

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, June 3, 1988 10:00 a.m.**  
Date: 88/06/03

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

We give thanks to God for the rich heritage of this province as found in our people.

We pray that native-born Albertans and those who have come from other places may continue to work together to preserve and enlarge the precious heritage called Alberta.

Amen.

## head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 42

## Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 1988

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 42, Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 1988. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill amends five different Acts: the Mines and Minerals Act, the Natural Gas Marketing Act, the Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Act, the Petroleum Marketing Act, and the Take-Or-Pay Costs Sharing Act. The principles of the Bill generally relate to the following: one, providing flexibility in lease continuations and enables the use of an average price to value the Crown royalty share of gas; it ensures take-or-pay levy is applied to Alberta gas delivered to the TransCanada PipeLines system outside of Alberta; and consolidates the flow-back and the market development incentive program funds for payout and allows government to take the royalty share. In addition, it strengthens audit powers and clarifies matters of administration.

[Leave granted; Bill 42 read a first time]

## Bill 46

## Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1988

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 46, the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1988.

This Bill has two essential elements to it. The first element is to allow us to improve the way in which we invest the funds under the administration of the Treasury Department to improve the rate of return and to ensure that it's contemporary practice with that practice being done in other portfolio management arrangements. The second element and the more substantive issue is to increase the borrowing capacity of the province from \$6.5 billion to \$7.5 billion. This increase is done annually, as you well know, and of course is in line with the forecast financial plan of this government, carrying us through to approximately

the summer of 1989.

Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of this Bill.

[Leave granted; Bill 46 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a copy of a letter from the research director of the Alberta Weather Modification Co-op, mailed some time ago to the Premier and which the Premier has assured the House that his staff could not find. So I thought I'd help out here.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, two constituents from Vermilion: Mrs. Elsie Little -- significant to note that Mrs. Little and her family have served the province of rural Alberta in the operation of their family farm implement dealership and agribusiness for 48 years. With the advent of Senior Citizens' Week next week I think it's proper for us to acknowledge the contributions and the building of the foundation of this province by our seniors. She is accompanied by her daughter-in-law Mrs. Lynne Little, and I would ask them to stand in the public gallery and receive the warm welcome of this House.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure for me today to be able to introduce a class from the *Dr. Elliott* school in Linden. The teacher Mr. Herb Heidebrecht has made a policy of bringing his young grade 6 class up to the Legislature, and I can assure the hon. members from visiting the Linden school that we have very bright students and a very dedicated teacher in this case. They are accompanied today by Allan and Lois Becker, John and Lucie Vanderlaak, and Tony Seiler, and a special young lady who came from my hometown and this morning delivered a little speech in front of the group that relayed some information about me that I'm not sure too many people would have. So I think we want to have her leave the Assembly early and not share it with too many people. I'd like the Assembly to welcome them, and I'd ask them to rise.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, a group of grades 5 and 6 students from the C.J. Peacock school in Cereal, located in the constituency of Chinook. All students and all schools are special to us, but this school is particularly special to me because it is named after my late father. These students are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ched Simmons, parents Bill and Joanne Barrack and Sharon Barrack, and their bus driver Mr. Bill O'Neill. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly, 46 bright and cheery grade 6 students from the St. Joseph school in Spruce Grove. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Denis MacNeil, Mrs. Edith Cole, and a parent Mrs. Pat Fraser. I ask that our guests, who are situated in the public gallery, stand and receive the warmest welcome of this

Assembly.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me this morning to introduce to you and through you, 28 bright young grade 6 students from Spirit River elementary school in the wonderful constituency of Dunvegan. They are accompanied this morning by their teacher Leon Tkachyk and parents Edie Johnson, Jacquelyn Peterson, and Helen Bertrand. They are seated in the members' gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Community Crime Prevention**

MR. MARTIN: To the Solicitor General. Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition is very concerned about the safety and security of our citizens in Alberta, especially the inner-city region of the provincial capital. The latest crime statistics show significantly high levels of types of crime, specifically in the city of Edmonton. These include crimes of violence, property-related offences, and drug offences. My question to the Solicitor General. Does he still stand by his statement that Edmonton streets are safe and that these latest crime statistics don't show any difference in that, or is he now concerned, and are we going to shake the complacency of this government in this matter?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, in question period of a couple of weeks ago this topic was up and the accuracy of the Member for Edmonton-Norwood was about the same as it is today. The violent crimes in Alberta generally have decreased 2.3 percent. I don't think any level of crime is acceptable to this side of the House or that side, but it happens to be a fact of life from time immemorial.

The Statistics Canada results that were published yesterday: I think we could use the adage that you can make statistics say whatever you want, but you have to get to the root of how they're compiled to find out whether they're accurate or not. In this particular instance they're not accurate because the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary report crimes on a significantly different basis. In the city of Calgary a crime is reported and when a call comes in, it's out and investigated. If there's justification, a charge is laid. That's marked down as being a crime statistic. In the city of Edmonton, upon receipt of a call of complaint it's registered as a crime statistic. Obviously, that would have a substantially different view as to what is a crime and what is not. I might give robbery as an example, which is considered a violent crime. In Calgary there were 591 cases reported, 468 of which were charged. In Edmonton there were 1,082 registered; 364 were charged. That was for the year 1987. I could give other examples.

This government has a great concern about the level of crime, and we have many instances and programs that are used to combat it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, by those answers that's the most complacent, arrogant argument I've ever heard. If the minister doesn't think this is a serious problem, he should come into my riding and talk to the people there. My question is: from the minister's answer, to make sure that it's clear, is he saying specifically that these figures are all lies and that crime is not a significant problem in this city?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, in the last question period where this was brought up . . . I'll use the same comment. The hon. member should take his earplugs out. I just said crime is very, very serious. He asked me if the statistics that were out there indicated that Edmonton had a far higher problem than Calgary. I indicated that they don't have that much greater. I still don't disagree that crime is a problem, and we're working on it. But it's a problem that's been with us from time immemorial. The statistics I've just indicated also indicate a 2.3 percent decrease in violent crimes. I can give him some further statistics that show that Edmonton is not that disparate from Calgary statistics.

MR. MARTIN: Well. Mr. Speaker, the backbenchers can pound, but I'll tell you: the people of Alberta are watching the minister in these answers.

My question to the Solicitor General. He said, and I quote from *Hansard*, May 19: "I think it's an affront to the people of Alberta to try and raise up that there is a problem with crime." If these new crime statistics that are brought out, no matter how he wants to report them, don't show that there's a serious problem with crime, I want to know from this minister: what do they show?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that *Hansard* in front of me, but I'm sure that if he took the sentences around that particular comment in context, I do agree that crime is a problem. I do agree that new initiatives are needed. At that particular time I think, if he looked in *Hansard*, I reiterated -- and I say reiterate, not just iterate -- a number of initiatives that have been taken. I think the neighbourhood police patrol in the city of Edmonton is a significant step towards bringing the community together with the police force to affront this problem. I think the number of volunteers who work with the police forces in block watch, Neighbourhood Watch, rural patrol, Range Patrol, indicate that a lot of people think it's a concern, and everybody's trying to work to solve this.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I guess I shouldn't quote the minister's own words, because it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General has said that there's not a problem with provincial funding. This is where I want to get into it specifically, because as I understand it, the cutbacks didn't really affect much because we weren't giving them enough money to begin with. So it really was not significant. My question to the Solicitor General: would the Solicitor General perhaps agree that this is precisely the problem, that the province is not providing enough money, or it's not even providing any leadership in this area?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, in the budget of 1988-89 the municipal police assistance grants, which are given on a per capita grant, were increased 1 percent from last year. I will also acknowledge, to save the hon. member getting up, that we had a reduction in that the year before. But those reductions did not affect one municipal police force by more than .5 of 1 percent. Take Edmonton, because again the hon. member is discussing Edmonton and his particular constituency: they have a budget of \$78 million. Our cutback in the municipal police assistance grants have not -- and I have concurrence from the Police Commission and from the police chief -- been, overall, significant in

the operation's effect. However, we have recognized that policing is important and have increased it. The RCMP budget was increased 6.5 percent this year, and I'm sure that if the hon. member was listening during the estimates, he would have had that indication.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. Supplementary, Calgary-North West, followed by Calgary-Buffalo.

DR. CASSIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Solicitor General. We recognize there may be a number of problems in the constituency of Edmonton-Norwood, but is the responsibility of policing in that constituency a responsibility of the province or the city of Edmonton?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, there are 11 municipalities around the province that have decided to form their own police forces, and under the police commission in those particular municipalities their police force is operated and funded with the assistance of the province. The other areas: if you're over a population of 5,000, you have your municipal police force, if you don't decide to have your own, with the RCMP. Any community over 1,500 is to have their own contract with it. Those particular cases, other than where you have your own contract, are funded by the province. In the situation at Edmonton the Edmonton Police Commission willingly, gladly takes the responsibility for operating the Edmonton city police department.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo, supplementary.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. To the Solicitor General or the Attorney General or possibly supplemented by the Attorney General. It's becoming frighteningly common for knives to be used in bars and street altercations, and this is causing many citizens to become very, very frightened. I'm wondering whether the Solicitor General and the Attorney General can give us a report on exactly what they're doing with respect to attempting to control this increasing problem. They've indicated that they have been in . . .

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, déjà vu. It was the same day that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood raised the policing that we had the same question on the knives, and the answer in that short thing is about the same. We are surveying other jurisdictions to find if someone has come up with an innovative way on how you police. You can pass a law saying a knife is not to be carried on your person, but it's very, very difficult to detect them. We realize the seriousness of knives and how they are being used, and we are working towards some sort of resolution to that problem.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

#### **Lubicon Band Land Claim**

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This mora-

ing my office contacted the office of the federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and I've learned that in regards to the Lubicon land claim Mr. McKnight stands by published comments that the Alberta Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

. . . has never imparted to me what took place at the meetings or how the tribunal would have been established.

He also stands by his statement that except for reports in the media he has never received any information about the Premier's proposal, not from the Prime Minister, the Premier, or the Alberta FIGA minister. I'd like to ask the Premier: did he ever instruct his Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs minister to present the proposal of a tribunal to the federal minister of Indian affairs?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, most members know, and there have been previous discussions about this matter. We have discussed how the provincial government have worked very hard to help the Lubicon Band in establishing their reserve, how we suggested that a tribunal would be an excellent way of dealing with matters that we're unable to resolve in straight negotiations, how we have discussed the matter with the federal government, both through ministers, through their lawyers, representatives, myself with the Prime Minister. There's been a considerable amount of discussion, and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and myself have worked closely together on it.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, did the Premier ever instruct his Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs minister to take the proposal of a tribunal, which was a positive proposal, we agree, and discuss that proposal specifically with the minister of Indian affairs? Did he ever issue that instruction?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I just answered the question in the first place. There's no question that the minister and myself have not only worked on the issue but have taken it to Ottawa and explained it to them. I find the hon. member now is into his best Perry Mason style: wouldn't you guess that there's a trick question coming?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, on May 6 the Premier told this Assembly:

I also had our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs discuss the matter with Mr. McKnight, and we are trying to convince the federal government that a tribunal system will work.

Can the Premier explain why his FIGA minister has failed to carry out the responsibility given to him of pushing this tribunal proposal with the federal minister of Indian affairs?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, he hasn't failed.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, then, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier now tell us in the Legislature this morning why Mr. McKnight cannot recollect ever being informed of this proposal by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly speak for Mr. McKnight. If the member wants to hear what Mr. McKnight's problems are, he should talk to him.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I did.

MR. GETTY: He did not.

AN HON. MEMBER: He talked to his office.

MR. GETTY: He talked to his office; what a lot of baloney.

If the hon. member wants to know the federal government's position, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here -- and I don't want to get in a position of having to table someone else's letter -- where it starts off, a full page, the Getty tribunal process and the federal government's response to it. Now, what a lot of baloney from the Member for Calgary-Mountain View. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Welcome to Friday morning.  
Westlock-Sturgeon, supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Lubicons must feel like they're caught in a revolving door. It would be nice if the Premier would table that letter.

But could the Premier now, after all this talking back and forth, call Mr. McKnight today? Then you could come in the House with no [inaudible]. Would he call him today and say, "Let's get going on it." Would he do that? Will he call him?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there's been considerable negotiation and discussion back and forth with the federal government. I want to again point out to the House and to the people of Alberta that the position of the Alberta government is -- and it's agreed with Chief Ominayak of the Lubicons -- that we established a relationship, that we were going to do what we felt was fair to assist the Lubicon Band in establishing an answer and a solution that is fair. Now, we've worked with them and the federal government to reach that position. We agreed to an interim reserve; we've committed to it. We agreed to move the location of the reserve to a location where the Lubicon Band would prefer. We agreed to that. We also agreed that we'd expand it to an even greater size to assist the Lubicons, because they feel that the interim reserve isn't big enough. We agreed to that, and we've also agreed that we're not going to enter into an arrangement with the federal government that the Lubicons don't think is fair. That is what we're going to do. They are Albertans; we're helping them, and if the federal government wants to take us to court for that reason, let them take us to court, and we'll fight them in court.

### Farm Debt Collection Policy

MR. TAYLOR: If that's help, I don't know what they do to their enemies.

My question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Agriculture in charge of chasing farmers off their land, Mr. Speaker. The farmers and cattlemen are busy fighting drought and poor prices and, of course, have been up to their armpits for the last while with agents of the Alberta government trying to foreclose, and if they're not foreclosing, then chasing them for the amount of the mortgage. In view of the fact that the recent federal court decision has said that the Queen's agents are no different from anyone else and cannot pursue farmers for any balance of mortgages owing after foreclosure, will the minister now order the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, and the hon. minister of our Treasury order the Treasury Branches, not to pursue or threaten farmers for further legal action after the land has been seized?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, we'll certainly take the member's question under advisement and look at the practices that ADC is following. I can assure the member that ADC never has under any circumstances looked at the personal covenants unless funds have been diverted that are ADC assets.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, personal covenants are what we're talking about. These farmers have got enough to put up with without having you people after them every day. Will the hon. minister present a proposal to the Treasurer asking that all those farmers who have been illegally threatened and have paid up money over and above their mortgage in the last three years just because we were off on the mistaken idea that you could pursue on a personal covenant -- will they get their money rebated now?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, ADC has only collected on six personal covenants in the past 14 years.

I might add that the kind of situation that the member is talking about -- an example is a loan that was made in 1981 for \$200,000. The total owing at the present date is \$386,000. The borrower has never paid one single cent. Mr. Speaker, I think we have an obligation to the people of Alberta and to the people who are making their payments to ensure that we try to treat all borrowers fairly, including the ones that are making those payments.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, that's a bunch of hooey. If we've even foreclosed on one person and chased him off to the ends of the earth for money, it's wrong, it's illegal, and it's immoral. Can she not make that promise now, to return to those farmers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's supplementary. Maybe we could have the question before the minister again, please, but just the question.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker; I'm getting worked up. But there's a lot of people out there who would like to lynch some of the Alberta government agents.

Will the minister promise now to return any funds that have now apparently been collected illegally on personal covenants from farmers and through the Treasury Branches and the Agricultural Development Corporation?

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for the Treasury Branches. In the second place, we will certainly look at it. In the third place, I'd like to quote from the hon. leader of the Liberal Party in a March 26, 1987, speech where he shows total disregard for personal obligations when he says:

Because a farmer, unlike a city slicker, when he goes under -- and I know; I've gone under in both areas, so I can you give some pretty good lessons on how to handle the sheriff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member has no regard for debt obligations and the ordinary citizen in terms of making the payments and in terms of recognizing those debt obligations.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, that's obviously a dried herring that she's trying to pull across the trail there. The fact of the matter is that this government is probably the . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question, question.

MR. TAYLOR: They sound like a bunch of frogs on lily pads there. Can I stop until they quit croaking?

MR. MARTIN: Just like Ottawa.

MR. TAYLOR: Just like Ottawa. I'm sorry; I have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps everybody could stop. Then we'll have the question without the comment. We went through this little exercise a while back, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister if she will immediately institute a practice of not foreclosing on any farmer south of the Peace River country because they are, obviously, in a drought area.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, Mr. Speaker. I just gave an illustration of the kinds of situation where we are . . . Someone who has had a debt obligation since 1981 and has made no payments in my mind is not a farmer.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I'm wondering if the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation without the protection of a personal covenant will be looking at changing its collection procedures on accounts and arrears to ensure that action is taken before a deficiency develops.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to say that ADC will make major changes in their collection procedures, but I would believe that in terms of prudent management we would ensure that we have adequate security and notation of that security.

MR. FOX: To the associate minister, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing that this decision indicates that the ADC has no legal or moral right to go after farmers for more than they've put up for security, will she instruct her agents in the ADC to cease their practice of harassing farmers with threats of further action and prolonging foreclosures to force these people to give up in frustration in their dealings with the ADC?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like to bring to my attention specific cases, I'd certainly be pleased to look at them. Because I don't believe that people are being harassed. We are trying to work through the debt situations of people who have serious problems, and I can assure the hon. member that in every case we will make sure that every borrower has every avenue of appeal open to him to ensure fair and just treatment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Could the Provincial Treasurer comment on this ruling in terms of Treasury Branch practices in the application of the law?

MR. JOHNSTON: That's a very good question, Mr. Speaker, in that it seems that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is suggesting that something inappropriate is being done with respect to the collection practices either in the Ag Development Corporation or in the Treasury Branches. The fundamental law of this province is, of course, that if an obligation is incurred, then those people who advance the money must take certain steps to ensure that collection practices are put in place. That is, in fact

what the law of this province is suggesting. That's the framework in which everybody accepts the operation.

Now, what has happened is that this government's responses have been to assist those farmers in a number of ways. The list is long. I know that just yesterday when we talked about providing additional money from the heritage fund to the Ag Development Corporation, the NDP opposition opposed it; the Liberal opposition was silent. But as usual they oppose this kind of a transfer. So we have assisted in a number of ways.

That's been a long debate that's taken place here. But coming back, fundamentally there's no doubt that we must pursue the legal claim, that the Treasury Branches in particular are very conscientious of the impact on the farmer with respect to the repossession of land and the need to take the claim back. In all cases I think they've been very generous with the kinds of settlements that have been worked out. It's been worked out Mr. Speaker, with the farmers across this province.

### Principal Group Inquiry

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. The Code inquiry continues, and it seems to be that there is not an end in sight. Could the minister indicate at this time what the projected cost of the inquiry would be, and are there further special warrants being contemplated?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd have to advise the Assembly that my best guess today is that the amount of money I have appropriated in the budget for '88-89 would not be adequate to cover the total costs of the Code inquiry. I haven't got a firm number that I can give, but given the rate at which the expenditures have taken place over the past few months, I think it's safe to say that we may have to go back and ask my colleagues to provide additional money to ensure that the Code inquiry is completed in its fullest context.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is there any indication at this time as to the length of that hearing, or does it seem to be infinite at this point?

MR. JOHNSTON: I hope not infinite, Mr. Speaker. I should say that the infinite wisdom came from, I guess, calling the inquiry, and it's our intention to ensure that that process is as full as possible. I can only say that it's now my best guess that the government ministers who are going to be involved, including myself, are now scheduled for sometime in the last half of August of this year. That incorporates an adjournment in the summer for a couple of weeks, but it would seem to me that if we can achieve the completion of the hearing process by the long weekend in September, we'll have done something significant.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. With regards to the billing practices or conditions for the various counsel, in issuing more funds towards the Code inquiry, would there be some revision of those billings that would be an encumbrance to the government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we use the normal kinds of professional practice in dealing with the rates. Those have been negotiated on an hourly basis. We have our own counsel ensuring that the appropriate times are reflected, and there's an opportunity for taxing back to the court if there's any doubt

about the appropriateness of the claims. Nonetheless, when Mr. Code and his counsel suggested that they would start the process at 1978, it was their judgment, not the government's judgment, that that would be an adequate program, an adequate period of time to review. But just recently new evidence has been introduced which would call for the inquiry to look back into the 1960s. If that's the wisdom of the Code inquiry, then that, of course, is appropriate and the government must in fact fund that. Obviously, the longer the period of time, the more the costs and, therefore, the longer the process will continue.

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

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Taking, then, the most optimistic time frame that the Treasurer was talking about, the Labour Day weekend, could he give us a ballpark figure, if that occurs, how much over budget we'll be this year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, that's a very difficult question. What is on the record and what is now a matter of fact and should be reinforced for the contract holders is that not only are we providing all the costs, providing as much possible investigative opportunity as we know of -- all files and documents have been turned over to the inquiry, and everyone in government has agreed to make themselves available. As the Premier pointed out yesterday, ministers will testify and provide confidential information about the way in which the cabinet has operated.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the additional costs which the government has incurred for such things as the Alberta portion of the liquidation of the two contract companies in particular is still unknown. That will be a significant dollar amount. Of course, anything the government pays in terms of the liquidation of that company is essentially a benefit to the contract holder. It's the same as a direct transfer to them. So all of these costs are very large. I would expect it would be impossible now to give any estimate because the testimony has now moved back a decade, if I look at the time frame, and therefore you can expect the costs to increase. It would be inappropriate for me to guess. The best I can say is that we'll have to come back for more money to ensure that the Code inquiry receives the fullest possible investigation.

MR. CHUMIR: Can the minister provide us any idea of the magnitude of the legal bills that have been tendered to the government by Mr. Cormie's lawyer, that the government has agreed to pay for?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't got that information, obviously. If I was to make a guess, I wouldn't be able to come close because Mr. Connie is now testifying and obviously there's a substantial cost imposed as a result of his testimony. I just can't give that information.

MR. SPEAKER: Vermilion-Viking, final supplementary, this topic.

DR. WEST: Yes. Could the Treasurer indicate that if in the future there was a chance to set up contracts with the legal counsel, it would be better to hire them on a fixed-fee contract rather than on an hourly basis -- in that it is rather self-conflictive to be on an hourly basis -- to end this?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not suggest that the lawyers who are involved here are trying to make this a protracted discussion -- that would be inappropriate, I think -- or for that matter the other professions who are involved. And I must be somewhat self-critical myself, because there is a lot of chartered accountants who are involved in this process. But it seems to me that what is being done here, I think, is an appropriate process and one where all possible information is trying to be determined. We fully committed to do that, and if there's a price tag attached to it, the government is going to pay the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for Grande Prairie, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

### Beverage Container Legislation

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment, and the topic is the Beverage Container Act. If I can quote from *Hansard* of May 18, the minister said, "We do have a regulation that's due to come into effect on July 1, 1988." My question is -- in the Grande Prairie area there's some concern that this is inadequate lead time to prepare the public for such a major change in this industry. Would the minister have a comment on the plan that he has?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's hardly going to be a major change. What there is is there's been a process under way for the last two years to have all of the provincialwide players and groups involved in the beverage container system sit down with me by way of a round table to see if we could bring about some improvements to the system. It was last fall that we had a regulation change that was to come into effect February 1, 1988. Prior to that point in time these same people came to me and said, "Hey, can we hold this off till July 1, 1988?" Now it seems that some of these players are coming back to me once again and saying, "Can we now hold it off till later?" That matter is currently under review. In the next several weeks we'll have some additional discussions with the groups involved and see whether or not we can in fact postpone the implementation of this regulation.

DR. ELLIOTT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. One of the major players in this Act, though, happens to be the public. I'm of the opinion that June, July, and August are peak periods in this industry, and I was wondering if the minister would consider delaying this initiation date to some lower point in the business cycle such as October or November.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I just responded to that. I'll repeat that the matter is under review. It may very well be that unless all of the players involved in the beverage container system in our province come to me and say that they unanimously agree that the changes they want should be implemented a little later than July 1, 1988 . . . At this point in time I think we've got a fairly good system in place. It's one that's well recognized. It's working. I'm also governed, of course, by the adage in government life: if it ain't broken, why fix it? This may very well be one of those situations.

DR. ELLIOTT: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To quote again from May 18 *Hansard*, the minister said that the rate of return "for most containers . . . in our province tends to be at the

90 to 95 percent level."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're having difficulty with the microphone here, a difficulty . . .

DR. ELLIOTT: Does the minister assume any drop in the return rate? If so, what level of return would be unacceptable before the depot refund payment would be increased?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, essentially, Mr. Speaker, what's under way right now is that all of the players and all of the people involved in the industry in the province have indicated to me that there are some gives and takes that we could bring into the beverage container system to improve it. One of the recommendations that's been provided to me is that there should be a principle -- and one that I've advocated -- that a container is a container and there should be no discrimination in terms of the tariff that would be applied to a tin can, a glass, or a plastic container. There's also a desire on some people to bring in Tetra Pak containers into the beverage container system.

I've also been informed, and it's been recommended to me by most of the players involved in it, that our current rate of tariffs, from 2 cents to 30 cents per container -- 2 cents for a tin can to 30 cents for a two-litre plastic container -- can be modified, and in fact the consumer in our province is now so well attuned to the beverage container system and they're so environmentally conscious that it's not the 30 cents per container that governs a person to return the bottle to a container but their love for, the need to enhance and improve, our environment. So it's been recommended to me that the 30 cents could be reduced to 5 cents, and the general feeling is that that would then benefit the consumer, reduce the cash flow of bottle depot associations and the like. But I'm not as convinced as those people who are providing that recommendation to me of that, Mr. Speaker, so the matter remains under review.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional supplementaries? Vegreville, supplementary.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of the Environment Will he then make a commitment to see that the deposit charged on pop cans is raised to the 5-cent level charged on beer cans?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, the current tariff is 2 cents per metal container, and statistics indicate that we have upwards of 90 to 95 percent return. In other words, the program is working and working very, very successfully and working very, very well. So what the hon. member is saying is that we should increase that tariff by 250 percent, when you've got something that's working. And I'll be governed by what I said a few minutes ago: if it ain't broken, why fix it?

### Pay Equity

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

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for women's issues. In August 1987 Mr. Scudder, chairman of the Human Rights Commission, called for "objective and realistic examination of equal pay for work of equal value . . . based on factual evidence." He said, "We want

the full facts on both sides of the question, not just rhetoric." The minister has now announced that she is funding a dialogue to determine public- and private-sector employers' perspectives and attitudes on women's issues in the workplace and discussion to define issues and generate ideas. Has she no commitment to determine the facts, not just the ideas and attitudes about women's economic situations?

MS McCOY: Well, Mr. Speaker, An Alberta Dialogue on Economic Equity for Women is an exciting initiative. What we have said is that we don't want simply to study, study, study; we want to get out into Alberta and find out what our Albertans want in the way of economic equity and what kind of framework they can help. Not only are we not simply talking to those who are in the paid work force, but we are also going out to those women who find themselves in the home or those women who find themselves in family businesses, such as working as rural partners on family farms. I'm excited about talking to Albertans.

About pay equity: we know a lot about pay equity, Mr. Speaker. Ontario is doing it; the federal government is doing it. It's been studied to death. We don't need \$25,000 to read the documents that have been developed elsewhere.

MS LAING: In view of her statements that pay equity legislation is a quick-fix solution, can the minister then claim any objectivity in the process of finding solutions for women?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, when I say that I am going out on a systematic basis to talk to men and women in Alberta and to ask them which solutions they want to apply to their own situations, I think I am being objective. I am saying, "You tell me what will help you most, then we'll work to help you get it."

MS LAING: It seems to me that facts would help that objectivity. How can the minister justify her views on pay equity as a quick-fix solution in view of Canada's ratification of the United Nations convention calling for equal pay for work of equal value and the Canadian Human Rights Commission's stand on the requirement for equal pay for work of equal value?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, this government is not a single-issue government. This government does not think that there is one solution that will solve everybody's problems. The concentration and line of questioning which the hon. member across has been pursuing would indicate to me that she has got far too narrow a focus, something of a channel beyond which she cannot look.

Economic equity does not simply consist of pay scales for women who are in the paid work force. What about the woman on the family farm who is not being given credit for all her contributions on that farm and therefore is ineligible for her own entitlement to Canada pension benefits? That would not be addressed by this one issue, pay equity. What we are going to do in this government is go out and talk to the men and women of Alberta and find out what they need, what they want and what will enhance economic equity for women all over Alberta.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there are many factors for women's economic inequities and that women have many different situations, but pay equity is held to be a major step in addressing this inequity for women in the paid labour force. Is the minister unwilling to take even this first step to-

ward eliminating women's economic inequality?

MS McCOY: Well, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about facts. Let's talk about facts. Has any other jurisdiction in Canada demonstrated that that pay equity legislation they have has truly helped women? Not yet. Not yet. It is far too soon to see the results of that program, and when you say to the people of Alberta, "Excuse me, but I want to spend \$4.3 million on setting up the civil service to administer a program that will benefit only some and not all," then I say: let's go and talk to Albertans and see what they really want. Would they prefer to spend \$4.3 million in some other aspect of helping themselves?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour, as minister responsible for personnel administration. Is the government of Alberta considering any change to its present policy of equal pay for equal work?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, that has for a long time been a traditional stance of the government of Alberta and has been accepted in very large degree by Albertans. It continues to be entrenched in the basic legislation that was brought in in 1972. It will continue to be a basic precept of this government. Equal pay for equal work or substantially similar work is a fact in Alberta and will continue to be so.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

#### **Violence against Women**

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans, and Edmontonians in particular, are struck by the contradictions in the statistics on crimes and in particular crimes against women and the Solicitor General's statements of a few days ago that our streets are very, very safe. The reality is that 27 percent of Canadian women can expect to be victims. More than two per day sex-related crimes occur in Edmonton, many in homes where the assailant is known to the victim. Child sex abuse is increasing, and much, much more needs to be done in intervention, education, socialization, and attitudinal change. I'd like to ask the Solicitor General: will he now make a responsible public statement to correct and clarify the apparent contradictions and to inform women that they should always take precautions regarding their safety on the street and in the home?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure where a lot of those comments attributed to me came from. I still will say that the streets of Edmonton and generally the streets in Alberta are safe. Certainly, as I said before, there's crime, and certainly sexual assault is a problem. You can cross the street and get run over by a car. I'm not trying to compare the two, but I'm using the analogy to point out that everything is relative in safety. Two of these crimes a day: yes, the statistics show that. But are they always on the street? Are they in the home? Are they by family members, by strangers? You have to take this whole thing in context. I think also that it's very, very wise for not only females but the male part of the population, too, to go out and to approach everything they do with safety in mind.

MRS. HEWES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that's irresponsible, because it raises expectations that simply cannot be met.

Mr. Speaker, to the minister responsible for women's affairs. In the light of current knowledge and information will this min-

ister put in place an aggressive public education program regarding women's vulnerability, wife abuse, child abuse, and safety, including safety in the home?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to advocate that among my colleagues. I would endorse a program of that nature completely.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

The Chair would also point out to the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar that the use of the word "irresponsible" is unparliamentary.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw the word "irresponsible." I think it was a statement made without due thought and care. Would that satisfy? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear the minister's response on an education program, but the question was: will we do it? The next question I have -- I'm not sure where it should go, because there are so many people involved in this kind of thing, and they pass it around -- probably to the Minister of Education. Can we anticipate an aggressive program, then, in education to reverse the negative socialization, the violence-is-exciting concept that we have in our schools, and can that be extended to vulnerable groups?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, to categorize our school program as violence is okay is a very poor and . . . I won't use the word that the hon. member used, but it's the wrong statement to make. I would like to have an opportunity to talk about some of the things we are doing in the school system in terms of dealing in the elementary level with some of the issues of violence within the home, of some of the issues which need to be addressed in order that young people have a sense of responsibility for themselves and a sense of things that should not happen to them and that they can say no about. That's very much a part of our curriculum, and I would welcome an opportunity to focus on some of the specific curriculum initiatives that we are taking. Perhaps the hon. member would like to put those specifics onto the Order Paper.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary, back to the Solicitor General. Will the Solicitor General please tell this House what the government is doing to provide comprehensive treatment programs for the abusers to break that cycle of violence that we see repeated, where they have minimum treatment and they're free to repeat the offence and often do?

MR. ROSTAD: I'm not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the question is directed to the right ministry. Maybe she could clarify in the sense what she means . . . What the government's doing for the abuser: are you meaning in terms of counseling? I'm not sure where that's coming from.

MRS. HEWES: Do you want me to repeat? No? It's all over.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore, followed by

Vermilion-Viking.

MS. LAING: Mr. Speaker, has the minister spoken to women in this city about how they feel about going into a parkade at night or how parents or men feel when their wives or daughters or mothers are out alone at night on the streets of this city? Does he realize how frightened they are until those people return home safely?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I've talked to a number of females about that. I've already indicated that crime and sexual assault specifically is very, very serious. I'm not so sure that the hon. member is indicating or would think that each person that goes out at evening would require a police officer or there should be one at each corner. There have to be precautions taken by people when they go out. The police are policing and are trying to get municipalities to light areas that are more prone to that type of thing. I think precautions have to be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes. To the Solicitor General. Our social services programs are very attractive to people from other jurisdictions. Could you indicate if you have any records to show how many transients that come here to access our welfare or social services programs actually may contribute to the crime levels here in the province of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you; that's it. Additional supplementaries?

Time for question period has expired. However, the Chair has been notified of two points of order. Because there is a group of school persons in the gallery who might have to leave because they've traveled the distance to Edmonton, might we vary the procedure on this occasion only and have unanimous consent to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

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

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the members of the Assembly and you allowing me to introduce to all the members a group of students from Peerless Lake school in the constituency of Lesser Slave Lake. These are grades 7, 8, and 9 students and, I believe, two grade 11 students that are there; teachers Mr. Gerry Zelinski and Mr. Ken Hoekstra; parents Charlie Orr, Marie Alook, and Ruth Okemow. I would ask that they rise in order that the members of the Assembly may accord them a warm Edmonton welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Points of order now. Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my point of order relates to the written answers filed yesterday as sessional papers 196 and 195 of 1988 to the written questions, formerly standing on the Order Paper, 195 and 196. The citations have been given to you, and they are in *Beauchesne* 363, 364, and 357. The point of order

revolves around the obligation of the government once it's undertaken to answer questions to answer them if not completely, at least in substance, particularly where there are questions such as these, which pertain to the exercise by a minister of his powers and the submission that he had exceeded his powers.

The history of these questions is as follows, Mr. Speaker. So far as the question that pertains to Written Question 196, which concerns the allocation of the minister of some \$800,000 to the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts which was earmarked for TV and audio, the circumstances were that in debate in the House on Bill 10, the lottery funds amendment Bill, the submission was made that the minister had exceeded his powers in earmarking this money in this way. A question was subsequently asked on May 16, in the course of which the minister in defence of his position said:

I can't believe that this particular member does not understand that when one prepares a film or when one shoots a video, one has to have a writer to first prepare the script.

Of course, that's quite right; that would bring that part of it within his powers. So the response from the questioner, who was myself, was:

To the minister of culture: in that case, how much of the \$800,000 set out for TV and audio was for scriptwriting?

Mr. Speaker, you suggested at that point that that might be a question for the Order Paper. The hon. minister responded,

Mr. Speaker, yes, I think that is a question for the Order Paper.

Accordingly, the question was put down on the Order Paper as follows:

Of the grants made or announced by the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism to the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts and amounting to \$800,000 for television and audio purposes, according to the minister's letter . . .

and that's cited, Mr. Speaker,

. . . how much is intended for scriptwriting and how much for other purposes, detailing same?

The government accepted that question and yesterday filed the following answer. I won't read it in full, but I'll simply summarize to say that it didn't even begin to make any sort of breakdown between what on the face of it is a legitimate exercise of the minister's power under the Act and what isn't. It did not answer the question in substance in one small point.

Simultaneously, Question 195 was on the Order Paper, and that was put down by my hon. friend the Member for Edmonton-Highlands. That asked for the budget of the Banff Television Festival for 1988, because the minister had stated in his statements -- and in the letter, in fact -- as to the purpose of this money earmarked in the amount of \$500,000 for the Banff foundation for TV that it was substantially for the Banff Television Festival. Again the response given yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was completely nonresponsive to the question as to the budget. It was simply the statement: the Banff Television Foundation is not a foundation which reports to me, but it does submit an annual financial statement. So once again, no vestige of an answer in substance.

Mr. Speaker, going through the points to be made on the citations, *Beauchesne* 363(1) says, of course, that

A minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal,

and you can't insist on an answer. *Beauchesne* 364 says:

If a question is made an Order . . . for a Return . . . it is understood that the answer . . . may not necessarily answer every portion of the original question.

Of course, this wasn't an order for a return; it was acceptance by the government of the question, which presumably is an under-

taking to do their best to answer it. But the analogy is correct in my submission. And 357(2) says:

Many of the traditional limitations on questions are now applied more strictly to written questions than to oral questions.

And we all know that, Mr. Speaker: that there are stricter rules to come within, which one would suppose would increase the obligation of the government once those strict rules had been complied with.

Now, my submission on this, Mr. Speaker, with respect, is that there's nothing in Standing Orders or elsewhere which compels a minister to answer a written question put to him. We can't insist on it, but once the decision to make the answer has been given, then does that not amount in effect to an undertaking to the Assembly to provide the information? And if, of course, they can't come up with the information, if they've been frustrated somewhere, that can be part of the answer. But to be evasive is not being straight with the House. Basically, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to the same rule that is a foundation of privilege; namely, that what is necessary to make the House work must be enforced. And it is necessary to make the business of the House work for all hon. members to be able to rely on the undertakings given expressly or implicitly in the course of business by other hon. members respecting the business of the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Two initial points. I would like to acknowledge the notice given to me in the House this morning by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona that he would be raising this at the end of question period. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend you for your patience, and perhaps all members of the House, in listening to what I would suggest is not a point or order at all.

Mr. Speaker, under our Standing Orders, when a point is being made, the member may respond to the point. I would therefore like to respond, but I'm conscious very much of our orders which say that I should not endeavour to provoke debate. The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona has referred far beyond the matters dealt with in the questions which he raised and which were raised by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands. All of the information that was requested in accordance with our Standing Orders was assembled and placed in the appropriate manner and tabled yesterday. But I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, as I have drawn to the Parliamentary Counsel's attention, an error in *Hansard* which has the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest responding in filing the responses to 195 and 196. I understand that will be corrected. In fact, it was the minister of culture that responded.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer the House to *Beauchesne* 357.171.(x), which states clearly that a question must not seek information which deals

with an action of a Minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament.

Further down on the page, under (ff), nor must the question seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner.

What I have done in responding to Question 195 raised by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands is to indicate that the Banff Television Foundation does not report to the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism by legislation. It doesn't. But I have agreed to provide to that member, the Member for Edmonton-

Highlands, all the financial statements that have been provided by that foundation to this minister and to the minister of lotteries. Now, that information is being assembled, and as indicated in the response, I will provide it.

In responding to Question 196, I again pointed out very carefully to the member -- and I won't bore you with all the detail, Mr. Speaker -- that the information he's seeking has not yet been determined in detail by the board to whom the funding has been directed. They are meeting with their clients. When that information is available, when those decisions are made, that information can be provided.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would note that while the member has referred to *Beauchesne* 363(1) and (2), he did not mention 364, in which it's indicated that if a question is made and an order is provided,

it is understood that the answer will be in the form of a Return and may not necessarily answer every portion of the original question.

Obviously, as soon as the information is made available to me by the board, I will provide that information.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

First, the Chair appreciates the notice which was given to the Chair by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. The Chair also has sympathy for the frustration of members from all parts of the House when, either in question period or in the form in which it is under discussion, one feels that the answer is not sufficiently complete or doesn't give one the kind of information one desired in the first place. Nevertheless, under *Beauchesne* and under parliamentary practice at Westminster, to be able to insist upon the form of an answer which one would prefer is really not in order with respect to the parliamentary process. The Chair has listened with care and attention, even though it might have looked otherwise as one was referring to some of the references which have been made by hon. members.

The difficulty in here then takes us back to *Beauchesne* 363(1) and (2), which indeed have been raised by both members speaking to the issue. The operative phrase in 363(1) of *Beauchesne* is indeed:

A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal, and insistence on an answer is out of order, with no debate being allowed.

Then it goes on with respect to refusal:

A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege, nor is it regular to comment upon such a refusal.

So we're back into that section of 363(1) as well. "A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege . . ." Not that the hon. member is doing that. But then the next part comes in, "nor is it regular to comment upon such a refusal," and that, indeed, bears upon this current purported point of order.

A Member may put a question but has no right to insist upon an answer.

Then we have the same issue coming through in 363(2). Then again, as pointed out by the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism and again as raised by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona in correspondence to the Chair, the operative part of 364:

. . . and may not necessarily answer every portion of the original question.

The final point, though, that the Chair would have to refer to takes us to *Erskine May*. On page 343, once again:

An answer to a question cannot be insisted upon.

So the difficulty the Chair is in is that the Chair must accept this as being a useful discussion with respect to the operation of the

House, nevertheless must not regard it as being a point of order but rather as a heartfelt complaint by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

An additional point of order, Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier in question period I asked the Premier to explain why the federal minister of Indian affairs could not recollect ever being informed of a proposal by the Alberta Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs minister to establish a tribunal to resolve the Lubicon land claim. In response to that question, the Premier then indicated that some document existed which would confirm the federal minister of Indian affairs had to be aware of the provincial government's proposal. I therefore stand, Mr. Speaker, under citation 327(1) of *Beauchesne*, in which it indicates clearly:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table. This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which . . .

[interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House, please. If other members wish to get involved in it, perhaps they can send notes to the parties involved. In the meantime, Member for Calgary-Mountain View, please proceed.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in.

I would also draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, *Beauchesne* 327(5) in terms of whether a document has been cited or not. Under subsection (5) it defines the phrase "to be cited" as such: . . . a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate.

Mr. Speaker, on both these subsections, first of all in subsection (1), clearly the Premier has indicated that some document exists and, in citing that document, led the House and the Legislature to believe that the minister, contrary to published statements and statements which I've confirmed through his office, were untrue. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that as the citation says, in so doing the Premier should lay before the House the evidence that the minister of Indian affairs was making statements that he knew to not be true. We've had a good recent example, a public one, highly publicized in the last day or two as being a matter before the Code inquiry, in which Mr. Code severely admonished counsel for one of the interest groups appearing before him raising the matter of a meeting with a former Premier and a member who was under cross-examination at the time. He severely admonished that counsel for not being able to table documentation or citing the source for the allegations he was making before the Code inquiry. By the same token, here this morning the Premier indicated that the federal minister had to have been aware of a written communication from the provincial government about this proposal.

Under subsection (5), in so doing, Mr. Speaker, the Premier specifically tried to influence debate. In this case, he specifically alluded to a document to influence the Legislature to believe that another minister of the Crown, a federal minister or that minister's office, was not telling the truth about the actions

of the Alberta government. Either the minister or statements of his office were unaware of what the Alberta government was doing and said so in the published reports in the newspaper. Again, as I'm expected before coming into the Legislature to confirm those statements, I did. In citing or referring to this document, Mr. Speaker, the Premier this morning tried to influence the Legislature to believe contrary to what the minister said in the newspaper today. We do not know whether this document cited by the Premier was a letter, whether it was briefing notes, or whether it was some other sort of document. The Premier failed to specifically mention to whom this document was addressed. Was it addressed to the federal minister, was it addressed to one of his staff, or was it addressed to the Prime Minister or even another minister of the federal government?

It would seem to me not only a matter of prudence but fundamentally a matter of fairness to the federal minister of Indian affairs that this document now be produced in evidence before the Alberta Legislature in order that we know who specifically is correct in the statements they have made about this matter, whether it be the Premier in statements made to the Legislature or whether it be the federal minister of Indian affairs in statements made to the press or through his office to my office this morning.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View would try to lend an interpretation of the kind that's being stretched before us right now. I invite us to recollect what the issue was all about. It was a question of who knew what, and it was during question period. My recollection is that the exchanges came down to: "I said, he said," "I said, he said," and a difference of view of that kind. Now, what the Premier did, by my recollection of it, was allude to the fact that he had satisfied himself, based on documents, as to his statement and his position. He did not cite the document, and section 327, used by the hon. member himself in trying to advance his argument, says:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table.

He neither quoted from it nor did he read from it. He neither quoted nor read.

AN HON. MEMBER: He cited it.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a back-and-forth argument, hon. members.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if we were to go over to subsection (5), it says again:

To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate.

We're not in a debating session in question period. We're in a situation where questions are supposed to be seeking information and information is supposed to be given. If in fact the hon. member thought it was degenerating into a debate, that's his problem, Mr. Speaker, not that of the Premier.

I would submit that this is an attempt to really extend the rules in a way that they were never ever contemplated. This is a mountain out of a molehill, to put it in its kindest term. The hon. member may have a complaint. He had a complaint, obviously, as I heard the question period, because he had one view, the Premier had another view -- and that's too bad. But that's a question of fact, and that's not the subject of anything

other than a complaint. It's not a point of order. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: No. The Chair is not prepared to listen to more than the member raising the matter and the response from the other side.

There are a number of issues raised here for clarification, and perhaps hon. members would like to listen carefully to what the Blues say. It will help with regard to one aspect of the issue as raised by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View. The Member for Calgary-Mountain View in one of his questions said:

Can the Premier explain why his FIGA minister has failed to carry out the responsibility given to him of pushing this tribunal proposal with the federal minister of Indian affairs?

The response by the Premier: "Mr Speaker, he hasn't failed." The Member for Calgary-Mountain View:

Well, then, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier now tell us in the Legislature this morning why Mr. McKnight cannot recollect ever being informed of this proposal by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs?

The response by the Premier

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly speak for Mr. McKnight. If the member wants to hear what Mr. McKnight's problems are, he should talk to him.

Some hon. members responded, "We did." The Premier responded, "He did not." An hon. member said, "He talked to his office." The response of the Premier then was this: "He talked to his office" -- a rhetorical question -- "what a lot of baloney."

Now, that's where that stops. Then we have this disagreement as to who contacted whom in what office and at what time, so that's a dispute as to who made telephone calls and who replied to them. Therefore, that aspect of the issue as raised by Calgary-Mountain View really falls by the wayside in this as to the rest of the argument as to whether or not a document was cited. However, carrying on from there as to the matter of whether the document was cited, whether it was referred to, or whether it was used to influence debate, the Premier continued:

If the hon. member wants to know the federal government's position, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here -- and I don't want to get in a position of having to table someone else's letter -- but where it starts off a full page: The Getty tribunal process and the federal government's response to it. Now, what a lot of baloney from the Member . . .

Now, whether that's a reference -- it doesn't appear to be a quotation; it appears to be just saying that this is what the general content of this communiqué of some form referred to at a certain time. The operative words -- and the Chair will make a request to the Premier's office to examine the document and will report back to the House on Monday -- the operative phrase is really one sentence: "The Getty tribunal process and the federal government's response to it." The preliminary indication the Chair has by looking at the Blues is that this is highly unlikely to be a very lengthy quote from any kind of document. Nevertheless, the Chair will take it under advisement and make a request to look at the document and report back to the House.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

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

#### 1988-89 Alberta Capital Fund Estimates

##### Hospitals and Medical Care

##### I -- Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, Mr. Moore, would you care to make opening comments to the committee?

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. This morning MLAs will be asked to approve some \$158,816,000 in capital funds for the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care for the ongoing planning and construction of a number of projects. I'd like to take a moment, Mr Chairman, to explain what some of those projects are and to explain our philosophy with respect to medical care in Alberta.

First of all, MLAs may be aware that back in 1975 we made a decision -- actually before that, in 1972, but it was reflected in actual construction starts in about 1975 -- to completely rebuild the hospital, auxiliary hospital, and nursing home system in Alberta and bring it up to a standard that's second to none in Canada. Since that time, since 1975 up until the end of the last fiscal year, Mr. Chairman, we have had 130 new or upgrading projects approved and most them completed at a cost of in excess of a billion dollars. In fact, \$1.027 billion has been spent since 1975 on some 130 projects throughout the province, plus \$414 million on the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That represents over the last 13 years a rebuilding program with a capital cost equaling about \$1.5 billion to rebuild the hospital, auxiliary hospital, and nursing home system in Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, the philosophy that went into that rebuilding was that people ought to be able to receive medical services in this province wherever they live, without having to commute to Edmonton or Calgary or some of the larger regional centres for the ordinary sorts of medical services they had been receiving for many years. In other words, contrary to the Official Opposition's position of closing hospitals in rural Alberta and shipping everybody into Edmonton and Calgary, we decided that we wanted all Albertans to have an opportunity to receive medical care in their own communities.

This fiscal year, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to advise the approval of several new projects. First of all, we made a decision that the Calgary children's hospital ought to be upgraded further with additional beds and programs established there. That came about after the Calgary Area Hospital Advisory Council made a very thorough review of the needs of pediatric care in the city of Calgary and southern Alberta and recommended to us that we focus more heavily than we even had in the past in terms of providing pediatric care at the Alberta children's hospital in Calgary and decreasing the level of beds and services in other Calgary city hospitals. That approach was agreed to by every hospital board in Calgary, and we are now well on the way to planning for expansion and additional facilities at the Calgary children's hospital.

The second project we recently approved in this year's budget that I'd like to speak about is the Calgary Beverly special care unit. The Beverly nursing home people -- a private-sector company who've done an excellent job for many years in the nursing home business in Calgary -- put a proposal forward to us to build a specialty care facility to look after people with Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia. We are well on the way there to planning for a 120-bed facility that will be

the first of its kind in Canada, with a unique type of care and planning that we hope will serve as a model for other specialty care units for persons with dementia and Alzheimer's disease in other parts of Alberta.

We approved as well, Mr. Chairman, a number of long-term care beds throughout the province. In the little town of Bentley in the hon. Member for Lacombe's constituency: five long-term care beds attached to the existing active treatment hospital. In Castor we approved for construction 10 long-term care beds that are in this budget this year, and the conversion of five existing active treatment hospital beds to long-term care. In Hanna the hon. Member for Chinook asked me to come down to Hanna and have a firsthand look at their situation, and after that we were able to approve 30 long-term care beds as an addition to the existing Hanna hospital. In Lamont we made a decision to replace the existing 37-bed acute care hospital, which has been there for more than 60 years, with a new 30-bed acute care hospital and the addition of 25 long-term care beds to provide opportunities for senior citizens there to live and stay in their own community.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest again has been working very hard to ensure that there are long-term beds in Pincher Creek. They have a lodge there, and a lot of people were concerned that the citizens there would have to go elsewhere. We were able to approve 30 long-term care beds as an addition to the Pincher Creek hospital. In Red Deer the hon. Member for Red Deer-North and the hon. Member for Red Deer-South asked us to take a good, hard look at replacing an existing 70-bed nursing home in Red Deer, the West Park nursing home, with a new facility which will be built on new property near the Red Deer exhibition site, with 100 beds. That's the addition of 30 long-term care beds and the replacement of an old facility that's no longer adequate to serve the needs of the community.

We then went north to the constituency of Lesser Slave Lake and Peace River where we've got an opportunity to provide a different kind of medical care to people, many of them from Edmonton and Calgary, who work in Red Earth and in Rainbow Lake and are many miles from any type of medical care. We approved the development and building this year of an ambulatory care facility in Red Earth and another similar facility in Rainbow Lake, much needed facilities that we hope will be staffed with some kind of nursing care that's required on an urgent basis and perhaps visiting doctors who will provide some assistance in those communities for the basic level of health care that's required for a lot of people who work in the oil patch in those two communities.

Out at Stony Plain the hon. member put forward very, very firmly the numbers that exist in terms of seniors in the Stony Plain area who have had to go to other parts of Alberta, mainly to Edmonton, for long-term care. There isn't a single long-term care bed in Stony Plain. If you look at the demographics of that particular area, you'd know that there are a lot of people there whose families really don't like to travel to Edmonton city, in spite of what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre might say. They like to stay in their own community. They'd like to be there, so that their sons and daughters and their families can visit them in their own community when they have to be in a nursing home or an auxiliary hospital.

In Drumheller we went and took a look at the existing auxiliary hospital there, which is very old and badly in need of replacement. We looked at the acute care hospital, which also needs some substantial renovation, and finally decided that the

best thing to do was to construct a brand-new acute care hospital on a new site and convert the existing acute care hospital to long-term care beds to replace the very old, run-down auxiliary hospital in Drumheller: again, a decision that will allow the people of Drumheller to have medical services in their community and not have to drive to Calgary or some other distant point for medical care. What better legacy could there be for one of the oldest coal mining centres in Alberta than to have the people there who need medical care be able to stay in their own homes and communities?

Mr. Chairman, that's just a review of what's been approved for construction and planning in the 1988-89 fiscal year. There are a whole host of projects that are ongoing that were approved in other years, and I just want to review a few of them.

The major dollars in this budget of \$158 million cover such things as the completion of the Peter Lougheed hospital in Calgary: mainly for equipment there's \$14.6 million. Again, a hospital that is designed exactly the same as the Mill Woods Grey Nuns hospital, which those who have had an opportunity to visit and see it suggest it's a state-of-the-art hospital second to none in Canada. When I visited it on opening day, the radiologist who operates the radiology equipment in the Grey Nuns hospital said to me, "There isn't anybody in Canada who has a better hospital to work with in terms of diagnostic equipment than we have in this hospital here." Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature ought to be extremely proud that we're able to provide that kind of equipment for the health care of our citizens and are able to provide it in Mill Woods as well as other parts of Alberta.

The refurbishing of the Edmonton General hospital downtown this year will take some \$12 million and will open about a year from now, if not a little sooner, with 300 additional new, long-term care beds badly needed in the city of Edmonton; completion of the Good Samaritan Auxiliary, which is now opening for some 200 additional long-term care patients.

Other communities: Camrose, Coaldale, Claresholm, Lethbridge Regional hospital, Medicine Hat regional, St Joseph's in Vegreville, Wabasca-Desmarais hospital -- all of these have some funding in this budget for the completion of the work that's presently going on.

The Glenrose: the replacement of the convalescent rehabilitation unit at the Glenrose hospital here in Edmonton, a very important and key component of our desire to see those long-term care patients who have been injured or hurt in accidents and other things being brought back into the mainstream of life in this longer term rehabilitation unit. There's \$10 million in this year's budget for that \$65 million project.

The Misericordia hospital, replacing one wing out there: \$3 million. Alberta Hospital Ponoka, the brain damage centre: \$1 million in this budget for that project. At Camrose we're replacing the Bethany Auxiliary and nursing home. At Fort Saskatchewan we're doing an upgrading of the hospital. I mentioned earlier Rainbow Lake and Red Earth ambulatory care. At Mayerthorpe: new auxiliary beds badly needed in that community, again to allow people to stay next to their families. The same thing in Raymond, Rimbey, Rocky Mountain House: all long-term care beds being constructed or added to existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we take pride in a system of nursing home care beds, long-term care beds, and acute care beds in this province that is second to none in Canada.

In concluding my remarks, I just want to make a few comments about how we see medical care being provided to our citi-

zens in terms of our institutional system. We've got a large number of smaller, rural, community-based hospitals, between 25 and 50 beds. They are the lowest cost operating hospitals in this province. They provide the kind of acute care that the average person needs on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis, and they are for the most part very active, full hospitals. They averaged in 1986-87 about \$295 a day in terms of their operating costs. Those hospitals are without question the best investment this province has in the medical care system.

Now, when you move into a category of medical requirement that's above and beyond what we're capable of providing in those facilities, then we have some larger community-based hospitals where we have more doctors, more specialists, more equipment, and we're able to do more things. I talk about places like Peace River, Cold Lake, St. Paul, Lloydminster, Drumheller, Brooks, Camrose: those kinds of hospitals where some smaller community hospital patients are fed into those centres.

Then, after that, we have the larger regional hospital system, where even more yet can be done for patients who require that higher level of care. And each time we take a step in this process, it costs more money. The large regional hospitals in Grande Prairie, Fort McMurray, Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat are capable of providing most of the service that's required by the ordinary individual.

If the requirements for health care and medical care are not met in these communities, then we have the large urban hospitals with a lot of specialists, a lot of high technology, a lot of ability to diagnose and treat that even the regional hospitals don't have. I refer to the University of Alberta hospital, to the Royal Alex hospital in Edmonton, to hospitals like the Foothills and the Calgary General in Calgary, who provide above and beyond what can be provided in most of the rural hospitals in Alberta. In addition to that, those hospitals have outreach programs connected with smaller hospitals to assist them in delivering health care.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have the specialized hospitals designed to treat specific illnesses or people in particular age categories. The foremost of those, of course, is the Alberta Cancer Board: the Cross cancer clinic operating out of Edmonton, Tom Baker Cancer Centre in Calgary, and the satellite treatment stations they have in other communities like Lethbridge, Red Deer, and Grande Prairie. Over the coming years I hope to be able to add dollars so that they can provide services of even more hospitals yet. Then we have the Alberta children's hospital in Calgary, which I mentioned earlier, and the Glenrose Rehabilitation hospital here in Edmonton.

Mr. Chairman, on top of that we have a system of nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals in Alberta that are spread out right across the province. We have, as I mentioned earlier, a number of new beds coming on stream this year and a number of others which are under planning and construction. In addition, I should mention that during the course of the last fiscal year we approved some 17 upgrading projects for private-sector nursing homes which, in addition to upgrading the existing beds, will add some 121 new beds: a total commitment between the government and the private sector there of some \$38 million.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my comments with some indication of what will happen in the long-term care field in terms of additional beds. We have presently under planning, design, or construction some 1,554 beds in more than 40 communities throughout Alberta. That follows very closely the recommendations in the Mirosh report to provide opportunities for long-term care patients throughout our province, while at the

same time placing a great deal of emphasis on keeping people in their homes and long-term care.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend MLAs' full support of the \$158 million that is asked for this morning in capital funds for 1988-89 so that Alberta can continue to be the leader in Canada in the providing of medical facilities to its citizens.

Thank you.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been here two years now, and I don't think I've ever heard a minister of the Crown talk as a kind of emperor of an empire as this minister who has just finished talking. I thought maybe in transportation, when they build roads on political purposes and political grounds, there was enough empire building in that portfolio. But it's clear from the litany the minister has just gone through that he wants to sit atop an empire of hospital building -- a bed empire -- in this province that is nothing but his own ego satisfaction and that of this government.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that I appreciate the minister's comments just concluded, because they stand in stark, stark contrast -- despite all other hon. back-bench members with their hands sticking up, despite their agenda and his agenda -- to the hundreds and thousands of Albertans I've spoken to over the last year who have said to me: "Listen; there is one thing that's wrong with this health care system in Alberta, and it's that we've got far too many buildings. We've got far too many beds. We put far too much money in capital construction, and there is no money left over for the hands-on care in those beds and in those hospitals."

Let me tell the minister that as I've gone around this province over the last year, everywhere I go -- I don't even ask for it, Mr. Chairman. I don't ask for it. I want to say, "Well, what's going on in your community in terms of health care?" "Well, listen," they say to me. "We've got this big H in the middle of town; we don't have a doctor for it. We've got this obstetrical suite in town; we don't have anybody to use it. We don't have an anaesthetist for surgery here. We've got these beds, and what we need is long-term care beds." And where's this government been for 12 years -- building, building, building beds -- with 500, 600 senior citizens still without long-term care beds?

Now, this minister comes around and says: "Okay, folks. We're going to get some money. We're going to build beds. We're going to get caught up on our commitment to the senior citizens", when they've built this vast, misguided empire of acute care beds, leaving the senior citizens of the province having to grovel, saying, "Please won't you build some long-term care beds?" Now we're going to get into that. And it's about time. It's five, 10 years too late. Where has the planning been? Where has been the sense in any kind of hospital planning development which really meets the health care needs of Albertans, not the health care needs of Alberta's politicians? Let me tell you that I haven't been saying this either. It's been the Minister of Community and Occupational Health, who in a speech just a year ago said to this group assembled that we have an edifice complex in the province, an edifice complex in terms of building beds. This is the minister's own colleague, the minister of community health.

Then we hear the minister just a year ago raising all kinds of questions about the Mill Woods and Peter Lougheed Centre. "Listen, where's the population gone? We don't have the money to pay the operating costs any more. We're going to have to mothball these two hospitals," he tells everybody, and goes to the board of the General hospital and causes a great

frenzy among the board members there and the doctors who have tried to put doctors' offices around. "Well, we're going to have to mothball these because we can't afford it anymore." Well, it doesn't take him long. It's taken about a year, and the fiscal floodgates have opened once more, and here we have the minister. I'm sure oil revenues are up, the lotteries are doing well, and it's going to be lots more money now for the institutional health care sector empire to continue in this vast program of capital spending, capital construction on beds, beds, beds.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. We've got to have beds, there's no question; I keep telling people that. But at the same time they say: "Well, where are the doctors for these beds? Where are the nurses for these beds? In fact, where are the patients for the acute care illness that's going to be in these beds when, in fact, what we need is long-term care? What we need is home care." We need home care in this province. The minister alluded to it in a passing reference, but the home care empire is what needs to be built to keep people in their homes and in their community. There might not be as many votes for certain members out of that kind of program, but it seems to me it's going to be a whole lot better to meet the health care needs of Albertans to have the kind of empire that you see built in home care and not in the edifice complex which the Minister of Community and Occupational Health has identified in terms of what's going on here.

Then we have the nurses' strike. What better evidence from the support that the nurses, in an illegal strike, had in this province than people beginning to realize that yeah, we've got a lot of hospitals; we've got a lot of beds; the nurses -- the acuity level is going up so high, and we don't have the nurses. We've got a shortage of nurses throughout the province and nurses going on strike because the minister says, "Yeah, we're going to build all these buildings, and then we're going to cut back 3 and 4 and 5 percent in your salary." Well, they weren't going to take it anymore, and they went on strike. The support they had on that illegal strike because of this same issue -- capital versus operating; that's where the nub of it was -- I can't believe the political tide that is turning in this province with respect to that particular issue, even in small rural communities, let me tell you.

I have never believed -- and I'm waiting to hear the Member for Taber-Warner, because what I've heard is that there's people in Coaldale who don't even want the hospital in Coaldale. I don't know if there's a petition or what, but they've said: "We don't need this little hospital in Coaldale. We want to have extra money, extra funding to go to the Lethbridge Regional. It's 10 kilometres away." Let's have the beds that the Lethbridge Regional wants; let's have the lab equipment that the Lethbridge Regional wants, not put up this extra hospital 10 kilometres away to meet the needs of the people in Coaldale when they themselves, Mr. Chairman, are asking to move and have the Lethbridge Regional and St. Mike's be better funded down there in Lethbridge.

You know, the minister keeps saying about the stated opposition of the opposition to close rural hospitals. So let me read to you what the minister said last year, Mr. Chairman. In fact it was June [8], a year ago almost to the day, when the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care in this province said, and I quote: Hon. members should know, particularly the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, that La Crete is only about 30 miles from . . . Fort Vermilion . . . and that we paved that road some years ago when I was the minister . . . [It was] completed . . . two or three years ago . . . So it isn't as though there are not services in the area. I am concerned about building additional

hospitals if they're not required, because you have to staff them and there have to be doctors and facilities there to look after injured patients. I suggested to the people in La Crete . . .

who live just 40 kilometres away,

that they [should improve] their ambulance service.

Well, Mr. Chairman, for heaven's sake, we've been saying that same thing for 10, 15 years in this province. We've been saying: let's rationalize the services, let's improve the ambulance service, let's have integration into the larger centres, and not have hospitals all over. And what are we doing? What are we doing with Coaldale? What are we doing with all these other hospitals? I'm sick and tired of this kind of rhetoric and language last year, and then the minister turning around and saying . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want to close Vegreville too?

REV. ROBERTS: Yes, let's have some -- what's the criteria? What's the consistent basis upon which hospitals are planned? It's political. That's the basis, and that's what we're going to find out in the final analysis, particularly at the next election, Mr. Chairman. [interjections]

Now, the minister has said -- and I sat and politely listened to him while he went on with his litany of the largess. His figures were \$1.5 billion in capital construction over the last 13 years, I believe: \$1.5 billion. Well, I would challenge those figures, Mr. Chairman. Our figures include other capital expenses that have gone in the votes year by year, and it includes \$2,190,646,000 in capital construction in this province over the last nine years: not the \$1.5 billion but the \$2.2 billion that has been spent in hospital construction over the last nine years. I still don't think that includes the \$40 million here and \$50 million there for other centres.

How they could have embarked upon such a capital construction program -- to this date, Mr. Chairman, to this date we've spent over the last number of years \$2 billion in capital construction for hospitals, and we still have 500 to 600 elderly awaiting long-term care. Now, how in heaven's name could anyone possibly administer a department which has that kind of enormous capital spending and it all goes to acute care, leaving those needing long-term care, the elderly and the disabled, on waiting lists for one to two years? Now where in the world has been the planning in that?

And then we have the situation now, and I know the minister's response: well, the population changed. But still this is the case of beds opening and new hospitals opening, and then closing the beds. Look at Ponoka just last year. Look even at Mill Woods; as they've said, there are going to be several units that are not going to be opened. Even at the Walter C. Mackenzie there are certain units there that haven't been opened, as well as other units being closed in other centres that have been open for a while. So we're great at institutionalizing. We're great at 'medicalizing,' even though we don't have the doctors in some of these areas. The superstructure that has been built for other than health care reasons is clear, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to know from this minister how much of the capital funds that have been expended on buildings and equipment and beds are currently not being used. Before we vote for all of this \$158 million more to go into the capital fund, how much of what is already -- he doesn't have the courtesy to even stay and listen, Mr. Chairman; I find that quite unacceptable of the minister . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Point of order, hon. Member for Stettler.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that remark was clearly out of order. I'd ask that it be stricken from the record.

REV. ROBERTS: [Inaudible] the hon. minister is out listening in the coffee room, as I've done for him sometimes.

DR. WEST: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I take exception to that

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Point of order, Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes, I take exception. It's been a rule in this House that the presence of an individual or a member in the House is not to be mentioned whether here or not, and that last remark by the individual directly stated where the individual was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre withdrew it.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: The point is, Mr. Chairman, what is the rationale? What is the basis? What are the planning guidelines? Is it going to be that, as with the situation for LaCrete, if they're 40 kilometres from each other, communities don't need hospitals? Or if we're going to improve the ambulance service, as the minister said a year ago, that's going to help to rationalize some services? Or is the staff availability in terms of the doctors and nurses and the rehab side -- are hospitals going to be based only where it's proven that it's going to have the staff commensurate to staff the facility? Is that going to be the basis? Is it going to be demographics in terms of the accident rate, the number of children, the number of elderly people, the moving in and out? Are demographics going to be the basis, or is the basis going to be who the MLA is and how hard they've lobbied the minister to get what they think is going to be vote-buying for the next election?

I would just like to know far more clearly -- because we've had nothing but a proven track record that is off the track, plus a political agenda that I think is quite blatant now and without regard to the kinds of demographic data and particularly the kind of staff availability for a number of these facilities which really should go into the planning process -- more about that kind of rationale and the guidelines that have been used for planning the hospital construction empire in this province.

What's the rationale for the number of acute care beds per 1,000? I guess I've asked the minister this over and over again. He says we're now going to come down from the seven or eight acute care beds per 1,000 to four or five. So how does what he's just mentioned and outlined this morning fit into that kind of ratio of four beds per thousand? If that's the goal, frankly, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you, and I'll tell all members and the minister this morning, that I'm fully in support of him in that goal that we need four acute care beds per thousand in this province. How are we going to get there, given what's before us this morning and the whole history of this empire before us? Is it going to be four beds per thousand? How are we going to

get there without having a number of beds sitting idle and empty throughout the system but rather have them well used where they are?

I'm not sure again what the minister said about the number of long-term care beds per thousand. I heard it's 65. We're aiming for 65 acute care beds per thousand. If that's going to be the goal, then how are we going to get to it? The minister told district 24 in a speech last year that we have to be careful that we don't build too many long-term care beds, because it might be that the aging population might change and we might end up with as many surplus long-term care beds as we have surplus acute care beds. He said that to district 24 last year. I want to make sure we don't have too many. I can't foresee how we would in the next five or 10 years, but at least we have to have some planning guidelines, some standard by which we're going to build and open long-term care centres. I want to know how many beds per thousand the goal is and how we're going to keep to that goal.

The minister has made reference to the conversion, then, of acute care beds to long-term care. Again, I was flabbergasted. It sounded to me this morning that maybe there were one or two references to hospital boards and hospitals that were in fact taking up his offer of converting their acute care beds to long-term care. But it sounded again this morning that we were keeping the acute care beds as they were and building long-term care beds alongside them.

Now, I got a letter from a very fine woman in Fort McMurray, Mr. Chairman. She says that she knows of a number of people who are elderly in the Fort McMurray general hospital who are really needing long-term care and don't need to be in the acute care hospital. She's been trying to move and lobby the hospital board to designate that certain unit or another unit for long-term care. I said: "Well, that should make sense, because the minister has asked that himself. He said that he wants hospital boards to look at this and find out if they can get one or two nursing units and convert them to long-term care." "Well," she said, "the board is unresponsive. I've written to the minister, and he says that he can't do anything about it."

Well, I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to be having a program of converting acute care to long-term care beds in what we the Official Opposition have called multilevel care facilities, then let's get on and do it. If it's going to be just up to the minister to wait for hospital boards to do it, I submit that he's going to have to wait a long time. Certainly you don't resolve it by leaving the acute care system as it is and building up a further empire of long-term care beds alongside it without the more reasoned approach of trying to do some conversion, which again is going to cost some capital dollars to do so, but it's better than just building a whole new system.

What further incentives is the minister providing for this kind of conversion? The minister says that we are second to none in terms of the hospital building program and what we're doing for senior citizens. Well, he's right. We're second to none with respect to how many of our elderly are institutionalized. We have the greatest rate of institutionalizing of our senior citizens in nursing homes and lodges and long-term care centres and hospitals. We have more seniors in institutions per thousand than any other jurisdictions in Australia, for heaven's sake. What is the minister doing to promote better home care, to promote better community care, to get those linkages to get people home, to get the Mirosh report clearly saying that the single point of entry to long-term care has to be in the community and in the health unit assessment side of things and not to

have a subdepartment in the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care for further building an institutional empire for senior citizens. Well, it begs a lot of questions.

The minister continues to talk about the waiting lists for surgery. So it's again surprising; we have this great system of so many hospitals and every different level of gradation of hospital services, yet we have all these waiting lists for people with elective surgery. And he says, "Well, you know, every province says we can't do much about it" How much of these capital dollars, Mr. Chairman, are going to help to convert services in acute care hospitals from inpatient to outpatient, from long-term surgery to day surgery? Now, it seems to me that would go a long, long way to helping to alleviate some of the waiting lists for surgery. When we have the facilities, we need to be able to convert some of the surgical facilities to be on an outpatient, on a day hospital basis. Yet the minister made no reference to it. The minister talks about further hospital beds and further hospital building and not the conversion to a more rational use of existing resources.

As I said already, I'd like to ask the minister what his inventory is of the number of beds, the units, the equipment that is not in use that has now been paid for by these capital dollars. Because as I've heard from, again, around the province that there's a great deal of spending in capital equipment and capital costs in Hospitals and Medical Care that is sitting idly by, that is not being used. And for a Progressive Conservative free enterprise government which wants to use public dollars for their best possible means to have all this investment sitting idly by, to me is, I think, a real telling lesson in terms of mismanagement and bad planning. I'd like to know how much of it's sitting idly by and what the minister intends to be doing about it before we add more to that inventory, more capital dollars and more capital spending.

Now, the minister also has talked about specialized tertiary care facilities such as the new Northern Alberta Children's hospital, and I would certainly like to ask the minister about that one. I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman. I will vote this minister to be Premier of the province if he can demonstrate how in this city of Edmonton he can build a children's hospital at a cost of nearly \$100 million, a 200-bed facility, and then go around . . . Now he's going to bring in the sledgehammer at this point; he's brought it out once or twice before. But I'd to see how he's going to go around to the Misericordia and say: "Okay. No more pediatric beds for you. You're going to close your pediatric unit entirely." And then he goes down to the Grey Nuns, which has just opened with their pediatric unit I'd like to see this minister go down and say: "Okay. Sony, Grey Nuns. You've had this pediatric unit for a year or so. Close it down. We're going to move it all to the children's hospital." All, Mr. Chairman. That's what this minister has said: that all other pediatric services in all other general hospitals in the city are going to be consolidated into the one Northern Alberta Children's hospital. That is a feat that I just can't politically imagine.

But if this minister can pull that off, as he has said he would, then I will give him great plaudits. The situation we have in Calgary, as we know, with the children's hospital in Calgary: the plans for the new Peter Lougheed hospital also have pediatric beds, and there is at least some level of pediatric and neonatal services for children in other general hospitals. But the minister is on record, and I want to hear him say again and then go out and do it; that is, to consolidate the pediatric beds in this city so that all children's services are at one hospital, which is the Northern Alberta Children's hospital. If he can pull that off

and not then also have pediatric beds in other general hospitals, then I will stand in amazement, because he will have done a thing that is far beyond what the current board members and current people in their hospitals are saying is what's going to happen to their pediatric beds.

Then as I said with the geriatric services. Again, Mr. Chairman, the minister has said, whether it's \$1.5 billion or \$2.2 billion or whatever amount has gone into capital construction of acute care hospitals and other services which have gone, as I submit, to institutionalize, has an institutional bias and has so institutionalized care for the elderly . . . Why is it that in these hospitals, when we go into them, you see pediatric services or general medicine and surgical services or psychiatric services; never once do you see a sign that says "geriatric services"? Never once do you go into any acute care hospital in this province and see where it says: "Here is where the geriatricians are. Here is the acute care treatment and assessment for elderly." Now, you see it in pediatrics; you see it in psychiatry in some places and so on. But you never once see a geriatric service in any acute care hospital which we've spent billions of dollars on.

Now, how in the world could we neglect our senior citizens in that way? Are we saying that anybody who gets to 65 or retires or is in their 70s we're not going to assess their geriatric needs; we'll just put them in a nursing home or an auxiliary hospital? Why is it that it's only the General hospital here in Edmonton? I think they're trying to develop some service in Foothills. Two hospitals of the 130 hospitals in this province, with this stated commitment to our senior citizens, have an active treatment geriatric service in them. Now, I ask you: what sense does that make? Because certainly the geriatric population, the senior population, comprises about 30 percent of those who use the health care system. Yet we have specialist services in all these buildings for others, except our elderly. Now, the minister's going to say, "Well, we don't have geriatricians." Well, why don't we have geriatricians? We haven't got the Minister of Advanced Education to fix that one.

But certainly if there's been some planning, if there's been some insight and some progressive thinking, we'd say, "Listen, let's have 130 hospitals, but of 10 or 20 or 30 of them, let's have an active treatment geriatric service in those hospitals so that senior citizens can, in a length of stay of 10 or 12 days, be assessed, be rehabilitated, and then get home again." But we've missed that boat entirely. The spending is a complete betrayal of meeting the real needs of those senior citizens who need assessment and treatment on an acute care, short-term basis so that they can get home again with the proper care to support them at home, not just lumping them into a big, long-term care empire, institutional-based, as we're getting from some quarters.

Well, the minister has also talked about the ambulance service. Well, I would like to see what impact the ambulance has, because every time that we have said we would like to upgrade the ambulance service in the province, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care says, "Well, there you go; that's evidence that the Official Opposition wants to close rural hospitals." Well, that's great, because I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, perhaps we could come back to the Capital Fund as opposed to the ambulance policy.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, they do bear upon one another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect, hon. member, we've been through the estimates, we've been through the heritage fund.

and we're now on the Capital Fund, dealing with capital projects. So perhaps the hon. member could bring his comment back to bricks and mortar somehow.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will do that, because the question I have for the minister is the extent to which an improvement of the ambulance service is going to lessen the need for further capital construction of hospitals in the province. Now, every time we have said that we need to improve the ambulance service, the minister has said, "Well, there's the Official Opposition; it means they're going to close rural hospitals." And he equates the two. He equates the capital construction of hospitals with improving ambulance service, because every time we've made that point, he's retorted with this thing, "There you go; the Official Opposition wants to close hospitals by having an ambulance instead."

Now that we have the Schumacher report and the ambulance proposal before us, I would like to know what impact the minister sees. But to be consistent and to be fair, I'd like to know from him what this is going to mean for the capital construction of hospitals. Does that mean that we're going to lessen hospitals, that we're going to have to close some hospitals, because every time we have raised that point, he says that's the implication of doing so. So I'd like to see the consistency of that and to see from him what impact that's going to have on the Capital Fund.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know in terms of the management of some of the hospitals -- now, we're going to build them, and the minister's alluded to the centre for Alzheimer's disease in Calgary. My information has it that it was a friend of the Member for Calgary-Glenmore who got this together, that it did not go out to public tender, that there was not a way for anyone else to bid on in terms of the building of that. I'd like to know from the minister about that. Was this centre done through a back door? I forget the exact millions of dollars that he said was going to go to it, but I'd like to know if it was an open public competition for building that centre and what role the private sector has in the whole hospital building and management in this province. Because certainly, if the minister is going to, as in this case . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Boy, wait'll the Calgary people hear what you're saying.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, it's Calgary people, hon. member, who have told me this, and I'm just raising their concerns that there are a lot of people in Calgary who feel somewhat resentful of the fact that this thing was sort of announced as a fait accompli and that there was no greater, wider input in terms of how it fits into the larger system.

But it does raise the whole question of private building and private management of hospitals. Certainly, to continue to build a number of hospitals in rural Alberta -- and I'm sure, given the political philosophy and ideology of many of the members who represent there, they would just love to see Extencare or American Medical International or some other big private management firm come in and manage those facilities. Now, I'd like to ask the minister if his capital building of these hospitals in those areas is a way to then leave it open for private management to come in and overtake them in terms of their management or whether his reference to regional centres, such as Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Grande Prairie -- whether it's the regional centres which were going to be using their management

expertise to help to run and manage the hospitals around them.

Now, that seems to me to be what I've heard many say needs to be the route to go, but I'm quite sure that with the political ideology of this government they would just love to see private management overtake and manage all these hospitals in Alberta. And particularly under the trade deal they are free and wide open to do that, because the trade deal clearly says that the management of hospital services is something that is open for national treatment and that hospitals can be managed by American firms.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the empire upon which the minister is now standing with such splendour is an empire which, like Nero fiddling while Rome was burning, is clearly not what the people of Alberta are asking for. They're asking for home care. They're asking for community care. They're asking for funding to go into some projects which have not a heavy capital component but which are going to have a high health care component to increase the health status of Albertans in their community. Yet the minister continues this orgy of edifice complex building, which even his own colleague the Minister of Community and Occupational Health has said is unacceptable and which many, many Albertans have said to me is unacceptable.

I want to find some balance, Mr. Chairman, but clearly the minister, in his litany of largess this morning, doling out one hospital after another hospital and talking . . . I don't know how many times he referred to beds, beds, beds. In this day and age, in 1988, with some of us having children and growing families, we want to look to a health care system in the year 2000 which is not institution-based, which is not bed-based, which has those services provided when they're needed but takes the much wiser use of existing resources and delivers that health care and improves that health status for people in their homes, in their communities, where the human touch can be highly visible and where the community can be working together bringing to bear all resources in terms of the improvement of the community's health, and not this big H, this big hospitalization program, this big medicalization program, which we neither can afford nor can we staff.

So I beseech the minister and members of government in their continued planning -- though they want to put up their hands and think that these big Hs in the middle of their town are going to get them votes, it will clearly prove to be the betrayal of the health care system of this province rather than moving toward a community and occupational health service which is home care and community care, which really means improving the health status of people which is where they are, in their homes and in their community. So let's put the big H over people's homes and say: "Your homes and your families. That's the place we're going to direct funds. That's the place we're going to improve health care status, and that's the place where you in your own self-care and your own understanding of your own health can be much more the sense of what we need for the day and age to come."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, we have 16 members who have comments, questions, or perhaps amendments in the next 27 minutes. Now, hon. members have their rights under Standing Orders. The Chair would simply bring it to the attention of all members that there is great interest in this this morning.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'll be as brief as I can.

Mr. Chairman, there's no question that we all share the so-called stated objective, and that is for good balanced care in our hospital and health care system in total. Heaven only knows, I've gone on long enough and often enough about the need for rationalization in the system, but I still believe there's considerable tilt in it. I'm still uneasy about what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre describes as the edifice complex. I know that's a kind of cute term and a bit of a buzzword, but, Mr. Chairman, you yourself said it when you said: return to bricks and mortar. I think we have had a considerable preoccupation in this province with bricks and mortar.

I take it from the minister's opening comments that there are no plans in his immediate thinking for regionalization of the system, where we would have elected boards that are responsible for the total system to create the balance that we all talk about, boards that would stop the kind of unfortunate competition that occurs quite naturally and unnecessarily between acute care boards, extended care boards, boards providing mental health care, and other community organizations, for dollars. Too often the decision appears to be made on political whimsy rather than on precise details about what the needs are and what the long-range plans would be.

Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt in my mind that there's a great deal of community pride tied up with the business of a hospital in your community. It's the same with your school. There's MLA pride; it's a very visible piece of evidence that, in fact, the government is concerned about people in this district, this community. It's going to require an immense amount of political will on the part of all of us in this House to make any changes in that system. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have here an enormous capital program. It's developed as a result of a capital program that went on for many, many years, that was really a catch-up when the province finally had funds to develop health care systems that had been needed for some time. But now we're into phase 2 or phase 3 or 4; we're into repairing it and maintaining it instead of rationalizing it.

Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt in my mind that specialized care should be centralized and that long-term care should be decentralized into our communities. But there is an urgent need for a balance in this system, not just institutional balance but day care, day hospital, home care balance introduced as well.

Unfortunate and tragic as it was, the nurses' strike, I think, brought home the precise dimensions of the scene to a great many Albertans, and citizens have really wakened up to it. There were remarks made during that strike, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that Alberta spent more on health care and hospitals than any other province, and to be sure, the facts bear that out. But then when one began to look at the figures more clearly, it was evident to Albertans that the funds are going into capital projects and the maintenance of those projects and that that is using up an enormous amount of that budget, as opposed to going into the actual operation. So we have the situation, the dichotomy that we experience where we see beds closing on the one hand and having to stay closed or not being able to open and, on the other hand, more and more beds being built.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just have a few precise questions for the minister that I hope he will have an opportunity to answer. First of all, unfortunately in the way this budget is presented, it doesn't tell us of the timing as to completion of these projects. I would like to make a request that we do put that in. In heritage fund -- at least in those capital programs we get some understanding of where we are in the whole project, and I think it

would be useful to members if we had some idea of whether this is the last payment or the first payment in three or five or whatever.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister then: in 1.2.8, Royal Alex Hospitals, \$800,000, may we know if this is simply for the advancement of the women's health care clinic, which I support in that institution? Or is it the first part of the extension and the improvements in the emergency and outpatient department of the hospital? I think Edmontonians are very anxious about that city hospital and about the circumstances that they find there, and we do need some reassurance that that is going to mean a difference in the day-to-day operation of the hospital and not simply something that we will achieve five years down the road.

In 1.4.1, the Calgary children's hospital: no objection to an improvement in this hospital, Mr. Chairman. But unfortunately, again it's my understanding that with our cutbacks in operating, they have not been able to operate the very special and very important and the excellent programs of outpatient care that they had developed in conjunction with the community. I think it's an excellent model and one we should attempt to support not allow it to deteriorate while we add to the capital construction of the hospital.

Mr. Chairman, the minister went over a great many hospital programs that are contained in this budget but 1.6.3 simply lumps 179.8 -- almost 180 percent -- into the central region. I heard him talk about a number of different places; perhaps we could have just a breakdown of that particular one.

In the 1.7 section, Auxiliary Hospitals, I don't have any sense of how many more beds we will have as a result of these or if they are simply improvements in those and, in fact, it's a decrease in the amount of expenditure in auxiliaries. Perhaps the minister is intending that the increase in the Edmonton General changeover will make up for that reduction, or are there in fact more beds anticipated in auxiliary hospitals?

Mr. Chairman, I have not seen in this budget any particular column that indicates dollars for retrofit; that is, beds that through the utilization study have now been determined not needed for acute care that could in fact become extended care. Is there a budget item for that, and if not why not?

The mental health hospital designated beds: again, many of these hospitals could be designated in more decentralized communities across the province. I think that would be of great benefit to people for early care and early treatment. But funds are needed for retrofit and perhaps the minister could tell us what his plans are for that.

Mr. Chairman, 1.8, the section on Nursing Homes: the minister indicated that 17 nursing homes will take advantage of this \$2,050,000. Are these, Mr. Minister, commercial nursing homes? And if they are, if they're all commercial nursing homes -- or if there is some balance there, perhaps we could find out what that is -- what share of the upgrading does the government pay in the light of a commercial nursing home as opposed to a private nonprofit or public nursing home? Do we still pay 100 percent into a profit-making organization? I think we need some better understanding for the public on that.

Just in closing, Mr. Chairman, we've had the Mirosh report on extended care, we've had the ambulance report, we're now waiting for the Hyndman commission, and I think this process could well have been undertaken some years before. We certainly know what needs to happen without studying it to death while we continue to build.

Quite finally, Mr. Chairman, the government's paper on caring and responsibility talks a great deal about independence

and taking responsibility for yourself and so on. I do not see that this capital budget in any way enhances what's being said there. This doesn't give us a real sense of primary or secondary prevention for people in need of medical care or minimum medical supervision, and I think it's gravely in error in that regard.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Taber-Warner, followed by Calgary-Glenmore.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last Friday evening I had the privilege of attending the annual shareholders' meeting of the Coaldale Community hospital. Because the Coaldale Community hospital is organized under the Societies Act and there are shareholders, there is the requirement for that kind of organizational structure. But I do want to share with the minister and my colleagues in this Assembly the tremendous support there is in the community for the facility, because in addition to the actual shareholders, there were a good number of citizens not only from the town but from the county of Lethbridge and the surrounding area. Of course, a lot of the meeting centered on the new building complex which is currently under way. Coaldale is replacing the existing active treatment hospital with a new prototypical hospital that will consist of the same number of active treatment beds, 25, and in addition there will be 23 auxiliary long-term care beds.

One of the most exciting aspects of this project, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that in addition to the substantial dollars the government is providing through the minister's department for the actual capital construction of the facility, approximately \$11.3 million, the site improvements, as is the case across the province, are the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. When you're dealing with a private hospital, they cannot fall back on the municipalities who have a statutory responsibility, as is the case with, let's say, the Lethbridge Regional hospital, where in addition to the city of Lethbridge we have the county of Lethbridge and towns like Picture Butte and Coaldale that are required to provide financial help so that the grounds and the parking lot and so on can be improved. Coaldale did not have that kind of position.

I do want to go on record as saying how very impressed I am with the work done by Mr. Jake Janzen, the chairman of the board, in consultation with the Coaldale town council, under the leadership of the mayor, and also the reeve of the county of Lethbridge and the county council, in terms of coming together and working in a co-operative way. Through Mayor Bill Holmes and Reeve Dick Papworth we see the approximately \$300,000 of site improvements being handled by the town and the county through contribution of men and equipment. Now, they're taking on that responsibility not with a cash outlay but indeed with some support, as I've indicated. To Mr. Jake Janzen, the chairman of the board, and to other board members -- George Schmidt, George Wall, Bill Regier, Leonard Fast, Dorothy Boras, Doug Foxall, and Jake Janz -- our compliments and congratulations.

Now, while I intended to go on at some length because I'm very proud of this project, I am keenly aware of the fact that other members want to get in within the next 13 minutes, but I do want to direct some comments to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre. It's unfortunate that he stepped out of the Assembly. I'm sure he's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. member. No reference to where members of the House are.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could withdraw that, and then the record may not even indicate it.

MR. BOGLE: I do want to repeat that what we are doing is replacing the active treatment beds that are currently in operation. We are adding auxiliary long-term care beds. When you look at the population of Coaldale with a senior citizens' ratio of about 11 percent and the needs in the community, why should the people of that community be required to go into the city of Lethbridge for long-term care beds and care?

It's interesting that the hon. member who raised the point on other occasions has condemned the government for the fact that people have to go from their traditional services provided at the Edmonton General hospital over to the Royal Alex, because that's about a 25 block trip. That in some way is deemed to be inappropriate, albeit within the same municipality with good public transport, in addition to taxi and other services that are available.

The hon. member in some way suggested that it's fine for rural Albertans to be uprooted from their communities and be forced to go into the cities. Now, if that's the official position of this party, I wish they'd come out to rural Alberta and say so, because that's unacceptable to the areas we represent. Our pioneers have fought long and hard to build the kind of province we've got, and they deserve care in their home communities. As long as this administration is in office, we're going to do everything possible to see that they get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief. I just wanted to mention some points the opposite members missed totally.

When we're talking about the Calgary regional hospital advisory council advising the minister about the Calgary children's hospital and the need for expansion, the Calgary children's hospital provides services on an outpatient basis, an outreach basis, from Calgary and in all rural areas in southern Alberta. I think we need that in northern Alberta too. For that reason, I would support a Northern Alberta Children's hospital so that it provides those outreach programs to the rural areas and a specialty in that area.

I'd also like to mention the hospitals that provide respite care for the elderly. The acute hospitals and long-term care hospitals provide respite care beds for those who are taking care of either their elderly or even mentally handicapped children or disabled children at home and need some relief from those services, and institutions are needed for this service. I'd like to mention, too, and thank the minister for the approval of the Cross Bow hospital upgrading for a very large day hospital. This provides, again, long-term care needs for people who are in their homes who can receive hospital care during the day and be sent home at night. What we have here when we cite these examples is a balance of care. We can't just provide only home care, and we can't just provide only institutions. We need a co-ordinated care program.

We were talking also about the women's pavilion in Calgary, the Grace hospital. It provides outreach programs for women in

their specific diseases. It promotes wellness, and it promotes prevention of diseases. Hospitals are playing a very major role in prevention and treatment and providing outpatient care, and they're also providing quality of service. We also know, and we cannot deny the fact, that there are people who have to be institutionalized for the rest of their lives and don't want to be, but the services need to be there and we have to provide a quality of life for these people. I think that this government and this province is doing that. With the upgrading of the institutions -- and one in my area specifically is the Calgary Glenmore hospital, they call it. It services long-term care, and the upgrading is long overdue. I thank the department and the minister for that money for this service.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the time to do this. I would hope that members opposite would start realizing that that balance of service is very important in our province.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister made mention of the new facility for the Stony Plain area, which is included in the estimates on page 9 under vote 1. I want to go on record as thanking the minister for responding to what I called an urgent and pressing situation.

Let me just counter some of the remarks which have been made earlier about the need for facilities in the local area. The hon. Member for Taber-Warner talked about the importance of keeping people in their area. Stony Plain was one of those areas. Stony Plain got its name a decade before the turn of this century. Stony Plain has an area of 50,000 people serviced by a much larger area which had a crying need, since not a single auxiliary bed existed in Stony Plain prior to the minister's announcement. It still doesn't, but certainly we can see some light at the end of the tunnel.

We have been penalized for years in many departments for our proximity to the city. Last year we had a senior citizen -- and I would like to acknowledge him for the record -- Reinhold Sturtz, who collected 2,044 names on a petition. This petition was submitted to the minister asking for them to see their spouses, is what they really were asking. The Sturtzes had been married 60 years. Mrs. Sturtz was placed in a southeast facility. We have numerous cases of people who have been married 40, 50, and 60 years being separated, and because they're elderly and they no longer drive, it limited their access to their spouse. Believe me, I brought this case to the minister, and I put in all my local publications: auxiliary beds a number one priority.

Well, let me tell you what this minister did. One morning he drove out there and toured that facility, looked it over, listened to the local people. He was impressed by the fact that all the municipal officials in the county and the city of Spruce Grove and the town of Stony Plain were pointed in one direction. There was no fight over land allocation. The land was already allocated by the town of Stony Plain. The minister then asked his officials to work closely. What I call a dynamic decision-making process occurred then, and today we are now enjoying the prospect of a fine new 75-bed extended care facility in Stony Plain. Believe me, there is no way that I can be appreciative enough on behalf of the constituents of Stony Plain, for one only has to go through some of the names on that petition of 2,044 to realize, Mr. Minister, that they are the salt of the earth.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to just take one or two minutes here to counter some of the observations made by the Mem-

ber for Edmonton-Centre. Now, I know that in the first year the Member for Edmonton-Centre made six speeches. Those six speeches were condensed into one. We have now heard that one six times, and believe me, with the speed of delivery I think he's about to register as a small power producer in southern Alberta, because he certainly has condensed that over and over and over into what I call something totally unacceptable to the people of Alberta. He's backing away from his position to close rural hospitals is now what the opposition indicates.

Well, one year ago *Hansard* records the comments of the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane wherein he took the *Hansard* and drew attention to the NDP position of closing rural hospitals, and he totally refuted that position in debate. Well, believe me, I just hope that they continue making comments in *Hansard*, because it makes great reading for my constituents.

I can't believe the perverted logic that goes into comparing the institutional care in Australia to that of Canada. There is no possible way that Australia compares in terms of social or economic programs to those of Canada. Even though they do have a socialistic government over there, they realize that you can only cut the pie so many ways and that certainly they cannot keep up with Canada in terms of its social programs.

But he went on to say that more long-term care beds are needed. Then he went on to criticize the institutionalizing of people in here. So he was totally inconsistent in his presentation. But I do say that if they keep on making this position, it makes it very, very easy to take the minister's actions and programs to Albertans and make them acceptable out there.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by extending a sincere thanks to the minister and the personnel in his department for being flexible and recognizing the needs of the Stony Plain constituents. In 1991 when the new extended care facility is opened, we can all stand with great pride in acknowledging the needs of the Stony Plain constituents.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Lacombe.

MR. R. MOORE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Quickly, in the minute and a half left, I would like to add my comments to those who have already spoken and to say that the Member for Taber-Warner covered very well what I would have had to say. But to add to what he said, there's one important factor that we must keep in mind. It's that in rural Alberta the infrastructure of all those communities is the hospital, and it must be there, contrary to what the opposition across say: that we can do away with our rural hospitals.

It is the one thing, Mr. Chairman, that keeps rural doctors in their communities. I can look to the little village of Bentley. Where in the world would you get two doctors practising in one little village if it weren't for that hospital, which fortunately this government with the support of this minister is seeing is there and will be there to serve these citizens in these small communities. It's a basic part of our life here in rural Alberta, and I don't see why the Liberals and the socialists want everything concentrated in the cities and forget about the infrastructure of our rural communities. The hospital is the number one centre of that, and that keeps our people there. The health of our people and the feeling of security of our people in rural Alberta is in that hospital that's there.

Thank God, Mr. Chairman, we have a minister and a government that realize this and support rural Alberta over the big major cities. I hope that some day the Liberals and the NDP, our

socialist friends, will realize that there's something out in Alberta besides the big cities and big is better, that small is just as important, and that rural Alberta is number one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, under Standing Order 59(2) the Chair is required to put the question 15 minutes before the hour. I now put to you the question. Do you approve all those outstanding estimates standing before this committee under the Capital Fund? All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no. Carried.  
Hon. minister.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions and reports as follows.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1989, a sum from the Capital Fund not exceeding the following for the department and purpose indicated.

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care: \$158,816,000 for Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's the intention of the government to go to Bills on the Order Paper next week, and we will probably go to Bills 21 and 22 maybe as early as Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is making a request not to move any motion. There are one or two items the Chair must deal with. Thank you. That's all.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'll give you time, Mr. Speaker.  
I understood you asked me not to move a motion to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. I'm waiting for a group of school children to enter so they might be introduced.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, I see.

MR. SPEAKER: Yeah. Sorry.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Get them seated as quickly as possible, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

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

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the indulgence of the House. I know we're getting ready to recess for the day.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and members of the Assembly, a group of young people who have just arrived in Edmonton from the St. Rose of Lima school in Calgary. I believe they've been over at the Citadel Theatre this morning and have won a major competition here in Alberta, and I certainly give them my most sincere congratulations. They're a fine group of young people. We just had a photograph taken. Along with them are teachers Mrs. de Waal and Miss Brandelli. Mrs. Secreto, Mrs. Baraniuk, Mrs. Hulme, and Mrs. Oliverio are parents that are traveling with these young people. I would ask the Legislature, after they stand, to give them a warm welcome and a congratulations on their very well deserved win this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, earlier today in question period in an exchange between the Member for Calgary-Mountain View and the Premier an issue developed which was raised as a point of order by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View after question period had been completed. At that time, the Chair mentioned to the House that the Chair would meet with the Premier and examine the document which had been referred to to determine whether or not the phrase which was uttered within the question period context by the Premier had occurred within the document so that one could determine whether or not this had been a citation or just a general reference with respect to the item of correspondence. To refresh the memory of the House, the quote which was given by the hon. Premier in reply to the Member for Calgary-Mountain View was basically this: "the Getty tribunal process and the federal government's response to it."

The Chair has examined the correspondence, and that total phrase does not occur anywhere in that document. Therefore, there is no need to have the document filed with the House. It was a general reference to what was in the letter.

[At 12:52 p.m. the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]