

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, June 15, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/06/15

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Our Father, we thank You for Your abundant blessings to our province and ourselves.

We ask You to ensure to us Your guidance and the will to follow it.

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today to introduce a distinguished visitor in your gallery. We are visited today by His Royal Highness Prince William of Luxembourg. He's the youngest son of the Grand Duke of Luxembourg and is spending six weeks in Alberta with Luscar Ltd. gaining an orientation to the province's mining and oil and gas industries. Prince William is a recent graduate of the school of foreign service at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., and plans to represent his country in international relations. His father, the Grand Duke, and the Grand Duchess were here in Calgary during the recent Winter Olympics as his father is a founding member of the International Olympic Committee. The royal family has a special relationship with Canada as some of them sought sanctuary here during the invasion of Luxembourg in the Second World War. The Grand Duke attended and graduated from Laval University during this period.

As a matter of interest to members of the Assembly I could point out that one of the captains of the Canadian hockey team during the Olympics, Mark Habscheid, originates from Luxembourg, and I met him and his father and mother at the reception sponsored by the Grand Duke and Duchess during the course of the Olympic Games.

I would ask hon. members of the Assembly to extend the warmest possible welcome to our distinguished visitor.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly, the Member of Parliament for Edmonton-East, Mr. Bill Lesick, who is in your gallery and who is accompanied today by Mr. Dick de Boer and his wife, of Bellevue, Ontario. Mr. de Boer and Mr. Lesick served together in Holland in the war during 1944-45. I would ask that they be accorded the usual warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling the response to Question 198.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to table for the Legislature a series of signed petitions from investors in First and Associated Investors which were sent to a number of government members over the last several months. As these petitions have never been presented in the Assembly, I feel it's important that all members of the Legislature be aware of their content.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, sir, to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly, 26 grade 6 students from Campbelltown school in Sherwood Park. They are joined by their teacher Ken Werenka and parents Mrs. Agrell-Smith, Mrs. Robson, Mrs. Lehman, Mrs. Shaw, and Mrs. Nadon. They're in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise so that we could extend to them the very warm, cordial welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Legislature is doubly blessed today in that we have not one but two groups of fine students from Red Deer. The first group is from the St Pat school, 43 students in all, accompanied by Mrs. Shacterle and Mr. John Adam, who are teachers in the school, and parents Mrs. Ackerman, Mrs. Pelletier, and Mrs. La Bonté.

The second group, equally as interesting and vivacious a group, 31 students from St Teresa school in grade 6, and they are accompanied by teachers Sheila Spencer and Barb Barrett and by parents Marita Lazaro, Colleen Caddy, and Carol Long. I'd ask them to stand together and receive the double warm reception of this Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you today and through you to the members of this Assembly, a very special friend of the west, a very special person, the Hon. Senator Bud Olsen, a former Minister of Agriculture, former leader of the government in the Senate. I'd ask the House to give the traditional welcome to the Hon. Bud Olsen in the public gallery.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce to you and through you to other members of the Legislature, a group of 27 students from St. Gabriel school in beautiful Edmonton-Gold Bar. They're in the public gallery, and they're accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Bahry. I'd ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the Legislature.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, in the public gallery this afternoon we have a visitor all the way from Guyana. She's currently studying in Birmingham and has come to visit her sister who lives in Edmonton. She's Patsy Hinds, and she is accompanied today by her sister Claudette Fraser. I'd ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Closure Motions on Bills 21 and 22**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. For the second time this session the government has bungled its way into a situation where it has to invoke closure to stop debate in the Legis-

lature. I remind this Premier that closure in a parliamentary democracy is meant to be used only in very exceptional circumstances, and unfortunately for this government -- the second time in a month -- it seems to be becoming commonplace that we're going to invoke closure in this Legislature. I want to ask the Premier a very serious, fundamental question about parliamentary democracy. Is the Premier not concerned that the government has fallen into the trap of using authoritarian tactics to stop and ram through legislation in this Legislature?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, obviously a government is not anxious, or doesn't desire to use closure. However, it doesn't take anybody with a high IQ to realize that some of the debate that has been going on in the two pieces of legislation that closure is being proposed for has been literally without meaning and merely a stalling practice. By reviewing the *Hansard* -- and I urge all members, if they can stand it, to do it. The other evening was a perfect example. I did not like the idea of using closure until again reviewing that. It obviously showed that the government had to proceed with the business and not allow that kind of delay to go on and on.

I say only one other thing, Mr. Speaker. Closure is a part of parliamentary democracy as established over the years. It is as much a part of Parliament as is the Speaker or leaders of the opposition or members of cabinet. Closure was put there long before us by people who understood there would be times when it's necessary to use it. It appears necessary to use it. [some applause]

MR. MARTIN: The backbenchers can pound all they want, Mr. Speaker, but I would remind this Premier that we have limited tools on this side of the House, that these two Bills that were brought in . . . [some laughter] Don't they find it funny when they bring in closure?

But these two Bills affect all the working people in the province, and they're odious, bad Bills, Mr. Speaker. I'd say to the Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is indeed getting a bit lengthy, and there's the whole problem with the question as anticipation of what might be indeed dealt with on the Order Paper today. Nevertheless, the Chair has allowed that to go, but we'll now have succinct supplementary questions.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, half the time they're pounding, and we have to wait, so . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Leader of the Opposition. [interjection] Order. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: My question is to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Are you so completely out of touch that you think you can pass unfair, bad legislation and then ram it through by closure in this Legislature?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a different point of view. Now, I understand that. He has a different point of view. They make their arguments. The House always deals with those situations. You have first reading; you have second reading; you have third reading; you have complete committee study of a Bill. We have taken hours upon hours upon hours upon hours of discussion of the legislation.

Also, the legislation, as a result of a painstaking process of consultation for some two years now, is now before the House. It's proper that the House deal with it.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a point of view that he happens to not agree with it. The fact of the matter is that he can't convince the House. The House finally deals with legislation, and that's what the House is doing. I've been in opposition. I know the position of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Let's be clear about one thing. The reason that closure isn't used very often is that usually you have a more responsible opposition.

MS BARRETT: The tyranny of the majority.

MR. MARTIN: As my colleague said, the tyranny of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, there have been three debates on Bill 21 and three on 22. I ask the Premier this question: is he saying that three debates on both these major Bills is too much, and you have to have closure after that?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, usually I've found in the Legislature that when members have weak positions, they raise their voices and yell. That seems to be the case again.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have taken many, many hours. The Bill was introduced. It then sat over for a year to come into this Legislature. It has then . . .

MS BARRETT: And then you changed it.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: You changed it totally.

MR. GETTY: Obviously it's been changed, because of the consultation process. People gave input, and that's what's now before the House. The hon. members can debate it, as they have and will be given additional opportunities.

But finally, Mr. Speaker, as I said, you only have to review the way the debate is now being presented by the opposition to see that they have decided to merely delay and not discuss the merits of the legislation. Trying to amend it on second reading without even getting to the committee study, where they could have made amendments, is silly. But they just wanted to do it. So Legislatures have a way of dealing with that, and we are.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the only emergency is that the golf course is calling for the Premier.

The Premier asked about committee stage then. Okay. Let's move, and I can guarantee that we will have a number of serious amendments to bring in at committee stage. Would the Premier now, then, give his word to this Assembly that this government will not invoke closure during committee stage?

MR. GETTY: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. I mean, how could you do that when the legislative procedure provides that under certain circumstances, when an opposition no longer tries to be a positive force in the Legislature but instead is merely attempting to delay and drag on and frustrate the House, there are certain procedures that we are obligated to use. Well, how would I then guarantee not to do that? I mean, that sounds just as silly as the other comments.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the government has some amendments. The minister responsible, the Minister of Labour, said he wants to introduce some amendments. I want to see those

amendments; we all want to see the amendments. Then we'll deal with how it proceeds. If it proceeds with dispatch, as it should, wonderful. If it's delayed and an attempt is made to frustrate the House, then the Legislature would have to deal with that as it sees fit as well. I just encourage the hon. members to pursue their responsibilities here in the House in a positive way, and so will we.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon, supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, a supplementary. In view of the rather disgraceful act yesterday of a member of the government moving adjournment on a private member's Bill before anyone had the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. This hasn't got anything to do with this question. Would the member proceed to the supplementary question?

MR. TAYLOR: That's part of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not closure. [interjections] Hon. member, the afternoon business was not closure. The questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition were.

MR. TAYLOR: It is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If this argument will continue, we can recognize someone else on the supplementary, hon. member.

The supplementary, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a stinkweed by any other name will smell just as bad.

What I'm interested in knowing is whether this Premier and the House are going to continue their reprehensible habit of using closure by adjournment.

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've noticed that when the opposition does not have a particularly good session, they tend to get a little desperate when it gets into the later days of the session. When that happens they get extreme and start to get a little shrill.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the House determines for itself what happens. If the members pursue their responsibilities in a positive way, over the years we've seen that the House proceeds in a positive way, and I'm sure that's the way we all want it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Red Deer-South.

MR. TAYLOR: That's positive? When you've got your lackeys to move an adjournment over there?

MR. SPEAKER: Red Deer-South.

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. That's the lackey . . .

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Red Deer-North is the lackey; I'm sorry.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm waiting for the leader of the

Liberal opposition to regain his composure so I can get on with my question.

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier on a little different perspective. I would like the Premier to assure this Assembly that when we get to second reading, can he assure this Assembly that we won't be subjected to the painful and needless rhetoric that he made reference to in *Hansard*, and the flagrant abuse of this Legislature's time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the House normally deals with those matters. I would assure the hon. member that it is the intention of the government to continue the business of the House in a positive, responsible way at all stages of legislation.

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

MR. STRONG: Point of order after question period, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MARTIN: They really need to get out on the golf course, don't they?

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

Ambulance Service

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite a letter by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to all the municipalities telling them to hold the line on funding increases for emergency medical services such as ambulances, the Alberta Ambulance Operators Association has written a letter of its own making it clear that a 14.5 percent increase will be necessary and that the minister, and I quote:

must not be allowed to shirk the onus for their decision by off-handedly and irresponsibly attempting to place the responsibility for that Provincial . . . decision onto . . . Municipal Governments or the Ambulance Operators.

Insofar, Mr. Speaker, as the minister was so easily able to find a 35 percent increase for cardiovascular surgeons in the province, will he at least be able to find the 14.5 percent increase that the municipalities need to implement emergency services as outlined by the Schumacher report?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Ambulance Operators Association have recommended an increase in ambulance fees that's well above that amount mentioned by the hon. member. The process in Alberta is that individual municipal governments must pass a bylaw establishing ambulance fees in each jurisdiction. We have not yet had an opportunity, indeed not had a request, for a meeting with the Ambulance Operators Association, although I have now asked staff of my department to meet with them. We've not had an opportunity to sit down with them and discuss what the real needs are. Certainly they're well, well below what the request is, in my view.

In the meantime, until those meetings have occurred and there's some understanding on our part and the ambulance operators with respect to what the real increase should be, I decided that it was necessary to let municipalities know what our position was. So I wrote to every municipality in Alberta, not telling them, Mr. Speaker, to not increase the fees but simply to

delay passing any bylaws until such time as we had had some meetings with the Ambulance Operators Association and would have some recommendations to make.

The government's interest in this, of course, develops from the fact that we pay all of the costs of ambulance services for our senior citizens, a lot with respect to people who are on Social Services, and all of the interhospital transfers, as well as the air ambulance services.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, insofar as municipalities such as the city of Edmonton are already accumulating huge deficits because of provincial health care responsibilities, is it the position of the minister that they reduce the level of service to the budgets that they have to be able to run ambulance services and just let injured Albertans have less access to emergency care by having to wait longer for the response times, for instance.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member never does very much research relative to his questions. If he had done so, he would know that the province has been funding 100 percent of hospital costs, 100 percent of doctors' fees, and so on, but the responsibility with respect to ambulance services has been divided between the province and municipalities. We have been paying the cost of interhospital transfer largely from hospitals outside of the major centres into the major centres because we feel that where additional medical hospitalization is required that isn't available in a community, it should reasonably be paid for by the government. So we've been funding the cost of transferring from one hospital to another one. We've also been funding all of the air ambulance.

But the responsibility at the present time for the provision of ambulance services within a community like Edmonton city rests with the municipal government. Now, the municipal responsibilities for health care in this province are far less than any province in Canada. In almost every other jurisdiction, capital costs of medical ... [interjection] Ontario is a fine example, where 25 percent of the capital costs of every hospital must be raised by the municipality. So our municipalities, having only to provide ambulance services, are very well treated by this government in terms of overall medical costs.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the transfer business is partly what's at the root of the problem here. Insofar as the minister has advocated that the lucrative transfer of patients business be taken away from some ambulance services, which has caused a reduction in their income, what compensation is the minister considering to compensate them for that loss of transfer revenue so that they can continue to fund emergency services for injured Albertans throughout the province?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have not advocated such arrangements at all. Even if I did, I would not suggest there would be any compensation to any existing ambulance authority.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, talking about not doing your homework, it's taken about five years for this government to come up with this final report, and I'd challenge the minister on recommendation 35, which says that in another year after this is passed, the emergency health services commission might then

be asked, one or two years from now, to develop a funding system which is adequate for medical transportation of emergency ambulance services.

MR. SPEAKER: Could we have the supplementary?

REV. ROBERTS: Why in the world is it taking so long for the minister and this government to come up with an adequate funding system for emergency services in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I'm sure he's had, as I've had, a number of requests from ambulance operators who have been denied payment due to listening either to the patient or doctor and taking the patient to a hospital that is further away than the closest one. Can he inform the House just what his procedures are on reimbursing ambulance people if there is a conflict in their directions from the patient and doctor versus the closest hospital?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the province funds the cost of transfer from one hospital to another, from a rural hospital to an urban one, with respect to people who are transferred from one hospital to the other, as I just explained. I don't think there's any difficulty there except when a patient is an outpatient rather than an inpatient, and the report deals with some recommendations in that regard.

Insofar as individuals getting transported by ambulance, other than those who are covered by Blue Cross or interhospital transfers, the provincial government does not provide any payment except in the case of those who may be on Social Services. So I'm not sure whether we would be involved in any disputes involving whether or not an individual was taken to the nearest hospital or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Member for Stettler, supplementary.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Rural municipalities are pleading that any new standards be not too onerous. Will the minister ensure that any new standards which are not accompanied by commensurate funding will not make service unaffordable for many or some rural municipalities?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the report which was done by a policy committee chaired by the hon. Member for Drumheller is an excellent report, and I personally concur with most if not all of the recommendations in the report. It should be noted, however, that the report was done on the basis of listening to interest groups and others across the province and is now the subject of discussion. We're asking interested persons and groups to respond to us by the end of September as to what they think of the report. Indeed, a number of municipalities have already responded. It won't be until after that time, sometime after September, that the government will be in a position after this kind of a consultative process to determine what direction we'll go. The member's question will best be answered at that time. The only thing that I can assure the House is that we will not, with respect to ambulance services, be following the NDP proposal of closing rural hospitals and moving everybody to the

city by ambulance.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Export of Water

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. The Premier's answers on exporting water yesterday are just not in accord with the facts, because no matter what he thinks, the free trade agreement clearly says that if there's any conflict between it and any other Act of Parliament, the free trade Act is paramount. Furthermore -- second sentence -- the free trade Act also says, as government minister Mr. Crosbie backs up, that the federal government can override provincial laws except when specifically noted in the agreement. Mr. Speaker, since water isn't specifically noted in the agreement how will the Premier then stop water export when it is clearly defined as a good, g-o-o-d, and subject to the Mulroney trade agreement? How could you stop it?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Liberal Party surely knows that there can be no legislation moved by the federal government for any reason that overrules the Constitution of this nation. Also, the hon. member surely knows that when this government of Alberta will not be a part of the export of water, then water will not be exported. We dealt with it yesterday. The hon. Minister of the Environment responded as well. It's unfortunate that he isn't here now because of responsibilities in this area, but I just tell the hon. member: Alberta as a matter or policy will not be part of the export of water from our province.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the point is that he can't prevent it. In view of the fact that ministers and Premiers change through the years -- much as you may not know that, Virginia -- the fact of the matter is, it'd be nice to have that protection in the Act. Would the Premier push the federal government to make sure that the export of water is explicitly excluded in the FTA?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the matter is covered by a policy of the government of Alberta. If there is a different government some time in the dark, dim recesses of the future, they can decide for themselves.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm having difficulty getting the point across that the FTA takes precedence over the federal House; the federal House takes precedence over the Alberta government. Mr. Crosbie was in here informing your minister of it the other day. Would the Premier not at least now tell the federal government that he will withdraw his support for the FTA unless they explicitly exclude water for export?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, obviously, we've taken care of the matter of the export of water.

Now, the hon. member indicates by his comments leading up to his question his belief that somehow this Confederation is established by a senior government dictating to junior governments, and he's absolutely wrong. It is true that that has been the feeling expressed by former Liberal governments, supported by the NDP, in Ottawa, where they have tried to impose from the centre their will on the provinces, but it has been the Alberta government that has fought this, prevented it in the past, and

will prevent it in the future.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, all the wishful thinking of the Premier will not help it at all.

Because there are obviously people of a certain amount of status in this country that feel that water can be exported because it's not explicit, would the Premier go so far as to commission an independent legal opinion outside the House or the Liberal, Conservative, or ND parties, as to whether or not water could be exported without the provinces' permission under the FTA?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I will have the Attorney General review the need for such a request, because the hon. member has some history of not being accurate in his desires to have certain things done. So we'll review that. In the past, of course, as the hon. member knows, when there's ever been any discussion across the bonier regarding water, there's had to be a treaty for that specific purpose. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I again state to the hon. member the policy of this government. We are not going to be a part of exporting water from Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. In view of the fact that federal negotiators were pushing for water to be part of the negotiations and that the B.C. government has sold a dam to an American concern, will the Premier instruct the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to get a specific agreement from the federal government that free trade has not and will never include negotiations for the sale of water or water-control devices such as dams?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, again that indicates this hon. member's or his party's position that the federal government is somehow able to dictate to provinces. They think that way because their parties act that way and have in the past out of Ottawa, where in such matters as the national energy program and others clearly in areas of provincial jurisdiction, they have tried to impose their will. [interjections] Well, this government in Alberta has fought that in the past, will resist it now and in the future. We're not interested in their . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Premier. [interjections]

MS BARRETT: Aw, we're not allowed to talk if the Premier is talking.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right, hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands. You are not allowed to talk. [interjections] Order please. Order. We can stand here for quite a while in spite of a number of other people wanting to get in.

Member for Little Bow, on a main question.

Language Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. The Premier has made statements in the Legislature with regards to the fact that any new legislation dealing with French language rights and other language rights will not alter the fundamental nature of Alberta. I would rather support that position, but I want to point out that the federal government

can take and has taken certain steps to alter that possibility by the introduction of the proposed federal bilingualism Bill, C-72. My question to the minister has the government considered obtaining from the federal government an agreement that will prevent the federal government from the promotion of French language rights in the province without first obtaining the written agreement of the government of Alberta?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the agreement, of course, is in the Meech Lake accord, which has provided that the provinces other than Quebec will preserve the linguistic characteristics of the province. I think the hon. member supported that Meech Lake accord, as I recall.

But I think perhaps the hon. member may be referring to some reports to the effect that Quebec has sought such an agreement from the federal government, and that matter is being reviewed now as to the accuracy of those reports.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister indicate what steps are being taken in that review? Is there someone in Ottawa directly asking the question, or is the minister by telephone requesting the information? What steps are being taken to assure Alberta clarity of that position?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, first of all, discussions are under way between officials of both the federal government and the government of Quebec to ascertain the accuracy of the reports relative to an issue that the hon. member has raised with me. We've not yet had confirmation of that.

The hon. members are aware, of course, that we do have an office in Ottawa, and that office is in touch with the federal government on this, along with many other issues.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The federal Multiculturalism Act, Bill C-93, should it pass in its present form, will have implications for the balance of ethnic groups that make up Alberta's character. Has the government considered the effects of this Bill, and would the minister be reporting on those possible effects to this Legislature?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, really the matter of federal legislation in the field of multiculturalism is something that is of concern to the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism in Alberta and, of course, will be the subject of concern and discussions in the Multicultural Commission, which has been created by this Legislature and which will in due course be filled with members from throughout the province of Alberta. So obviously, that is a matter that will have to be taken into consideration by that organization as well as the department.

Insofar as the particular Bill is concerned, it is being analyzed and assessed by the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Attorney General's department and, in the view of those departments, does not appear to create problems for us proceeding in our province to deal with multiculturalism as this province deems fit through the procedures in the legislation that I've already mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional, Little Bow.
Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister and possibly to the Minister of Education: whoever can handle it. How much is the province of Alberta now advantaging them-

selves of any grant from the federal government in each year to promote bilingualism?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education may wish to supplement the answer, but I did respond to a similar question yesterday without the specifics in terms of the number of dollars, and I think that may be what the hon. member is getting at. I indicated that funds are being made available in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, and whatever funds are available through the formulas that have been established as a result of negotiations between the federal government and the Council of Ministers of Education for Canada, although I'm no longer a member of that interesting body. The formulas are there. I can't give the hon. member the specific amounts, but certainly Alberta is sharing when programs are advanced, and Alberta is in fact the leader in many areas of bilingualism and in training in languages other than English and French.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary?
Minister of Education, additional information.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would only add that if the member would like some additional information, he should perhaps put the question on the Order Paper. I don't have the details with me at this moment, but I can assure him that we are accessing through the protocol on official languages the dollars that are available for bilingualism. There may well be more dollars that flow into that accord because of the federal announcement, and we are certainly looking at accessing our share.

Water Supply Assistance

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, the recent rains have certainly been very welcome in our province, and indeed if you read the papers, you would consider the drought over. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Would you update the Assembly as to the amount of relief that it actually has provided throughout the province?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report to the Assembly that the relief was immense. We're delighted that we did have the rainfall, but we also acknowledge that there are some areas within the province that had a much lower rate of precipitation than other parts did. The hon. member's constituency is a fine example of that, where it is still reason for deep concern because there are pockets within the province that still do require additional rainfall.

MRS. McCLELLAN: A supplementary. Has there been a notable change in participation level in the programs that we have initiated for drought relief?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the uptake has been considerable. Towards the end of last week we had participated in the filling of in excess of 500 dugouts. I don't have the specific details as to the other components of our water supplies program, but I'm more than happy to share them with the hon. member.

MRS. McCLELLAN: The fact that in the southern part of the area many ranchers are still feeding and probably will continue

to have to, are there any considerations for additional or alternate programs to address those concerns?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're still in the stage of analyzing various contingency plans in the event that they are required. Today officials from our department are meeting with the Alberta Cattle Commission so that we, in consort with them, can develop programs in the event that they are required. We have also worked very closely with the federal government and the provinces of B.C., Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: Athabasca-Lac La Biche. Forgive me. The Chair has had a very interesting note sent. I wasn't laughing at any of the issues or the member. I've just been told to start smiling a bit more, and I agree.

Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Agriculture. I'm still getting concerns from farmers who feel the \$150 a day for the pumping services, the pumps your department is providing, is excessive as compared, for example, to rental companies, which provide pumps for \$85 to \$100 per week. Why the \$150 a day? Couldn't that be reviewed by your department?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, as I did to the hon. Member for Vegreville and the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, that if they had specific concerns, I'd be more than happy to deal with them. None of them has brought me any specific concerns, so it only leads me to believe that they're raising issues that are non-issues. But if they do have specifics, I'm more than happy to deal with them. I would hope that they would share them with me, because we want to be very reactive as best we can, but if they don't share those specifics with me, it's tough for me to respond, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: I've done that and you don't respond.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

MR. FOX: I'll produce the letters. Who are you calling a liar?

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, legislation introduced . . .

MR. FOX: You've sent me letters; I've sent you letters. Don't you call me a liar.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Edmonton-Calder, not Vegreville, hon. member. With due respect, Edmonton-Calder, please.

Private Adoptions

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, legislation introduced yesterday endorses private adoption, which raises some serious concerns. The minister has excluded some extremely important procedures which were recommended in 1986 in a report done for her department. The new legislation does not regulate fees for home studies, legal services, or medical services but merely states that these fees must be reasonable. I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services what fees the department will consider reasonable: \$3,000, \$5,000, \$10,000? How much is reasonable?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should take an opportunity, obviously just down the road, to participate when the Bill is under debate. But I would say that there is a fair amount of experience in terms of the number of hours required to complete a suitable home study. On that basis, we will see if the adoption agencies follow that rather rule of thumb.

MS MJOLSNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're still not sure what is reasonable.

Can the minister explain how her policy won't discriminate against those who can't afford \$3,000 or \$5,000 up front?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is throwing out some figures. It would be interesting to find out what she bases those figures on, because it is an interesting supposition.

I think that what we have provided for is an option for people in this province who do not want to deal with government in respect of their children and the potential giving up of their children. I believe that's a very fine option with the appropriate safeguards.

MS MJOLSNESS: Well, those figures, Mr. Speaker, are based on what's being charged now.

A supplementary to the minister. As mandatory preplacement counseling for parents is recommended in the 1986 report but is nowhere mentioned in the new legislation, doesn't the minister consider counseling as an essential step in the whole process of adoption?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I first want to deal with the preface to the hon. member's question, which related to my previous answer. I don't know where she's getting her figures, because right now the Department of Social Services does all the home studies that are required for all adoptions in this province. So I'd be interested in the hon. member sharing that information afterwards.

When we discuss counseling, Mr. Speaker -- and I would agree with the hon. member that there is some concern about appropriate information for people. We have provided for that particular area by saying that a Social Services worker with the appropriate information will be available to the relinquishing parent in order to make sure that they have been counseled and have all the information in order to make a good decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary; it's the final.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What standards will be set for preplacement home assessments then? Is something as essential as preplacement home assessments going to be left up to the agencies to make arbitrary decisions?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, professional people will be involved in that assessment.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will the minister describe for the House precisely how the department proposes to regulate and monitor fees so that we will not produce a two-tier system?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the department certainly has a long history of doing home studies and the type of information

and hours that are required. We will take the information that comes from the individual agencies in terms of what they believe to be appropriate and make sure that that is in line. I think all hon. members should understand and note that in the legislation there is the ability for the minister to set fees.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional supplementaries? Member for Calgary-Bufferalo.

Water Management

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was surprised to see that the minister has returned. It's to the Minister of the Environment. Yesterday my motion proposing a program to conserve our rivers proceeded not only without the Minister of the Environment's participation, but it was subject to closure of debate by a government majority after one and one-hundredth speakers. So I'm back again on an important environmental issue that should be publicly discussed.

The Canadian Heritage Rivers System is a co-operative program of the federal government and, to date, six provinces to give national recognition to and protect important rivers of this country, which Alberta has refused to participate in despite having been involved in planning the program. I'm wondering whether the minister can say why it is that Alberta has refused to join this Canadian heritage rivers program, which is designed to protect important rivers and which six progressive provinces in this country have joined.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Member for Calgary-Bufferalo would be surprised that I would return; I enjoy this place very, very much. It's just that I had to go out to do a very important event that I'll talk about in a couple of minutes from now.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Rivers System that has been established since 1978 in the country of Canada is a very good system for acknowledgment of heritage rivers. Alberta had participated in the early 1980s in the discussion on the whole program, and Alberta will continue to participate in further discussions with respect to the possibility of designating certain portions of rivers within our province as heritage rivers. It has to be pointed out, however, that when one talks about designating certain portions of rivers, what one is really doing is designating those rivers in a natural state, a state that has been that way since the beginning of time and one that will continue to the end of time.

Yesterday in the debate in the House with respect to the motion of the Member for Calgary-Bufferalo, the way he put it forward he basically was talking about reaches of rivers in our province that have been well populated by people and well used by people and would not really fit the criteria of the Heritage Rivers System. Notwithstanding that, there may very well be some rivers within our national parks that would very well fit the criteria, and we have that subject matter under review.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, it's nice to have it under review, but why is it that the government doesn't have any policy in place? We have no legislation in any of our statutes. We have no agency set aside to develop a policy to protect the wild rivers of this province, such as the Clearwater and the Red Deer. Why not?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, what the member is saying is completely unfactual. One of the reasons that I was

awaiting an opportunity to make further public comments with respect to this matter is -- Certainly out of honesty and integrity I looked at the hon. member's motion on the Order Paper. The Member of the Legislative Assembly, the hon. member, had taken the time to pen a motion, to have it put on the Order Paper; it came up on the Order Paper. I listened very carefully to the comments made by the hon. member in the House, and I must say that in the end I walked away totally unimpressed with the comments that were made.

I just finished commenting, Mr. Speaker, that one of the important aspects about heritage rivers is that you're talking about natural, untamed rivers. If the hon. gentleman is talking about the Red Deer River, one can talk about settlements along the Red Deer River that really go all the way from the reaches to the west of the city of Red Deer and down to the Saskatchewan border. As far as I understand, there are people who live and people who use that river and have used it for upwards of a hundred years and undoubtedly will continue until the end of time in our province.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd call that baloney, but I don't want to offend the sausage. I wonder if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Perhaps we could get on to it.

MR. CHUMIR: Could the minister perhaps, then, give us some information as to what specific rivers in this province are designated for protection of any kind? What policy do we have with respect to any specific rivers?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may disagree -- and I know that he does because I can hear him shaking his head. In terms of the policies that we have in our province, they're very clearly elucidated and outlined in a very important document called Water Resource Management Principles for Alberta. This is a document that contains some 20 easily definable and identifiable policies with respect to our overall management of water within the province of Alberta. We have in this province -- the previous provincial government prior to 1971, the provincial government since 1971 -- taken a very aggressive stance with respect to the need to protect, preserve, conserve the water resource of our province. I think that it's also necessary to point out that less than 1 percent of the land mass of this province is water. We have apportionment agreements with our sister provinces to the east, and we must manage and conserve and preserve those waters and maintain them as free from any form of human pollution as possible. That is what we are doing, and that is the policy of this government.

MR. CHUMIR: Sounds like sausage to me.

When will the government, Mr. Speaker, change its ridiculous policy of having the Department of the Environment in charge of protecting the environment at the same time as it has

the directly conflicting responsibility of promoting dams and water development projects in this province?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, this is a question that's been put forward by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo on several occasions before. My idea, my understanding of the definition of the word "environment" includes air, water, and land. If the hon. member is saying that a Minister of the Environment should not be concerned about water quality and the management and the conservation or preservation of water, then I think it's extremely important that the Member for Calgary-Buffalo should identify what department of the government should be responsible for the protection of the most essential commodity that we have to preserve, sustain, and, in fact, allow the origination of life. If that is not part of the environment, then I would challenge the member to tell us who should be responsible, if not the Minister of the Environment, for water and life in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister confirm that a Conservative government would not want to participate in a program to conserve rivers in their natural state because it sees their value as industrial development and waste disposal as being much more important?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, somebody indicated to me not too many minutes ago that a socialist in the Alberta Legislative Assembly looks exactly the same as a socialist in the Canadian House of Commons, and that statement just confirms everything that was repeated to me less than 20 minutes ago by a distinguished Canadian. It's not worthy of a response; it's so silly.

MR. SPEAKER: Red Deer-North. [interjections] We'll let the question flow from the Member for Red Deer-North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ho ho.

AN HON. MEMBER: Groan.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the reception given to me by the opposition, but I'd like to proceed with the question. To the Minister of the Environment. Are there any implications of a loss of control or jurisdiction when a province signs under the Canadian Heritage Rivers System?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in 1978 when the Canadian Heritage Rivers System was presented to Canadians for the first time, the federal government of the day -- it then of course was a Liberal government, supported by its NDP allies. One can be assured that any arrangement of that form of government would certainly have lead to the conclusion raised by the Member for Red Deer-North. We live in a different environment in 1988, a very co-operative environment, with a federal government that is concerning itself about provincial rights and the rights of the people of this province. That's why we say that we have the matter under review. We have a much more confident factor today than we ever could have had in 1978, when the Reds were around.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The time for question period has expired. I believe we have

a point of order from the Member for St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I raise my point of order under Standing Order 23:

- (h) makes allegations against another member,
- (i) imputes false or unavowed motives to another member.

Mr. Speaker, during question period in response to questions asked by the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Premier responded in various fashions and ways. He said that he'd read *Hansard* and indicated that he found nothing positive in our remarks as members of the Official Opposition relating to the two labour Bills that are before this Assembly. He indicated that we as the Official Opposition were not pursuing our duties in a positive way. He implied that if positive comment would have been made, debate would have gone on. He implied that closure is and can be used by government and made it sound as if closure were introduced every day.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Red Deer-South rose and commented about the "needless rhetoric" that was put on in *Hansard* in our response in second reading as an Official Opposition. That clearly is not the case. The comments that were offered by the Official Opposition dealt with a review by the Attorney General's department of the legislation that we unfortunately had before us, as it applies to the legalities and the protection offered . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. We are not about to go back through the thick *Hansard* report of the last 10 days or so. The member's point of complaint has been raised, and the Chair really regards it as a matter of complaint. It's a matter of note in this House, as in other Houses, that all hon. members are entitled to their own opinion. Under the standing order cited by the hon. member, the Chair really does not regard it as being a violation of any of the wording that is there in Standing Orders.

Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. SPEAKER: First, the Chair would recognize the Minister of the Environment, followed by the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased today to introduce to you a very distinguished member of the Canadian House of Commons and a distinguished Canadian parliamentarian, the Hon. Perrin Beatty, Minister of National Defence and minister responsible for Emergency Preparedness Canada. In 1986 and 1987, the citizens of Alberta unfortunately were racked with two devastating disasters. In 1987 there was a very quick and compassionate and immediate response from our federal government to a request made by the government of Alberta on behalf of the people of Alberta for federal assistance to the tornado which caused such dramatic damage in the Edmonton

area and central Alberta. A few minutes ago Mr. Beatty presented to the government of Alberta, and of course to the people of Alberta, a cheque for \$22 million, a partial payment in terms of the federal contribution to this enormous disaster. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to publicly acknowledge the outstanding response of the government of Canada, the outstanding response of the office of the minister responsible for Emergency Preparedness Canada, and the compassionate approach taken by Mr. Beatty on behalf of the citizens of Alberta. I'd also like to acknowledge the determination of Deputy Prime Minister Don Mazankowski, the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, and the Member of Parliament for the area, Mr. Walter Van De Walle, as well as the Member of Parliament for Edmonton North, Mr. Bill Lesick, in regards to this.

Mr. Beatty is in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and joining him this afternoon are Katie McCunn, special assistant to the minister; Marie-Diane Faucher, communications adviser; and Gwynne R. McLoughlin, assistant regional director, Emergency Preparedness Canada, for Alberta and the northwest region. They're also accompanied by Mr. Mark Egener, the executive director of Alberta Public Safety Services. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister and our other guests to rise and receive the appreciation of this Assembly.

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

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to introduce to all members of the House, 62 grades 5 and 6 students from Plamondon school, where I live and where I taught for a number of years. They are accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Jerry Stefanyk and Mrs. Fern Plamondon and teacher aide Mrs. Bernice Plamondon; parents Mrs. Shirley Gauthier, Mrs. Bourassa, Mrs. Zatorski, and Mrs. Jocelyn Fediuk; also the bus driver, Mr. John Menard. I would like to congratulate the teachers for bringing their students to the Alberta Legislature in terms of making sure that the story of government is taught to the students. I would ask that they please rise and receive a warm welcome to the Alberta Legislature.

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

Bill 31
Calgary General Hospital Board
Amendment Act, 1988

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 31, the Calgary General Hospital Board Amendment Act, 1988.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addressing second reading to this Bill, it's hard to again look at some of the principles contained herein. However, even without the explanation from the minister at all, it basically can be deemed a kind of housekeeping Bill which permits the board of the Calgary General hospital to be expanded both in members and in how those members are appointed so they can govern two sites and one hospital, the Bow Valley site and the Peter Lougheed site, both under the Calgary General hospital board. Though we'll have certain questions on specifics during committee, particularly with respect to how the new Peter Lougheed hospital compares with the Grey Nuns, as we're told it's almost entirely

similar in design, I'm getting lots and lots of mail and phone calls from people who work at the Grey Nuns hospital in terms of some of the real problems they're facing down there. I'm wondering if any changes are going to be made before the new Peter Lougheed is opened down there in Calgary. But those questions, I guess, would wait for committee stage.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

The two principles I'd like to address with respect to this Bill I think are implicit in it. They really are these two principles. One is the principle of how the authority flows for governing a hospital or hospitals. Should, for instance, a board govern one hospital, one site? Or are we moving now into the world of one board and two sites or three sites or four sites or more? It's been the tradition throughout the province, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, particularly with active treatment hospitals, that there is one board and one hospital site it has authority over. We don't have that experience with long-term care boards -- district 24, of course, having three or four different facilities which it manages and others who manage long-term care auxiliary hospitals and so on. But the minister is going in a new direction with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I'm just wondering how far he wants to pursue it.

I know there is increasing discussion and debate about the need for this kind of method of having one board governing several different sites of active treatment facilities. In fact, I don't know whether in the session we'll get to the Bill presented by the Member for Calgary-North West, his view that in all instances where there are two hospitals in one area -- such as, for instance, the city of Lethbridge -- those two hospitals must of necessity be governed by one board. Now, you can imagine some of the local difficulties with such a proposal. Yet I would have to agree with the member on such a move insofar as it would improve a lot of efficiencies and reduce overlap and help to fill out some of the gaps that might occur when there are two hospitals with two boards in the same town or city. So I'm wondering if the minister is, by this Bill 31, implicitly agreeing with the Member for Calgary-North West that, in fact, where there are two hospitals in one locale, they should be governed by one board.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have comments from the executive director of the Hyndman commission, the former deputy minister of the department, Dr. Alex McPherson. It seems to be implied in some of the work of the Hyndman commission, for instance, that they're already looking at this whole notion of what they call a superboard, wherein a board that would oversee an entire city of, say, Edmonton or Calgary would be set up that would, in a management way, look at all the efficiencies that could be gained by having one central authority, one central superboard, that could manage all the tricky decisions in terms of how the fund is allocated among the four or five or six hospitals within a particular city. Yet I think we've heard the minister say in the House here that he doesn't stand by that position at all and it's not one he would support, and again it sets up a debate of a very important principle here, Mr. Speaker.

I'm aware also that in the province of Ontario they have regional health councils, which are elected people who help to look at the planning and again the allocation of funds for hospitals within a particular region of the province. At the Official Opposition New Democrat health care reform conference we had just a week or so ago, there was a great deal of support for this kind of concept from people, say, in the city of Red Deer or

with the Red Deer Regional or other regional hospitals. They would like to see a kind of regional health council that could help them integrate the work, whether it be the laundry or the lab testing or the medical personnel or all the available resources in a particular region, to meet the acute care needs of the people of that region and meet those needs with the best deployment of the resources available. To do so, it would at least be ameliorated by a regional health council, a board that has this wider jurisdiction.

So I'd have to ask the minister with respect to this Bill if he, in fact, is just seeing this as a fluke necessity for this particular hospital, the Calgary General, with this move to one hospital on two sites and, therefore, one board governing two sites, or whether he sees it as opening the door to a new way of looking at hospital governance and how authority is used with respect to making those kinds of decisions for larger areas rather than just the one site of the one hospital.

The other principle I ascertained from this Bill 31, Mr. Speaker, is the principle we've debated on at least one occasion in this House, and I'd like to get some final sense from the Legislature on it. It has to do with whether members of the boards of hospitals should be elected or should be appointed. Now, I don't want to introduce that whole debate again here, but in fact, Mr. Speaker, it is begged by this Bill 31 insofar as some members of this new Calgary General hospital board will be people who would have been elected, whether it be the mayor or certain members of city council, as well as some people who are not elected but rather appointed by the minister from a list of, I'm sure, ex-Conservative MLAs or other members he has sitting around who might want to sit on such a board at his own discretion.

Now, this whole issue of representation by requisition is a difficult one. I frankly haven't made up my own mind in terms of the best way to go on that, but it would be an area to be debated more fully, particularly with the irony here, Mr. Speaker, of this Calgary General hospital situation where we have almost 100 percent requisition being done by the province and they turn around and appoint the members, no requisition done by the city and they have to have some of the members be elected officials. I think there's great irony in that, and it shows some of the twisted kinds of situations we're getting into here, all because we have not clearly looked in this Legislature in terms of whether we really want to take a move with hospital boards, that in fact members of them be entirely elected members, or whether in fact we're satisfied they should be appointed by others and that's sufficient.

So these are two principles, Mr. Speaker, which I ascertain as being implicit in the Bill. The first is whether or not the minister is moving in the direction more and more of one board governing many sites, and the issue of whether or not the minister is also moving toward a system where there are more and more members of hospital boards who are elected. But we'll clarify those and ask other specific questions at committee stage and support it now at second reading.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make a few comments, as this hospital is not only in my constituency but the General hospital's not far away, and having been a former board member of the General hospital for a couple of years, I would like to support the initiative of the minister. Certainly

because of the fact that the General hospital in Calgary is owned by the city of Calgary and the Peter Lougheed is owned by the government, it is necessary for the government to have some management abilities to oversee the operation of this and any other hospital.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

The arrangement that's been made with the General hospital to have two hospitals under the control of one board is not only a good move but I think will ultimately save the taxpayer considerable money yet offer a complete service to that taxpayer and the citizens of Calgary and surrounding areas. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm supportive of a board that would examine the whole issue of all the hospitals in the city of Calgary under one roof. That, in my view, would certainly save the taxpayer considerable money through the fact that much of the operations of these boards -- they like to do their thing and, of course, ultimately a lot of duplication of services which may not be necessary in the city of Calgary or, for that matter, Edmonton. And I guess we could examine the area of purchasing, laundries, and so on. It's my view that one board with the budget of all those hospitals could, in fact, find some cost savings, provided the board is made up of those people who have some management capacities and also the ability to manage budgets and make some hard decisions.

So I support the minister's initiative here fully and look forward to the opening of the Peter Lougheed hospital in the very near future so we can serve those citizens of the northeast end of the city and outlying regions to the extent they expect under the one board, and I'm sure we will find the success of the two hospitals will continue.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and voice a few comments in support of Bill 31. The hon. member that has just spoken mentioned that Calgary General hospital is not far away. Well, it's not far away in Calgary-Mountain View. As well, I had the pleasure and privilege to serve on the board of the Calgary General hospital for almost six years, and during that time the planning for this new facility in northeast Calgary was one that engendered considerable debate over the course of that time. To remind all members of the Legislature, the initial planning for the northeast -- it was only the northeast hospital at the time, Mr. Speaker -- was undertaken by the Calgary General hospital. They were doing good work on that, except early on -- I guess it was sometime in 1982 -- the minister of the day believed he had a better plan and removed that planning authority from the Calgary General hospital board and took it into the province. Then somewhere along the line that hospital was then passed over to district 92 hospital board. So it sat there for a while, and planning was being undertaken integrating the services at the northeast hospital within their corporate range of services at district 92.

AN HON. MEMBER: District 93.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: District 93. That's right. I stand corrected.

Well, then, somewhere along the line this minister began negotiations with the Calgary General hospital board, and the

Peter Lougheed hospital then came under their wing. If I could think of any image, Mr. Speaker, it would be that of an orphan child that sort of got handed around to the various family relatives until it finally ended back where it began and where I think it most appropriately ought to rest.

However, the fact that this Peter Lougheed Centre has been traveling this circuit from jurisdiction to board to jurisdiction raises a number of concerns, and that is: will this hospital remain under the auspices of the Calgary General hospital board not just for a year or two or even five years or 10 years, but how about the long term? So I'd like to put this question to the minister this afternoon. Would he, at least in his closing comments, if he would, inform the Legislature what steps are being taken to secure the tenure of this hospital in two sites? One proposal could be, for example, that the provincial government could sell that facility to the Calgary General hospital board or to the city of Calgary for a dollar. Another option might be a long-term lease -- say, for example, a 99-year lease. I understand there are some discussions going on at the present time, but that's not been finalized. So given that that hasn't been finalized yet -- the Bill is in front of us -- perhaps the other option would be to recognize in legislation that the Calgary General hospital is not just the one building at the site of the Bow Valley Centre right now but it does consist of two centres, the Bow Valley Centre and the Peter Lougheed Centre. Perhaps one of the sections or provisions of the Act could be amended at committee stage in order to recognize that reality so we would provide that long-term tenure.

The Calgary General hospital is in the hospital business, Mr. Speaker, not the political business, so they don't want down the road to be embroiled once again in some political disagreement with the minister of the day over who has the auspices or the jurisdiction for that Peter Lougheed Centre in northeast Calgary. So that kind of recognition in legislation, I think, along with the signing of perhaps a long-term lease between the department and the minister with the Calgary General hospital board, would go a long way in providing that sort of security to the staff and the board and administration at the Calgary General hospital.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I certainly don't mind the concept of taking over and rationalizing services between two centres. I think it's worked well in other places. We can show examples both here in Edmonton as well as in Calgary, and I think this is going to work well, knowing the people involved at the Calgary General hospital. But again, I just don't want there to be some arbitrary decision made in the future where the minister of the day or the government of the day could simply pick up one facility and transfer it over to another authority or jurisdiction.

I do have some concerns which I think need to be placed on the record. I know the planning that's gone on to integrate these two centres. There are still some question marks -- and that's all they are at this point, Mr. Speaker -- between the emergency department which will continue at the Bow Valley Centre and what is not really an emergency department, perhaps an urgency clinic, at the Peter Lougheed Centre in northeast Calgary; some concerns that people, at least in the initial stages of that operation, may present themselves at the Peter Lougheed hospital and not really be at the right place. They should more properly be down at the Bow Valley Centre. There's going to be a bit of confusion in the early stages. I'm sure all the steps will be taken to inform the public, but I just want to express some concerns

that that be undertaken to ensure people know what they're getting at the Lougheed hospital and it's not a full-scale emergency department.

As well, there have been concerns brought to my attention in the past about the backup for the obstetrics at the Peter Lougheed hospital. As I understand, it should require tertiary-level backup, but without having a tertiary-level emergency department at that hospital, there are some concerns that individuals in cases might fall through the cracks. I know people are taking steps to look after that. Perhaps the minister could give us an update about those plans to allay whatever concerns there might be.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I know the people and the individuals concerned at the Calgary General hospital have a high level of professionalism and concern, and I know they've done a good job in taking over the responsibilities that have been given to them by the minister in integrating these two hospitals into one operation. I expect that that tradition, a fine and long tradition, at the Calgary General hospital will continue at its two sites, the Bow Valley Centre and the Peter Lougheed Centre, on into the future. I am in some ways, I guess, a bit envious of these individuals who over the years are going to be appointed on behalf of the minister and elected and appointed by members of the city council. I know they will have a tremendous opportunity to serve the people of Calgary and the people of southern Alberta, and I wish them well in that endeavour.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief. I don't have too many problems with this Bill. I understand it to be more or less of a housekeeping item that the minister has placed before us at this point in time and that it does need to happen now. However, I'd just like to ask the minister a couple of questions.

It appears, as we see this type of Bill, that there are some different mechanisms being brought into play. I'm conscious of the comparable situation in Edmonton where the Grey Nuns hospital in Mill Woods was developed almost simultaneously with the Peter Lougheed Centre. In that case, of course, it was started by district 106, a board especially set up with representatives from rural municipalities as well to deal with that hospital and manage that hospital, which presumably will serve some of those municipalities to the east of Edmonton as well. As time went on, that board originally, as we understood it, was also to manage the Queen Elizabeth in the north end of the city. As time went on, things changed and district 106 -- the Mill Woods hospital was removed from their jurisdiction, and eventually they were given the Camsell hospital to manage, which in itself is also curious because it is an urban hospital, although I expect all hospitals serve people from other municipalities.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have here an example of two hospitals, two different sites, being managed by one board. I have no major objection to that, but I wonder if this is a pattern that's emerging and if the minister can comment on that. Because it appears we have different styles in different places. And perhaps that's a good thing; perhaps we have to accommodate our management systems to the urban situation or the rural situation in which they are found.

I'm also interested to know if in doing this the minister has

been in contact with the Hyndman commission and if this is verified by any of the things they're determining in their original studies. I note the AHA report, which has just recently arrived, does not bear out the notion of regionalization of management of hospitals, and I'm not sure I fully understand that particular comment in that report. I'll have to study it further.

Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt there could be some immense benefits in economies of scale, efficiencies, and things of that kind in having more than one site managed by a board. I would like to ask the minister if, in fact, he and the department are looking at the potential, therefore, for horizontal means of health care management that would include not only acute care but patients moving from acute to convalescent to discharge and home care or auxiliary nursing home, whatever, and if there is any kind of consideration being given to increasing the management of health care systems rather than decreasing it or confining it to one or more sites.

Mr. Speaker, further to that, I was interested -- the style of naming the board appears to be just the same as we've had essentially in former years, and I wonder if the minister is telling us by putting this in that it's the intention of this government to maintain that I have no objection to people from municipalities, people who are on municipal councils, sitting on hospital boards, but these are very busy people who frequently do not have the time to devote to that hospital board that perhaps another could. I wonder if the minister has considered advertising for applicants and choosing from them, as opposed to the notion of the sort of Noah's Ark principle enunciated in this Bill. I believe there could be some real merits in looking to other ways to find active participants in the hospital management and health care management process.

So I've just two major questions. Is there a management pattern emerging, or is this a system of design to fit any particular need? And will the government be considering new methods of appointing hospital boards? Included in that, I would suggest the methodology of all hospital boards to be elected.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Comments by the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care will close debate on Bill 31.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to thank hon. members for their comments with respect to this Bill. Perhaps I could just review the history of the development of the Peter Lougheed hospital in Calgary and that would answer, I think, a lot of the questions members have asked.

When I assumed responsibility as Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, the Peter Lougheed hospital was under construction and had been assigned to or given to the Calgary District Hospital Group to operate and manage. The Calgary District Hospital Group operates the Colonel Belcher hospital, the Holy Cross hospital, and the Rockyview. They would, in fact, have had four hospitals to operate. One of the reasons the government decided the Calgary District Hospital Group should operate the Peter Lougheed hospital was that we had decided the Holy Cross hospital downtown would be converted to extended care and the active treatment component of the Holy Cross would be phased out: exactly the same situation we had decided to undertake here in Edmonton with the Edmonton General hospital. Then there was a great deal of community concern in Calgary expressed about the closure of the active treatment beds at the Holy Cross, so a decision was made to keep the Holy Cross open and renovate it as an active treatment hospital. That

was about the time when I took responsibility for the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care.

It did seem to government -- indeed, it had seemed earlier -- that it would be more appropriate for the Calgary General board to be operating the Peter Lougheed. So we went back to the Calgary General board and said, "In view of these changed circumstances, would you be interested in operating the Peter Lougheed hospital?" They considered that matter for some length of time and said they would be. We then negotiated the conditions upon which they would operate it, which would be one hospital on two sites with a minimum duplication of programs. We then discussed the matter with the Calgary District Hospital Group, who were very co-operative in turning over the hospital. It was actually under construction, and the ownership, of course, was in the hands of the provincial government. But they turned over their involvement in helping to plan and design the hospital to the Calgary General hospital board. So that's sort of the history of how the Calgary General board became responsible for this particular hospital.

Now, with respect to the operation of the Peter Lougheed hospital, all of the manner in which programs will be run in that hospital or at that site and the old Calgary General site has not been completely finalized. The hospital board will, in due course, be announcing to the public all the aspects of the operation of the two hospitals, including what programs are being carried out, at which site, and which sites will have full emergency services and which ones won't. That will be communicated prior to the opening in August in a very public way in Calgary.

With respect to the ownership of the site, the province will continue to own the Peter Lougheed Centre. One of the reasons for that is that if we were to provide or sell or give that hospital to the city of Calgary, who own the Calgary General, and if we were to follow the legislation with respect to the development of hospitals, the city would have to pay for the land cost and the land servicing costs, and they amount to about \$15 million. The mayor and council of the city of Calgary are not anxious to assume that responsibility, and so have agreed to the province continuing to own the Peter Lougheed. It will simply be on a lease basis arrangement to the Calgary General hospital board. Those matters are now being dealt with.

If I could just conclude with a couple of comments about hospital boards, it's not my intention to introduce any amendments to the Hospitals Act between now and the next civic election with respect to the election or appointment of hospital boards. The reasons for that are -- I thought it over very carefully; I raised the matter in November of 1986 at the annual meeting of the Alberta Hospital Association, and there are some fairly strong objections from some quarters to the idea that all hospital boards would be elected, and they come for a variety of reasons. For example, from what constituency -- and by constituency I mean area -- would you elect members to the Royal Alex hospital board in Edmonton? It serves all of northern Alberta and it serves a great variety of people in the city of Edmonton. One would be hard pressed to know how to set up wards to elect members to that hospital board. The same with the University hospital board, which happens to be a Crown board. Most of the large urban hospitals that are district operated or Crown operated do not lend themselves to defining an area from which you would elect board members. So that's one difficulty.

In other cases, in rural communities -- I am told in some communities that there's a great deal of difficulty in finding

people to run for the hospital board, and the local town council or village council has greater opportunity to find somebody if they're actively seeking someone to be appointed to the board. On the other hand, a number of people say there's more responsibility on behalf of board members who are elected than those who are appointed. So I think that until there's a better consensus on the whole issue, the existing system where municipalities are free to choose whether to appoint or elect the members is the best route to go.

With respect to how we get board members: with respect to Crown hospitals, we ask Progressive Conservative government MLAs for recommendations. We even accept recommendations from members of the opposition. We don't always act upon them, but it depends on what kind and calibre of people they put forward. We also get a lot of recommendations from existing board members and board chairmen and from a variety of sources. So we're never really lacking -- and there are some exceptions to that, perhaps -- but never generally lacking names of very good Albertans to put on Crown hospital boards. The exceptions are the two mental health hospital boards where I've noticed some reluctance -- or I think it's probably individuals' sort of fear of entering into a new field -- for people to come forward to sit on those two boards: the Edmonton hospital and the Ponoka hospital.

Mr. Speaker, finally with respect to questions about super-boards and the Hyndman commission. It's certainly not our intention to make any further changes in the major metropolitan hospital boards. They've now been established and we think are operating very well. If the Hyndman commission makes a recommendation in their final report in December of 1989 -- which is almost two years from now -- with respect to some different form of hospital management or boards, then certainly the government would consider the matter. But between now and then I don't intend to make any particular moves that would either frustrate or assist that commission in making any recommendations to us.

The final comment I want to make related to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar's comments about whether or not the co-ordination in the hospital system -- relative to the management of seniors in particular, I guess. I wanted to refer the hon. members to the committee on long-term care that's chaired by the hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore and the recommendations in that report which refer to a task force being established in the city of Edmonton to look at how we can take long-term care patients out of active treatment hospital beds. There are about 400-plus long-term care patients in active treatment hospital beds. That task force has now reported to me, and one of the recommendations is that we establish some small geriatric assessment units in each hospital so that each hospital will have some capability on its own to assess people, particularly seniors, when they come in, so that they simply aren't placed in a bed by the doctor and then sort of forgotten about and not made aware of the opportunities to go back home on home care or to go into some other program that will assist them to recover. So we're now discussing some of those ideas with the four Edmonton hospital boards that are involved, plus the Edmonton Board of Health and our department staff, and we're hopeful of making some considerable progress in those areas in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 31, the Calgary General Hospital Board Amendment Act, 1988.

[Motion carried; Bill 31 read a second time]

Bill 33

Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1988

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 33, Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1988.

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

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had a good debate on the contents of what is now Bill 33 in the Capital Fund discussion, so at this stage we have nothing further to add and would concur with second reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 33 read a second time]

Bill 34

Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1988-89

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 34, Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1988-89, now be read a second time.

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

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Bill 34 I do have a few comments. We had some discussion on the details, point by point, of what are now the contents of Bill 34 in the capital projects estimates debate. But there are a few points, I think, to be made around the Bill as a whole.

First, I guess we would say that the expenditures this year at \$164 million are up from last year at \$140 million. This surprised me a little bit anyway, being on the heritage trust fund committee and listening to the discussions in the fall of '86 and January of '87, because they did spill over into that time. We distinctly got the impression on the committee that the capital projects division expenditures were winding down, and instead of that, we find they've gone up by some \$24 million.

The two main reasons are in two particular votes: Advanced Education, for a new health clinic, is up \$14 million; and Technology, Research and Telecommunications is up nearly \$40 million. Now, the bigger one of those two, the Technology, Research and Telecommunications vote, is mainly for the rural telephone lines, so that each individual rural Albertan has their own line instead of having to be on a party line. While we think that's a worthwhile project, I can't help wondering why the government has decided they should take the funds out of the capital projects division of the heritage trust fund. The expenditure of funds in that section is a rather dubious idea in the first place, because really the heritage trust fund, I thought, was money we were setting aside for the future of the province, and this division has become a sort of catchall for little pet projects the government likes to do that they don't seem to want to put into the budget.

Now, the total expenditures for the capital projects division, which the government tends to call assets rather than expenditures, according to the financial estimates we were debating earlier, are some \$2.8 billion. I notice that the Treasurer's report on the heritage trust fund as of December 31 indicates there is only \$2.7 billion in the fund as of December 31, and I guess I'm assuming the discrepancy comes from some further expendi-

tures during that period but also subtracting, in the one case, the \$200 million from Vencap, which sometimes is included and sometimes isn't in this section. So you'd think the Treasurer would get sorted out as to which way he wants to do that.

In terms of the individual expenditures, I've mentioned the two in which expenditures have gone up considerably. The rest have dropped, and one of those is noteworthy of commenting on. AOSTRA has gone down from some \$20 billion to a little less than \$10 billion, and that is being made up by the Department of Energy, I believe -- or at least in the departmental estimates of the government. So I'm wondering why that process which was started back in the '86-87 fiscal year wasn't continued into this budget. Why did we not keep on doing expenditures out of the general revenue account and cutting out and cutting down until they were zero, the new expenditures out of this fund? I really think the minister should address that problem at least a little bit and give us some idea of his thinking on why he's carrying on with that section.

Now, if you're going to have expenditures out of that division of the fund, Mr. Speaker, then you need to get the money from somewhere for those expenditures. So I look around at the heritage trust fund in other sections and wonder where it could come from, because, of course, we've capped the fund and no more new money is coming to be available for this type of expenditure. So of course the obvious place is the cash and marketable securities section, which is suddenly quite large, much larger than it was two or three years ago: just under \$3 billion at \$2.8 billion. Now, how much of that is liquid, I suppose, is questionable, although that is certainly the most liquid part of the fund. Quite a lot of it's been borrowed by the Alberta government for the farm credit stability program and the Small Business Term Assistance Fund Act, but there would still be, I think, enough money available there for the Treasurer to get the cash he needs to make these expenditures from the capital projects division.

He might, however, have looked, I suppose, at the Alberta division of the fund, where I notice that the provincial government borrowed \$200 million. That was a thought that occurred to me, and then I realized: no; I guess if the Treasurer has borrowed that money -- that \$200 million from the Alberta division -- he has borrowed it into the general revenue account, and so it would not be available, then, to the capital projects division expenditures.

There are a couple of other sections there that he's also taken some money out of, and I assume he's moved it into the cash and marketable securities section and they would be available. Over the last couple of years the debentures in ACT and Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation have gone down considerably. I assume they've ended up in the cash and marketable securities section. And that section, by the way, when you look at the December 31 statement, has a rather interesting couple of numbers. It says here that the short-term money market securities cost the province of Alberta some \$1.092 billion, and then: other, \$1.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, I will bet you that that is the biggest "other" or "miscellaneous" category on any financial statement anywhere in the world. I don't suppose there's any Treasurer in the world that would pass off a \$1.5 billion miscellaneous category and not explain to people a little more detail about where it is, what it's worth, what kind of money it might be bringing back into the fund, or what are you using it to -- some of it, \$164 million, would hardly touch it for the capital projects division. So I'm wondering if the Treasurer in some of his comments couldn't address that question. It does rather

startle me when I see a "miscellaneous" or an "other" category of \$1.5 billion totally unexplained.

Mr. Speaker, those are most of my comments on this Bill. I would just like to say that I think the government should be consistent and decide: are they or are they not winding down these expenditures, or are they or are they not going to sling them back over to the general revenue account where it would make much more sense to have them? So those are my comments on Bill 34.

[Leave granted; Bill 34 read a second time]

Bill 38

Pharmaceutical Profession Act

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move second reading of Bill 38, the Pharmaceutical Profession Act.

The Bill represents a great deal of work and consultation over the last number of years between officials of the hon. Minister of Labour's department and leaders of the Pharmaceutical Association, and I would like to recognize the effort that's been made in the development of this Act dealing with this profession. Bill 38 follows the government's policy on professions and occupations. However, I would like to take a few moments to outline some of the main features of the Act which are specific to the pharmaceutical profession.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have a modernized definition of the practice of pharmacy. It's part of the section which outlines the exclusive scope of practice. The clauses in the Act are of a proactive or positive nature rather than the set of prohibitions which were used in the previous legislation. These reflect the modern practice of pharmacy, the fact that modern pharmacy is based on the professional knowledge and advice that pharmacists can provide for the proper use of drugs and pharmaceutical products to their clients.

Mr. Speaker, there's also the right to title section of the Act which is modernized to include four terms which are often used interchangeably in the profession of pharmacy: "pharmacist," "pharmaceutical chemist," "druggist," and "apothecary." The Bill also provides for the operation of hospitals and nursing homes and other sites, where other professions and authorities have regulations in place to provide for the dispensing of drugs and proper safeguards are in place for the operation of those centres.

An important feature of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is the provision for public representation on the council of the profession. This is the so-called window on the profession, which is common to our professional statutes.

The Bill provides for two categories of pharmacies: the licensed pharmacies which are the retail outlets presided over by a pharmacist; it also provides for certified pharmacies, and this is a situation where public institutions may choose to have their pharmaceutical department certified and would have it come under the provisions of this particular Act in terms of its overall operation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the sections of the Bill that took considerable discussion was the section at the end of the Act, which deals with the schedules. Schedules 1 and 2 are fairly standard. The items that are listed on schedules 1 and 2 are for the most part governed by federal legislation concerning drugs, but I would draw members' attention to schedule 3, which provides for a very limited number of products to be displayed in what is referred to as the "professional products department." These

items would be located very near to the dispensary of a pharmacy and would be under the supervision of a licensed pharmacist as provided for in the Act. I'd like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the list that is provided here is very limited, and it is a carefully selected number of products which it is felt need the professional overseeing or advice of a pharmacist before they are, in fact, sold to customers. I would also note that any additions or subtractions from this particular schedule must be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, by way of introducing second reading of this Bill, we have a very detailed disciplinary process provided for in the Act. As I indicated before, these provisions conform to the policy on professions and occupations, but I feel attention should be drawn to the definition in the Bill of a "proprietor" and the section of the disciplinary process which provides that in certain special circumstances, where the pharmacy is part of a retail outlet, certain disciplinary procedures may be brought to bear on a person who owns and controls the retail outlet, by way of possibly -- ultimately, I suppose -- shutting down the pharmaceutical practice or requiring that certain changes and improvements be made. The disciplinary process also provides for disciplinary measures being applicable to both an individual and a corporation.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the main, key features of this particular Bill, and I recommend it to the Assembly for second reading.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am sure there is much that is commendable in this Bill, and we will have some questions on particular sections at committee stage, but in the meantime, on the principles in the Bill, we note with some concern that there appears to be a monopoly given to pharmacists on certain products which are more widely available presently in places other than pharmacies, and it needs to be ascertained, I would think, that this is a good restriction. I'm sure the purpose of it is to make sure that the products are not used by those who might endanger themselves in the use of them, yet if I read the Bill aright, Mr. Speaker, it could have the effect of increasing the price of those products, since the places from which they would be withdrawn are sales in general stores or home-supply places which do not have pharmacists on but which do business and sometimes offer products with a cheaper price than in pharmacies.

We note the right given to pharmacists to substitute generic equivalents, which we're very much in favour of. The promoter of the Bill might consider that it would be more consonant with public policy, and certainly better for the people's purse -- and the health care purse, for that matter -- to require that generic substitutions be made of prescriptions if that will save money and it is not specifically directed by the physician who prescribed the prescription or requested specifically by the patient.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, we're all aware of the power the pharmaceutical products lobby has and its contact with doctors -- which can only be described as overwhelming and pervasive in many ways -- on the one hand, and on the other hand, the busyness of physicians who all too easily prescribe some drug, which may be the latest drug or the latest one they have noticed or which is well written up in the journals, without any idea of the cost, let alone attention to the cost of it. I know very recently from an experience that's been related to me by people in

my family when: the doctor was told of the cost of drugs he'd prescribed for some really very minor ailment. The single prescription that would cover perhaps three weeks or a month of medication came to \$300. He had no idea of the cost of this, and when it was pointed out to him he was authorized to . . . He said, "Oh well, do use these other things that you say are the same," and he was assured that they would be the same. So it's not the case that these drugs are prescribed very often with any exact knowledge of their efficacy compared to other types of medication. Certainly I would say that it is the rule rather than the exception that the doctor does not know the cost of them, and yet someone has to pay those costs. In a majority of cases it's the patient; in a minority of cases, the health care system. But I suppose in between it's passed on to Blue Cross and the like, private insurance systems, which makes it more expensive, of course. The premiums are higher and so on. So we wonder what the rationale would be against requiring that pharmacists make these generic substitutions as a matter of course, except in the cases I've mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

We agree, of course, with that part of it that ensures that prescriptions are filled only by qualified pharmacists. It has to be admitted that unless you are up to date with knowledge in the pharmaceutical industry, which is having an almost explosive rate of growth, you can make serious mistakes in underestimating or not knowing the efficacy or side effects or potential hazards of newly invented drugs and therefore prescribe. So it is important to have a proper regime of education of pharmacists and a discipline for them that will ensure that, in the name of protection of the public. But that itself must be administered with a view to protection of the public in the other sense of allowing reasonable protection of the public's purse.

Mr. Speaker, the move towards greater self-regulation, again, is commendable, and also the parts of the Act which give the professional body the rights of discipline, being coupled with reasonable rights of appeal. The safeguards that are necessary for ensuring that pharmacists are not improperly or unduly or unfairly prevented from practising do appear to be there. So from that point of view the Bill is commendable. Perhaps the right of defence and reply could have been somewhat more carefully ensured, but that's detailed stuff which you can reach later.

In general, one notes that the profession of pharmacy has changed remarkably since the last Act, really, and so there is a need for this Bill. The scheduling of drugs under prescription drugs, nonprescription drugs sold under the direct supervision of the pharmacist, and the third schedule, a limited number of high-risk nonprescription drugs which are registered, restricted to pharmacy sale to ensure the customer has access to professional advice when purchasing the drug, is good in principle. But it certainly, as I hinted at earlier, depends on the accurate definition of what these high-risk nonprescription drugs are, since aspirin can certainly be a risky drug by itself, to name the commonest of all of them. Yet to restrict their sale, it would be counterproductive and not worth the -- well, just wrong. Of course, I'm not suggesting that aspirin is one of those, but that illustrates the point, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Now, the pharmacists are, again, delineated as licensed on the one hand and certified on the other. This again is illustrative of the greater sophistication that is appropriate now to the whole business of pharmacies because of the progress that has been made and is explosively continuing day by day in the sophistica-

tion of drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I note in the Bill that the practice review committee is well constituted and is an advance over the current one. I hoped that the experience that has been fairly positive to date in the profession of pharmacy in the province will continue and be enhanced by the present Bill. And certainly we have no objections in principle to this Bill proceeding on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to rise in support, in general, of this Bill. I think that the discipline sections do appear to be just and recognize the seriousness of unprofessional conduct or incompetency in that there are some safeguards, and that a profession should be, in fact, self-regulating.

I have received some letters of concerns in regard to the restricting of the availability of some drugs and compounds, those that are generally used for self-medication. I would say that I am very concerned about the easy accessibility of some of the preparations that are used for self-medication. In particular, some of the common headache compounds have a high level of lethality in terms of overdosing. Certainly I have heard of cases where people overdosed on something that is really readily available, and after their stomach is pumped, they recover for two days and then they're dead from liver damage. So I think we have to be very cautious of the availability of those kinds of drugs or the kinds of warnings that need to be given with them.

The other concern I have is with people that have some kind of medical condition that may be taking prescribed drugs for that condition in which some of the self-medication would be contraindicated, or they have a medical condition in which some of, again, the self-medications -- even though they may not be on a prescribed drug, there may be contraindication. I certainly know that a number of cold remedies are contraindicated for diabetics. So I think we do have to be cautious in terms of making available some of the kinds of preparations that are used for self-medication.

MR. SPEAKER: Ponoka-Rimbey, summation.

MR. JONSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to comment on three of the items raised by previous speakers.

First of all, I appreciate the point made by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore in that it is a problem in our society that people misuse pharmaceutical products. I think, as I understand the point, there was a concern about certain items being too readily available. I feel that there are such a large number of products that if misused could be harmful to an individual that it would be difficult to ever cover that type of problem in a piece of legislation of this type. But certainly there is a need for education and increased awareness on the part of the public of the responsibility that they assume as individuals when they use these products.

There was also, Mr. Speaker, the concern about what might be an increased monopoly provided for in some way in this Act. Certainly it would not be the wish of the government to in any way inhibit competition in retail trade unduly, but we are talking here about a type of product that has a great deal of impact upon the health of the individual, and therefore it needs to be regulated. Perhaps the concern is with respect to Schedule 3, and I would like to once again assure the members of the Legislature that the listing that is provided of 13 items in Schedule 3 of this

Act was arrived at after long and very careful discussion of the need for items being on this list. I won't go through all 13 items, but I would just like to use one example. That is that item (a), bacitracin, is a drug which is a member of a family of drugs, but the particular item referred to here is one which has the potential for causing an allergic reaction in certain individuals. Therefore, because of this potential danger it was felt necessary to have it on Schedule 3.

I'd like to just very briefly comment on the matter of generic substitutes. This provision is similar to that in six other provinces, and I feel that it will be handled responsibly.

Finally, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona has raised the whole issue of drug costs. I know that's been in the media recently. That is a very broad issue which should have some overall attention, perhaps by the Hyndman commission on health care.

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

[Motion carried; Bill 38 read a second time]

Bill 21

Employment Standards Code

[Adjourned debate on subamendment to motion for second reading, June 9: Mrs. Osterman]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to notice given, I move that debate on Bill 21 shall not be further adjourned.

MR. WRIGHT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There's a point of order on this. I'm curious.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is based on Standing Order 21 and also Standing Order 38. Now, Standing Order 21 is the standing order itself which gives the right of closure, and 38 is the one that deals with what motions need notice, and written notice.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with Standing Order 21, we note that it reads that "A minister of the Crown may, on at least one clear day's notice," move for what we call closure. Why I rise is because under the rule, the introduction of the motion now is premature, since no clear day has elapsed.

Mr. Speaker, a clear day means that there has to be a calendar day -- by calendar day I mean to exclude a day which is measured as being part of one day and part of another day -- between the giving of the notice and the doing of the thing about which notice is given. I realize that that is not the custom here, Mr. Speaker, but custom yields to the standing order. If you've been interpreting the standing order wrongly, then no amount of repetition will make it right once you realize the error. Why it must mean that is that otherwise it would be the same as if the word "clear" were not in there. There is a presumption, of course, which is more certain, that the more legal the document is, the more it's been carefully drawn up. Standing Orders are certainly in that class; they are drawn up by legally trained people, that words are not unnecessarily used. So if you have an expression that you interpret disregarding the meaning of a word, then you must ask yourself: are we doing it correctly?

The hon. House leader has moved closure in the motion, or he's trying to, as if the word "clear" did not exist, as if it read "at least one day's notice." In fact, Mr. Speaker, even if it said that my argument would apply on the logic of it, that the intention is

to give a day to the person for whose advantage the notice is given -- that's to say, the object of the closure -- so that the person concerned therewith can prepare; a whole day to do that. If the expression was simply "one day", then there would be the argument on the logic of it, and the argument would be whether you could start the time running at the very hour of the day that it was given or whether you'd have to give a clear day. But by adding the word "clear", Mr. Speaker, you put the matter beyond doubt.

I have taken the trouble to copy a couple of authorities on the matter. They deal mainly with the logic of the matter, but if I can just quote the one taken from Halsbury's *Laws of England*, which on something like this is general law . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That's with regard to parliamentary law.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm coming to that, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about the general law first because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Quite rapidly, please.

MR. WRIGHT: Pardon, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Quite rapidly, please.

Regarding the point of order, the Chair will not allow the debate to go on at a lengthy time.

MR. WRIGHT: Of course not, Mr. Speaker. I think you will admit that this is an important point, an extremely important point. It's not any point of order, Mr. Speaker. What I refer to is

The general rule in cases in which a period is fixed within which a person must act or take the consequences is that the day of the act or event from which the period runs should not be counted against him.

Then it goes on to say:

Expressions showing intention to exclude. In many statutes [or] statutory rules and bylaws the intention to exclude both days . . .

The "both days" being the beginning day and the day on which the action referred to is to take place.

. . . and to give the person affected a clear interval of time between the two is put beyond all doubt by the insertion of words such as "clear days," or "not less than" so many days, or so many days "at least."

That sums it up, Mr. Speaker, and just to make it clear that this is common outside this Legislature, I append a case which goes carefully into it. I have two spare copies of this so that the Parliamentary Counsel and yourself can look at it.

Now, that deals with the logic of the matter, Mr. Speaker, and the rules outside this Chamber. And the answer, of course, is that though that may be what it says there, and though we may be convinced that the logic of it must require a clear day -- that's to say, day A, notice given; day B, the clear day; and day C, when the act of which we're given notice takes place -- we can forget that somehow, by reason of parliamentary custom or tradition or even Speaker's rulings. So reaching that point, Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully submit that that cannot be so, that if the standing order is plain, then some custom or the other cannot override it.

As it says, Mr. Speaker, in *Beauchesne* in article 10, Precedent and Tradition:

Behind the written rules and filling in the gaps, lies the vast quantity of precedent.

There's no suggestion that it can alter what's written there. And in section 11:

The interpretation of both the written rules and tradition is in the hands of the Speaker and his deputies, with their rulings forming a fundamental part of procedure. . . . When the Standing Orders change, for example, rulings based on the old rules must obviously become obsolete. More important, many rulings must be made with little opportunity for reflection or consultation. When possible the Speaker may defer a decision . . . Time, however, is not always available and unsatisfactory rulings may result. Finally, it must be noted that rarely are two points of order precisely the same. While previous rulings may be useful guidelines, they may well lack the precision and certainty which may be desired.

It's all part of the picture which bears an analogy in ordinary law, Mr. Speaker, that in Canada the law consists of the common law and the statutory law and the judge's interpretation of both. But one thing you cannot have is tradition or custom altering the written law, and the Standing Orders are analogous to the written law. You can have interpretations of them, but you can't have overruling of them.

And again, Mr. Speaker, in *Beauchesne*, section 21:

The most fundamental privilege of the House as a whole is to establish rules of procedure for itself and to enforce them. A few rules are laid down in the British North America Act, but the vast majority are resolutions of the House which may be added to, amended, or repealed at the discretion of the House. It follows, therefore, that the House may dispense with the application of any of these rules by unanimous consent on any occasion, or, by motion, may suspend their operation for a specified length of time.

Nothing about custom or Speaker's rulings or any amount [inaudible] to the contrary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Will the member be able to conclude remarks in the next two minutes? The Chair so directs, please.

MR. WRIGHT: You are giving me two minutes to have done, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, 10 minutes ago the Chair gave some direction, and the House will not spend the whole afternoon on a point of order.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm hardly exceeding in my length of time the importance of the matter to be debated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the other point, then, that we proceed to is 38, and that is fairly briefly stated. Thirty-eight says:

One clear day's notice shall be given

of a motion for leave to present a resolution or address.

Now, this is a motion for leave to present a resolution. The word used is "shall," and it says:

A notice under this standing order shall be laid on the Table before 5:30 p.m. or 4:00 p.m. if it be a Friday, and shall be entered in the Votes and Proceedings of that day.

Mr. Speaker, it was not laid on the Table, because it was not in writing. It has not been entered in the Votes and Proceedings of the day. It is wholly out of order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Government House Leader.

MR. YOUNG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm intrigued by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and the arguments that he's advanced, which are ingenious, to say the very least.

It has been, and I submit still is, the practice of this House to regard notice given on one day to permit procedures to follow on the succeeding day. That has been the practice for as long as I've been in this Legislature. The hon. member has brought forth arguments which I think relate to his legal training and practices which may prevail elsewhere. I really wouldn't know.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the situation in which we find ourselves and the practices in which we find ourselves I submit mean that there has been 24 hours' notice given -- all members are aware of it -- as presumed when notice is given orally. And that's the reason for opportunity for oral notice, that that is notice to members. Subsequent to that, of course, the motion itself has appeared in the Votes and Proceedings and is available to all members and, of course, is also in *Hansard* and is available to members there.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that basing ourselves upon the interpretation and the Standing Orders as they have long been used in this Assembly, while his argument is interesting, it is not applicable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is appreciative of the documentation as supplied by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. The Chair is also deeply cognizant of the difficulties of the issues as being raised with respect to the operation of the House as a whole in addition to the matter of the purported point of order. The Chair appreciates one of the citations as given by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, *Beauchesne* 21, the first sentence of which reads:

The most fundamental privilege of the House as a whole is to establish rules of procedure for itself and to enforce them.

In the opinion of the Chair, clearly the precedence of the House has been of such long-standing duration that oral notice can be given one day. It was not objected to at that time, and the practice of the House then continues that the notice is indeed in order because of the precedence of the House.

Again, the Chair also would point out Standing Order 2, and our own Standing Orders do indeed take precedence over both *Beauchesne* and *Erskine May* and any other citation which might be supplied. Again, here it says that the Speaker shall make his ruling and "shall base his decision on the usages and precedents of the Assembly and on parliamentary tradition." And quite clearly, in this issue the precedence of the House has been to give the oral notice on the one day and for it to be moved, if the government in this case sees fit to move it, on the next day, which has indeed taken place.

The Table officers, the Deputy Speaker, and myself examined this issue at some considerable length earlier in the day, and the arguments as presented have not seemed to change the mind of the Chair. Therefore, the Chair does not uphold the point of order.

The Chair therefore calls for a vote on the motion as proposed by the government House Leader. Those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

All right; division.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Elliott	Nelson
Ady	Elzinga	Oldring
Bogle	Fischer	Orman
Bradley	Fjordbotten	Pengelly
Brassard	Getty	Reid
Campbell	Heron	Rostad
Cherry	Isley	Russell
Clegg	Johnston	Stewart
Cripps	Jonson	Weiss
Day	McClellan	West
Dinning	Moore, M.	Young
Downey	Moore, R.	Zarusky
Drobot	Musgrove	

Against the motion:

Barrett	McEachern	Strong
Ewasiuk	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hewes	Pashak	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie
Martin	Sigurdson	

Totals: Ayes - 38 Noes - 14

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, speaking to the sub-amendment on Bill 21.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the subamendment moved by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods. The subamendment requests that we withhold second reading because this Bill is an insufficient return on the investment of one half million public dollars.

The minister and his entourage toured eight countries and many Alberta locations, but money was not spent to address the specific employment issues that have a particular impact on women. Women make up 49 percent of the paid labour force. The Premier has spoken in this Chamber of his commitment to the promotion of the equal participation of women in the economic, social, and political life of this province and of his commitment to strengthening the family. But in reviewing the legislation, in viewing the tour made by this task force, I see nothing that would indicate to me that these were considerations or concerns of the task force.

I would note, firstly, that only two women were on the task force of 15 members, even though women make up 52 percent of the population and 49 percent of the work force. Although many countries were visited, there is no evidence of sufficient representation by women representing the unique needs of women in the paid labour force, not in foreign countries and not in Alberta; no evidence of consultation in regard to issues that are of particular concern to women, issues such as maternity leave -- paternity leave, too -- pay equity, safeguards for part-time workers, safety in the workplace, flex time, and pensions that address the particular needs of women in terms of their pattern of work.

I'd like to return, firstly, to indicate what a waste of money this task force was. I would return to the issue particularly relevant to women, the issue of pay equity. Equal pay for work of equal value as a convention of the International Labour Organisation, to which Canada is a signatory: no evidence that it was studied, even though it's been in place in England for a number of years. I have a case study in my files of the Continental Can Co. in England which has successfully implemented pay equity. New Zealand, Australia, in which pay equity has been in place for 15 years: we have no evidence that these things were studied or reported on. Therefore, the task force, we can only conclude, was a waste of money.

We have no evidence of representation from workers in traditionally female jobs, nurses, or of non-unionized workers who are primarily women and that legislation needs to protect. Where was the representation of part-time workers? The majority of part-time workers, 77 percent, are women, and indeed 25 percent of women in the paid labour force are part-time workers. We have no evidence of consultation with them, and certainly the legislation offers no protection to them. So this committee, I can only conclude, was a waste of money because it did not build in gender parity into the constitution of the committee. It did not build in gender parity when it looked at issues and met with people.

So what can we say? How can this represent the working people of this country, of this province of Alberta? We have to say again that we need to have women -- that members on the task force are cognizant of such issues as maternity leave, job sharing, flex time, and part-time work so that women can stay in the paid labour force while they raise their families. If we really are committed to families, we will make the workplace responsive to the needs of families, and there is nothing in this legislation, I would suggest, that is anywhere near responsive to the needs of families. In fact, much of it is unresponsive and detrimental to families. So I think we can only conclude that this task force wasted money and wasted time. Because obviously they didn't know what questions to ask, what kinds of focus they should be taking when they looked at issues.

To not include women at the very outset means that we have missed the needs of 49 percent of the workers. What else can we say if this was not a waste of money? We can say again: what places were visited? Did they meet and talk about particular answers to women's problems? Did they talk about those things when they visited England, when they visited the United States and Australia and New Zealand, which for many years have had legislation in place, practices in place that allow women to be in the paid labour force, that recognize the importance of families?

Mr. Speaker, in the words of the Premier to the First Ministers' Conference in 1986 -- and I would file three copies for the members of the Assembly -- I would quote the Premier: "I am pleased that, for the first time, we are addressing women's concerns at this table as a separate topic." What about women's concerns on this task force? Surely if the Premier recognizes that it is important to address women's concerns at a First Ministers' Conference, he should have considered it important that this task force address it when it looked to establishing labour relations and employment codes and standards that affect women, that affect all people. The Premier, I would hold, if he didn't want this task force to be a waste of money, should have directed his minister to ensure adequate representation of women. I think this task force must reflect, because it does not do those things, a waste of money.

Again, we hear of much commitment to the family. Last fall the first ministers met around integration of family and integration of family and workplace responsibilities. I don't see anything of that in the task force report or in this legislation. We need to make consideration of the many legitimate initiatives that would help people in the paid labour force, whether they be men or women, meet the responsibilities of their family. There are many solutions. I don't see evidence of any of them anywhere, so how can we say anything but that this was a waste of half a million taxpayers' dollars? But we have to ask further: where, in reality, is the government's commitment to women, and where, in reality, is the government's commitment to families? From looking at this task force and this Bill, I would say that their commitment is nothing but empty rhetoric. I therefore ask that we adopt this subamendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this subamendment because I agree with the previous speaker that probably never in the history of parliamentary democracy has so much money been wasted on nine people on a world junket that came back without any constructive ideas or thoughts that would improve labour relations in this province. I can cite two examples to support my case.

This group went to Japan. They must have been totally blinkered the whole time they were there, because anybody who knows anything about the Japanese economy, Mr. Speaker, knows that it's based on profit sharing. They know that that's the engine of Japanese growth; that most workers, especially in their big industrial organizations, not only do they share in profits, but they often sit on the management teams of these organizations. For the minister to not come back and bring those kinds of ideas into the labour legislation that he has tabled before us is just astounding. His whole labour legislation in this respect is based on an outmoded concept of workers. It's the old master/servant relationship. Well, Canadian workers aren't like that anymore. They're like the Japanese workers. They're highly educated; they're skilled people. They want to have a voice and a share in what happens in their lives, and by encouraging their productivity, by giving them incentives, we'd have not only better working relations, but we'd have a much more productive and dynamic economy.

The other thing that was neglected in this tour, this holiday that was provided to nine people: in terms of selecting countries, they omitted perhaps the best country that could have provided them with a sense of really good industrial working relationships. They could have selected Sweden, for example, and gone there. They could have learned something really significant there, because Sweden is not only an industrial democracy in the western tradition; it has a parliamentary tradition that's like our own. It also happens to have a much higher standard of living than we have here in Canada, and it's got a much higher productivity per person. It has that because they've virtually eliminated strikes in Sweden, and they've done that because they've established a good climate of working relationships between industrial workers and employers. They don't hate each other; they don't polarize the situation. Management and labour show mutual respect for one another.

This measure that's before us will do just the opposite. It's going to set worker against management in ways that are going to be so counterproductive and so bitter and so fraught with violence that we're going to pay an enormous price for that. That's

why I say, Mr. Speaker, that this minister and his traveling entourage should have gone to Sweden. What they would have found out there is that management and labour sit down with each other. They have representatives from all the-trade unions in their country and from all employment organizations; they get predictions in terms of what the economy is likely to do in the following year, and there's an agreement that the wage increases on the average will not exceed what the average rate of productivity is.

Now, we tried to do that in this country not so many years ago. We imposed the old six and five solution. We imposed wage controls, but we didn't impose price controls. We didn't tie wages to productivity gains so that everybody could respond to these controls in a way and see them in some fair kind of perspective.

MS BARRETT: That's Liberals for you.

MR. PASHAK: That's Liberals; I realize that. That was a Liberal strategy. But in this country if we want to get any kind of decent harmony, the provinces have to co-operate with the federal government. We have to begin thinking in terms of national productivity gains, and we have to apportion those gains so that they go equally to management as they do to labour. We can't get those factors out of balance, or we're building in conflict to the situation. I would like the minister at some point to explain why Sweden wasn't on his traveling itinerary, because without going to Sweden, that money was totally wasted.

Again, in the Swedish country if there's a group that's behind what others are, they may be able to get gains that meet their needs. But on balance, on the average, wage settlements in Sweden do not exceed the national average in terms of productivity increases, so there is harmony.

There are many models that this minister could have looked at in terms of improving labour relationships in this country, but to go back to draconian measures that existed in this country in the 1930s is completely irresponsible, and it'll set this province aflame.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this subamendment as well, not that it by itself constitutes a reason for saying no to second reading, but attached to the amendment, which says, "You talked out of one side of your mouth; you went and spent a whole bunch of money, and then you didn't deliver" -- that's the context in which this subamendment has to be seen. I object strenuously to the fact that that minister's world tour comprised of all of his friends taking -- what? -- some 240 hours of time, at minimum, for each one of those people compared to three days' debate on second reading of this Bill and this subamendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WRIGHT: Shame, shame.

MS BARRETT: Shame indeed. If the minister had used the brains that God gave him, he'd realize that there are a lot of people that are left out of consideration under Bill 21, which is the reason that we can't support it and have to support this amendment and subamendment. He could have gone to the library, like I did, and found the booklet called "What this Country Did to Us it Did to Itself," a Report of the B.C. Human Rights Commission on the Farmworkers & Domestic Workers, a very

instructive booklet right here in the Alberta library since June 27, 1983. He'd have found out that there's a whole section of farm workers who are exposed to very dangerous chemicals in spraying materials on the farms, resulting in a number of related illnesses and consequential poor effects on both their ability to perform their work and look after their health in the long run. And he would have been able to incorporate some of the recommendations of this booklet into his own legislation instead of going around the world, costing Alberta taxpayers a half a million dollars.

I point out to the members of the Assembly, similarly in the Legislature Library, what is a semiannual publication called Poverty Profile, a report from the National Council of Welfare, which would have told him clearly how to fix his own legislation so that he doesn't have to compensate for poverty in the part-time work force by having to spend money through the Social Services department. All he would have to do is protect the part-time employees, and women employees especially, in the work force, and he'd save a lot of money for the entire Alberta government in another regard.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to send the titles and the call numbers for a number of good documents which I over the years have been able to acquire through the library and haven't had to spend half a million dollars, or even half a dollar, traveling around the world to learn about.

I think the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn was absolutely right when he talked about how it was that the minister very carefully selected the countries to which he went to make sure that he didn't learn the optimum amount that was available for learning about industrial relations in the world. I point to Sweden, as a matter of fact, wherein the work force is mainly unionized, Mr. Speaker, in contrast to Alberta, but wherein all of the rights that are extended to those who have the benefit of collective agreement are automatically extended to those who don't have a collective agreement. And it's done by law. That's the sort of thing that would have made this trip worth while if -- if -- the minister had bothered to reflect that knowledge, and I do mean knowledge, not information, in the Bill that he has presented to us.

I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that it's more convenient for this government to spend half a million dollars on a world tour in which they say they're going to come up with legislation resulting therefrom and ignore the vital components of our labour force, but it's politically convenient for them to go to the First Ministers' Conference and say: Oh, women are high on our agenda. The reason I say that is because if they'd gone to the countries and talked about the serious issues, they'd have been forced into putting that stuff on the agenda.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Within the direction of the motion as passed, the Chair now must put the question with respect to the subamendment and the amendment and the motion for second reading.

All those in favour of the subamendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The subamendment is defeated.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	McEachern	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hewes	Pashak	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie
Martin		

Against the motion:

Adair	Elliott	Orman
Ady	Elzinga	Osterman
Bogle	Fischer	Pengelly
Bradley	Getty	Reid
Brassard	Heron	Rostad
Campbell	Isley	Russell
Cherry	Johnston	Stevens
Clegg	Jonson	Stewart
Cripps	McClellan	Weiss
Day	Moore, M.	West
Dinning	Moore, R.	Young
Downey	Musgrove	Zarusky
Drobot	Oldring	

Totals: Ayes - 13 Noes - 38

[Motion on subamendment lost]

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the amendment as proposed by the Member for St. Albert, those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is defeated.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	McEachern	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hewes	Pashak	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie
Martin		

Against the motion:

Adair	Elliott	Oldring
Ady	Elzinga	Orman

Bogle	Fischer	Osterman
Bradley	Getty	Pengelly
Brassard	Heron	Reid
Campbell	Isley	Rostad
Cherry	Johnston	Russell
Clegg	Jonson	Stevens
Cripps	McClellan	Stewart
Day	Moore, M.	Weiss
Dinning	Moore, R.	Young
Downey	Musgrove	Zarusky
Drobot		

Totals: Ayes - 13 Noes - 37

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour has moved second reading of Bill 21, Employment Standards Code.

Those members in favour of second reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: In the opinion of the Chair the motion carries.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Drobot	Oldring
Ady	Elliott	Orman
Bogle	Elzinga	Osterman
Bradley	Fischer	Pengelly
Brassard	Getty	Reid
Campbell	Heron	Rostad
Cherry	Isley	Russell
Clegg	Jonson	Stevens
Cripps	McClellan	Stewart
Day	Moore, M.	Weiss
Dinning	Moore, R.	Young
Downey	Musgrove	Zarusky

Against the motion:

Barrett	McEachern	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	Mjolsness	Taylor
Hewes	Pashak	Wright
Laing	Roberts	Younie
Martin		

Totals: Ayes - 36 Noes - 13

[Motion carried; Bill 21 read a second time]

[At 6 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]