

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Wednesday, July 6, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/07/06

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

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

MR. OLDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table a petition that's been brought forward by two groups, PAID and REID, People Against Impaired Drivers and Research and Education into Impaired Driving. There are some 1,300 names in support of my Motion 208, which was withdrawn from the Order Paper and replaced by a government Bill, Bill 26.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 269****An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I may have to have your help a little on this in view of the possible proroguing of the House today. I wanted to introduce a Bill that normally would come up Thursday, although I have them numbered and approved and so on. I gather the procedure is to ask for the unanimous approval of the House, to seek unanimous consent from the Assembly to introduce Bill 269, which is An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act, notwithstanding the fact that the Bill has not had the clear day's notice. Could I have that unanimous approval?

MR. SPEAKER: All members willing to give consent to this variation in procedure for this particular Bill, Bill 269, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries. And the member has introduced.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it leaves me drunk with power, so it allows me to ask again if I may seek also unanimous consent of the Assembly to introduce the Alberta Farm . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Let's not get this confused. We've now had unanimous consent to introduce that

particular Bill. Would you now just read the number and the title of that Bill? Then we'll go to the next, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. The Bill is Bill 269, and it's entitled An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act, which in fact gives municipalities an input into the type of entertainment approved by the Alberta Liquor Control Board.

[Leave granted; Bill 269 read a first time]

Bill 271**Alberta Farm Security Act**

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House prepared to extend the same courtesy with regard to Bill 271 as sponsored by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Westlock-Sturgeon, 271.

MR. TAYLOR: Bill 271, Mr. Speaker, is entitled the Alberta Farm Security Act and is modeled on the Farm Security Act that was recently passed in Saskatchewan, which protects the home corridor and goes onto other things to do with being able to stop too hasty a foreclosure, particularly by the government's own agencies.

[Leave granted; Bill 271 read a first time]

Bill 270**An Act to Amend the Law of Property Act**

MR. SPEAKER: Would the House be gracious enough to extend the same courtesy to the Member for Calgary-Buffalo with regard to Bill 270, that we might have unanimous consent for introduction, for first reading?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill, being An Act to Amend the Law of Property Act, the purpose of which is to help over 50,000 Albertans with royalty interests in this province.

[Leave granted; Bill 270 read a first time]

Bill 268**Alberta Arts Board Act**

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 268, which I did have the foresight to put on notice. The title of the Bill is . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, your halo's going to choke you to death one of these days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MS BARRETT: The title of the Bill is the Alberta Arts Board Act, Mr. Speaker.

It would establish the Alberta arts council, which is a voluntary association which on an annual basis would elect members to the Alberta arts board, that body being the body which would adjudicate applications for funding for cultural endeavours at a ratio of 50 percent plus one as elected members, the remaining members being appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[Leave granted; Bill 268 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure . . . [interjection] Well, Mr. Speaker, somebody invited me to lunch, so I bought a jacket. Actually, the Premier gave me heck last week; he told me to be a little sharper, so I went out and bought some new clothes.

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to table with the Legislative Assembly today the 1987 annual report of the Environment Council of Alberta.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Alberta Electric Energy Marketing Agency for the year 1987-88.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm filing today certain responses to motions for returns 176, 197, and 204, and Written Question 208.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling today the response to Motion for a Return 200.

As well, I have the pleasure of tabling with the Assembly the first annual report of the Department of Community and Occupational Health for the year ended March 31, 1987, and the 70th annual report of the Workers' Compensation Board of Alberta for the year ended December 31, 1987.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the response to Question 207.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Alberta Liquor Control Board's 64th annual report for the fiscal year ended January 5, 1988.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and members of the Assembly, a special guest staying at my house, although I just met him a few minutes ago. He's been there a couple of nights. This gentleman's name is Greg Cawood. He's from Leeds, England, and he's accompanied by a new friend Dan Beharry, from Edmonton. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and receive the warm applause of the Assembly.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce a delegation of ministers here today. Not cabinet ministers; these are real ministers. Heading up the group is Rev. Albert Lindoff, who has dedicated his lifetime to serving others and is especially

fond of his association with the late John Diefenbaker. Representing British Columbia is Rev. Lyle Preston, and representing a unique inner-city ministry to the homeless is Richard Martin. I would ask the three men if they would stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly today.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Hospitals and Medical Care Deputy Minister

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister of hospitals and medicare. The minister has hired Rhéal LeBlanc as his new deputy minister effective June 17, 1988 -- Brian Mulroney's old university buddy. Now, Mr. LeBlanc has been the subject of an investigation by the Comptroller General of Canada for his handling of certain consulting contracts with a computer consulting firm known as CACI Canada Ltd. My question to the minister will be the minister advise whether he obtained knowledge of the circumstances of the Comptroller General's investigation of Mr. LeBlanc's handling of the government contracts prior to making the appointment of Mr. LeBlanc as his deputy?

MR. M. MOORE: First, might I say, Mr. Speaker, that the innuendo contained in the preamble to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question for the most part is totally inaccurate and should not have been repeated in the House.

With respect to the question, the matter of the allegations contained in the *Globe and Mail* story this morning with respect to Mr. LeBlanc are the subject of consideration by the Deputy Minister of Executive Council. Until that is complete, I don't have any further comments to make on that.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. It's all right to look into it after; we want to know what happened before, and that was my question.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that there was a gap of a few months between Mr. LeBlanc's departure as commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada and his appointment as the deputy. I'm wondering why this minister would appoint an individual to the highest level of authority in his department without determining if in fact his resignation from the Correctional Service of Canada was connected to the CACI contract. Why wouldn't you check that in the first place?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I've said that the matter of the allegations in the *Globe and Mail* report are being looked into. But again, the hon. member is totally wrong. He reads the newspaper and thinks that's the gospel truth. The facts of the matter are that Mr. LeBlanc was hired by our department before he resigned his federal post, and it was only a matter of some two or three weeks from his departure there until he went to work here, at which time he was on holidays. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has again maligned somebody without any foundation whatsoever.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, let's move back to Alberta in view of the fact that Mr. LeBlanc was a Deputy Solicitor General here in Alberta during the time when the Auditor General said in 1985, and I quote:

As a result of the Department of the Solicitor General's senior financial management failing to provide appropriate direction and control during the development and implementation of a major new computer system for its Motor Vehicles Division, financial accounting and control were seriously impaired.

That was in Alberta, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister even check into what was going on in the Solicitor General's department at that time, before he made this appointment?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the allegations contained in the *Globe and Mail* report are being looked into by the Deputy Minister of Executive Council. The allegations just now made and repeated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be looked into as well. If he has any additional allegations to make, he may wish to make them now, verbally or in writing, and we'll look into them.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, clearly somebody has to do the job for this minister.

Now, my last question to this minister then. Is the minister even aware that CACI Canada Ltd. was also involved with the Solicitor General's department during that time and that Mr. Anderson of CACI served under Mr. LeBlanc as the director of the department's counselling services? Was he aware of that?

MR. M. MOORE: The innuendo that the hon. Leader of the Opposition persists in putting out in this House is nothing more than what he read in the *Globe and Mail*, for the most part. Whether or not that is accurate in any way, shape, or form, I don't know. That matter is being investigated, and it will be fully investigated. What the Leader of the Opposition might wish to do when he leaves the question period is make the same allegations toward the Deputy Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care that he has just made in the House outside of the House so that that individual might take appropriate action.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary. Westlock-Sturgeon. [interjections] Thank you, opposition members. Westlock-Sturgeon is recognized.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, supplemental to the minister. Could the minister tell this House whether he discussed this issue with Mr. LeBlanc's former employer, the federal Solicitor General, Mr. Kelleher? Has he talked to Mr. Kelleher?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I can say this: that before the hiring of any deputy minister is done, there is a very thorough review done of the performance of that individual in other jobs. Recommendations are sought; there is a committee that involves the Deputy Minister of Executive Council that looks into a variety of matters. As I said earlier, the matter of these allegations, which are nothing more than allegations at this point in time, contained in a *Globe and Mail* report, are being looked into. It's inappropriate for me to make further comments until we have a better understanding of the true facts.

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

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

Health Care Funding

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In less than two years the current Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has flip-flopped on more than 12 policy issues affecting the health of Albertans. These include one where the minister announced

that the Mill Woods and Peter Lougheed hospitals were to be mothballed, and then of course he opened them; that Bill 14 was to privatize health insurance, and then he withdrew it; that a fees agreement with the Alberta Medical Association was reached, and then he breached it; that several preventative health services were deinsured, then he reinsured . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, hon. member, let us come to the question.

REV. ROBERTS: It is a long list, Mr. Speaker, I know.

MR. SPEAKER: We're not going to have the long list.

REV. ROBERTS: Hospital funding was announced to be 2.2 percent; now it's being bumped up to 4 and 5 and 6 percent. Can the minister now offer one good reason why average Albertans ought to believe any announcement that he may make, since his track record has been so abysmal over the last two years.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, for an hon. member who has such a callous disregard for the truth, that's a rather outstanding statement. The facts of the matter are, starting with the first preamble to the hon. member's question: the Mill Woods hospital was scheduled to be constructed and opened at the same time as the Edmonton General hospital was going to be open, to a large extent as an active treatment hospital too. My statement at the time was that it was not possible, in my view, financially to open the new Mill Woods hospital and at the same time keep the Edmonton General hospital open as a full-service active treatment hospital. The member will recall, if he can think that far back, that that situation changed and the Edmonton General became for all intents and purposes an auxiliary hospital and a long-term care centre. So we were able to provide more funding to open the Mill Woods hospital.

Now, I can go on and on about a number of decisions that have been made, Mr. Speaker. They've all been good decisions, in my view. The facts of the matter are that hospital boards across this province were asked last year to take a 3 percent cut in their entire budget. Coupled with about 4 or 5 percent inflation, that meant a reduction of about 8 percent. This year, after we know what the facts are with regard to the cost of operating the hospitals -- and I have said in this House on many occasions over the last two months that we were reviewing every single hospital board's budget. Having completed that work, we now are in a position to provide some additional funding. On balance, the increase over two years in hospital board budgets is about 1 percent per year -- outstanding performance by hospital boards in maintaining cost increases that are very acceptable in the economic climate we have in Alberta today. Mr. Speaker, we should all be proud that hospital boards were able to do that and there's been nothing wrong at all with the government's approach to funding hospitals.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, there's another flip-flop, Mr. Speaker. The minister said it was going to be a world-class geriatric facility in Edmonton, and now it's an auxiliary hospital. What kind of reversal is that?

Can the minister please advise which other cabinet minister -- or deputy minister, for that matter -- does have the final say on health matters, since this minister obviously has been forced to reverse his own stated position so many times?

MR. M. MOORE: Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, it's not the Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, some would wonder.

Can the minister, then, confirm that the reason for this remarkable litany of policy flip-flops has been that the cabinet itself is so deeply divided that it had to bring in the Hyndman commission to sort things out, or that like Stephen Leacock's great detective, they're just riding "off in all directions."

MR. SPEAKER: Next question.

REV. ROBERTS: We'll leave it for big Lou to figure out.

Does the minister really enjoy being constantly embarrassed by such forced flip-flops, which have more flop than flip to them, I might add? Or will he for the consistent health of Albertans simply resign this position?

MR. SPEAKER: The question has no place in question period.

Supplementary, Edmonton-Gold Bar. [interjections]
Edmonton-Gold Bar, please.

MRS. HEWES: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the minister's not going to resign, instead of simply lurching at problems to keep the lid on them, will the minister now please sit down and review the situation with the AHA, the Alberta Hospital Association, to develop some collaborative stability in hospital services and in hospital funding so that we know what we can expect over the next years?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it's extremely difficult for the AHA or any hospital board to know several months in advance what their costs are going to be in terms of wage settlements or a lot of other variabilities that occur from time to time. What we have done in this province every year, with the exception of last year, for at least the last 10 years is that we've established a base budget for hospitals, and then we have increased that over the course of the year as known costs came in with respect to wage settlements and so on. We also had a system for many years where hospital boards were able to appeal their budget, based upon increased costs.

What we are doing this year is no different than what we've done time and time again, and that is that we established a 1.5 percent increase in January. It was later increased to about 2.2 percent or 2.1 percent when the nurses' salary settlement was known. Over the course of the last two months I have advised in this House at least a dozen times that we are working with every hospital board to see what kind of additional funding they need in order to maintain their operations and not close beds or reduce services. We completed that work, and we've now announced additional funding. That is the procedure that we intended to follow, and it's one that we've now completed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer. In light of the fact that we seem to have discovered some spare money, because we've added on to the physiotherapists, chiropractors, now \$60 million to hospitals, can the Provincial Treasurer indicate if it is because the Provincial Treasurer underestimated the projected revenue or because of the efficiency in the department that we've been able to come up with this new money?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that addi-

tional expenditures of the order now responded to by the minister of hospitals are important in the context of the situation facing the hospital system and other systems. I think it's a reasonable response for us to make the moves that the minister has announced. But in the financial consideration it is, of course, additional dollars which the government will have to find. I think in terms of our forecast, we're still reasonably accurate as to what is expected to be our potential deficit for this year. Moreover, we are a bit ahead, of course, in terms of our fiscal plan with respect to 1987 and 1988. So we do have some flexibility on a multi-year approach to this problem. Needless to say, this kind of response is the way in which this government has operated. If it's necessary for us to provide first-class medical accommodation, as we've indicated, or for that matter to reinforce our priority in education, we'll find the dollars to do it. That's essentially what's happened here today.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care reports to myself as chairman of the Executive Council, I think it should be clear that the people of Alberta are pleased that they have a minister who has the guts to try and deal with one of the most difficult problems facing Canadians, that we have a minister who has the guts to do that, not merely whining and complaining like the members opposite. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the House will join me in recognizing the leader of the Liberal Party for this main question.

Pay Equity

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to know Little Orphan Moore has a friend anyhow.

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Premier. On June 24, Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day, the province of Newfoundland announced that it will spend between \$15 million and \$20 million on a new equal pay for work of equal value program for the Newfoundland public service. Now, this follows Nova Scotia and Manitoba, also Conservative governments, which in turn followed a couple of Liberal governments, Quebec and Ontario, in recognizing inequity in the work force and how much women earn versus men.

MR. SPEAKER: The question will now follow.

MR. TAYLOR: It's only the second sentence, Mr. Speaker. They're very short sentences from what I usually use. To the Premier, a short question then. When will we be seeing pay equity legislation in Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care having a friend. I might say he is surrounded by his supporters on this side of the House. That's certainly not true of the hon. member on his side of the House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the Premier's tenuous hold on reality is very well known; nevertheless, I asked the question only 10 seconds ago, and the retention factor is very poor there.

So let's go on a little bit farther. Why do we need more studies -- I'm anticipating the Premier's answer because I saw the House leader whisper it to him -- in Alberta when three out of four Conservative provinces in the East have already put that in?

MR. GETTY: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader's party would operate that way. Whatever anyone else does, he would follow. In Alberta we have by law equal pay for equal work. That has stood up and been a fact of life in this province for some time and is supported by Albertans. The hon. member is trying to impose on Alberta what happens in other provinces. We don't do it that way. We make sure that before we do things, it's the best for Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR: That's clear. We also hire the rejects of everybody else too.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the government's plan of action for women, which is being developed in conjunction with the so-called Alberta Dialogue on Economic Equity for Women, will this include pay equity legislation for women?

MR. GETTY: As I said, Mr. Speaker, by law in this province it's equal pay for equal work. That is the law, and that is the way we will develop our policies. The hon. minister responsible for women's issues has commenced a dialogue on other ways in which we can be responsive to women's issues, and should any of them require additional moves by the government, then of course we'll follow them through, because we have always been working to provide the greatest opportunities possible to women in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. It's a funny way of trying to keep women in the home. Does the Premier explain, then, why women in Alberta in general earn between 60 and 65 cents in comparison to every dollar men earn for the same jobs in Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are doing equal work, then they receive equal pay.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore, supplementary.

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. Does the Premier not recognize that even the International Labour Organisation, to which Canada is a signatory, has a covenant that recognizes that there will not be justice for women until there is equal pay for work of equal value? That is, goes beyond equal pay for equal work, but equal pay for work of equal value.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can quote some international body if she wishes. I'm telling her what the law is in Alberta, and it is a law supported by Albertans.

Government-Established Lending Agencies

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of economic development, and it relates to the Alberta Opportunity Company. As of late I've had the opportunity of reviewing a number of the press releases of the Alberta Opportunity Company and note a number of loans to various kinds of businesses and entities in the province of Alberta. I also note that some of the loans that are made could also, I think, possibly be made by the Treasury Branches or regular lending agencies. My question to the minister is with regards to just that. Could the minister assure this House that all of those loans that have been made by the Alberta Opportunity Company could not have been made by regular lending institutions in this province?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member might recall the throne speech of about 16 months ago, when the government announced a change in focus in terms of policy direction for the Alberta Opportunity Company. Reference, I believe, in the throne speech was a request by the government to the board of directors of AOC to be, rather than continuing to be a lender of last resort, a provider of creative financing. I believe the recent performance by the Alberta Opportunity Company responds to that government directive.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate, then, what procedure is used in terms of this creative financing that would take into consideration that matter of regular lending agencies being able to creative finance as well? What is the difference?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that the hon. member might want to seek further information from the board of directors, but I would provide him with a general idea of the process that is used. There is a board of directors that is responsible for the Alberta Opportunity Company; that is, private-sector individuals from across this province who deal with the individual loan applications at their regular board meetings twice a month after those applications have been dealt with by the staff of the corporation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of a specific question to the minister. I note that two private insurance agencies and one business described as a holding company for chartered accountants have been provided with loans. Could the minister indicate the uniqueness of those types of businesses that would qualify under the Alberta Opportunity Company's lending program?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on the specifics that the hon. member has raised, except to say that the Alberta Opportunity Company over the course of a year provides financial assistance to between 300 and 400 Alberta companies and over the course of its history has provided support to Alberta companies that total about 5,000. Recently the company has embarked on a program, which we're pleased with, of providing venture capital financing. It would be impossible, Mr. Speaker, for me to be able to comment on one of 5,000 or two of 5,000 loans that the corporation has made.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final to either the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer. It's with regards to the broad number of lending agencies that government has established in the last few years: the Treasury Branches, the Alberta Opportunity Company, Vencap, the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, the Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Is there any consideration by government in terms of reviewing those various lending agencies, of consolidating them or reorganizing them under one agency of government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, those lending organizations, of course, have been developed over some 14 or 15 years of government action to assist Albertans. In the course of that period of time, there are always reviews to make sure that the services which they deliver are delivered in the most efficient, effective way possible to Albertans. In some cases that leads to a consideration of amalgamation or even the elimination of some. As the hon. member knows -- for instance, he mentions ADC --

there has been a review of ADC already, and a change is being made.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, from time to time the various organizations in the government that do lend money will end up foreclosing and receiving land, for example, as foreclosed collateral. Is there any effort made in this government to ensure that the marketing of land owned by the government is done through a single agency to avoid cross-competition, which might affect prices that can be received for the sale of that land?

MR. GETTY: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker -- the hon. member didn't direct the question to anybody, but obviously that would be considered in any assessment, although when you think of it, one is dealing in the area of homes, the other in the area of farmland. While there is a co-ordination, it does not appear from our point of view wise to have it all lumped under one body.

Federal/Provincial Drought Assistance Program

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Although the rainfall in the past days has been more than generous in and around the city of Edmonton, it's my understanding that there are areas of our province that are experiencing high winds and little or no precipitation to date. Would the minister inform the Assembly of the current conditions in the province?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we're all very thankful for the rains that have fallen, but unfortunately, even acknowledging that the rains have been fairly general, there are pockets through the province that are still suffering in a very severe way from the dry conditions. If one examines a map of the province, we still have areas where there is reason for deep concern.

MRS. McCLELLAN: A supplementary again to the Minister. Last week the minister met with the Hon. John Wise to discuss drought assistance for the province. Would the minister be prepared to inform the Assembly as to our participation in that provincial/federal cost-shared program?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct. On June 30 we had the opportunity to be present when the federal Minister of Agriculture announced a federal and provincial program, and I'm happy to report to the Assembly today that this morning cabinet, on behalf of the Premier and the government of Alberta, concurred in an additional \$31.5 million to offset the dry conditions within the province. This is in addition to the \$23.5 million that the Premier announced some time ago under our water supply assistance program, bringing our provincial participation to a total of some \$55 million. This \$31.5 million we have committed today is on a fifty-fifty cost-sharing basis, with a threefold program that we are going to participate in with the federal government: one, a forage program; secondly, a per herd payment; and also, Mr. Speaker, we're delighted that the federal government in their wisdom saw their way to accept our recommendation as it relates to tax deferral for our livestock producers in the province of Alberta.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Again to the minister. I'm sure that our producers will be very heartened by this program that's announced, but being a representative of a rural constituency, I

certainly understand the problems that we encounter when we try to implement a drought program and that guidelines will have to be set out for that. Has the minister determined how drought areas will be defined?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, just prior to responding to the hon. member's question, may I take this opportunity, too, to commend the hon. Member for Chinook and the hon. members for St. Paul, Bow Valley, Cypress-Redcliff, Taber-Warner. We can go through a long list of individuals like yourselves who were very kind in offering their support for this specific program.

We have indicated in our news release today, as did the federal government, that we are going to go on the basis of the forage insurance program experience so that there will be a feathering of these support payments that go to our individual producers. There are going to be two payments to a maximum of \$30 each: one based on the inventory July 1, 1988, and one based on the April 1, '89, inventory. We are sure that the program will be very well accepted, and we are making it a province-wide program based solely on the forage insurance program experience.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether any consideration is being given towards transportation costs for cattle that have to be moved from one area of the province to another area in terms of grazing facilities?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the hon. Member for Little Bow, I acknowledge also that he put questions to the associate minister the same day that I was meeting with the federal minister when he announced this program.

It was decided in consultation with the cattle people that they could best decide themselves how they could use the funds that are going to be made available to them rather than have any special program. So there isn't going to be any special transportation subsidy or allocation, but there is going to be a per head payment, whereby they can best use those funds as they see fit themselves.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister with regard to the per head payment. I don't know whether the minister has been seeding clouds or what. Because of the fact that there's so much rain around the province, obviously we would have some funds in there. Could the minister agree to increase the \$30 allotment, say, to \$40 or \$45, thereby bringing the total to \$75? Because there's so much less dry area to worry about now and fewer cattle.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we put the program together in consultation with our federal counterparts and with the individuals involved with the livestock industry. They felt, in view of the fact that they have had fairly good years in the short time past, that this would be sufficient.

MR. POX: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The minister recognizes that there are many areas of the province where the forage insurance program wasn't available last year, and some of these areas experienced drought last year and very dry conditions this spring. There's a severe shortage of hay in some areas. Is there a retroactive consideration to any of the programs that the government is now involved in with the

federal government in terms of providing hay or paying for hay already purchased by farmers in those affected areas?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member, the per head payment will be based on inventory taken on July 1 of this year and April 1 of next year. We did include some retroactivity provisions in the initial program that was announced by the Premier, our water supply program, to take into account some of the concerns that were expressed by the individuals within the St. Paul area. In addition to that, we also increased the retroactivity provisions as they relate to water wells, dugouts, and our water hauling programs to take into account the concerns just expressed by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Glenarry.

Flooding in Lake District

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some questions on behalf of some Edmonton residents who don't appreciate all the rain. Residents in the Lake District in my riding are again experiencing flooding of basements, and it's a frequent and ongoing problem in their neighbourhood. Many of the residents of the area feel that the developer should have known that such a low-lying area would require a better sewer system and that the city should have been aware of this need as well. For the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will the minister undertake to investigate this situation to determine if there was any negligence or cutting of corners on the part of the private developer who developed the Lake District?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the responsibility for that would fall within my portfolio. I do believe development permits are a municipal affair.

MR. YOUNIE: If they were not following rules, then it should be the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who investigates. I wonder if she will also investigate to determine whether or not residents deserve compensation from the developer, for the reason just cited, for damage from repeated flooding or for increased insurance rates due to repeated flooding.

MS McCOY: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is discussing civil remedies that flow from contracts which are a private matter between individuals. In that event, he would be looking at, again, a remedy that would not fall within the responsibility of the government.

MR. YOUNIE: We're looking at a problem that nobody wants to solve.

Will the Premier have the Minister of Municipal Affairs investigate my constituents' concerns that the city did not adequately review plans for and installation of sewers in the area?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is making a declaration that that happened, then I would draw it to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. If the hon. member is merely asking if that happened, obviously it's hypothetical. Nevertheless, I will pass on to the Minister of Municipal Affairs the import of his questions.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I was saying that many residents of

the area say that was the case.

Will the Premier have cabinet consider the possibility of provincial assistance to help the city replace the inadequate sewer system of the Lake District on the fastest possible schedule?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member surely has some regard for taxpayers and the amount of dollars that they've put into matters. [interjection] Perhaps he doesn't; maybe that is the socialist way. As far as the city of Edmonton, they should be represented by a mayor and council; maybe not.

Federal/Provincial Drought Assistance Program

(continued)

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions to the Minister of Agriculture also on his recently announced program. The first has to do with the tax deferral program. Could the minister tell us what portion of the money from forced sales of livestock from drought the taxes will be deferred on and for how long?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, when we met with the federal Minister of Agriculture, he indicated that the federal Minister of Finance was going to introduce provisions to change the Income Tax Act whereby the federal minister could designate, in the event that he so desired, a drought area. Once that legislation was passed, he was going to designate the three prairie provinces as a drought area. It would be a graduated scale as it relates to the tax deferral whereby there would be no tax deferral on the first 15 percent of the sales, there would only be a 30 percent tax deferral on the second 15 percent and on the remaining 70 percent there would be a 90 percent tax deferral.

MR. MUSGROVE: A supplementary, also referring to the program and the \$15 an acre that farmers can collect for crop seeded after June 21 to July 31. Would these crops also be eligible for a payout of all-risk crop insurance if they have been devastated by drought prior to that time?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the associate minister had announced some provisions as they relate to hail and crop insurance whereby we wanted to relax the provisions so that individuals could take advantage of using seeded crops for pasture purposes in the event that it was required. I would report to the hon. member that \$15 per acre is going to be offered for those who do plant between June 21 and July 31 for purposes of hay, silage, or pasture.

MR. MUSGROVE: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The per head basis will be paid out on the basis of collection of the all-risk crop insurance in areas. Could the minister tell us if in certain areas where no one has taken out the all-risk crop insurance, would they still be able to collect some portion of that \$60 per head?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have received that assurance from the Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation that they still do have the mechanisms in place to gauge sufficiently the payouts that individual farmers would be available for.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

Free Trade

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, from whom we'll hopefully get some answers with respect to free trade. The government of Canada has been lobbying madly to stop United States' business interests from forcing into free trade legislation a provision which will make United States investigations of Canadian subsidy programs more likely rather than less likely under free trade. Now, this is of fundamental importance to Alberta, since we have over \$2 billion of loans, grants, and guarantees to forest companies, packing plants, and other businesses in order to encourage diversification. I note that in the government's booklet here with respect to free trade on page 5 they say:

Therefore, while regional development programs are still permissible, they may also be subject to countervailing duty action if they are large enough to distort trade, and cause injury to the U.S.

I'm wondering, with respect to these \$2 billion of programs: is it fair to say that the government by its policy are of the view that these loans, grants, and guarantees are necessary in order to encourage diversification of this province? The people of Alberta want in simple terms to know why we're so involved in helping business.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, through the course of the negotiations that resulted in the free trade agreement that we anticipate will be signed soon, both the United States' and Canada's negotiators were well aware of the programs of support that had been undertaken and were under consideration. One of the key factors that was agreed to by both sides was that there had to be some flexibility to allow regional economic development to occur in Canada. That was agreed to by both parties. I believe that the hon. member may be anticipating concerns that do not exist.

MR. CHUMIR: You anticipate concerns in your free trade document where at page 24 you say that "loan guarantees are less likely to be countervailed than direct government financial assistance." You're talking about problems. I'm wondering whether the minister will agree that there's significant doubt under free trade about our capacity to continue with these loans, grants, and guarantee programs, natural gas subsidies, business, and so on, and that without these we're going to be locked into our position as suppliers of primary materials and can kiss good-bye to diversification.

MR. SHABEN: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. We believe and are confident that Canada, and particularly our area of responsibility, Alberta, has an enormous opportunity to access some markets in the United States, not just in primary products but in value-added products, as evidenced by the market opportunities in agricultural products, petrochemical downstream products, high value/low weight plastics. There is a whole range of both hard products and software that Canadians and Albertans in particular can market in the United States, because we are now doing it and we're now competitive in that market.

MR. CHUMIR: Yes, but the issues are \$2 billion of subsidies as the U.S. starts to look more closely. I'd like to deal with a concrete example and ask the minister if he'll tell this House why the \$4 million provincial grant to Cargill packing and the \$12 million grant to Gainers for packing plants wouldn't be considered by United States packers facing competition from those

plants to be unfair . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should perhaps do a little more careful research. The support to Gainers is not a grant. I think it's been described in the House on a number of occasions, and if the member would pay attention, he would have known that it's a \$12 million loan at commercial interest rates.

With respect to the subagreement that Alberta has with the federal government for agricultural development the negotiators from the United States and the Canadian negotiators are well aware of the subagreements for agricultural processing that exist in Alberta between the federal government and the provincial government.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, the free trade agreement provides for a five- to seven-year period for defining permissible subsidies. We just don't know what those are. I'm wondering why the minister doesn't recognize how important this is and argue and set in motion a process for deciding that issue within two years rather than waiting the five to seven years, so that we can know where we stand without getting locked into an agreement that we can't get out of.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, a lot of us fail to understand the reluctance of some members in the Assembly to appreciate the value to Canadians of being able to access a market of 235 million people. The terms and conditions under which Canadians can access that market have been negotiated over a two-year period. Now, over the next number of years certain matters need to be resolved, particularly as it relates to disputes resolution. That we have no doubt, can be worked out. But the opportunities for Canadians to have our economy grow and to increase job creation is simply phenomenal, and those who are afraid of entering into an agreement to trade with a neighbour, I believe, are not current on what the people of Canada would like to see happen to their economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Vegreville, main question.

Excessive Interest Charges on Farm Loans

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Agriculture. The minister is well aware that there have been some problems with potential bank interest overcharges. The banks prior to 1982 were using fixed interest rate notes and charging variable interest rates, and the likely cost to many farmers in Alberta has been tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars of extra money paid in interest to the banks. Is the minister aware that under the Limitation of Actions Act many farmers will soon no longer be able to pursue cases against lending institutions for excessive interest charges?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: Well, I'm glad the minister is aware. He should also be aware that all this money that's been taken out of farmers' pockets, perhaps illegally, is money taken out of rural communities as well.

I'm wondering if the minister, because he's apparently concerned about the statute of limitations, would direct his depart-

ment to mount a public information campaign to make sure farmers in Alberta are aware of the statute of limitations so that they can get their claims in prior to that time line.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions and also to have the Minister of Energy give supplementary information from a previous question period?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm more than happy to take under consideration the hon. Member for Vegreville's suggestion that we do conduct some type of advertising campaign to the extent of making the farming population aware that there are certain time constraints under the statute of limitations. I should share with the hon. member, though, that we have had consultations with the chap -- I'll call him as he calls himself -- the borrowers' advocate, whereby we've done everything possible to offer assistance and help through our office. We've also worked with Winston Elgersma, who is a lawyer who has acted on behalf of a number of our farmers.

MR. FOX: Well, it's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that farmers shouldn't be made to pay for the mistakes of the banks and lending institutions.

Now, the Treasury Branches are involved in this as well, and it's my understanding that they're not obliged to invoke the Limitation of Actions Act. The effective date for the Treasury Branches is October 15 of 1988, and I'd like to ask the Treasurer if he would make representation on behalf of farmers to the Treasury Branch to make sure they don't use the statute of limitations as a mechanism to avoid repaying their clients, who trusted them to be fair and to treat them fairly with interest charges.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when this became an issue about four or five months ago -- and frankly, I expected a question on it much sooner than this -- I asked the Treasury Branches to review the way in which they have proceeded with the loan portfolio. They did advise me that they do have some trouble with some of their loans, that in fact they did not agree with the terms of the loan agreement, not because they're above it but in all cases because their loan interest was charged below the current rates provided for in the agreement. Therefore, the Treasury Branches in fact have recognized fully the plight of the farmer much sooner than the member across the way has and have adjusted their schedule accordingly as a result of government policy going back to 1983-84.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, any farmer who paid interest rates in the late '70s and early '80s knows that interest rates were going up, not down.

I'd like the Provincial Treasurer to give us his assurance that the Treasury Branches will not use the statute of limitations as a mechanism to avoid settling these claims and that they are not trying to impede in any way the farmers' access to the documentation they need to initiate these claims against the Treasury Branch.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm two things. First of all, interest rates do go up and down. The member has now discovered that. It's interesting that he suddenly has come to that realization, but what I have said clearly here is that the Treasury Branches and this government, far in advance of any considerations as a result of the Member for Vegreville, have in fact dealt with that problem. The Treasury Branches, as a result of government policy -- and I know it's before the member's time -- had a specific policy in place in 1981-82 which provided a premium to farmers and to small businessmen. We actually told the Treasury Branches to set the rates below the current market levels, and that's how they've reacted. That's exactly the point I'm making: we saw the problem, we provided the compromise, and we have no problem with the policy Treasury Branches have faced. We were well in advance and very sensitive to the issues of farmers and small businessmen, and the policy is in place to prove it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture and probably back to the Treasurer, too, since they're responsible for the two lending organizations ADC and Treasury Branches. Further to the statute of limitations but to go on to personal covenant, will both ministers take pains to see that a new directive going out to managers of their different departments around Alberta tells these managers that they cannot pursue on personal covenant in view of the recent court actions?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of us telling agencies what to do. It's a matter of what is the law. As the Court of Appeal has in fact said, when the government sets foot inside the courtroom, it does it on the same basis as all other Albertans. That means if it's under foreclosures, we do not have the right to pursue personal guarantees. That is the law.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Minister of Energy, with regard to the question as raised by Calgary-Forest Lawn.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's in reference to the questions yesterday in the House raised by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

Energy Industry under the Free Trade Agreement

DR. WEBBER: When the hon. member asked the question related to the proportional sharing of resources to the U.S., Mr. Speaker, he indicated that, in fact, a 3 percent cut in U.S. exports would require a 10 percent cut in Canadian production. Extending the same kind of reasoning, you get to the point where a 30 percent cut in reduction in U.S. would mean a 100 percent cut in Canadian production, I might be so bold as to suggest that even Dostoyevski's Idiot would not have erred to that degree in logic.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is that access to the United States is in relation to historically purchased volumes and that it would be Canada and not the United States that would invoke any clause for any reductions. There'd be four reasons given for that, that were outlined. I believe, in the document the hon. member referred to yesterday; namely, short supply, to conserve a finite resource, as part of a price stabilization scheme, or for

reasons of national security. In the case of crude oil, because of the International Energy Agency agreement going back a number of years, we would essentially be applying similar rules as agreed to at that time. If there is any conflict between the commitments to the free trade agreement and the IEA, then the latter would prevail.

Mr. Speaker, whether there is an agreement or not, we would want to be known as reliable suppliers to our customers so that long-term contracts would be the basis for providing a customer satisfactory service. So the intent would be to treat our customers fairly whether it be the United States or Canada, and the two main aspects that are a positive would be assured markets for our supplies to the United States and improve access to those markets.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo, supplementary.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister's answer would have been as comprehensible to this House if he had given it in Russian.

I stand by my example, but I'm wondering whether or not the minister would undertake to file before this House a paper outlining exactly how those cutback provisions under the free trade agreement will work so that the people of this province can see something significant and in detail instead of being provided with half a page of puffery on one of the most significant natural gas supply issues to this country.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'll go even further by suggesting that I'd be happy to sit down and tutor the hon. member relative to the logic he was using here yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for question period has expired. The Chair would point out that on the desks of all hon. members there is a copy of the 77th birthday letter from the chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. This letter is on all hon. members' desks to take note of the fact that that anniversary occurs on the 18th day of this month.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

20. Moved by Mr. Young:

Be it resolved that when the Legislative Assembly adjourns to recess the Third Session of the 21st Legislature, it shall stand adjourned until a time and date prior to the commencement of the Fourth Session of the Legislature as is determined by Mr. Speaker after consultation with the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[Motion carried]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: PRIVATE BILLS (Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

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

Bill Pr. 1

Royal Canadian Legion Alberta Property Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or further amendments to this Act?

Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Chairman, just to make our position clear on this, we had some concerns with respect to the matter raised by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and were prepared to defer consideration of this particular Bill. However, in light of the fact that the House declined to set this matter over for six months and our position on this as a caucus was that we know the Canadian Legion, we're prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt on that important issue. We understand that they're addressing it. We intend to consult with them and have a discussion with them. But on the basis of the matter that was raised only at that instance without previous notice to this caucus, our decision was to give the benefit of the doubt to the Canadian Legion on that one.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

We'll be looking at the issue. If we continue to have problems, I can assure the House that I will be raising it again. But at this point in time we're giving a vote of confidence to the Canadian Legion, which has been doing yeoman service to this country for many, many years. We're not going to object to this piece of legislation on the basis of a clause that we know very little about and that may not be enforced at this particular time and is being reviewed by the Legion. So that is our position on this particular question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Lethbridge-West.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I just want to simply state that the Royal Canadian Legion -- and it obviously got enough of a hearing last night -- is one of the few organizations that hasn't really asked for anything.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, hon. member. Could we have some order in the committee, please? Order.

MR. GOGO: As I say, Mr. Chairman, the Royal Canadian Legion is one of the few groups that didn't request of the Private Bills Committee of this Legislature anything. They're simply requesting in this Bill a consolidation of their holdings in Alberta. They're not asking for 10 cents. The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo's comments are very welcome. It's amazing what four hours' or six hours' sleep can do to an hon. member's attitude. I would point out that it's particularly important, I think, to recognize, as was stated last night by me, the good deeds of the Royal Canadian Legion. The president of the Alberta/NWT Command, Mr. Bert Sharp, I know will be deeply indebted to members of the House for going along with this Bill Pr. 1 to see that all their holdings in Alberta are consolidated under one Bill.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly welcome the support of the committee.

[The sections of Bill Pr. 1 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I proudly move that Bill Pr. 1, the Royal Canadian Legion Alberta Property Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 2
Canada Olympic Park Transfer of Title Act

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, just simply to say that the amendment as recommended by the committee is satisfactory to the parties involved.

[The sections of Bill Pr. 2 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of clarification with respect to the amendment, do we understand that when approval was given, it was approval for the amendment as well as the Bill?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just to make sure the committee understands, I'll first ask the committee if they approve of the amendment to Bill Pr. 2. Are you in favour of the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, are you in favour of Bill Pr. 2 as amended?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Bill Pr. 2, Canada Olympic Park Transfer of Title Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 3
Paul Mark and
Cheryl-Lynne Mary Ibbotson Adoption Act

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question has been called on Bill Pr. 3.

[The sections of Bill Pr. 3 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 3, the Paul Mark and Cheryl-Lynne Mary Ibbotson Adoption Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, would it be in order for me to

move that the remaining private Bills be passed as presented with amendments, if any, together with their titles and preambles?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the committee agrees, we have no problem. Everybody in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's all Pr. Bills. So the question is: all remaining private Bills as amended are approved by the committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Bills are Pr. 4, Pr. 6, Pr. 7, Pr. 8, Pr. 12, Pr. 16, Pr. 19, Pr. 20. Some of those Bills are amended. So the committee agrees all those Bills are passed.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Titles and preambles agreed to]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports the following Bills: Pr. 1, Pr. 3, Pr. 4, Pr. 16, Pr. 19; and reports with some amendments the following Bills: Pr. 2, Pr. 6, Pr. 7, Pr. 8, Pr. 12, and Pr. 20.

MR. SPEAKER: All those members who concur with the report, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

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

Bill 18
Animal Protection Act

MR. SPEAKER: Order. We'll wait. Thank you.
Member for Vermilion-Viking,

DR. WEST: My apologies to the Assembly, I move that the Animal Protection Act, Bill 18, be now read a third time.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to take a very few brief moments of the Assembly's time to advance the original reasons why we supported this Bill. As a result of the remarks I made at second reading, I had representations from both sides of the House as to support for the general issues I'd raised at that time, and I'd just like to bring members who are interested in the circumstance I provided then up to date with respect to what's happened since. Shortly after my remarks I had indicated that a certain Mrs. Marie Folding was responsible for get-

ting together a group of people that were really concerned about the way in which horses destined for slaughter were being treated. Just after we'd finished debate on second reading, Mrs. Polding visited the city of Calgary, and as a result of that my office tried to put her in touch with the media to relate her visit to the small animal protection Act.

In particular, we contacted CFCN news. A reporter from that station by the name of Suzette Myers, who I understand is leaving for Victoria soon, which will represent a loss as far as I'm concerned to the city of Calgary through losing a very valuable media person, got on top of the issue. She went down to the stockyards herself and found that the kinds of conditions the women who had raised the petition in the first place had described were still occurring. She found, for example, that there was one dead horse in the stockyards at the corral, and there was another mare who was alive but had a dead foal that hadn't been birthed. There was no veterinarian in attendance, and as you can imagine this created quite a bit of publicity in the local Calgary newspapers. As a result of that a certain Mrs. Doreen Erskine contacted a number of people and got another petition together with respect to how horses should be treated that are destined for slaughter. She directed this to the Premier of the province, so I'm assuming he received it. There are some 72 names in this latest petition.

I'd just like to read one paragraph from the letter they sent to the Premier of the province, which I think captures just how it is that these women and the one gentleman associated with them felt so strongly about this issue and why they became so involved with it. She says:

It is beyond me why any horse is slaughtered, but if it must be,
then please let these beautiful animals be in comfort and with
the dignity they deserve.

I think that's an appropriate sentiment given the place, as I say, that the horse plays in western culture.

In any event the group has tried to get in touch with a national association. They're making some attempts in that direction. I understand they met last week. They've also established a renewed and a better working relationship with the SPCA, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, but of course, they're underfunded. They're not able to visit the stockyards as often as they want and they're still going to have to rely on this group to police the treatment of these horses.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Just in conclusion, I'd say that not all is clear sailing for this group. The rocks of neglect you might say, are still operative. There is a tide of government indifference working against them, and of course there is always an ill wind of an apathetic tendency among the general public. But let's just hope that in the future this Act -- which won't deal with the problem completely, but at least it makes a step in that direction -- will help to bring improvements to the situation these women strove so hard to correct.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes. Just a few comments to the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn. When I first came to this province in 1967, this Bill was just being brought in. I worked in the industry, close to some of the slaughterhouses for horses. We have come a long way, and this government has not been in-

different to the issue of the slaughter of horses. The upgrading of our facilities and the constant supervision by the Alberta SPCA over the years has been progressive. We will continue to work. I acknowledge the comments made by the individuals who have come to you and say that we must work hard in these areas. But I take issue with the term "indifference." Bill 18 is a model Bill throughout the country of Canada, and I'll look forward to the new, innovative changes to this Bill.

Thank you.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

[Motion carried; Bill 18 read a third time]

Bill 20

Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988

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

Mr. Speaker, in committee stage the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn raised some questions with respect to section 23. I would make the following comments with respect to the points that were raised. Section 23 does not change the powers of the ERCB with respect to the orders addressing the so-called rateable take of gas. They are made to clarify the intent of the section in two areas. First of all, the application of the section is to all natural gas pools and not just associated gas. It has been argued that the current section as written only applies to associated gas; that is, the gas cap in oil pools. The intent of the legislation was that the section apply to all natural gas pools. Secondly, the orders can be issued for reasons of equity alone and not just for conservation purposes. The current drafting links two clauses which provide for limiting production one for conservation reasons and the other for equity considerations.

In addition, the new section eliminates the requirement for a mandatory hearing, and there are three considerations there. First, hearings under the section are generally uncontested. Secondly, delay resulting from a hearing process works to the detriment of the well owner being drained. Because orders are not retroactive, someone draining another well owner benefits from the production during the time preoccupied with the hearing process. Finally, as in the case with other sections of the Bill where the mandatory hearing has been removed, section 29 of the Energy Resources Conservation Act ensures any person directly and adversely affected must receive notice of the application, an opportunity to furnish evidence, an opportunity for cross examination, and an opportunity to make an argument to the board. So in short the mandatory requirement for a hearing is effectively replaced by the requirement to hold a hearing when necessary to meet the concerns of the affected party.

[Motion carried; Bill 20 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
23	Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act 1988	Clegg (for Cherry)
25	Municipal Taxation Amendment Act 1988	Young (for Anderson)
26	Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1988	Oldring

Bill 27
School Act

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that Bill 27, the School Act, now be read a third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make a few brief comments arising from some of the debate that occurred during committee reading of this particular Bill. At the time this was debated in the Legislature, the hon. Member for Lethbridge-West made reference to a contract between the Calgary Jewish Academy and the Calgary Catholic school board. At least I believe that's what he was referring to when he said:

let's talk about . . . Calgary . . . if that's what you want to talk about. Because as the hon. member knows, there's been a sweetheart deal going on for years. It's about to end.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly this afternoon just to ensure that the wrong impression was not left by that statement when it was made in committee. I'm sure it was not the member's intention to imply that something untoward existed in the relationship between the Calgary Jewish Academy and the Catholic school board. However, the use of the term "sweetheart deal" has certain connotations that something questionable might be going on or that some very exclusive treatment has been accorded to some . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, in view of the comments, the Chair has sent for the Member for Lethbridge-West. Perhaps you could briefly summarize what you've said to this date to the hon. member, who at least has the opportunity to respond.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. Just to say that I don't believe the hon. member wanted to leave a certain impression, so I want to just briefly raise the history, as I understand it, of this relationship just to ensure that the wrong impression was not left by the use of the particular phrase "sweetheart deal." I'm sure the member did not want to leave any wrong impression about that relationship.

The Calgary Jewish Academy, Mr. Speaker, as members know, was formed after the Calgary public school board terminated its relationship with two alternative Jewish schools in Calgary in 1984. As best I've been able to determine, around that time some members of the Jewish community met with the then Minister of Education for Alberta, who advised them that he was aware of a contract wherein a private school had a contractual relationship with the county of Lethbridge, and it was suggested to those representatives at the time that such a contract could prove to be a model for the arrangement they wanted to enter into with the Calgary Catholic board of education. Arrangements were made with the Calgary Catholic school board, the separate school board, to set up a contractual arrangement between the Calgary Jewish Academy and the board. It's also my understanding that both parties, even though it wasn't required by legislation or anything like that, wanted to make sure this was all done in accordance with provincial government policy, and so this contract was referred to the minister to receive the approval of the minister. It's my understanding that that was given by the previous minister and that the extension of the contract was approved subsequently to that by the previous minister and, as I understand it, the present minister as well.

It was an open and a public arrangement. I believe all parties understood that it was undertaken in accordance with existing government policy, which of course may change from time to time. But at the time the relationship was entered into it was understood, I believe, that this was in keeping with the intentions or the blessing, or at least the approval, of the provincial government.

I also understand, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of relationship wherein a private school has a contract with a board of education is not the only one that exists in the province, that there are other cases where similar contracts have been entered into. So it's not as if this is the only one that exists in the province. There may be some aspects of this particular contract that vary from the specific details which those other private schools may have entered into with those other school boards.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think all I wanted to ensure was that it was made clear that while this may be an unusual relationship -- that is, there are not a lot of contracts of this nature in existence in the province at this time -- it was not something that was done quietly or behind the scenes but it was publicly altered into, it was known to the public, and it was something that fit in with provincial government policy.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As those who have listened to my comments will be aware, the Alberta Liberal Party caucus is opposed to this legislation, and I don't intend to repeat any of my previous comments. But there is an additional comment I omitted to make earlier dealing with a very important issue that I just wish to raise for the record -- and perhaps get the minister's observations, as I discussed this matter with her last night -- and that is a concern expressed by the Edmonton public school board with respect to the potential impact of the conflict-of-interest rules under the Act. The conflict of interest arises in circumstances where a trustee may be married to a teacher. This in fact happened, I understand, three times on the Edmonton public school board, and on many rural school boards.

The effect of this is that under the legislation these trustees with that conflict are prohibited from being present in deliberations with respect to teachers' salaries and can't be part of the quorum. In the event that the number of trustees with such conflicts should exceed half the members, the concern I have is that we may be in a situation of impasse under the legislation, where we have validly elected trustees but where we may have snookered ourselves into a situation in which there is total stalemate and no solution to that problem. It seems to me that as legislators and as a matter of passing good legislation, we should never pass on to a school board or the people of this province a situation in which they may be faced with a stalemate problem without solution. The solution should be inherent in the legislation. I understand, for example, that the minister has certain powers with respect to quorums in the event there are vacancies, but this would only arise in the event there are vacancies and that is not covered by this situation.

So I believe we are creating a potential problem of very, very serious and critical magnitude. It may not arise. It'll be a lottery of the electoral process. But if it does arise, I think we would be validly criticized for not having provided for that issue in the legislation. Now, it's difficult. There are way difficult choices; it's not an easy issue. But I think it's incumbent upon

us to provide some process to resolve that issue in the chess game of possibilities. We don't have that here, and I think it should be and I hope it will be addressed soon. So that is the additional concern I wished to mention.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to third reading of Bill 27, I want to make a brief comment or two and point out that I think we in Alberta are so fortunate to have a school system, an educational system, perhaps second to none in the country, and it would be interesting to again reiterate that Alberta was the first and is still, I think, the only one that supports independent schools or private schooling.

The other evening I had made a comment, and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont's been kind enough to remind me of it by sending me *Hansard* of June 28, where I made a comment relative to comments made by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo, whose views on the private school system are well known, Mr. Speaker, not only in Calgary, but throughout the province. My intent in commenting on that was in no way to embarrass anybody. It was simply to draw attention to the fact that the Member for Calgary-Buffalo's comments were well known, and they should be repeated. I think in the province we have -- certainly within my community, school district 51 and separate school district 9 do an excellent job in terms of education. But I would reiterate again that some 13 percent of the county of Lethbridge are in private or independent schools.

This government, I think, should be commended for its view of tolerance and understanding in believing that parents of this province should have a lot of say with regard to the education of their children. There seems to be a view that the state knows best, and I've heard that comment several times. "The state knows best in everything." There's no room, it seems to me, for the recognition that parents are not only responsible for their children but indeed have, and should have, a say in how they're educated.

I want to close by commending the hon. Minister of Education, who I know has not had an easy time with Bill 27 or Bill 59 -- and that was evidenced by the amendments brought forward at committee stage -- that with this Bill I think all of Canada will look at Alberta as a symbol and an example of what we should be doing with education in the country, and certainly within the province. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to strongly support the hon. Minister of Education and urge all members to support Bill 27 as amended with all its contents.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other evening in committee stage the minister referred to me as "the artful Dodger," and that comes from the Charles Dickens novel *Oliver Twist*. But I sort of feel more like the title character, Oliver Twist -- although I'm sure I don't look like Oliver Twist -- always asking for a little more gruel, a little more for education, I suppose, Mr. Speaker.

But I'm sure that in wanting more for education, I won't be responded to in the same way that Mr. Bumble responded to young Oliver Twist. In fact, I'm sure that even the Minister of Education would want more for education. I know that to be a

fact. I'm sure the minister would love to be able to stand up in this Assembly and say that we have enough; no longer will school boards have to charge user fees for language and cultural programs, no longer will those programs be considered alternative programs, and no longer will we have fees for noninstructional supplies and materials. But she can't do that. The minister isn't able to get Fagin over there, otherwise known as the Provincial Treasurer, to loosen up some of the loot he's stored away. That's really rather regrettable, because you know again, Mr. Speaker, what happened with that loot that Fagin had stored away is that in a panic all of the loot was lost.

I think the analogy is rather important, because I think we've lost some of the opportunity we had with this Bill, and while it's not completely lost, it's been somewhat stalled. I believe we ought to be doing more to enhance public education by taking the responsibility as a government and saying "no" to user fees. It's not good enough for the government to be satisfied with the fact that there's an appeal mechanism in the Act, because as I said at committee stage, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be too many Albertans that will either not be aware of the appeal mechanism or will not utilize the appeal mechanism for a variety of reasons.

Rather than enhancing the public system, what has happened, I think, is that the government has made it more attractive for parents to educate their children through a variety of other methods outside the public system. I don't think we're addressing the concerns of those parents who want alternative language programs to be user fee free. We're not addressing the needs of a multicultural, multiethnic, or multilingual makeup of what are our Judeo-Christian traditions, which is of course what Canada is and what our province is. The department prescribes courses of studies and then allows boards of education to fill in other requests that their constituents have in their communities. But the department doesn't encourage the development of those very important programs to the degree that it ought to, and I believe private educators may end up doing that. And that's my real fear. I believe that we as a government are putting up a wall, a rather ugly wall, that will only force parents to look away from the public education system to something else.

Some of the provisions that are contained in Bill 27, such as setting up a private school to become an accredited private school, are far too weak and if not carefully monitored -- and I'm pleased the minister has given her commitment to carefully monitor the applications for private schools that will come before her -- I believe that if they're not carefully monitored, we will see the slow erosion of a public system.

Mr. Speaker, with this Act there was much that could have been done to enhance public education, but I regret that I don't see the vision in the Bill. Of course, there's no doubt that in order to enhance public education, there would be an increased need for investment from the department. But it is that it is an investment. It's not a cost as I've heard so many times. And if we really want to try something costly, Mr. Speaker, then we ought to try the cost of ignorance.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge-West said he's heard from this side of the Assembly that the state knows best. Well, I can say on behalf of all of my colleagues in the Official Opposition that nobody in my caucus believes the state knows best. We believe the input that comes from parents inside the community is an important component to education, and that's where we stand. I think this Bill does address that; there are measures in here that are good. But on the whole I regret that my colleagues in the New Democrat Official Opposition will not be able to

support the Bill at third reading.

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

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, a pause for reflection here on the Bill as a whole. I think it's important to recognize, as I reflect on this Bill, that if I personally had written this Bill, it would appear differently than it is today. If the Member for Edmonton-Belmont had written this Bill, it would be in a different form today. If the man or woman on the street as an individual had written this Bill, it would be different than it is today. A superintendent from Red Deer would write it differently than one from Edmonton.

There's an important observation here. The Bill in its present form has the unanimous agreement amongst stakeholders throughout the province that we have an improved Bill here today. We have an improved Act before us. Is it perfect in every clause and form? No, it is not. Does it please every single person 100 percent? No, it does not. Nor can it; that is an impossibility. But we have an improved Bill which has received input from a wide number of people and groups around the province over a considerable period of time, and certainly there has to be some recognition of that process having taken place and having resulted again in what we see to be a much improved system of education being laid before us as we have had in the past.

As an MLA who's concerned for quality in education, I have found it challenging and exciting to be able to put aside personal preferences as far as a particular type of curriculum, a particular type of teacher or methodology, and work with people in my constituency for the enhancement of the quality of education regardless of the particular mode of delivery or who's doing the delivery. It's been a joy to work with a variety of people from that standpoint, to look at overall quality. I believe that some of the challenges as far as references on independent education, though they may come from a person's particular philosophy, have no proof in fact. When we talk about the growth of independent schools resulting in fragmentation and erosion of public education, there simply is nothing in fact anywhere in any jurisdiction to prove that. In fact, the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding declared in its final report that:

In stating our principle on the importance of maintaining a strong public education system we are not proposing the elimination of alternate schools or programs within the public [schools] or private schools.

And the quote ends by saying:

Strength is not achieved by eliminating choice and competition.

We hear of concerns of funding to education, that that will enhance growth. But independent schools in Ontario which receive no government funding have grown approximately twice as fast as schools in Alberta and British Columbia. So we see no foundation in these concerns. What we do see and what we need to reflect around the province is a true understanding and tolerance of various personal preferences of parents in educating their children.

I call on all colleagues here in this House to support this Bill as a reflection of the input that has come in from around the province and as a reflection again of our tolerance and our understanding in pressing towards quality education in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister, in summation.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker. I'd just make a few comments. In respect to the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, the difference with respect to the Jewish private school in Calgary and the school mentioned by the Member for Lethbridge-West was that the Calgary Jewish school was able through a section of the School Act to designate taxes to the support of a private school, an option which was not available to the Immanuel Christian school. I'm assuming that is the point the hon. member was referring to. Nothing prevents the contract from continuing with the Calgary separate board or the school; simply that in fact there's even no more need for the minister to approve the contract.

With respect to the questions raised by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo, Bill 27 will have no impact on the existing situation with respect to the Edmonton public school board if there is another trustee elected, because there are now four out of nine who would be in a conflict with respect to pecuniary interests because of their spouse, parent, or child being an employee of the board. If that were to occur, which is not there now, then the mechanism would be for there to be some of the trustees to resign and the minister could declare that the quorum exists with the remaining trustees until by-elections are held. I think, in fact, there is the release valve. Nonetheless, conflict-of-interest provisions are made for the protection of the public interest, not for the convenience of trustees. And I do not think any of us in this Assembly -- and surely the Member for Calgary-Buffalo is not suggesting that a couple of trustees should be able to control about 80 percent of a school board budget with respect to conflict.

Finally, we've had a good number of discussions in this House, as this Bill has proceeded through, with respect to public education. And there is no question that this Bill is about balance. It's not a perfect pocket for everybody's particular interest. It is about balancing a legislative and a regulatory authority. It is about balancing the province's role with the role of duly elected school boards and local community participation in something as fundamental to society as education is, and that is strengthened by this Bill. It certainly talks about rights and responsibilities, but it balances one off against the other, whether it's parents or students or trustees or a Minister of Education. The question is balance.

There is no question as well that the public education system in this province, as we face the 21st century, has some major, major challenges before it: challenges to ensure that our kids in this province are able to compete in and lead this world into the 21st century because of the abilities they have gained through education in this province. That is support for a public education system. That is confidence that the people out there that are elected to run our public education system through the framework of this legislation are there, and it's a strong voice of support for this government for this Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 27 read a third time]

Bill 29 Mental Health Act

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Smoky River, I move third reading of Bill 29, the Mental Health Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish the minister were here to hear some of these comments and to enter into the debate himself on this very important piece of legislation which has received a lot of attention and a lot of debate and continues to need that kind of refinement of discourse in the public domain, because part of what we're dealing with here is a sad history of the neglect of those citizens among us who suffer from mental illness and mental disorders of various kinds. We need to reverse that history, Mr. Speaker, and bring to bear in our mental health legislation some of the most progressive, enlightened, effective public policy directions we possibly can, not just because it's our duty as legislators but because we, I feel, needed to redeem ourselves in a sense for the sad history of neglect the mentally ill among us have endured for so long.

It's hard to speak to the principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker -- I know you've always admonished us to speak to the narrow issue of the principle of the Bill -- because I'm not entirely clear upon what principle this Bill is based. At second reading I really felt strongly that what I would like to see front and centre is an articulation of the principle of care and that that principle of caring for the mentally ill and those with mental disorders would abound throughout the legislation. Moreover, I felt we needed to not just hear from the various provider groups, the various players in the system, but to hear more from those who are ex-involuntary patients themselves. For instance, in the province of Ontario there's a group called On Our Own. There's a growing number of people in that group who are ex-psychiatric patients who are, some of them for the first time, speaking out of their experience of being involuntarily admitted to psychiatric hospitals, and out of that experience being able to speak very clearly and articulately and profoundly about the nature of psychiatric treatment and their suggestions, their sense of the direction psychiatric care needs to take.

So I'm not entirely sure, despite the long history of review of mental health legislation starting way back from the Blair report and then moving into the Drewry report and then into Bill 3 and now into Bill 29, that, as the minister said, it's been under review for some period of time. But the evidence is clear, Mr. Speaker, to the members in the liberal caucus as well as we New Democrats in the Official Opposition that despite the sense of the longevity of the review process, the balance is still not struck as best it might be, that there is still room for improvement, for enlightenment, for progressivity, for boldness in this mental health Bill before us. It just isn't there, Mr. Speaker.

You would think, as we have in the School Act just passed or in the labour Act or Child Welfare Act -- they all begin with a statement of principle, a preamble, upon which the whole Bill goes. And here it would seem to be a very parallel case, a major piece of legislation conceived in a new legislative day, in a new legislative session, and yet no purpose, no preamble. It's just sort of stuck out there and misses that hallmark of what good legislative drafting would be about. And why? There's no excuse for it. We brought in amendments which could have fixed it up very nicely and yet were rejected by government. What are they afraid of? What are they hiding from? Why do they have a preamble in some Bills and not others, particularly with respect to this major piece?

There is no resolution of the thorny issue of objection to treatment. We still have great concern expressed among those in the psychiatric community throughout the system about what to do with those patients who object to treatment and whose objection is upheld by the review panel. Are they then to be discharged? Are they then to be sent back for other forms of as-

essment or diagnosis or treatment? Are they to be incarcerated as criminals in an institution or what? And despite the minister's trying to dance around it, there's still no clear articulation of what he would most like to see, how that difficulty can be resolved.

The whole business of designating facilities. The minister talked yesterday of how we could designate any facility we want as a psychiatric facility throughout the province. Well, big deal. I doubt if they could possibly get away with that, because we've heard from psychiatrists and clinical heads of psychiatry in those hospitals that have designated facilities that they're finding this Bill to be impossible to work with and to deal with.

We're not going to get into the funding questions, but that's another real area of concern. Is the funding level going to be adequate for there to be designation of facilities in active treatment hospitals so that those who are involuntarily admitted or who need outpatient care or have other psychiatric needs can be dealt with close to home, close to their community, instead of being institutionalized away from home? So that's a whole major issue which is still just dangling there. I would have thought, given all this review, that it would have been much more thoroughly thought out and brought before us.

And of course the debate over what is proposed in the Bill to be the patient advocate when, in fact, it's clear that a patient adviser service can be much more thorough, much more comprehensive, can be with patients who are involuntarily admitted and advise them and ensure them and assist them with the exercise of their rights, not just have this mini-Ombudsman who's going to be in place, maybe have some staff, maybe have some funding, may be able to investigate here or there if they choose. Now, that's a very weak, very pale comparison to what was really called for. Drewry called for it, we've called for it. Other people in other jurisdictions have called for it. And yet we've missed the mark. We've missed the opportunity with this Bill to do this bold, new thing.

Further, the whole sense of even beginning to hint that there was a suggestion of going in a direction of continuity of care or linked up with community care, community resources, that the mental health needs of people are not just that which is focused upon those who are involuntarily admitted into institutions -- that's clearly, in the minister's mind, what this Bill is about. He's said that on record, and that may be necessary; maybe we needed to have that stated. But surely you'd think in the world of politics, where perception plays such a key role, that he could have had some perception sent out that yes, we'd like to link up and develop the continuity of care and have institutional treatment of those involuntarily admitted with their outpatient care and have it linked into a much better -- again, bolder, more progressive -- piece of legislation. In fact, the Drewry report, again, calls for that. It said there needs to be a legislative obligation to talk about this and to have it in statute, and yet it's just not there.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I think I said at the outset, I'm most concerned, and I'd like, on principle, to state how I understand a lot of these difficult and thorny issues from my perception. But I would really want in the future to have much more input and much more experience of those who are ex-psychiatric patients themselves, to have their sense of their experience and the direction that mental health legislation needs to go. That's the principle of care which I think really needs to be brought to bear much more fully on the discussions, and whether or not we're going to have a shortage of psychiatrists who are going to refuse to deal with this Bill so that we're going to have the big mental hospi-

tals being short staffed both with psychiatrists and psychiatric nurses, which is a scenario that's out there because of this Bill, or whether funding is going to continue to flow, or whether it's going to be review panels that are going to refuse to deal with this objection-to-treatment dilemma.

As the minister stated yesterday: "Well, we have to live with it for a while. We'll see what happens, and we'll have to bring in amendments in time." And that's for sure, because certainly this Bill does not strike the balance that could be struck. This Bill does not have the sense of fairness in both legal and medical treatment which can be best for those who are mentally ill. So that will just have to come in time, after we have more enlightened legislators with a more enlightened government that has the boldness to bring in the kind of mental health legislation that we need in this province.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 29 read a third time]

Bill 30

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to ask the Assembly to read Bill 30, the Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1988, for a third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. I wanted to take a few moments to again state my views and the views of many Albertans relative to this particular Bill. First of all, I think it's among one or two of the really bad Bills that have been introduced in this session. I think Bills 21 and 22 and Bill 30 are probably the worst Bills in that they attack the average Albertan, particularly, in this case, the injured workers. I think this Bill is also bad because it wasn't necessary. There was no need for this particular Bill to be rammed through this session at this time, particularly in light of the fact that there is a task force touring the province speaking to the stakeholders relative to workers' compensation. And here the minister is putting a Bill through before the evidence and information available from that task force is made available to him. I therefore think the Bill should not be supported. It does not reflect the concerns and the views of the stakeholders, as I mentioned. I think it's really an arrogant minister who's putting a Bill without consultation with injured workers and management who are responsible for this particular department, more so than the minister is.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

[Motion carried; Bill 30 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
31	Calgary General Hospital Board Amendment Act, 1988 (for	Reid M. Moore)
33	Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1988	Johnston
34	Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1988-89	Johnston

35

Occupational Health and Safety Dinning
Amendment Act, 1988

Bill 36

Public Health Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker. I move third reading of Bill 36.

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

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Bill 36: what can one say about Bill 36? If there's one principle at work here, it's the principle of change and that things are certainly changing, particularly in the whole area of public health. And these amendments that are brought in in this helter-skelter, willy-nilly fashion here before us in Bill 36 go back to what I said at second reading and would like to re-emphasize, particularly for the minister. I know he's going to have lots of time this summer to do some work in drafting a whole new Public Health Act.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

It seems to me that the whole area of public health, both in terms of its philosophy, the personnel at it, the needs that it's meeting, the emphasis that's on it -- it's not just the protection of the health of the public, but we're getting much more into the delivery of services of health in the community. That's just one of the many dilemmas and reorientations of public health these days, and though these amendments try to change some of that, I do see the need to have a whole new drafting of a community health Act or community health protection Act or something that's going to provide for the health of our Alberta citizens in the community, and what that is going to look like under statute.

Certainly the AIDS amendments which were brought in here, those dealing with incurable infectious diseases and the failure of certain individuals to comply with any other conditions that might be prescribed to mitigate the disease, I think are the regrettable product of this kind of helter-skelter thinking about public health. It seems to be brought in the side door in a way that hasn't been at all clearly thought out, as we've debated on this side. They are unfair, they are unjust and unacceptable and leave a black spot on an otherwise enlightened approach to both AIDS education and prevention in the province. It's regrettable on that basis.

But let's see it, with the errors it has in it, as the need to in time, over the next while, draft a new public health or community health Act which is going to look to the year 2000 and beyond to provide the best kind of community health for the citizens of this province.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a third time]

Bill 37

Soil Conservation Act

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to move third reading of Bill 37, Soil Conservation Act.

[Motion carried; Bill 37 read a third time]

Bill 38
Pharmaceutical Profession Act

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill 38, the Pharmaceutical Profession Act, now be read a third time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: There's a call for the question. The hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey has moved third reading of Bill 38, the Pharmaceutical Profession Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pop the question.

MR. SPEAKER: What's the problem, hon. member?

[Motion carried; Bill 38 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
39	Insurance Amendment Act, 1988	McCoy
40	Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1988	Young (for Horsman)
41	Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1988	Webber
42	Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 1988	Webber
43	Alberta Securities Commission Reorganization Act	McCoy
44	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1988	Johnston
45	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1988	Johnston
46	Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1988	Johnston
47	Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1988	Johnston
48	Department of Tourism Amendment Act, 1988	Sparrow
49	Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1988	Day
51	Personal Property Security Act	Stewart
53	Provincial Offences Procedure Act	Stewart
54	Small Power Research and Development Act	Adair

Bill 55
Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1988

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague Mrs. Osterman, I move third reading of Bill 55, Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1988.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief comment on Bill 55 as it moves through third reading. Bill 55, in my view, is a seriously weak Bill in relation to the private adoption area. I feel that as this Bill stands, with all of its gaps and a lot of absences in numerous provisions in relation to many crucial issues in this Bill, this Bill does not represent the best interests of the child. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it clearly allows children to be placed at risk, and I think that if the government

members believed, as does the Official Opposition, that the needs of the child must supersede all other considerations in legislation, then they would join us in voting against this Bill in third reading.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a weak Bill. It is seriously lacking in several crucial areas, and I feel it should not be supported.

[Motion carried; Bill 55 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
57	Alberta Agricultural Research Institute Amendment Act, 1988	Young (for Elzinga)
58	Water Resources Commission Amendment Act, 1988	Shaben (for Elzinga)
59	Telecommunications Act	Young
61	Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1988	Young
63	Regulations Amendment Act, 1988	Oldring

head: PRIVATE BILLS
(Third Reading)

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
Pr. 1	Royal Canadian Legion Alberta Property Act	Gogo
Pr. 2	Canada Olympic Park Transfer of Title Act	Stewart
Pr. 3	Paul Mark and Cheryl-Lynne Mary Ibbotson Adoption Act	Pengelly
Pr. 4	Warren S. Forest Bar Admission Act	Nelson
Pr. 6	Old Sun Community College Act	Schumacher (for R. Speaker)
Pr. 7	The Alberta Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church Act	Oldring
Pr. 8	Rosebud School of the Arts Act	McClellan
Pr. 12	Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary Act	Alger
Pr. 16	Leslie Roy Peck Adoption Act	Ady (for Brassard)
Pr. 19	Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Amendment Act, 1988	Schumacher (for Mirosh)
Pr. 20	Maskwachees Cultural College Act	Jonson

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: ROYAL ASSENT

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

[The Honourable W. Helen Hunley, Lieutenant Governor of Al-

berta, took her place upon the Throne]

HER HONOUR: Please be seated.

MR. SPEAKER: Qu'il puisse plaire à Votre Honneur, l'Assemblée législative, au cours de la présente séance, a adopté certains Projets de loi pour lesquels, et au nom de l'Assemblée législative, je sollicite respectueusement la sanction de Votre Honneur. May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present sitting, passed certain Bills to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK: Votre Honneur, voici les titres des Projets de loi pour lesquels la sanction de Votre Honneur est sollicitée. Your Honour, the following are the titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

No.	Title
18	Animal Protection Act
20	Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988
21	Employment Standards Code
22	Labour Relations Code
23	Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1988
24	Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1988
25	Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1988
26	Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1988
27	School Act
28	Police Act,
29	Mental Health Act
30	Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1988
31	Calgary General Hospital Board Amendment Act, 1988
33	Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1988
34	Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1988-89
35	Occupational Health and Safety Amendment Act, 1988
36	Public Health Amendment Act, 1988
37	Soil Conservation Act
38	Pharmaceutical Profession Act
39	Insurance Amendment Act, 1988
40	Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1988
41	Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1988
42	Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 1988
43	Alberta Securities Commission Reorganization Act
44	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1988
45	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1988
46	Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1988
47	Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1988
48	Department of Tourism Amendment Act, 1988
49	Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1988
50	Planning Amendment Act, 1988
51	Personal Property Security Act
52	Land Tides Amendment Act, 1988
53	Provincial Offences Procedure Act
54	Small Power Research and Development Act
55	Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1988
57	Alberta Agricultural Research Institute Amendment Act, 1988
58	Water Resources Commission Amendment Act, 1988
59	Telecommunications Act
60	Languages Act

60	Loi linguistique
61	Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1988
63	Regulations Amendment Act, 1988
Pr. 1	Royal Canadian Legion Alberta Property Act
Pr. 2	Canada Olympic Park Transfer of Tide Act
Pr. 3	Paul Mark and Cheryl-Lynne Mary Ibbotson Adoption Act
Pr. 4	Warren S. Forest Bar Admission Act
Pr. 6	Old Sun Community College Act
Pr. 7	The Alberta Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church Act
Pr. 8	Rosebud School of the Arts Act
Pr. 12	Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary Act
Pr. 16	Leslie Roy Peck Adoption Act
Pr. 19	Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Amendment Act, 1988
Pr. 20	Maskwachees Cultural College Act

CLERK: Voici les Projets de loi pour lesquels la sanction de Votre Honneur est sollicitée. These are the Bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated her assent. Le lieutenant-gouverneur a indiqué sa sanction]

CLERK: Au nom de Sa Majesté, Son Honneur approuve expressément ces Projets de loi. In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these Bills.

HER HONOUR: Mr. Premier, Mr. Speaker, hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, hon. ministers, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

I almost hesitate to correctly use all that salutation and use up 30 seconds more of your time, because I'm aware of how many hours you have already put in in your service to the people of this province. However, I suppose if I wanted to treat this lightly, I might say that if this were a ball game, it would be called on account of rain. The rain is almost over, you'll be glad to hear, and I'm sure that there is a fair amount of relief in all your minds because this longest session on record is finally over.

Also, I have been observing with interest the activities of this Legislature. I am aware that while we go back with a great and honourable tradition, we have during this session created some new traditions for our province and for this Legislature. These should not be taken lightly. I think that as we move and change in order to adequately interpret the views of the people that are represented here, it's important that we keep that in mind and that we have always foremost in our minds the great desire that I know each person here has, to serve their constituents and the people of Alberta to the best of their ability. I am grateful for that. So, too, I believe, are the people.

I wish you an opportunity to have some relaxation so that you may return to this House and to your other activities, as you serve the people, refreshed and renewed. I wish you well.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the House]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

Hon. members, as has become our tradition, before we entertain our motion of adjournment, we would like to acknowledge the help of all of our support staff who have helped us to get through this, the longest session. As hon. members know, there are a number of people not only in your offices but with respect to the Legislative Assembly who work many long hours to be a support to this House and its operation, not the least of which are the people at Hansard who stay here a couple of hours after all of us finally leave this edifice. I personally would like to express my own thanks and that of yourselves to not only our security staff but our Table officers as well as to our pages. [applause]

If I could invite all the pages to come to the Speaker's dais so that we might . . . Please. I won't sit down. You can come.

We're going to do something slightly different. We're going to have the one man on the page staff come forward first. It's a pretty tough job to have those kinds of odds, Roderick. Roderick Frey.

PAGE: I've lived through it, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: That scroll . . . A book is given on behalf of all members of the Assembly. Carla Marciano, my roadrunner friend. Jannet Nguyen. Most of these people are going to be back with us, God willing. Kara Stewart, the lady that travels the farthest. From Stony Plain, right? Cecelia Paolucci is in Calgary right now. Correct? Catherine Wallace, Diep Do, Deanna Blais, Regena Sebatier. One of the ladies from the

procession, one of the more serious parts of the procession, Dianne Makowecki. Thank you again, pages. You're special; you really are. [applause]

Unless there are any points of order, perhaps we could recognize the Government House Leader.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to move, in accordance with Motion 20 passed earlier this day, that the Assembly do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Having heard the motion by the Government House Leader, all those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: I can't think of any reason why anyone would want to be opposed, but anyone opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: That describes this sitting. The motion is carried. The House stands adjourned.

On behalf of the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, and myself, I wish you all a pleasant and a very safe summer until we meet again.

[The House adjourned at 5:16 p.m.]