would take due regard to the parliamentary process in this province. Thank you.

Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, seeing as how he's given some retroactive consideration to the \$20 million drought assistance program, if he would consider extending that to some date in the fall, perhaps October 1 instead of January 1, recognizing that it's nearly impossible to dig a dugout in the middle of winter and that many people anticipating the problem undertook those projects in the fall.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've indicated our openness to examine all suggestions brought to us. I appreciate the suggestion that has just come forward from the hon. Member for Vegreville. Maybe I could use this opportunity to underscore, as he's indicated, that we have made retroactive to January 1 this year all the programs that were not, so that in the event that an individual did drill a well or construct a dugout, he will have funding made available to him. But we will take his suggestions

under consideration, as I indicated, under the chairmanship of the committee put together by the Premier, chaired by the Minister of the Environment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. The minister attended a meeting in St. Paul a few weeks ago, and there were special requests relative to the drought in the area. Has the minister considered those requests and can he report to the Assembly at this time any recommended changes?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In response to the hon. Member for Little Bow, I sent off -- I believe it was two days ago -- a letter in response to the meeting and carbon copied my colleagues who were affected by that, the hon. Member for St. Paul and the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, whereby because of the representations we did inject the retroactivity. It was because of that meeting in Goodridge and the strong representations brought forward by the Member for St. Paul and the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services that the retroactivity clauses were included. Their other specific request, as it related to an actual payment on a per quarter basis, is something that we indicated to them we could not accept at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Vermilion-Viking, final supplementary.

DR. WEST: Yes. To the Minister of the Environment. I have a community that's in the process of using the temporary water transmission line program, but they would like the structure to remain permanently there for future use. Will the funding be the same if they do proceed to put in a more permanent type transmission line to protect them against this problem in the future?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's going to be some degree of flexibility to be allocated to the program under the community water supply program. While, though, that aspect of the program concentrates on the temporary nature of it, all hon. members should be aware that the Minister of Transportation and Utilities and his department are involved as well with the community water supply assistance program, so if there's an argument that an individual community can make to take a temporary facility and turn it into a more permanent facility, that's one we would bend over backwards to try and accommodate.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Little Bow, on behalf of the Representative caucus, followed by Stony Plain.

Postsecondary Endowment and Incentive Fund

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education, and it stems from the announcement in the Speech from the Throne recorded in *Hansard* of April 3, 1986, where the announcement was made of the new \$80 million postsecondary endowment fund. Could the minister indicate at this time the distribution that's been made to the three somewhat major universities, the University of Lethbridge, the University of Calgary, and the University of Edmonton, relative to funds from that endowment fund?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the details of the dollar amounts other than to say they're very significant. I

guess the bottom line is to report to the House that the program is turning out to be far more successful than we had planned on it being. Already, just seven weeks into this fiscal year, there's only \$2 million left of this year's allotment, and the total \$80 million fund is within \$7 million of being taken up.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The two large universities of Edmonton and Calgary rather have the inside track on national fund contributions. Has the minister considered any changes in the ground rules to the fund in terms of compensation or matching grants in terms of the smaller institutions?

MR. RUSSELL: No, we haven't, Mr. Speaker, because to date the institutions generally have been very innovative in seeking out funds. I recall the last one that went to one of the smaller institutions. Banff Centre got a \$.5 million contribution from Maclean Hunter publishing company out of Ontario. The University of Lethbridge has been very successful also in getting out-of-province funding. So it hasn't appeared to be a problem yet. The problem has been the good news/bad news part of the thing, in that the good news is that they're gaining contributions at a far greater rate than anybody ever dreamt would happen, and the bad news, of course -- if I can use that term -- is that with our current fiscal situation we're having to get special warrants to cover those matching grants.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. We're just two years into the program of what I believed would be a five-year program. Would the minister be considering at this time an increase of that \$80 million allotment that was outlined in the Speech from the Throne, April 3, 1986?

MR. RUSSELL: That is something that will have to be considered, I suppose, and we are aware of that problem. The original program announced in 1980 was "80 for the '80s" -- \$80 million for the decade of the '80s to be matched. And that was used up by 1985. So phase 2, this endowment and incentive fund, was brought in, another \$80 million for what was left of the '80s. And in two years and a couple of weeks it's almost gone. So obviously, we're tapping a market out there that's very supportive of the system, and we want to maintain that encouragement if we're able.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is there any consideration in changing the two-for-one formula to a one-to-one formula?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of details, I suppose, that could be looked at. That is the one that has been very successful and attractive to major donors in establishing permanent endowments for special chairs and special programs. So we will be reviewing that, but it has been a very attractive part of the total program.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education. He indicated that there's almost a complete commitment of this year's fiscal allocation for the endowment fund. I wonder if he could make a commitment today to the people at the institutions of the province that he will in fact ensure that there are adequate resources to meet all of the commitments that are submitted by the institutions in this fiscal year.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, we've been able to do that so far. Hon. members will recall the passage in the last fiscal year of two special warrants totaling \$38 million for that very purpose. I can't give at this point a guarantee that that will happen again, but we do consult with institutions prior to their getting the final donations -- that their donors' gifts comply with the program. Of course, once we give that approval, the commitment is there to match the funds.

MR. SPEAKER: Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes, to the minister. There's been some concern that donations in kind rather than cash might have been abused a bit. Are you looking at a program that targets more cash donations than those speculating in kind?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that correction was made during the interim period between phase 1 and phase 2 of the program that I outlined. There were some problems with respect to matching various kinds of equipment and things that were donated rather than cash, and I believe most of those difficulties have been overcome.

Principal Group

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. The topic is Principal Group. Over the past two days several constituents have called to express very negative reaction to the reports -- that is, the print and electronic media -- alleging that this government is considering a \$150 million purchase of real estate investments connected with the Principal Group. Will the Provincial Treasurer comment on the accuracy and perhaps the source of these reports?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't perhaps talk about the source of the reports. I can give the government policy. That is that until the Code inquiry has completed its full review of the investigation -- and, I suppose, although the Ombudsman is not here, when the Ombudsman has completed his review -- I would imagine at that point the government would assess its position in light of the comments made by Mr. Code. I should say that I understand this rumour was started from discussions picked up by the *Edmonton Journal*. I have attempted to make it clear that the government is not at this point contemplating any sort of assistance to the Principal companies. As I said, we would wait until Mr. Code's inquiry is completed.

MR. HERON: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, given the Provincial Treasurer's articulate, crystal clear, and detailed answer, which I think should clear up any uncertainty created by this rumour, I will pass on any further supplementaries.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for the statement.
Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the Treasurer could now reconsider very seriously the 35 percent proposal that we put forward. It does not in any way depend on the Code inquiry or any other problems in the long term.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's not unreasonable that we would consider it as an idea. First of all, the way in which restructuring of financial institutions has taken place in this province has been that the nonproducing real estate or some of the foreclosed real estate has been transferred to another entity and, therefore, cleaning up the balance sheet.

In that sense I would draw the member's attention to the very successful way in which North West Trust was restructured, using not one cent of the government of Alberta's money to restructure that company. It's operating with extensive profits right now, Mr. Speaker, and the real estate is parked in another vehicle. That has allowed two things to happen. It allows for a managed disposition of the property, and it in fact does allow a financial institution -- the one in this case North West Trust, which is the example -- to operate very effectively.

Now, this is not just a new idea. This has happened in a variety of other financial institutions, including the credit union system and, to some extent, the Heritage company, which was operating here in Edmonton. So the notion itself is not new. We could consider it, Mr. Speaker, but as I've clearly stated before, in our view it would be inappropriate to do anything to interrupt the process, because it's a very difficult unraveling of the transactions. We would not want to cloud the issue by moving ourselves, but once the Code inquiry is finished and once the Ombudsman has made his report, then we will look at all possible options.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

First, with respect, hon. member, the Chair has decided to add the nine minutes of the adjournment back onto question period.

Edmonton-Avonmore.

Women's Emergency Services

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister responsible for women's issues. We have heard that 27 percent of Canadian women are victims of sexual assault, that the number reported to the Sexual Assault Centre in 1987 was 17 percent higher than the number reported in 1986. In addition, a recent survey at the University of Alberta revealed that one out of nine Alberta women in married-type relationships is battered by her partner. In view of the fact that there are only seven or eight sexual assault centres and 14 shelters for battered women in this province, does the minister consider that available resources are anywhere near adequate?

MS McCOY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said time and time again that we would like to do more and more to help the victims of sexual assault. The Minister of Social Services may wish to supplement my answer. In fact, we have been allocating more resources into the shelters for women in Alberta in the last two years. We've given them substantial increases in their budget.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many women do not have access to the basic minimum service of a crisis line, will the minister responsible for women lobby the Minister of Community and Occupational Health to establish forthwith a provincewide toll-free crisis line?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, that subject has been discussed. I know that in many communities there is a crisis line, and cer-

tainly it's funded through the FCSS program. Many local communities have chosen to establish that sort of help in their area. A provincewide hot line: there are pros and cons to that suggestion, one of them being that the nature of the crisis is so immediate and the woman who is calling needs such immediate attention where she is, not in some centralized depot in one of the major cities, that one would have to be very careful to ensure that there was somebody within a few minutes to come to her aid. There is some question as to whether a hot line provincewide would offer that kind of service.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that even with treatment intervention, not just crisis intervention, it takes two to five years to recover from a sexual assault, what commitment is the minister willing to make to ensure that such treatment is available so that all women who have experienced violence may regain their health?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is using the World Health Organization definition of "health", and I would endorse that, because it does mean total mental and physical health. There is no question that when one has been assaulted there is an ongoing trauma to a person which isn't immediately healed. However, we in Alberta have one of the best health care systems, and those facilities and professional counseling to help a woman come through the experience are widely available in this province.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the Solicitor General. Given that most rapists and wife batterers are repeat offenders and given that treatment programs for such individuals are virtually nonexistent, what steps is the Solicitor General willing to commit himself to to ensure treatment being made available to all offenders who can benefit from such treatment while they are serving their sentences?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I echo the concerns for this type of offence and for the victims of this type of offence. In most instances where people have been prosecuted and found guilty, their incarceration usually puts them beyond the realm of the Solicitor General of Alberta's jurisdiction in the fact that they get more than a two-year sentence. I am more than happy to work with our department to see if there is some way we can institute a rehabilitation program specifically to this offence.

MR. SPEAKER: Vermilion-Viking, supplementary.

DR. WEST: Yes, to the Minister of Social Services. To clarify some of the statistical information that we hear today in reference to abuse, could the minister indicate that if somebody was sexually abused in a home 12 times during a year and it was reported on those instances 12 times -- is it recorded statistically as one incidence of abuse or 12?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a number of studies that have been done with respect to abuse, I believe the data has been compiled in a different way. That is one of the problems we have in terms of comparisons across the country, because we're not necessarily always comparing apples with apples, if you will. In terms of the direct question, I would have to ask the hon. member what particular study he may be looking at or what particular purported reported information he may be looking at. But regardless of how it's reported, it is a very seri-

ous problem.

Crop Insurance

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my questions, I suppose, should be to the Associate Minister of Agriculture, but I will ask them of the minister.

In southern Alberta there's been a severe drought. As it pertains to drought insurance, I've had some of my constituents calling, saying there's a limit to the time when you should seed and be able to collect drought insurance. As there is no moisture, have there been any discussions with the federal minister to see if the date of seeding can be delayed or eliminated?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report to the hon. member that the Associate Minister of Agriculture has had communications with our federal counterpart, the Hon. John Wise, to have him take into consideration the recommendations the hon. member has just made to us so there is greater flexibility, so our farmers in southern Alberta can take advantage of putting their cattle onto those crops and still have some applicable insurance coverage.

MR. MUSGROVE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Right now, if these farmers go out and disturb their land in an attempt to seed -- why, all they're doing is causing erosion problems. The ideal thing would be to wait for rain. But if it doesn't rain before the end of June and they don't seed the crop at all, will they still be eligible for some type of crop insurance?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, that is an area the associate minister is working on along with the chairman of Hail and Crop Insurance, the hon. Member for Whitecourt. They are working together with our federal counterparts so we can come up with some fair and equitable program for our farming population. Just as it relates to soil conservation, also I'm sure the hon. member did note the communiqué that came forward from the Premiers that are meeting in B.C., whereby there is going to be an elevation of that concern so we can have greater soil conservation methods. The hon. Member for Chinook also introduced legislation so that we can upgrade our support for soil conservation methods.

MR. MUSGROVE: In that you have to declare the amount of seeded acres for crop insurance some time previous to the present date, and given the fact that if it doesn't rain they would be damaging their soil to seed, would the farmers be able to collect crop insurance on their declared acres that they would have seeded had there been some rain to germinate it?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, those are areas that are presently under consideration, and hopefully we will have a response to the hon. member very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry.

Landfill Sites

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the Aurum dump site, many residents of my constituency and other areas of northeast Edmonton and beyond are concerned about the environmental dangers of the dump site chosen by the city. Those who contact me believe that the groundwater activity in

the area makes the site environmentally unsafe and that no amount of engineering wizardry can make it safe. Can the Minister of the Environment confirm that it is ultimately the responsibility of Alberta Environment to judge the environmental safety of the dump site and the engineering plans for it?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the process that's followed is threefold. Number one is that a local municipality will make a decision in terms of a location of a particular landfill. Then, once that local municipality makes the decision, that decision is then forwarded to the local board of health, and it is the board of health which determines whether or not the application will be upheld for a siting. When the local board of health gets the application, the board of health then can refer the application to Alberta Environment for a technical environmental review. Alberta Environment will determine, on the basis of the information provided to it, whether or not the site is suitable from an environmental point of view and an environmental point of view only. This is a process that we followed very successfully and well throughout the province of Alberta and the one that happens once, twice, three times a week.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.
Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to continue.

Will the minister commit himself to giving a thorough environmental investigation of this site and outline today what research studies or environmental impact assessments he will carry out to investigate the environmental concerns?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've just indicated already in the previous question that this is the process Alberta Environment follows with literally hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of landfills that have been established in the province of Alberta over the last number of years. Of course, if the board of health approves the site, if the board of health refers the project to Alberta Environment -- which is the process that is available -- then of course Alberta Environment will undertake a very thorough analysis from a purely technical environmental point of view.

I would point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that what I am encouraging as the Minister of the Environment is the reduction in the number of landfills in the province of Alberta. Since 1980 we've seen a reduction of some 1,350 landfills in this province to a current inventory of approximately 800. I believe there is a much more innovative approach to controlling garbage that exists in our society. And anybody that's heard me give a speech in the last two years -- and needless to say, all hon. members who have had the benefit of those speeches will know that in my humble opinion and view, the last alternative we should be following in 1980 in dealing with garbage is the creation of a hole in the ground and simply burying it so it becomes out of sight. We can be much more innovative. Edmonton, I believe, is right on the leading edge of providing a new technology for everybody. Surely we can find a very positive alternative to

simply a hole in the ground.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much. The minister has taken some commendable but very halting steps in what is a long journey that should have already been finished towards safe disposal. Has he set any specific targets, in terms of recycling and other alternatives, to reduce landfilling by, say, 30 or 40 percent over the next three years in the province?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's always amazing to me how a member of the NDP gets up and has four questions. They asked question number 2: have you taken any steps to reduce? Well, in question 3, have you taken any steps . . . In the response to question 2, I gave the statistics. I indicated that since 1980 there has been a reduction in the number of landfills in this province from 1,350 to some 800. I appreciate the difficulty the Speaker has periodically in trying to get people to deal with the question, but I answered the question. In addition to that, we've outlined in the public . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. By your own admission you've answered the question. Therefore a final supplementary.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. Replacing a whole bunch of small landfills with a few big ones is not an improvement. I was talking about the volume of garbage buried, not the number of sites. Now, in view of the conflict that seems to be developing between Edmonton and the county of Strathcona -- and that kind of conflict is almost inevitable in the situation of planning a dump site -- will the minister recognize that it's time for the province, and especially his department, not the health units, to show some real leadership in finding alternatives to landfilling, not just some small window-dressing projects?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, once again I'm absolutely, totally amazed. In September of 1986 the Minister of the Environment announced, as a result of the meeting with the mayor of the city of Edmonton, the reeve of the county of Strathcona, the mayor of the city of Fort Saskatchewan -- as a result of meetings that were held here in this building, the four of us -- that the province of Alberta would allocate to these four municipalities a certain amount of dollars to, in fact investigate alternatives. We have done that. Studies have been done. Studies have been made available.

Since that time as well, of course we have had the benefit of the very exciting Environment Council of Alberta report on recycling. Since that time we have opened in Alberta, on September 11, 1987, the world's best fully integrated special waste management plant. The NDP, of course, have been totally opposed to it. We uphold the Alberta Beverage Container Act, that I'm attempting to bring changes to. The NDP told me two days ago in this House they were opposed. "Get rid of all those small businessmen," they said. "Get rid of that. Do that." Mr. Speaker, we have had now in Ryley, Alberta, a very exciting composting project and in a couple weeks from now I'm going to bring their mascots in this Assembly and introduce them. There have been literally dozens and dozens of initiatives with respect to this matter all over Alberta, and I want all members of the NDP to take the time to read the new environmental newspaper we're going to make available to all citizens of Alberta in the next number of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Stony Plain, a supplementary.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the critical comments pertaining to the Alberta environment made by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, I feel compelled to ask the minister if he would comment on the report submitted by the national task force on the environment; that is, the report which commented on Alberta's efforts toward conservation and its strategy. That report was submitted to the national council . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. It's a very long supplementary. The House needs to learn a bit more about it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The National Task Force on the Environment and the Economy was a very exciting report. It was written in 1987 by five ministers of the environment of the country of Canada, leaders of industry, and leaders of national environmental groups. That report was taken to the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, tabled there. It's a reflection of the Brundtland international commission report. It said that Alberta is, was, and will remain the leader in environmental mitigation protection.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The question period has expired.

Earlier in question period there was some concern raised by the members for Calgary-Buffalo and Westlock-Sturgeon with respect to the ruling out of order by the Chair of the supplementary by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo. It was so entirely repetitious. It was almost word for word the same question which was asked yesterday in this House, and that was the reason that member was called to order at that time. That again clearly violates *Erskine May*, page 342, paragraph 9.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests if they have had sufficient patience to stay with us?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Any opposed? Carried.

The Chair recognizes Little Bow first, followed by Grande Prairie.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague Dr. Buck, the Member for Clover Bar, I'd like to introduce to the Assembly a group of grade 6 students from the Rudolph Hennig school. There are 46 students in the members' gallery. They're with their teachers Mrs. Olga Alexandruk, Mrs. Kumpula, Trixie Veltman -- a student teacher -- and Mrs. Dunsmore, Mrs. Masters, Mrs. Tetz, and Mr. Jeffrey. I'd ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Grande Prairie.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a group from my constituency, representing both the Hythe Re-

gional junior high and the Beaverlodge Regional senior high. We have grades 7 and 8 from Hythe and grades 10 and 12 from Beaverlodge. They're in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, 67 members. The teacher with them is Paul Godel, and they're accompanied by parents Mrs. Longson, Mrs. McLaren, Mrs. MacDonald, and Mrs. Bratland. Also with the group are Marty Clarke and Barry Clarke. I'd ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Third Reading)

Bill 32
Appropriation Act, 1988

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think for the next 25 or 30 minutes I'll just recite some of the clear principles of this legislation. But I'm getting a frown from the House leader, so I'll simply move third reading of Bill 32.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: There's a call for the question.
Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One couldn't let this go by without a bit of a discussion. I would like to say I'm a little disappointed that the Treasurer didn't take this opportunity to answer some of the questions he didn't answer the other day. At Committee of the Whole on this Bill he chose not to answer the questions we'd asked previously but launched into a long tirade about what NDP policy is, as if he knew and we couldn't speak for ourselves. So I thought today he might have taken some time to answer some of the questions. What I would like to do, however, is just summarize some of the previous comments I've made and add one or two slants to them.

At third reading of a \$10 billion budget, I don't think one should let it go by without some comment. It's a lot of money. It's the main expenditures of the province. It's not all the expenditures, Mr. Speaker, and I'll deal with that briefly in a few minutes. But it is a \$10 billion budget. I would say also, though, that last year's budget was almost a \$10 billion budget. It was a \$9.95 billion one, and the year before that was a \$10 billion budget also. Those figures are less the statutory expenditures, which are about half a billion in each year. The increase in the budget from last year to this year is a .0007 percent increase. So I would say to the Treasurer that he has not kept up to inflation this year, last year he didn't keep up to inflation either, and the year before that, of course, was the year of the big tax grab -- last year being the year of some major cuts in education and health care, for example, and social services.

The Treasurer has brought in a budget that really is a fairly neutral budget in some ways, but if anything it certainly is a bit on the depressant side. It depresses the economy rather than stimulates it. As I pointed out to you earlier, there's no demand-side stimulus in the budget and certainly no supply-side stimulus either, as I pointed out in indicating that some six different economic departments were, in fact, cut back 3.7 percent. Sorry; you had to throw in northern development with those six to get the 3.7 percent cutback. That on top of a 4 percent cutback, is a fairly serious depressant to the economy of this province on the supply side. On the demand side there was really nothing except a bit of an increase in health care that was

slightly more than the inflation rate. Even so, on balance, considering that we've had a couple of years of inflation at just over 4 percent each year, you've got to say that this budget has not provided any stimulus to the economy in this province.

The budget document itself, the first part of it, is concerned with the government warrant aspect of the government expenditures. Those are the expenditures that were not accounted for in last year's budget but were in fact spent last year, or at least committed last year, and now the government is asking us for approval in hindsight. I would just point out that there is a list of some 27 different government warrants in section A of this Bill, totaling \$300 million and some. I guess it tells me that this government hasn't planned very carefully or didn't plan its budget very carefully last year. There's only one of those expenditures that really ranks as an emergency, and that's the money for the tornado victims. We would all agree that that made sense, but the other expenditures did not really warrant the term "emergency expenditures."

It's true that there may have been some time pressures, but they were not the kind of pressures that couldn't be anticipated, and the government certainly could adjust the budget in midstream in some cases where they come up with a bright idea that they want to spend some taxpayers' money, like they've done this year, for example. We're just in the process of finishing passing this year's budget and already they've announced a government warrant which will not be before this Assembly until next year. So they could make some adjustments near the end of the period, as we do sit for a two- or three-month period, if they have some ideas that really are important and should be added to the budget. They could also, Mr. Speaker, think in terms of a fall sitting of the Legislature in which they would bring in either an amendment to the budget or a new mini-budget, so to speak, in the fall. Therefore, they could ask for prior approval to these expenditures rather than approval after the fact and after they've been spent. That, of course, is the basic principle we were enunciating in our defence against Bill 10, which in a sense makes it legal for the government to do that with the lottery funds.

So, Mr. Speaker, the lottery funds is one area where there isn't anything in the budget on it and there should be. So the budget in spite of having \$10 billion in it doesn't really cover all the government expenditures. In fact, there's a number of other expenditures that aren't in there as well. Looking at the audited statement for the public accounts for the year '86-87, one finds that the Auditor General is saying the consolidated expenditures of the province were something in the neighbourhood of \$13 billion, whereas only \$9 billion or \$10 billion of those received approval from this Legislature in the budgetary process.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I've mentioned the lottery funds as not being in there: \$100 million a year that is not in the budget. The government warrants, of course, that we are already starting for next year are not in the budget, and I guess the government thinks it's okay to have 20-odd different categories of what should really be only emergency spending. Instead, they seem to use it as a routine way of avoiding the House when they want to make some announcements, or they think they get a lot of good publicity out of the press releases or something. I'm not quite sure why they have this penchant for bypassing the House.

I've pointed out on previous occasions that they also

manipulate incredible numbers of dollars with the heritage trust fund without telling us what's going on there. I won't go through the examples again. I'll save that for the heritage trust fund debate to come on the capital projects division.

They have made an incredible number of loan guarantees which never show up either in this budget or in any documents of the House, except a couple of years later in the public accounts -- a sort of list of them. It's something that the government should really consider. They should look at the terms under which they decide to make loan guarantees. They should bring some kind of legislation into this Assembly that sets out some guidelines we could look at and debate, and then whenever there's a major one -- you know, some of those loan guarantees are hundreds of millions of dollars -- they should bring those before this Assembly for debate before they go ahead with them.

This is the place where the taxpayers expect us to debate and be responsible for the expenditures and commitments of the tax dollars of this province. I find it strange that the government doesn't like to live up to that commitment. They don't like to subject their ideas and their suggestions for expenditures to the debate of this Assembly. And in case you think I am not serious about that, I could quote some of the things the Minister for Career Development and Employment said last night on the debate on Bill 10. But maybe we'll save that for further debate on Bill 10.

[Mr. R. Speaker in the Chair]

The government has also had to borrow quite an incredible amount of money. They have borrowing power of up to \$6.5 billion, and yet we don't see that in the budget or any accounting for it or debate on it before this Assembly other than a Bill they've passed at one stage allowing themselves to borrow up to that amount. And, Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the Speech from the Throne document that there was some \$460 million planned to cover the interest payments on those borrowings. Now, the government likes to brag about how much money we get back from the heritage trust fund -- in fact, in this fiscal year they're planning on getting back \$1.245 billion -- but they don't stop to tell us that at the same time they've got this other big debt which is costing us almost half a billion dollars. Those are the kinds of things we learn later, so to speak, and they're not brought before this Assembly for discussion and debate, and they should be. Of course, that saw-off one against the other is a debt against the heritage trust fund earnings.

We should also throw into that the fact that we will probably see a motion -- and I haven't seen any motion to this effect yet this year, but we have every other year and I have no reason to assume we won't -- asking us to give some \$300 million to three of the losing Crown corporations that are funded out of the heritage trust fund. So you have to consider the net gain or loss out of that heritage trust fund before you can sort of say how much it's worth to us, and that's something this government doesn't like to own up to. They like to tell just half of the story and brag that the heritage trust fund is worth a 7 percent sales tax.

Incidentally, on the 7 percent sales tax the other day, the Treasurer says it's 6 percent in the Speech from the Throne, but he usually uses the words "7 percent." Lately I've noticed he's quit using it. I hope it's because I gave him the figures to show that in fact we have to balance what we put in with what we took out before you can claim the net gain, and it certainly isn't \$7 billion in the last five years and worth a 6 or 7 percent sales

tax as he has been saying. However, he jumped all over our party and claimed that we were in favour of a sales tax, and I would like to assure the House and the people of Alberta that that's not true. I had no intention to really launch a discussion on the sales tax, but I must just at least answer that point.

I would say, however, that when he brags that we don't have a sales tax in Alberta, you do have a couple of taxes that are much like a sales tax. We have a gas tax, a fuel tax, and we also have a hotel tax. Both of them can only be ranked as sales taxes. And the medicare premiums have to be ranked, by comparison to income taxes anyway, as a type of sales tax. It's a flat tax on everybody regardless of their ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, that covers most of the things that are not in the budget or not accounted for by this government that should be, except for one thing. That was the North West Trust the credit unions, and the Softco real estate partner of the North West Trust Company. Those things are not accounted for in the consolidated statements in the way they should be. So we do not see a budget before us that covers all the expenditures of this province. What we do see is the core of the government expenditures, however.

I want to say also at the same time that here is one other aspect of the budget process in this province that bothers me. We don't really have time to adequately debate some of the expenditures in enough detail. Particularly for some of the bigger departments, we should get more than one day. But the part of the budget that really is so badly treated or just sort of bypassed almost, except that we get to make a few comments in the first two or three days of the budget debate, is the revenue side. The projections of what the revenues of this province will be are very shoddily covered in the Speech from the Throne. There's not much in the way of detail as to why or how the government has arrived at those projections, and they do not give us much chance to debate those things. For instance, the taxes collected. We pointed out in the House in a couple of different ways the imbalance between the corporate and personal taxes, and yet we don't really have a time when we can debate that in a detailed manner that is very effective, partly because we don't get enough numbers. All we get is rhetoric from the other side about what a wonderful tax regime we have in this province, most of which is nonsense. We're not much different from the other provinces now since that billion dollar tax grab of two years ago.

Certainly we've come to a very poor balance between the corporate and personal taxes, and when I raised that with the Treasurer, all he did was stand up in . . . I put a motion for a return asking him how he could justify his statement that, in fact, the corporations pay half a percent more tax than do individuals in this province. He said: "Oh well, it's just the methodologies, you know, and you wouldn't understand them. It's just a dispute about methodologies." I would understand if he were prepared to lay out exactly what his methodology is for calculating how much taxes corporations pay and how much taxes individuals pay. In our statement we laid out very clearly exactly what our methodology was, and the Treasurer had no answer as to why that wasn't a fair methodology. So I would challenge him again to come up with the proof on that statement instead of just standing up in the House and saying, "Oh well, you know, it's just a dispute about methodologies." The fact of the matter is that he hasn't got the proof to back up what he's stated in this House, and he should not state facts of that sort without being prepared to lay it on the line exactly where and how he gets his statistics and make it clear that he knows what

he's talking about. The reason, of course, that he doesn't do it is because he doesn't know what he's talking about. He's just bragging off the top of his head to try to refute the points we had put forward.

Another section of the expenditures and revenues of this province that causes a great deal of trouble not only to me but to the Auditor General is the tax expenditures of this province. This government has given away a lot of royalty tax credits: it's reduced taxes in a number of different ways for a number of different reasons. It cost us perhaps as much as a billion dollars in the '84-85 year -- this is from the Auditor General's reports -- and a billion and a half in the '85-86 year. In the '86-87 year it may be as much as a billion dollars, although there were, I think, a few other things thrown in there. But it's a little more difficult because of some changes of accounting to know exactly how much. Of course, last year and this year haven't been figured out yet, how much we've given away in tax expenditures. And I might point out that the Auditor General suggests to the Treasurer that he should account for tax expenditures just like he accounts for any other kind of expenditures in this Assembly. So it really should be part of this Bill 32, exactly what we are giving away in tax expenditures.

In terms of revenues one would have to, of course, mention oil; it's been the main source of revenues for many years. We did take that drastic fall in the '86-87 fiscal year, but it's recovered somewhat since. The Treasurer, however, has indicated his projections for this year are based on \$18.50 U.S. a barrel for oil for the year. I just read the other day in the *Financial Post* that for the first quarter it's only averaged \$16 a barrel. So I say to the Treasurer: he'd better keep a pretty good eye on that and check his planned deficit and what his borrowing plans are for the year, because he may not have handled that very well.

The government instituted a couple of years ago -- or at least the budget indicated an intention to raise quite a lot more money by user fees for various government services, and it's been very difficult to get out of them exactly what those fees are and the total amounts. I wrote a letter to each and every minister asking them for an outline of exactly what fees they had raised, how much they'd raised them, and how much revenue that was raising. I got a rather odd mixture of answers back. Some people complied and did a pretty good job, but most said, "Oh, the Treasurer will do that." Somehow the Treasurer hasn't done that, and so we still don't know whether these user fees are just reasonable fees that people should expect to pay when they put the government to some expense, or whether, in other words, they're just sort of recovering costs and are not deterring people from asking for information which is very fundamental and important in a democracy, or whether, in fact, some of them are almost a hidden tax. So it would be nice to know if the government would do a summary of how that's working out and let us know in some detail exactly what is going on there.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, I'll just summarize my comments on the budget by saying that this was not a very good budget. I guess the best that could be said for it is that it could have been worse. It was not a particularly bad budget either. I would say that in terms of asking permission of this House for expenditures, as they should do because the power of the purse in a democracy resides in this Assembly, the government has not done very well.

I pointed out a minute ago that the Auditor General said that

there was some \$9 billion expended in the '86-87 fiscal year due to budgetary requisitions, but there was a total of some \$13 billion spent. So I'm saying that there is around \$3 billion or \$4 billion that is not really vetted through this Legislature before it's spent. And then I'm saying that on the accounting side, when we start to say, "Where was that money spent, and was the money that was planned to be spent all spent in the way that it was meant to be spent?" -- in other words, the public accounts side -- the government also doesn't do a very good job. I would just on that point say that we get this supplement to the public accounts that lists all the companies that receive money from the provincial government, but they're put in alphabetical order and it stretches over some 300 or 400 pages. Of course then, if you want to know how much the Department of Economic Development and Trade spent, you have to try to go through these 300 or 400 pages and find all the times their name shows up as the department that paid certain people certain amounts of money.

Now, all I've asked the Treasurer for is a very simple thing: that he would have that same information relisted department by department and in each department break it down by programs so that we know exactly how and where it was spent quickly and easily by looking at the numbers. I asked, Mr. Speaker, for a similar kind of thing from my friends on the Public Accounts Committee, and the government members all turned it down. I guess they prefer to hide their heads in the sand and not know what's going on with government expenditures. How they can claim they're doing the job for the taxpayers of Alberta to check whether or not the government is really spending the money the way it should be spent, I don't know. I guess maybe they're beginning to think that it's in their interests not to let the taxpayers know how they're spending the money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to wind up by saying that the Treasurer has only been in that position for a couple of years, and he inherited a heck of a mess. But I don't think he's tried to reform the system. I think he's just been papering over the cracks, and one day it's all going to fall apart. I guess that will probably be in the next provincial election.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say a few words relating to the whole impact of the provincial budget and Bill 32.

In previous discussions and debates I have outlined some of the concerns I have in terms of the provincial budget relating to education, transportation, agriculture, and tourism. One of the areas I'd like to amplify a lot more is in relating to the whole tourism development in our province and the lack of provincial priorities set on the development of tourism in Alberta. In the past two provincial budgets handed down, tourism, culture, and parks and recreation have all suffered approximately a one-third reduction in budget allocation, even though during the last provincial election the government made tourism a priority in terms of funding for the province of Alberta, in terms of making it a very important diversification tool. For northern Albertans this is basically empty rhetoric.

Today I'd like to spend a bit of time for the information of the members on a project which relates to the Alberta North concept, the Lakeland region of the province which encompasses the Lac La Biche-Bonnyville area. There are over 152 lakes located within that part of the province, containing over 70 percent of the beaches that are found in Alberta. That

whole area of the province has been studied to death since 1980 by the provincial government, and we continue to find in budget allocation, or a declaration by the Minister of Recreation and Parks or from the minister of culture, important designation of the Alberta North concept that has been proposed for that area in terms of developing that portion of the province as a very important tourism destination point for Albertans, for Canadians, and for people from overseas. Looking at the statistics provided by the study Tourism Lac La Biche Country completed in 1985, we find that in the area there are only 840 camping sites to serve a tourist industry which could be tripled and quadrupled in that part of the province, relating to the creation of many hundreds of jobs in the area.

The town of Lac La Biche, for example, is a town dependent on welfare and government, where 51 percent of jobs are related to government and not related to the use of our renewable resources, which tourism very definitely is. We have, for example, had an important historical designation for the Lac La Biche mission, which has come out with a study indicating the hundreds and thousands of tourists that it could attract to that portion of the province if it was developed into an important interpretive centre, an historical park development, if the government would move to make sure that funds are allocated to preserve and to add on to that very important facility.

The area has a very ancient history. The native people of Alberta have inhabited that area for over 10,000 years, and there's hundreds of archaeological sites which have been identified by such people as Ed McCullough. These could be all put into a context of an interpretive centre in terms of our aboriginal people. We could be expanding on the historical concept of the area in terms of the early missionaries and fur trappers who established missions and trading posts in the area. It goes back into the late 1700s and early 1800s, this history that we have in that part of Alberta. It's actually, in terms of a site, the second oldest in the province after Fort Chipewyan.

So you can imagine that if that was used by the government as a very important destination point in terms of looking and searching our aboriginal history and the early fur trappers and the mapmakers and, of course, the early French people who came into that area to establish farms in the early part of the last century. . . . Besides, I've already pointed out the over 152 lakes which are located in that area, over 70 percent of the provincial sandy beaches located in that area, many of them undeveloped at this time, without any master plan on how the government is going to be tackling that very important destination point. The Lakeland region could become, after the mountain parks, the most important tourist destination point in Alberta. And I'm not kidding you: if it was properly planned and developed, it would become a very important destination point. We already have people who go there who know the area, people who are repeat visitors to that area year after year because of its unique environment, unique beauty, unique fauna, et cetera.

However, we have seen inaction by this government -- a lot of promises, but inaction by this government. If the government is really believing in economic diversification, then tourism must play a very important part in that economic diversification. We have the forests, we have the trees, but we have also that natural beauty that can be enjoyed by future generations of people. At this time, the Lakeland area doesn't even have a freeze on the land which prevents, perhaps, development encroaching into that very sensitive area so that we're not going to be unfairly impacting on the future use of that area for park development and tourism development.

We definitely need to increase the campsites available in that area. I indicated, for example, 840 campsites, of which there are only, I believe, two private campsites in the area. We've had renovation and expansion of the Long Lake Provincial Park and Churchill, but totally inadequate to serve the public. Sir Winston Churchill park, for example, and Beaver River park are usually booked weeks in advance in the summertime, and simply, the other lakes which have inadequate road connections are still waiting to be developed.

So I urge the government, in terms of its budget review, that it starts taking a look at some of the great economic spin-offs that can result by the government making sure that it knows where it's going and puts in place proper park, historical park, and interpretive centre types of development in the northern part of the province, especially the northeastern part where much of our history, much of our lakes, and much of our natural beauty exist.

[Motion carried; Bill 32 read a third time]

Bill 5 Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Amendment Act, 1988

[Debate adjourned May 13]

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, on Bill 5 there was a question raised, and in the absence of the hon. member who is carrying the Bill, I would just like to respond to the question from the Member for . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. minister moving third reading of the Bill?

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm moving third reading of Bill 5 for the hon. Member for Redwater-Andrew.

One question arose during the committee stage, I believe, related to the appropriation of funds to the AOSTRA research fund, a question asking how it was that funds were able to move previously, before this Bill came on the Order Paper.

Currently, funds are allowed to be appropriated to the research fund from the General Revenue Fund. They're able to receive these funds only on an advance basis. As the Act now stands, funding from the General Revenue Fund is to be in the form of an advance and repayable. So funds moving in have been perfectly legitimate and appropriate. Prior to the '85-86 fiscal year the AOSTRA's capital fund was funded from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and as the hon. member knows, the moneys from the trust fund have been declining in terms of the amount they're moving to AOSTRA and more from the General Revenue Fund.

So this amendment is for the purpose of being able to move funds from the General Revenue Fund to the research fund of AOSTRA without them being in advance and repayable. That's the reason for this Bill.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the hon. minister for clarifying that point. With that I rise in support of the Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 5 read a third time]

Bill 13
Surveys Amendment Act, 1988

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 13 and do pass.

[Motion carried; Bill 13 read a third time]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Second Reading)

Bill 20
Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move second reading of Bill 20, the Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, there's a number of amendments related to this Oil and Gas Conservation Act that I'd like to touch on this morning. First of all, there's a clarification of the definition of the term "bitumen." It removes bitumen from the definition of oil so that mined and in situ bitumen will be treated the same. I might add that a number of these changes are fairly technical type changes.

The second definitional change relates to a concept of a holding for gas. It creates a "holding" in place of "block," a term that's used in the industry for natural gas. This entity or this holding is required to allow flexibility in production and the drilling of gas in an area of common ownership. The previously used term "block" had been allowed, but a recent court decision held that the definition of block does not apply to natural gas.

Another amendment relates to the advancement of funds to the ERCB in accordance with the practice and other legislation. So there is an amendment there. This was brought to our attention by the Auditor General.

There's the deletion of a reference to the Hydro and Electric Energy Act. The petroleum industry should not, and has not, borne costs of board activity under that Act, so this corrects an error of including the Hydro and Electric Energy Act.

Another area relates to drilling deposits. We've deleted regulation-making powers of the ERCB regarding these drilling deposits. These drilling deposits were discontinued in 1985 by the ERCB because they were ineffective and inconsequential. Deposits were required amounting to \$2,500 a well to a corporate total of \$10,000 per company. That amount was insignificant in terms of the covering costs of completion, suspension, or abandonment of a well. Increasing the deposit to cover potential costs could well prohibit smaller companies from participating in the industry. These deposits could be applied to completion, suspension, or abandonment of wells, and the ERCB is empowered to pay for such activity and recover the expenses from sale of production or from licence fees or from a deposit. In most cases, if the well has value, the licensee will perform the work and absorb the costs themselves.

An abandonment fund was established to abandon orphan wells, primarily those drilled early in the development of the industry in Alberta. Because of a problem of abandonment of wells when oil prices fell in 1986, we've established an ERCB industry task force to examine how to deal with these abandoned wells and problems related to that. These would be wells that had been abandoned when companies were in receivership or disappeared or surrendered their leases on the wells.

Another amendment relates to moving a regulation-making power from a general regulatory power provision to a specific

one in the Act.

The next area relates to hearings. There are several sections in the Act that require hearings of the ERCB, which result in superfluous hearings to prove such things as a name change or a rescindment of an order where all of the participants are in favour. The practice has been -- not only the practice, the requirement has been that the ERCB would have to have a hearing in those cases when everybody was agreed to the result. The change in no way excludes a person from calling a hearing. The ERCB is still required to post a notice so anyone directly or adversely affected could intervene and trigger a hearing.

The final amendment, Mr. Speaker, relates to what is called a rateable take order. It's an order limiting production of gas from a pool. This is clarification that an order can be for equity or market demand reasons.

Those are the number of amendments related to the Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the minister indicated in his introductory remarks, this Bill is really quite highly technical in nature, and so I propose to suspend any judgment that I might make about that Bill until we've had further opportunity to examine it in somewhat greater detail during Committee of the Whole stage. Also, I'd like to advise the minister that I've yet to receive any representation with respect to this Bill from the industry itself, and I'll try to seek their point of view before we get into Committee of the Whole.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 20 read a second time]

Bill 4
Energy Resources Conservation
Amendment Act, 1988

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 4, the Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1988.

What this does, Mr. Speaker, is adjust three things: it changes the timing of installment payments from the Treasurer to the ERCB; secondly, it provides for records retention consistent with practice in other governmental agencies; and thirdly, it will provide a mechanism for enforcement of local intervenor's costs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I suspend judgment on this Bill until after we get through Committee of the Whole stage. I note the points that the Member for Red Deer-South just made, and I would seek at that time further clarification as to just why those funding dates have been changed and what the implication of repealing section 24 is. Apparently, this section requires the board to keep records of business transacted and accounts and records of the financial business of the board, and it's being changed to make it comply with other legislation. What legislation, and why?

The same thing with respect to section 26. It deals with records, photographs. And that's repealed because apparently it, too, is in conflict with other legislation. Again: what legisla-

tion? In that context, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to find out just how it is that the public can be assured, in light of these changes, that proper records are being kept.

Section 31 is added to provide enforcement of costs provided to intervenors through the courts. I think that's an important provision in legislation. I've had the experience of appearing before the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the Public Utilities Board, and I must say that unless you're a lawyer with a considerable degree of background or you have a lot of technical expertise, it's very difficult to make a public interest appearance at these hearings. I'd just like to suggest -- and perhaps this is not particularly the right Bill in which to make this suggestion -- but in any event, I'd like to see some kind of funding provided so that consumer groups could have effective representation at these hearings in the future.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too just want to echo my concerns, given the brief overview by the member introducing Bill 4. Perhaps he can take these questions into account when he comes to closing debate here on second reading.

The legislation of section 24 gives the direction to the board to maintain in its office

full and complete accounts and records of all the financial business of the Board.

We see now that the Act in front of us repeals that requirement. It seems to me that's a fairly dramatic move to be taken, at least on the surface, that the board is no longer required to keep in its office those records -- I don't understand why that should be repealed or might be repealed -- as well as the minutes of the business transacted at its meetings, because I don't know what the implications are, then, in terms of public accessibility to those accounts and records of the financial business of the board, whether the repeal of this section in any way jeopardizes the public's right to know or any individual member of the public's right to know. These are the kinds of questions that come to mind when we see that this section is being repealed, and I would seek from the member introducing the Bill some assurance that there is not going to be a loss of the public's right to know what the business of the board is and its financial accounting of the board. So if he'd address those.

As well, the repeal of section 26 is also contemplated by this Bill. I would like to know why that is, that reproduction of records which have been ordered by the board in this section -- why that power should be removed from the Energy Resources Conservation Act. I just would like a better and fuller explanation from the member. If he could do that in closing his debate here on second reading, it would be appreciated. I know we can get into more questions and answers in committee hearing, but it just raises some real questions of concern which I hope you'll address.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Comments by the hon. Member for Red Deer-South will close debate on this.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the concerns raised, first as it relates to timing, as it stands right now under section 19(3), the transfer of payments from Treasury to the ERCB occurs in April and again in January. Because

they're wailing until January of the following year, there is some concern that it could actually leave the ERCB with a shortfall of cash flow. So now it's being expedited and moved from January to July so they'll receive their two payments, one in April and one in July, as opposed to April and the following January.

In relation to records retention, the repeal of section 24, again this is to bring it into line with standard government practice under the Public Works, Supply and Services Act and the public works regulations. Basically, what these Acts and regulations do is they allow for the disposal of records subject to the approval of a committee. I should note that up until now the ERCB has continued to retain all records, many of which are no longer required. So the repeal of this section of the Act allows them to destroy records that are no longer required. I should note that all records of meetings, hearings, et cetera, will be retained indefinitely by the board and will not be destroyed. But there are some records that are redundant, and it's basically taking up space that doesn't need to be utilized. So subject to committee approval, they can then destroy some of the redundant paperwork.

Lastly again, Mr. Speaker, the last section related to enforcement. What this does is it allows intervenors' costs to be awarded and enforced, indeed, by Court of Queen's Bench, and they can actually have a judgment handed down through the courts as a result of that change.

[Motion carried; Bill 4 read a second time]

Bill 12

Professional and Occupational Associations Registration Amendment Act, 1988

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Professional and Occupational Associations Registration Amendment Act, I'd like to just start out by making very brief comments about the basic Act prior to commenting on the amendments themselves, because this particular Act is not perhaps the most famous of our pieces of legislation. I would like to give a little bit of background.

Mr. Speaker, the Act in question is umbrella legislation. It provides a structure under which many occupations and professions may register. It's very important also to note that it provides protection or right-to-title legislation and does not deal in that area of exclusive scope of practice.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, it was designed to fill a need deemed important by a number of occupations and professions to improve and maintain their practice and to police their own membership. Overall, of course, it was of importance to the government to have such legislation so that where the arrangements could be worked out with professions and occupations, there would be an Act in place to also protect the public interest in terms of certain types of services. Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed in Bill 12 give strength and substance to the disciplinary process provided for in the Act by way of allowing penalties to be imposed on those deemed to be in need of professional discipline.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

It's also important to note that it contains a second provision. This is a provision that at the second, or appeal stage -- and I emphasize at the second, or appeal stage -- for the levying of

costs, there is a provision that a claimant may be levied costs for an appeal deemed to be "frivolous or vexatious." Mr. Speaker, these provisions with respect to strengthening the disciplinary process are standard to our professional legislation in recent times. There are a number of recently dealt with professional Acts which have similar provisions, and it is a set of changes which have been requested by groups that are considering registration under this particular Act. They feel that there must be some strength or, if I might use the term, teeth in the legislation if this legislation is to be effective on behalf of the public and their own membership.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly complain about the provisions of this Act, because they parallel those in the Legal Profession Act and the Medical Profession Act and have been found to be reasonable over the years. I just had one question, which perhaps is more appropriate to committee stage, but since it's really the whole principle of this Bill anyway, I'll put it now. That is, suppose a complainant makes what turns out to be a very much unwarranted complaint and the professional complained against is cleared but has been put to considerable expense in the meantime. Is there some mechanism in the existing Act -- I've just only now had it brought to me -- to provide for the association to recompense, in their discretion of course, the professional who's been so unnecessarily put to this loss of time and expense?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the question that the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona raises is that -- in the existing Act there is nothing in the statute which would allow this compensation or support to be provided to the person deemed to be the victim of a frivolous or vexatious case. The precedent or the usual manner in which that type of situation is handled is through the regulations and bylaws of the professional association itself. I'm only familiar with one piece of professional legislation, Mr. Speaker, and that one is not yet proclaimed; that is, the Chartered Accountants Act, where it states right in the statute that the Institute of Chartered Accountants could reimburse the person complained against.

But in direct answer to the member's question, it is not specifically stated in the statute but is commonly dealt with in the bylaws of associations concerned.

[Ms Mjolsness rose]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member, but the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey has closed debate.

[Motion carried; Bill 12 read a second time]

Bill 17
Municipal District of Brazeau No. 77
Incorporation Act

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 17, Municipal District of Brazeau No. 77 Incorporation Act.

The purpose of this Act is to establish in the Drayton Valley

area a new municipal district in accordance with the wishes expressed by the people of that area in plebiscite. Mr. Speaker, this municipal district has been some time in coming. The residents have long expressed the desire to have a local government established close to them so that their needs could be best dealt with in close proximity to their government. The process has been a long one, and I would like to thank all of those from the surrounding communities who have participated and been so understanding in the establishment of this particular area. To the best of my knowledge this is the first time we have moved to incorporate a new municipal district in large part from existing municipal districts. Usually when we do this, it happens from an improvement district, and while that technically is taking place now, in fact we have, both with the counties of Parkland and Leduc, taken large parts of those areas to include in this, as well as some small additional portion from improvement district No. 14.

Just briefly for members, I'll outline the recent history of the establishment of this area. There was a plebiscite held initially, which led to the establishment of improvement district No. 222 on December 31, 1987, and then a series of open houses with the assistance of reports from Municipal Affairs and from Education that were held for the people of the area in order to make them aware of the various information on which they could base their decision as to whether or not they wanted to join the new municipal district. That led to a vote in a number of areas that had expressed initial interest in March of this year, and as a result of that vote the boundaries for the new municipal district have been established.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that that's never an easy process. There are always people on one section of a vote to be taken who feel they should be together with another voting division. There are always some individuals in parts of the area who either want to be in or out of a new district. But we have decided that almost entirely we would go with the area defined by the vote. The one very small exception to that is an area known as Tomahawk south, which will go back to the county of Parkland. The people in that area have indicated the desire for that to happen, and the boundary would make it consistent with that of the education boundary involved and therefore be a logical outcome of the vote itself. The effect of the Bill, if passed, will be to establish the new municipal district on July 1 of this year with the boundaries outlined. Then on December 31 of this year territory from Leduc would be annexed to the new municipal district in accordance with the vote, and those would be basically the Breton rural areas and those known as the Moose Hills areas.

Mr. Speaker, we've gone through quite a series of negotiations with respect to employees, and I'm pleased to tell the House that those employees that are in the county of Parkland who service the area that is part of the new municipal district have all been now offered employment in one of the two areas, and that has been resolved. Negotiations are still taking place, and we will ensure that all employees and services will continue to be provided for the new areas to be annexed by the end of December.

Again, I would like to express my thanks to all of those involved but particularly the Associate Minister of Agriculture, who is the member of the Legislature for that area, who has worked long and hard for the establishment of this municipal district and who has advocated for it and negotiated with the residents of the area in reaching the conclusions that have been reached. I trust that once this new municipal district is estab-

lished, residents in that area will feel much more involved with their community.

I might say that it's intended that there be an election in the latter part of June for councillors for that area in that initially established district and then at a later time for the two areas to be annexed, so that, as quickly as possible, representative local government can be made available to this new municipal district joining the family of municipalities in the province of Alberta.

With those few comments I would ask for support on second reading of Bill 17.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to only take a few moments to make a few comments relative to this Bill. I have no particular objections to it as presented. However, I thought I might make some comments and maybe reflect some of the observations that have been brought forward to my attention as a result of the process, I think it was, that was involved towards the implementation of this Bill, rather than the Bill itself.

I agree with the minister: it's not easy, an undertaking of this nature. You certainly are going to find pockets within an area that are going to have difficulty in accepting a change, because perhaps there is some impact on the particular community or group of people that the change will affect. So you'll have to deal with this on kind of a slow, long process. I guess it was a slow, long process. However, I'm pleased to see that the Bill is finally before us.

If I may say, I think the comments that were passed on to me were that while the Bill, as it is now, is acceptable, they are quite pleased that the minister, in the final analysis, and the department were able to make the modification amendments to the original proposal to accommodate those who felt this had to be readressed. That was done. However, it seems like the process itself perhaps needs some addressing, tightening up. I think the involvement of various department people -- the impression I get is that they did not necessarily totally work with and cooperate with and adhere to the kinds of wishes of the various groups within that particular municipality. There seemed to be, at least the impression was left, that: "We know what needs to be done. We know how it's going to be done. So don't sort of confuse us with facts." Those are the kinds of comments that I heard. I think if that is the case, then surely the minister may want to know that and perhaps look at the process as to how these things occur. Obviously, this is a unique situation. It was different because of the complexities of the creation of this municipality. So it's taken, perhaps, some very determined positions on both sides: both the department and those involved in the process.

Education was also an important component in the overall structuring of the boundaries and so on. So that also had an impact and some determining on the length it took to get this thing resolved. Of course, one of the major concerns, I believe, was in fact educational and the boundaries. I wonder why we don't reinstitute the boundaries commissions, which I think at one time functioned in this province to deal with the establishment of boundaries, rather than having your department doing that sort of work. Perhaps it might expedite the process, and it may sort of move the department at arm's length from the structuring of boundaries and may perhaps make it more acceptable to the communities involved.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, I think the Bill is well received, and again I think primarily because people were listened to in the final analysis, various amendments were made, changes were made to accommodate those who had differences with the Bill. I have no difficulty and this caucus has no difficulty in supporting this Bill.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a couple of comments and thank the minister for his work in working through this difficult process, and the department for the work that they've done in terms of doing the studies and getting the facts and figures together and working with the people of all of the communities in developing the new municipal district of Brazeau.

I'd also like to thank the Minister of Education for appointing a committee which did an external study of the whole area. I think the study was very useful and will be put to good use in the longer term. This has been a long-standing issue in the Drayton Valley area. I believe it goes back to about 1958, and on an ongoing basis there have been petitions and people working for the past 17 years to come to some conclusion on local government and autonomy. I am sure that this will result in a more responsive government. Certainly it will result in a government which is much closer to the area. One of the problems, Mr. Speaker, is that the municipal governments have been at some distance. It's the equivalent of Edmonton actually being governed by Red Deer. That's the distance involved. So I'm sure that people are very happy to have this Bill introduced, and I know that there's wide support for it in the Drayton Valley constituency. My compliments to the minister.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the minister close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly. In closing debate on Bill 17, I appreciate the helpful comments from the Member for Edmonton-Beverly. I believe that the department was as sensitive in this issue as at all possible. If the member has any specific recommendations with respect to how we could be more sensitive in the future or how the system could work better, I'd much appreciate that. The suggestion of a boundaries commission, I suppose, is one we can always look at in the future. It was felt in this case that there was indeed a closer and more direct, democratic involvement through the plebiscite process in what we did accomplish. But that's a helpful suggestion for future possible incorporations.

Again, just my thanks to the associate minister for her kind words and for all of those who were involved, surrounding MLAs for the various areas for their involvement and understanding. The difficult negotiation process, as well, should be recognized, and I would do that in closing second reading debate on this Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 17 read a second time]

Bill 24

Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1988

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce the

Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1988, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker, this Act is introduced as a result of a recommendation that was made by the Auditor General in the 1986 report to the Legislature, where the Auditor General was concerned that at some time the advances made to the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation could exceed the amount permitted in the Hail and Crop Insurance Act. Therefore, these amendments are in keeping with the Auditor General's request to make those changes.

There are two areas where changes are made. First, in respect to premiums, prior to the introduction of this amendment the government could advance up to \$30 million to the crop insurance corporation. That advance has been increased to \$60 million. The second one is in respect to indemnities. Prior to the introduction of this Bill the advance outlined in the Act was \$50 million. That's been increased to \$100 million.

Mr. Speaker, these advances will be repaid on a quarterly basis by the federal government. It would be unusual, I think, for that amount of money to be outstanding, but this year we may be looking at something in the neighbourhood of the amount that's in the Bill. Actually, the provincial government pays the federal government's share of the premiums, and then those premium advances are repaid to the Provincial Treasurer. In fact, if you look at -- no, that's in the committee study. I believe that it also allows for a reinsurance fund to be established.

I recommend, Mr. Speaker, second reading of this Bill to the Assembly.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've studied the Act fairly closely and find it to be much as the minister describes: a fairly straightforward Bill that changes some of the fiscal arrangements that the corporation has with the government, that will likely facilitate a smoother operation of the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation in terms of its interaction with the federal government and certainly with the contract holders, the farmers in the province of Alberta.

I hope that during subsequent discussion of the Bill the minister will explain to me why section 3 is being repealed and replaced with a new section. If I might read that for members, section 3 presently reads that

the head office of the corporation shall be situated in Calgary or some other place that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time, by order, designate.

That's being changed to:

The head office of the corporation shall be situated at a location within the Province as designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

It seems to me that in saying that it shall be located in Calgary or some other place, one would expect that would be in the province of Alberta. It isn't very much of a change, but I'm sure hon. members from Calgary would like to know what the implications of that are and the minister would like to explain.

On a more serious note, the challenges that will confront the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation in a year like this, when we have a very serious drought through most parts of the province that is riding on the heels of a serious drought last year in some parts of the province, are enormous. I've been encouraged by comments I've heard from both ministers about their willingness to try and adapt to the changing demands of the agriculture

industry in terms of crop insurance, whether or not people will be able to seed. Our colleague from Bow Valley certainly raised a lot of good points in question period today about seeding deadlines and whether or not people who decide not to seed because to do so wouldn't produce a crop and would only encourage wind erosion and stuff would be considered in some way. They're difficult problems, but I'm confident that there will be some ways to deal with them in the future.

It's not included in this Act, but I would hope that the minister would be able to take some action on a proposal that we in the New Democrats have made on a number of occasions, indeed something we campaigned on. I believe it was something that was proposed in the review conducted by the minister of the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation, and that is that a disaster assistance fund that is something over and above crop insurance be put in place so that it could be relied upon to provide the kind of extraordinary assistance to producers in various parts of the province when need is demonstrated. We do have, Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members will recognize, situations that occur from time to time that are most unfortunate and that cause distress to farmers, be they crop producers or livestock producers, that go beyond the kind of coverage that can normally be expected from an all-risk kind of crop insurance program or forage insurance program that's now been developed, a kind of program that would be there to kick in in the case of severe flooding of the Pembina River valley for example, severe drought in the Two Hills-St. Paul area, certainly droughts that are experienced from time to time in southern Alberta. Perhaps we might have an experience again where crops of canola would be ravaged by the bertha armyworm. Knock on wood, that's not happened since 1972, but it could happen again.

I'm just suggesting that what we need to have in place is an ongoing disaster assistance fund that could be relied upon in these extraordinary circumstances, Mr. Speaker, so that the considerations that are made about how to respond to those dire emergencies aren't political ones. I'm not suggesting that they've been politically motivated in the past, but we need to remove any fear about that sort of thing so that we can have a program that's there on sound footing and ready to respond when the need arises. That being said, the minister can consider herself lobbied but certainly supported on Bill 24.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, I'd just like to add my comments briefly, Mr. Speaker, to commend the minister. I take it that the changes that are being brought forward stem from the report from the Auditor General, 1986-87, which indicated previous years' special warrants. He had some concerns that they didn't properly fit the legislative authority or mandate under the existing Act, and I'd just like to commend the minister for adopting the recommendations recommended by the Auditor General.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Question?
Minister.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great deal of pleasure to sum up this Bill. I might say that I would like to respond to a couple of the comments from the Member for Vegreville, even though I think they are a little outside of second reading of the Bill. But I would give the hon. member the assurance that we are looking at crop insurance in terms of the

drought, I think, in a manner using good sense, good husbandry, and soil conservation. I think those three terms would give the essence of the terms in which I would want the corporation to look at the crop insurance Act and the farming practices of the people who may have problems with dry weather.

The hon. Peter Trynchy, who is chairman of the crop insurance board, is working very hard. I've also had a call to John Wise on Wednesday about this very issue to ensure that the policy we use in the crop insurance corporation does ensure that farmers use the best husbandry and soil conservation practices possible.

The member mentioned crop disaster insurance, and we do have a disaster insurance program in Canada under the Minister of the Environment, and that triggers when there is any disaster which is of a magnitude that normal funding and insurance does not cover. We did also look at the prairie grain revenue insurance, which I think maybe the member was also alluding to, and it does not at this point in time look to be practical. Aside from that, the federal government considers crop insurance to be disaster insurance; therefore, any subsequent disaster insurance for a major disaster would have to come under the Canadian disaster insurance fund, under the auspices of the Minister of the Environment.

I appreciate the support of the member and all members on this Bill and hope that members will support it.

[Motion carried; Bill 24 read a second time]

Bill 26
Motor Vehicle Administration
Amendment Act, 1988

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 26, the Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, on more of a personal thought, it's of interest for me to note that it was just over one year ago today that I had the opportunity of introducing a private member's motion calling for harsher penalties and a more effective means of dealing with impaired drivers and, in particular, repeat offenders. So I am delighted this afternoon to be able to bring forward the government initiatives in Bill 26.

Although I am delighted to bring forward the initiatives, Mr. Speaker, I take no delight in terms of the situation that's calling for these initiatives to be brought forward. I've never lost a child or a parent or a loved one or even a friend as a result of an impaired driver, and I can only speculate on how I might feel had that been the situation. But I do know that I have some very strong feelings about this particular situation as a result of media: as a result of reading newspapers, watching news on TV. And time and time and time again we see lives lost as a result of impaired drivers. This senseless, thoughtless, callous act leaves a long, long trail of human carnage and a long, long trail of loss and suffering.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of attending, along with the Attorney General, a candlelight service organized by a group called PAID, People Against Impaired Drivers. It was a memorial service in recognition of family members and Mends and loved ones who were lost as a result of impaired drivers. The human toll, the sense of loss, the heartache, and the anguish on the faces of the people attending that service that evening couldn't help but have an impact on you. It was a heart-wrenching situation to be a part of. I know that in discuss-

ing it with the Attorney General afterwards, we felt that it might be appropriate for anybody who has actually been charged with or convicted of impaired driving to take in a service like that and just see the long-lasting impact.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans are fed up. Clearly, they are fed up with irresponsible people who continue to drink too much and then drive. Now, I recognize that legislation alone cannot resolve this problem. It really requires a three-pronged attack: education, legislation, and a willingness on the part of the judicial process to enforce the legislation. I again might just comment on the tremendous work that AADAC and REID and PAID are doing on the education side.

Mr. Speaker, again I'm delighted to be bringing forward this morning for second reading what I consider to be a very progressive and most appropriate amendment to the existing legislation. The amendments in Bill 26 provide penalties and sanctions that are considerably more severe than at present respecting persons who are convicted of impaired driving or driving while suspended, driving without insurance, or permitting someone who is suspended to drive one's vehicle while a person is under suspension. These measures are necessary to send strong signals to persons who drink and drive and to impress upon those who endanger the safety of Albertans who use our highways and streets that their disregard for the law will not be tolerated.

The proposed amendments to the Motor Vehicle Administration Act will also permit the police, judges, and motor vehicle administrators to be more effective in carrying out their responsibilities in relation to the stated objectives of this legislative initiative and related program initiatives. The amendments will also permit Albertans who have had their licence suspended as a result of an accumulation of demerit points to apply and, if criteria are met, to have their licences reinstated conditionally in those cases where a loss of licence would impose a serious economic or other hardship on the family. These conditional licences, however, will not apply to suspensions that have resulted for impaired driving or other Criminal Code offences, such as dangerous driving.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are most necessary and most timely, and I would encourage all members of the Assembly to support them. If there's ever been a truly nonpartisan initiative that is in the interest of all Albertans and worthy of support of all members of this Assembly, these amendments have to be those. Again, I encourage all members to support the amendments proposed in Bill 26.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

With respect, hon. member, could we have unanimous consent of the House to introduce special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.
Leader of the Opposition.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS
(reversion)

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to welcome Jay Cowan, who is a former member of the Executive Council of the Manitoba government, also one of the returning MLAs from the New Democratic

Party, and now the House Leader. I'm sorry I don't know the names of his family, but I would ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Second Reading)

Bill 26
Motor Vehicle Administration
Amendment Act, 1988
(continued)

MR. WRIGHT: I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with everything that has fallen from the hon. Member for Red Deer-South. It's not a terribly common thing I can say, but I'm very glad to say it. These are harsh measures taken to address a severe problem. They override what most people will consider to be some aspects of personal liberty but for a good purpose, and I agree about the nonpolitical and bipartisan effort that must be made.

In committee stage, Mr. Speaker, we'll doubtless go through some of the details to make sure that both sides are adequately protected. There are some elements in it which require some scrutiny, but in general, the principle and the thrust of it are good, and we stand behind it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to get up and support the Bill introduced by the Member for Red Deer-South. In 1983 I introduced Bill 201, An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicle Administration Act, which had very, very similar aspects to this Act. I remember that the Deputy Speaker of the House called me draconian for daring to impose such harsh penalties on the public because of drunken driving.

So I'm really pleased that the member introduced it and that the Solicitor General had the courage to bring this amendment to caucus. Albertans support stronger penalties, and I have long said that the only way to solve the problem of drinking and driving is for it to become publicly unacceptable for someone to drink and drive. Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is happening, and I endorse this Bill and am very pleased to see it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Lethbridge-West, followed by Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support Bill 26 in principle. My views with regard to impaired driving, I think, over the years have become very well known. The hon. Associate Minister of Agriculture mentioned a moment ago terms I used with regard to a motion, I believe it was, that the hon. member had on the Order Paper a few years ago. I didn't think it was right then, and I'm not all convinced that it's right today.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the annual report of the hon. Solicitor General just tabled in the House, and it's reality that in Alberta -- we're not England; we're not Toronto -- four wheels is an essential way of life. You must have a motor vehicle virtually to do anything, even in the capital city if you work at certain packing plants. Mr. Speaker, I simply refer to the annual report submitted. There were 2 million licence plates issued in this province last year. We don't have that many people of legal age to drive, in my opinion, so there's a multiplicity of vehicles. That's a reality. In terms of operating licences, there are 2 million operator's licences issued in this province under a class 5,

the type that's most commonly used. It's a reality that people are going to drive.

What we must do, and I insist that we continue to address ourselves to the fact, is to support organizations like PAID, like MADD, like these volunteer organizations who have taken a strong stand, that we continue to fund AADAC. AADAC has a marvelous track record.

We have been one of the few provinces that have not had conditional licensing. Surely that time has arrived. If a man has to choose between working for a living, even though he's suspended, or going on social allowance, we know what he's going to do. He has pride in his family, so he continues to drive. So it's a welcome sign to see that the government is supporting conditional licensing for those who have lost their licences.

Mr. Speaker, I think many of us at the time decided about the refusal to blow. That's self-incrimination. Since when, under our parliamentary system or judicial system, have we said, "You must testify against yourself." That was not easy for me as a legislator to swallow: forcing you to blow or giving you a penalty for refusing to blow. But I, along with others, accepted it on the basis that some 3,000 Canadians are killed annually regarding impaired driving. That's like the equivalent of a hundred flights of Time Air, which some members are familiar with. If that happened in this country, the world would stop until we resolved it but we've never had the same courage to deal with impaired driving.

The blood testing obviously is an invasion of privacy in terms of invasion medicine, as hon. doctors are well aware. That was not an easy pill to swallow when the government of Canada came out with it, but it shows the seriousness with which I think most Canadians view the whole problem of impaired driving.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I support Bill 26 in principle, but there are parts of that Bill I simply caution hon. members to be aware of. Unless this government is prepared to commit funds, substantial funds, to end impaired driving through legislative and enforcement measures, I question whether it's even going to happen. So I simply close by saying that in principle I support the Bill. There are many parts of that Bill that I frankly don't feel very strong in support of, and undoubtedly we'll deal with those at committee stage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that I was able to listen to the Member for Lethbridge-West, because I think that his comments are indicative of a person who has contemplated both sides of this issue in a fairly in-depth fashion. He made a comment with respect to: I don't know if we will ever be able to stop this problem. I often have reason to wonder if we can stop a lot of the problems that we have on the face of this planet.

I have the experience of having lived in Britain and visited in Europe some -- geez, it's a long time ago now -- nine years and eight years ago. I was pleasantly surprised. I left this province in 1979. We were in the height of the boom years, and it was unbelievably common to watch people go into lounges after work, not just on the weekends but during the week days, and come out pie-eyed and get into their cars and drive around. In those days people had a lot of money, and they were driving fancy cars with big engines and, you know, sort of modern-looking bodies on them. People were just by and large not paying attention to the fact that they were dangerous when they were on the road. I had felt some alarm myself over that, and

I'd even gotten to the point where I didn't like to drive too late on Friday and Saturday evenings because of the drunks, right? I'd try to get home early if I had to be out, because I didn't want to be on the road with those people. I didn't want them to kill me.

Then I went to Britain, and I got my eyes opened. I don't know how those people did it, and I don't know how the Europeans did it. I don't know if it was a Bill like this or if it was a series of campaigns to educate the public or if it was a combination of everything. But, by God, those people will not drink and drive. They are terrified of it. Now, they've got a lot more traffic. The United Kingdom is a very dense country, as you know, and they do have stiff penalties; I do know that. In West Germany, for instance, you cannot have a modicum of registrable blood alcohol and drive at the same time. Period. You cannot have a blood alcohol level that is registrable and be driving legally. You know, these countries have made it a top priority that those who drive on the roads are entitled to the best amount of safety. Those of us who walk on the roads are entitled to that, and every citizen has the responsibility to uphold those predominant mores.

So having been through that experience, Mr. Speaker, having seen societies that really do not tolerate it, societies that are very careful to take taxis when they want to be out drinking, that are very careful to designate a driver who won't drink, that simply won't get in the car if they think they're even close to the legal limit -- and some of those legal limits are much less than ours, and in some instances, as I've said, there's no such thing as a legal limit; it is all prohibited -- I think it is time that we did the same thing here.

I live and work in the downtown area. I have to be on streets such as 97th, 96th, and 95th streets in Edmonton very commonly. Those are heavy traffic routes, just as is Jasper Avenue, and I'm frequently driving on Jasper Avenue. Anyway, all throughout the downtown area, wherever you've got a main artery, all you have to do is be on that main artery a couple of times a day and you're bound to see somebody who's been drinking and driving. You can tell them a mile away.

I'm afraid of eroding civil liberties, as is the Member for Lethbridge-West, and at the same time I recognize the need to make this issue a broad social issue. It seems to me that if you put the advertising campaigns and the support for alcoholism correction and Solicitor General type campaigns and this Bill together, it would be nice if five, 10 years from now the member could stand in his place and say, "There's no need for this Bill anymore, and I recommend that we repeal the Act." But for now, Mr. Speaker, I'm one of the people who stands with the member sponsoring the Bill.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I'd first of all like to

offer my congratulations to the hon. member for not only having initiated the member's resolution in a previous sitting but for having, as a result of that process, convinced the government to proceed with this as a government Bill.

I don't want to repeat all the same arguments that the members have been making this afternoon, but I'd just like to say that I think we're all concerned about civil liberties. No one is denying that people have the right to drive if they're properly qualified, and no one loses the right to drink provided they meet the minimum age requirements. But, Mr. Speaker, when you take one right and combine it with another -- I don't think any one of us believes that you have the right to endanger the safety of others by being impaired when in the operation of a motor vehicle. I mean, two rights. I suppose, sometimes do make a wrong, if you look at it in that sense.

I'd just say that I commend the member for having been able to get the government to see the merit in the proposal. I also note that the amendment that was put forward by the Official Opposition at the time the member's resolution was discussed and debated in this Legislature has also been reflected in the Bill that's before us, and that is that there's provision to allow for extenuating family circumstances to be considered at the time the immobilization of a vehicle is being ordered or being considered by the courts.

So I think that all the way around, the general direction given by the Legislature when the motion was debated earlier has been reflected in the Bill. I think it's all part of the healthy process of what's best about this place when it works well. That is that when government listens to the different points of view that are expressed and reflects those in legislation, it means good legislation is brought forward, and I commend the member for doing that.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a call for the question. Member, summation.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to thank all the members who participated in the debate this afternoon for their thoughtful and supportive comments and now ask for the question.

[Motion carried; Bill 26 read a second time]

[At 12:56 p.m., pursuant to Government Motion 14, the House adjourned to Wednesday, May 25, 1988, at 2:30 p.m.]