

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Thursday, July 5, 1990 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 90/07/05

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Prayers

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

We, Thine unworthy servants here gathered together in Thy name, do humbly beseech Thee to send down Thy heavenly wisdom from above to direct and guide us in all our considerations.

Amen.

head: Presenting Petitions

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a petition from 386 members of the Westlock-Sturgeon and St. Albert constituencies requesting that the provincial government utilize a laundry service that's presently being installed in the new Sturgeon hospital at St. Albert to do its own laundry and not contract out the laundry to outside organizations, because of the loss of jobs and the waste of taxpayers' money that would result.

head: Tabling Returns and Reports

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to table responses to written questions 185, 186, 187, 196, 197, 198, 199, 217, 316, 317, 321, and 328.

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table responses to questions 251 and 275, as well as the information requested in motions for returns 262 and 284.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table responses to questions I took as notice during main estimates.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to table with the Assembly five items: the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation 1989 annual report; responses to written questions 231, 232, and 278; and a response to Order for a Return 184.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I'm filing with the Assembly copies of the seven pension reports for the year ended March 31, 1989.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table responses to written questions 341, 342, 343, 351, 359, 364, and Motion for a Return 379.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to file with the House oral questions asked during the budget estimates debate in accordance with the indication of the government earlier in the estimates.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file three copies of a letter from the Chair of the public advisory committee to Daishowa complaining about their lack of information from

Daishowa and the fact that the government didn't allow them to be involved in deciding the ground rules in the Daishowa FMA.

head: Introduction of Special Guests

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly members of the family of my esteemed colleague from Stony Plain: his brother Bill, his son Chris, and his nephews Douglas and Wayne, who are sons of Bill. I would ask that they now rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I often talk about partnership in meeting the needs of Albertans today, and with us in the members' gallery we have some representatives from a program called Second Chance for Youth. This program is a partnership of this government with the citizens of Edmonton and a volunteer board. I would ask Vivian Edwards, Jason Longmore, Dawn Pooke, Lanaya Rollof, Trevor Thomas, and their youth worker Mr. Al McCullough to rise in the members' gallery and receive the warm reception of this Assembly.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you today and to the Assembly a retired lawyer and prominent citizen of the town of Brooks. Don Crerar is seated in the members' gallery. If he would please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to introduce three special guests from the Federal Republic of Germany. We spent some time today discussing the German question, which is actually how many goals they'll win the World Cup by on Sunday. They are Peter Hansen, Hans-Vico Petersen, and Hauke Carstensen. I'd like them to rise in the public gallery and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce 12 students from the English as a Second Language class at the AVC Winnifred Stewart campus in my riding. They're in the public gallery, and they're accompanied by their teacher Dean Mackay. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce on behalf of our Member for Edmonton-Parkallen two visitors from Edmonton-Parkallen who are here: Mr. Bill Kobluk and his daughter Devorah. If they'd please stand and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Taber-Warner.

MR. BOGLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to introduce three Albertans: two constituents and one resident from Lethbridge – I'm not sure if it's Lethbridge-West or Lethbridge-East. Earl O'Donnell is a councillor for the county of Warner; Kevin Moore, administrator for the country of Warner; and Ken Craig from UMA. These three gentlemen were in our city today for an important meeting with the Minister of Transportation and Utilities on our very popular

Alberta farm water grant program. If they would rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if I was going to have to take a number to get into this queue.

It's my pleasure today to introduce somebody who's visiting from the province of Quebec, Quebec City in fact. Suzanne Caron is working in Edmonton under the Alberta/Quebec student exchange program. She's accompanied today by another person under the same program, Benoit Beauchemin. The program is offered by Career Development and Employment. We're all pleased to have these two people here. Would they rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly anybody in either the members' or public galleries who hasn't already been introduced. I'd like them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I realize, hon. members, this is the time for the silly season.

MR. FOX: They came to visit, and they deserve to be introduced. It's the last time.

MR. SPEAKER: That's a false assumption, Member for Vegreville.

The Chair has attempted to point out on a number of occasions through the House leaders that introductions are supposed to be treated seriously and very briefly. Also, it's been pointed out that we are not here to be introducing our relatives. The time of the House is valuable, even on the last day. Other Legislatures, including the House of Commons and other provincial Legislatures, do not allow members to do the introduction of guests.

MR. TAYLOR: Or reeves from other constituencies. It was allowed yesterday.

MS BARRETT: It was a good joke.

MR. SPEAKER: Yeah. Well, it's okay. It's just a concern again that hon. members realize that it's a special privilege to this Legislature, and the Chair hopes it will continue, but it still needs to be in a brief manner.

Thank you.

head: Oral Question Period

Alberta-Pacific Project

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. An intergovernmental task force with members from Alberta, the Northwest Territories, and the federal government says that a series of studies is needed to look at the impact of industrial development on the Peace-Athabasca rivers systems. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Environment minister had a bad case of déjà vu when he heard about this report, because it sure sounds a lot like the report of the original Al-Pac review board,

which called for similar studies before the Al-Pac project is allowed to go ahead. It seems almost everybody in the province seems to understand the need for these studies except this government and this minister. My question to the minister: now that a second task force has called for further studies on the rivers systems, will the Minister of the Environment guarantee that the Al-Pac project will not be allowed to proceed before these studies are complete?

MR. KLEIN: The task force that the hon. member alludes to was formed some time ago. Indeed, it was always thought that the work of that task force would be tied in to the more extensive studies of the Athabasca and Peace rivers systems that will be initiated and launched as a result of the Al-Pac report.

With respect to the Alberta-Pacific project, the project that was the subject of probably the most extensive public review in the history of pulp mill development in this world – with respect to that particular program the province is now preparing its response to the 60-odd recommendations in that report; the federal government is now preparing its response to the 60-odd recommendations in that report. Those responses, when they are co-ordinated and prepared, will be communicated to the company. They will be identified, many of them, as deficiencies. They will have to be addressed by the company at that particular time.

With respect to what we now have – not officially by any stretch of the imagination – with respect to the so-called revised proposal, I have already said publicly that it will be subjected to some kind of public review. What that review is going to be, the shape it takes at this particular time, I don't know, hon. member.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, by that answer – by not giving an answer – we know the answer to the question.

I want to ask this minister this question. We understand that he's announced a news conference tomorrow in Calgary at 11 o'clock to deal with the Al-Pac project – as soon as the House rises. I say that's cowardly and contemptible. I ask this minister: will the minister at least show some respect for the parliamentary system and stand in this House today and announce that in fact he has accepted the new Al-Pac proposal and there will not be full EIAs? Will he at least do the honourable thing?

MR. KLEIN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I answered the questions. I did answer the questions; the hon. member simply can't understand the answers. If he can't understand, he just refuses to listen to the answers. That's been typical of this member throughout this session and the last session, and I wouldn't be surprised to see him react the same way during the next session and all subsequent sessions. It's so typical of the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Now, with respect to the so-called announcement that I'll be having at 11 o'clock tomorrow, well, that is absolute poppycock, if I can use that word, because I'm going to be in the Stampede parade at 11 o'clock tomorrow. As a matter of fact, I said that I would be available sometime in the afternoon in Calgary to respond to a statement that is going to be made by Alberta-Pacific, and I would advise the hon. member to wait and see what that statement is.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, he may want to be cute. I hope he doesn't get a bucking horse. Mind you, the people of Alberta probably do.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that he knows in this Assembly right now what they're going to be advocating; he knows what he's going to say tomorrow. I'm saying to him: rather than worrying about the Calgary Stampede – he is in the Assembly here right now – will he stand up and do the honourable thing and tell us precisely what's going to happen tomorrow?

MR. KLEIN: No, I won't. Absolutely. I mean, why take the excitement out of it just for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition? I don't know what Al-Pac is going to say tomorrow – I have an idea what they're going to say tomorrow – and I don't know what my response is going to be. So why doesn't the hon. member do like I'm prepared to do, and that is: wait until tomorrow.

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

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. And we believe the minister doesn't know at all. It's just coincidence that it's going to happen the day of the Royal Assent. Yeah, Mr. Minister, we believe that, and so do the people of Alberta.

Rural Economy

MR. MARTIN: My question is to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, Albertans know that this government has, frankly, done a terrible job of managing the economy. In fact, the Treasurer has asked us that he can borrow up to 11 and a half billion dollars because of their bungling and incompetence. What's the solution to the problem? They punish the taxpayers in Alberta, especially rural Alberta, by making dramatic cuts to a number of important programs needed by municipalities to provide service to their ratepayers. I'll give examples: cuts to CRC grants, elimination of the income tax rebate for private utilities, cuts to grants in lieu of taxes, new ambulance standards but no funding for municipalities to implement them, and the list goes on. I'd like to ask the Premier, who loves rural Alberta, who represents a rural riding, why he is making municipalities shoulder the burdens for this government's mismanagement.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition seemed to try and cover a whole bunch of areas in that question. He started out by saying there was something wrong with the Alberta economy, and I think we should just bring to his attention that the Alberta economy is the strongest economy in Canada. In Alberta we have unemployment dramatically down, we have diversification a fact of life in this province. Even with a flat oil industry we have strong growth: investment and confidence flowing across the province. We have the highest per capita retail sales in Canada. We have the lowest taxes in Canada, no sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, people are pouring into Alberta to invest. This is an economy that has been turned around, broadened, and is strong and healthy. Now, it may be that the Leader of the Opposition and the NDP don't like those conditions, and I can understand that, because, after all, they tend to find that they are happiest when things are gloomiest. Well, things aren't gloomy right now. They're strong and healthy in Alberta, and you're just going to have to enjoy it for a while.

MR. MARTIN: This is almost as incompetent an answer as I got from the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat the question slowly to the Premier: in view

of the fact that we've had a myriad of new taxes – call it what you want – on rural municipalities and the Premier is well aware that these are causing hardships in rural Alberta, and because he is a lover of rural Alberta, why is he doing it to them?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's just not so. As a matter of fact, if you'll only check with the municipalities, you'll find the municipalities in this province are strong and healthy, many operating with large surpluses and bank accounts. Now, if we want to talk about what's happening in rural Alberta to our agricultural industry, let's talk about this: they have the lowest fuel costs in North America, they have the lowest cost of money than any farmers and ranchers in North America, we have for the first time in history single telephone lines going into all of our rural homes, we have a free trade agreement allowing agriculture to expand, we have new investments . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GETTY: . . . we have a strengthening of the secondary highway system, we have a new crop insurance program, we have a commitment to the quality of life in rural Alberta, we have protection against high interest rates for rural Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, but the Leader of the Opposition is wrong. It is true I'm committed to rural Alberta, but I'm committed to making sure that rural Alberta is strong and healthy, and that's the way it is.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, those darn rural Albertans are just not grateful to the Premier: they keep complaining. Even his own figures indicate that there will be 92,000 people less in rural Alberta. That's a lot of love. Is he going to love them when they move into the city?

Mr. Speaker, I was asking about Bills that happened in this session: Bill 26, cuts to grants in lieu of taxes, et cetera, et cetera. I'm asking the Premier again: how does he feel that these devastating policies are really going to help rural Albertans and their communities? Contrary to what the Premier says, a lot of them are suffering.

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, I just don't agree with the Leader of the Opposition. If he looks, the municipal assistance grants are up; the environmental and policing grants are up; we have the AMPLE program that's increased; we have health grants increased. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is dead wrong. He is dead wrong. Knowing him as I do, I'm happier that he's wrong than dead, but he is dead wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Provincial Debt

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. GAGNON: Let's hear it. Let's hear it. [some applause]

MRS. HEWES: They have to be coached.

Mr. Speaker, during this longest session in Alberta's history we've dealt with many serious problems that face the people of the province, but no problem on Alberta's plate can compare with the seriousness of the very frightening financial position we're in after our sixth consecutive deficit budget and after years

of mismanagement of our responsibility to the 200,000 Albertans whose pensions are guaranteed by this province. Mr. Speaker, I've just listened to the Premier's joy to the world speech with interest, and we have from time to time been entertained but seldom enlightened by the Treasurer's old soft-shoe. Now, I'd like to ask the Treasurer a question. Will the Provincial Treasurer stop this graceful dancing around long enough to admit what we all know and commit to tell us when we reconvene in the fall just what Alberta's revised budget deficit will be for the current year and what he plans to do about it?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I must say that the question in its circuitous fashion covered a lot of ground, but I'm glad it came back on an area where I can make some very positive statements. I know the leader-in-waiting, the Premier's honourable friend, wants a clear answer, and I'm going to do my best to give her a very clear answer about the forecast for this province. I can certainly draw on the framework that the Premier has just put before the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, a framework which I think is a truly remarkable statement of the success of this government in achieving a recovery that has been unprecedented in the history of this province. Going from 1986 to 1990, this province has rebounded like no other province has rebounded, given the sacrifices we had to make in '86 and '87. And we did it, Mr. Speaker, without burdening the taxpayer in this province, by maintaining the lowest possible taxes of any province in Canada to the benefit of those people right here in Alberta. And this economy has responded. It has responded with new investment. It has responded with consumer confidence showing up in the sales that retailers are experiencing and the new investment intentions to which the private sector – the market economy, which is alien to those socialists across the way – is responding in this province. Do you know why that's happening, Mr. Speaker? Because this government has created an environment for investment, an environment of trust, an environment with a future attached to it. That's why it's happening, and that's why that budget forecast is right on track.

MRS. HEWES: What did I tell you? Always entertaining; seldom enlightening. He should talk to the Fraser Institute about what they think about our taxes.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the zero deficit pie in the sky we have another challenge to meet, and that's actually getting down to it and paying off the nearly \$10 billion debt this government has rung up. Can the Treasurer tell us what his plan is? Is there a plan? Will he table it for us?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member talked about the Fraser Institute, and I think it's only appropriate that I comment on the Fraser Institute. Many times before I've tried to clarify for the people of Alberta and for this Assembly that royalties are not part of the tax base, and this is why the Fraser Institute continues to misrepresent the facts. Now, I can understand why the Liberal Party would align itself with that position. I can understand that, Mr. Speaker, because of course it was the Liberal Party that raped this province with the national energy program. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party, as shown by this Liberal Party here in the province, has no respect for the royalties that belong to the people of this province. That was not a flippant comment; that was a comment of true intention. Part of their manifesto, Mr. Speaker, is that they have no respect for the royalties which flow to the people of this province, which belong to all Albertans and do not belong to the centralist Liberal Party.

MRS. HEWES: I would have hated to end the session without another one of these, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Treasurer, if he's learned anything from Ontario's plan to pay off its much smaller per capita unfunded pension liability, now tell us what is Alberta's plan, and when are we going to see it?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I could also speak about Ontario, but I understand the Premier of Ontario is visiting us on Monday and I wouldn't want to see my words given back to our Premier when they meet. So I'll be careful about that.

But I can say that with respect to the pension liability, we have spoken in this House on many occasions about the liability. I've indicated already that it's under review, that we have a plan which will deal with the unfunded liability. But since the Liberal opposition continues to raise it, I'm sure that they will buy in to some of the solutions which are implicit in dealing with unfunded pension liabilities; that is to say, the people who are beneficiaries of the plan must pay more and therefore those people who are receiving the benefits must have to have their benefits adjusted. Now, if the Liberal Party continues to raise those kinds of concerns time after time and time again, they must be able to buy in to that kind of a solution, Mr. Speaker, because really that's the only thing that can be put in place to solve it.

Let me make it very clear, though, Mr. Speaker, that the concerns that have been raised with me personally by many people receiving pension benefits from this province as a result of the alarmist statements made by the Liberal Party across the way – let me make it very clear that we will not back away from our commitment to those pensioners. We continue to provide COLA adjustments, which have not been paid for by the beneficiaries; we continue to maintain our commitment to those pension beneficiaries that they will receive the benefits. Now, despite the misleading statements of the opposition leader, the member of the Liberal Party across the way, we will not back down from that. I want that to be crystal clear: despite the misrepresentations by the Liberal Party we will not back away from our commitment to the pension plan. So let's hope that that alarmist statement does not confuse the beneficiaries of the pension plan, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Drumheller.

Federal/Provincial Discussions

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the hon. Premier. Because constitutional renewal in Canada has been torpedoed by the misguided and selfish attitudes of a couple of individuals, can the Premier say . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Brian Mulroney.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SCHUMACHER: . . . if other methods have been found to address Alberta's concerns within our federal system?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it is true that now that we are not having meetings amongst the 11 first ministers we have lost a

valuable way in which to discuss and deal with national issues or issues of importance to Alberta as it relates to the federal government or other provinces, but it is necessary, I believe, to continue to deal with the other provinces as we can. The hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned that the Premier of Ontario will be visiting Sunday evening and Monday for an Ontario/Alberta bilateral meeting. I have been invited to Quebec to have a bilateral meeting with the Premier of Quebec. In order that we have Ottawa fully aware of and dealing with the important federal/provincial issues, the issues between Alberta and the federal government, I can confirm that the first bilateral meeting – that is, between Ottawa and a province – will be between Alberta and the federal government, and we intend to make that a meeting that includes key ministers, perhaps key public servants, as well as the Prime Minister and myself.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Can the hon. Premier say what subjects are on the agenda for discussion with the federal government and when this meeting might be held?

MR. FOX: He can, but he won't.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Vegreville.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I would hope the meeting could be held before the end of this month. It may be that just the scheduling of the individual people's itineraries will cause it to be a little beyond that, but we want it to be as quickly as possible. It would involve such matters as agriculture, obviously, the jurisdiction over the environment, co-operation on the environment, matters of tourism, economic development and trade, interprovincial trade barriers, stabilization payments, and telecommunications. There's quite an array of issues, as the hon. members would know, and we will want to deal with them all in a fully detailed way and set in place a process for having these federal/provincial issues dealt with in a way that's best for our province.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

Social Policy Reform

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Family and Social Services. The cost of living continues to increase, and people on social assistance are trying to cope on incomes that were set for them in 1982. The assured income for the severely handicapped has not been increased for over four years, yet people living on AISH in auxiliary hospitals are being charged 14 percent more for basic care, thanks to this government. I'd like to ask this minister: in view of the fact that food banks continue to do the job of this government and that people are breaking down because they are trying to make ends meet, why does this minister continue to stall and refuse to raise rates when there are so many people in such desperate situations?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, again, I'm not stalling. I've said all along that this government is looking very thoroughly, very carefully, very appropriately at major, major social reforms; that we're not going to do it on a casual basis; that we're not going to do it without taking the necessary time to make sure that the steps we take are the appropriate ones. I want to say, as the minister responsible, how encouraged I am and how much I appreciate the time that our caucus and our Premier have spent

in looking for solutions, the time that Albertans have spent in working with us, the kind of effort that community groups, advocacy groups, and Albertans are putting towards looking for solutions right across this province.

Again, I want to remind the members opposite that they can't continue to take just a shallow look at this very complex problem, that the solutions aren't just a matter of standing up and waving a wand or simply throwing more money at the problem. We are spending \$1.4 billion in my department this year, and I'm looking for long-term answers. I'm looking for meaningful solutions. I'm trying to reach a challenge that's not unique to Alberta; it's a challenge that indeed we're facing as a nation. Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that I'm not going to allow the integrity of these reforms to be compromised by jumping into it blindly, as the members opposite would have us do.

MS MJOLSNESS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, the empty words from the minister are very little comfort for all those people that are living in poverty in this province. I would like to remind this minister that on March 14 in this Assembly he said, "This government is committed to introducing . . . new social reforms in this session." Well, it's the last day of session, and the minister still has not kept his promise to put more money in the pockets of the poor of this province.

So my last question to the minister is: does the minister intend to live up to his word in this Assembly and recognize the urgency of this issue and raise these rates before this session is through today?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, I would only say a number of things: one is that this session hasn't ended yet, and obviously there's no way with any certainty of anticipating when sessions might end. I would only say that we are as committed as I was on March 14 to bringing forward social reforms, that we've obviously spent more time on it than I had anticipated was going to be necessary. Again, I want to reiterate that from my perspective, it's more important to do it the right way than to do it in a rushed and unthoughtful fashion. So, Mr. Speaker, we are committed to major social reform.

I would want to say that to suggest that we've done nothing . . . It's always difficult to have the members opposite listen to some of the information that we try to provide them from time to time through question period, but I think the Premier earlier in question period outlined some of the initiatives that we are doing to help people living below the poverty line. I know the members opposite don't think jobs are the answer. I happen to think that jobs are an important part of the answer, and this government has created more jobs in Alberta today than we've ever had in the history of this province. We happen to think diversification is an important part of it. Again, our diversification . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister.
Westlock-Sturgeon.

Westcan Malting Ltd.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture and possibly to the Treasurer as he was bragging about the environment of trust that is stampeding all these international buccaneers coming into Alberta to invest and take loans from the government. I'm speaking particularly of Westcan Malting, which concerns me a

bit because some of the principals who are founders in this group have taken the Saskatchewan government to the cleaners in a plant that they've just taken over, and it would be interesting to note just what precautions the minister has taken here. For instance, besides the subsidy of not having to pay interest for three years on half the loan, the other half of the loan will pay no interest at all unless the company makes money. Was the minister able to get personal guarantees from the principals involved in the Westcan Malting thing?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure where the hon. member is getting some of his misinformation. As I stated before in the House, the involvement with Westcan is through the Agricultural Development Corporation, our agribusiness lending arm. The arrangement is commercial, with part of it being in redeemable preferred shares, part of it being in a direct loan with capitalized interest, granted. Our position is, I would say, commercially secure, and I think it's a good news project for Alix, Alberta. It's certainly a good news project for barley producers across this province.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, even such a financial terpsichorean as the Treasurer would agree that capitalizing interest and preferred shares redeemable for interest only if they made profit would be a subsidy.

But let's go a step further. Has the minister gone out of his way to check whether or not the principals involved in the fund – some of them are in construction, some have represented and sold malting equipment in North America – are not involved in any cosy type of a relationship where the charges will come back into the building of the plant?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that the staff at the Ag Development Corporation has checked the backgrounds of all participants very carefully, has checked the financial strength of the participants very carefully, and feels comfortable that they've invested money in a worthwhile venture for secondary processing in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Lesser Slave Lake.

OSLO Project

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Energy. There's been a lot of talk in the past in print and electronic media that suggests energy megaprojects may be a thing of the past, particularly since we have done such an excellent job in diversifying our economy in the forestry industry. [interjections] Sounds like the eggs are hatching. Mr. Speaker, these myths dampen the spirits of Albertans interested in progress and jobs for Albertans in the energy sector. To the minister: what is your view of the future of megaprojects such as OSLO?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the opposition is another example of how they do not want to hear the good news about orderly development of our resources, job creation, and carrying on with the economy.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Chair is willing to hear both the good news and the bad news, but at the moment the Chair can't hear anything, so could

we tone it down a little bit, please.

Minister of Energy.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, with the OSLO project we had some nervous moments recently with the pullout of the federal government. Quite frankly, as we've indicated previously, we find it somewhat troublesome that the federal government has not extended a commitment to security of supply in this country for oil. As we have indicated in the past, by the year 2010 it is quite possible that the country of Canada will import 925,000 barrels of oil per day with one other oil sands plant. Today we produce about 1.4 million and consume about 1.4 million, so the responsibility for security of supply, in the opinion of the federal government, obviously does not lie at their feet.

Mr. Speaker, we have recently concluded negotiations with the OSLO consortium, and we are very pleased that they have renewed their commitment. My belief is that the project will continue, that there will be other interest in oil sands development. We have seen Petro-Canada coming forward expressing an interest in developing their Daphne lease. So I think that on the oil sands side we are dispatching our responsibilities as a government and proceeding with orderly development of our resources in an environmentally sound way.

MS CALAHASEN: Well, I'm really glad to hear that certain things are starting to occur in the energy sector.

However, there seem to be many articles that have just been recently surfacing regarding the government commitments to the OSLO project, and I know you discussed that to some extent. Could you please explain where Alberta stands in its commitment to ensure that this important Alberta project like all others goes ahead?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, at least the Member for Vegreville is appreciative of the job this government does.

Mr. Speaker, we have just this week concluded negotiations with the OSLO partners. As I've indicated earlier, there were some difficult moments with regard to the OSLO project pullout of the federal government. We have recently concluded negotiations whereby the province of Alberta will contribute 36 percent of the OSLO engineering phase, which amounts to about \$46.8 million. We are very pleased with the commitment that our government has seen their way clear to support the completion of this project. As we know, the federal government has converted their interest to grants and will contribute \$45.5 million. This is important to Alberta. This is a huge economic generator to the province of Alberta. It demonstrates that the province and certain industry players are interested in oil sands development. This agreement now ensures that all parties, including Petro-Canada, will be participating through to completion of the engineering phase, which will be sometime around the end of 1991.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the parties, the OSLO owners, are now wanting to discuss the appropriation stage, the big project, the \$4.1 billion project, so this summer we will be conducting discussions with them. I'm very optimistic, given the fact that OPEC is pretty much at a maximum in terms of productive capacity. Conventional supplies are declining in this country. I believe it's the right decision. Certainly the province of Alberta will be proceeding with the project, firstly, because it's important on self-sufficiency and secondly, because it will contribute to orderly endowment of our resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

Propane Tax

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a result of the decision to require all service stations selling propane in Alberta to act as tax collectors for the new 5-cent per litre fuel tax on liquid petroleum gas, this government has needlessly burdened small business in this province with another layer of paperwork and red tape. To the Provincial Treasurer: given that the tax on other types of fuels such as gasoline and diesel fuel has successfully been collected for years at the wholesale rather than the retail level and given that the corporate tax administration people in the Treasury Department told us that the decision to collect the propane tax at the retail level was not made by them, how can the Treasurer justify needlessly burdening service station dealers in this province with the job of collecting and remitting the 5-cent per litre tax on LPG fuels?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's obviously some misinformation in the member's question as usual. No doubt when we put into place the tax on propane, we imposed the tax across those people who use propane for transportation purposes, exempting farmers and exempting other uses that were not aligned with transportation. I've said in the House before, Mr. Speaker, that the tax rate in Alberta in fact is among the lowest on propane, and we have allowed the propane users time to retrofit their vehicles to take advantage of the cheap fuel over a fairly extensive period, about three and a half to four years. So the benefit is there.

We've talked already about the need to have the taxation for the balanced budget. We want to have fiscal responsibility. It seems that even the opposition talks about it; even the opposition agrees with the fiscal responsibility side. Then, of course, we needed that tax side. Now, what we have done, Mr. Speaker, in terms of implementation, is ask those people who collect the fuel tax for us on other forms of fuel to collect it for us as well.

I can assure you that nobody in Treasury said it was not their recommendation to do it that way. They are the ones who make the policy and recommend, then, the way in which it works. They're the ones who are sensitive to the field response and the people who are employing the tax, and they're the ones who, on a matter of course, will adjust the tax and the tax collection system to best suit those people who are assisting the province — for a fee, by the way — to collect that tax.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Mr. Speaker, I find the Treasurer's explanation extremely hard to accept. Also, I would like to give him the source of my misinformation: his own information circulars out of the department. I'd like the page to take that over to him, please.

Mr. Speaker, this department is needlessly burdening thousands of small businesses in Alberta with extra paperwork just so that they can deal with the small volumes of propane that most service stations would sell for nontransportation uses. In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is a process now in place for propane rebates to some people on a quarterly basis. I can't help but wonder whether the real explanation for the propane tax being applied at the retail level is that this government is using it as a pilot project for bringing in a broadly based retail sales tax down the road. Given the deplorable state of the province's finances and given that the decision to collect the LPG tax at the retail level was made by tax policy rather than the administration side of the Treasurer's department, is this a

foreshadowing of things to come, namely the introduction of a more broadly based retail sales tax at some point in the future?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I take that as a recommendation from the socialist NDP, and we will quickly reject it. I have believed all along that the only solution that the nonthinking socialists of the Liberal or the NDP persuasion would come up with would be a retail sales tax, and now their true intention, their true policy has been outlined today. I'm glad they did it on the last day of the Assembly. I want the record to show that they're advocating that sales tax, Mr. Speaker, and let the people of Alberta know, finally, that these socialists will tax everything away: a tax on your mother's house, a tax on retail sales, Mr. Speaker. That's the way . . .

MR. SPEAKER: And from time to time question period taxes us all.

Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: To the Treasurer: a simple yes or no would have sufficed.

Waste Recycling

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that for three years the village of Ryley has conducted a highly successful composting project which has a 95 percent participation rate by the people of Ryley and which has contributed to a reduction in Ryley's solid wastes of between 35 and 40 percent. It has received support from the provincial government over these three years, but now suddenly provincial support has been stopped. To the Minister of the Environment: why at a time when we need constructive environmental action, not just talk, not just public relations, would this government demonstrate once again a distinct bias for inaction by cutting off this important Ryley composting project?

MR. KLEIN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, we haven't cut off the composting program at all. We're highly supportive of the initiatives being undertaken in Ryley. The situation is this: we are discussing now with officials in Ryley a funding formula for that particular program, and those discussions haven't been concluded. We haven't cut them off; we have no intention of cutting them off. It's simply a matter of them asking for something and negotiating what is deemed to be reasonable under the circumstances. To say that we've cut them off and to say that we have brought the program to a halt is absolutely wrong.

MR. MITCHELL: Given that the funding year, of course, ended at the end of March, could the minister please give us some indication of how it is that he expects this project to continue over three or four or five or six months without funding, and will he give us an indication specifically of when they will be told whether or not and how much funding they will get for this year and for years to come?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, we have asked the officials to give us some specific information relative to this project. That information, I understand, has been received; it is being assessed. We will work out with the community a reasonable funding formula that is equitable not only to the town of Ryley and to that project but is fair to all other municipalities in the province that also have recycling initiatives. The town of Ryley

is not the only municipality in the province with alternate forms of waste management under way. We have a program in the town of Wainwright relative to incineration. We have under consideration a recycling proposal to take organic garbage and mix it with manure and swine urine in the town of Olds. That's under consideration. So we have to make sure that our resources are shared properly.

We also have in the works a comprehensive waste minimization and recycling program that will hopefully spell out a whole new set of policy relative to government funding for recycling programs. So Ryley is not the only town in this particular game. We are supportive of the particular project there. We are willing to fund the project, but we must do it on an equitable basis.

Trade of Alcoholic Beverages

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. In the beautiful constituency of Highwood we have Highwood Distillers. They produce a fine range of quality distilled products that sell at competitive prices in Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba. This past week Highwood Distillers announced the sale of 10,000 units to the republic of South Korea. At almost the same time they were turned down by the province of British Columbia for the third time by the liquor authorities there. My question, then, to the minister is: what is this minister prepared to do to foster interprovincial trade in Alberta products like those of Alberta owned Highwood Distillers, to boost the spirits of free trade?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member should be aware, this province has been the leader in the breaking down of the interprovincial trade barriers that have existed. We recently signed a memorandum of understanding with the four western provinces, and I'm happy to make representations to the proper agencies in British Columbia in conjunction with the hon. member if he feels an injustice is being created. We're more than happy, recognizing the industrious nature of the Highwood Distillers, to pursue their goal with them so that they will have access to the B.C. market.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Highwood.

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary question, then, is to the minister responsible for the Alberta Liquor Control Board, the Solicitor General. This kind of trade barrier goes against the western grain. Is the minister prepared to use the goodwill that he has created by ALCB's acceptance of B.C.'s Kokanee and numerous B.C. wines to gain shelf space for Alberta products like those of Highwood Distillers?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to respond to the hon. Member for Highwood and indicate that for the past year the Alberta Liquor Control Board has been inquiring into, investigating, and making great strides in rationalizing the free movement of liquor and beer, most particularly beer, over the provincial trade barriers that have been in existence for many years. Both major breweries have been given permission by the ALCB to import beers from other provinces into Alberta.

We remain concerned, of course, about the number of jobs that may possibly disappear in the rationalization of the beer industry in Canada and have a very deep regard for that

particular matter. We'll continue to do so as discussions continue on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

No points of order? No points of privilege? No more questions? Gee whiz.

Orders of the Day

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the opposition parties had agreed or perhaps would agree to do government business today, so I would request unanimous support to suspend Standing Order 8 so that we may proceed with government business.

MR. SPEAKER: Question. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries, let the record show, unanimously.

head: Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole will come to order, please.

Bill 49 Ambulance Services Act

[Adjourned debate July 4: Mrs. Hewes]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll just continue.

I had reached the point of some questions regarding section 22(5) in the Bill. Mr. Chairman, I'll present an amendment. This section and further sections relate to the appeal board. This particular section allows for evidence to "be given before the Appeal Board in any manner that the . . . Board considers appropriate," and further doesn't bind the appeal board to "the rules of law respecting evidence applicable to judicial proceedings." I'm not sure, and I'd like the minister to consider this and reassure me that this is acceptable. It seems to me that we must be clear whether or not the appeal board is bound by the Alberta rules of court. My amendment to it would be to strike this section and state that the appeal board must follow the *Alberta Rules of Court* respecting evidence applicable to judicial proceedings. The minister has some response, I'm sure.

Following section 23, in "Witnesses" it allows the appeal board to cast an individual as a compellable witness who can then be examined under oath on anything relevant to the investigation. The criticism here, Mr. Chairman, is that this section may perhaps be in contravention of the Charter of Rights. The appeal board is not a court of law, as I understand it, and yet it appears that they are giving themselves the power of a court of law. The amendment in this section would be to delete "compellable," since this infers that the person can be arrested to attend the proceedings.

Further in section 24(a) and (b), civil contempt, it sets out the civil contempt proceedings that can be brought against a witness.

This too, in my view, incorrectly assumes that the appeal board is a court of law.

Inspection of place. The section states that an authorized person can enter any domicile at any time, do anything, take anything, provided it relates to the investigation at hand. I wonder why an individual doing such a search should not have to apply to a court of law for a search warrant and be accompanied by a police officer.

Section 31. I think there perhaps could be thought given to deleting this section. It seems to me that the government should be held accountable for their actions and decisions. This section removes the Crown in right of Alberta and the Crown's agents from any liability for "acts or omissions of an operator or of the operator's agents."

Section 32(1). My question has to do with whether or not this statement isn't rather vague. It says, "The Minister may do anything the Minister considers necessary . . ." It seems to me this would allow for an abuse of power, the present minister, of course, excepted.

Mr. Chairman, section 33, ambulance attendants. I'm assuming, and perhaps the minister will clarify, that the regulations, requirements, and so on will all be contained in detail in regulations, and I would like to know who, in fact, is going to set the standards.

Section 34, liability for payment. Mr. Chairman, this allows the minister or an operator to recover the amount charged for the service "from the patient or a person prescribed in the regulations." It further allows for the recovery of debt by a civil action. It seems to me that a fee for ambulance services is comparable to extra-billing charges, which we in our Liberal caucus have always condemned. Further, we're on record as wanting to abolish all health care premium collections, based on the belief that that's a regressive tax as well, such that we would like to ask the minister to comment on our amendment to delete this section in total or reword it to allow for billing to Alberta health care insurance, which the Member for Edmonton-Centre has already commented on.

Section 36(1). This is operating costs and the requisitioning of capital. We want to know how this is going to be based. The municipalities want to know if it's based on per capita and needs. The qualifications for memberships to boards: will that also include a requirement for representation from the public at large? Further, "respecting liability for payment of the amount that may be charged in respect of a service . . . and the person required": I'd be more comfortable if it were deleted, the same as our amendment on 34.

Hurrying on, Mr. Chairman, to section 36(2), regulations being made by the minister. I would hope they will consider compulsory liability insurance, whether or not this is made available by the government, whether the standards will be the internationally known and accepted standards of KKK-A-1822 and if in fact the minister is going to develop her standards based on recommendations provided by qualified professionals.

Mr. Chairman, section 36(2)(s), "respecting ambulance communications systems," I spoke about on second reading. I'm not at all clear whether or not a communications system would be provincially controlled, operated, and funded, or how it would work. It seems to me that an ambulance system provincewide with quality standards would only operate effectively if there were a proper communications system in place. The minister has not really committed to whether or not that is going to be provincially managed, controlled, and funded. I think the various districts and municipalities that want to co-operate on this need that information.

Mr. Chairman, I will present an amendment related to that, and another amendment,

defining "air ambulance services," "basic life support," "intermediate life support," "advanced life support," or "inter-hospital transfer . . ." for the purposes of this Act will expand section 36(2)(v), which I think is too limited in its concept. In subsection (x), I think it is, "to the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan" could be added to conform with my earlier comments on payment.

Mr. Chairman, those are my questions on the Bill. As I said before, I'm pleased this Bill is here. We've waited a long time for it. I believe the people of Alberta are supportive of the idea of a standardized ambulance service across the province, but there are many things still unanswered. I would hope the minister will table some responses to these questions so that as we move forward into developing the service – as your committee did its study and, I think, did a tremendous service to the people of Alberta in reviewing the circumstances and the needs of the people of Alberta – we will move smoothly into developing the kind of service, but we need to know the answers to some of the questions first. I fear that a great deal was left to the regulations.

Mr. Chairman, my amendments, therefore, have been submitted and circulated to members of the Assembly in advance of today, and I look to you for direction, sir. I have spoken to most of the amendments briefly as I've gone along. They are labeled A, B, C, through to M. I would be interested in your direction as to whether you could call the question separately on them once the minister has commented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think before the hon. member sits down, perhaps for the record she should formally move the amendment.

MRS. HEWES: I'll move the amendments as circulated, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, just a question of clarification. I had two separate amendments circulated. I would just wonder if you could bring me up to speed. There's one, A to M, and there's a second amendment from Mrs. Hewes in regards to section 4. I'm just wondering: what is the status of that second one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would say that the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar with respect to section 4 would not be in order because it deals substantially with the same proposal made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, on which the committee made a decision yesterday.

The hon. minister.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'll go through the amendments as best I can.

First of all, with respect to amendment A – this was number H of the amendments for the Member for Edmonton-Centre – it's the whole issue of the consultative approach. The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar mentioned that she would hope the regulations would be available this summer, and I can confirm for her that that would be the case. I would endeavour to get her a copy as soon as they're public. They will go through the consultation process that this Bill has, and in fact when you look at things like boundary changes under any of the Hospitals Act, the Public Health Act, the consultative process is very wide and

very important, and that will certainly will be the model I will continue to follow in this legislation.

With respect to B, in effect this clause that's amended would allow an executive decision made by the minister to be appealed to an advisory board reporting to the minister. I think it makes it a little cumbersome in that sense.

Section C. This is the amendment of the board being able to act as its own operator, and it's one that occurs in about 20 instances around the province where the hospital board is in fact the ambulance operator for the district. It's relevant in the sense that if there's no other operator available and the hospital board can do it, I think we should not prevent them from doing it. It's why the clause is in the legislation.

Number D. I think it's difficult to determine who would be a member of the public for the purposes of the board, and it may be inappropriate since the affiliations of the other board members are not purposefully designated. They will be representatives as designated in the legislation, and they're not designated by profession. Representation from the general public, I think, is in keeping with the philosophy of accountability and community representation, which is very much a tenet of the board appointments in this legislation.

Amendment E. It's my intent not to make the proceedings before the advisory and appeal board similar to a court of law because I think individuals appearing before the board should not have to have legal counsel. It might not be necessary for them to do so, and I don't think we should compel them to have that kind of situation. Therefore, we have made the exception that it would be not applicable to the *Alberta Rules of Court*.

Section F, with respect to a competent witness. That word "competent" in the legal sense is a person that has mental capacity to provide evidence. In fact, I believe the term – and I checked it with Legislative Counsel – is compellable because it means the witness must attend the board hearing and provide evidence.

Section G. Because I realize that the regulatory power on this legislation is quite broad – and perhaps if we were at the point of amending the Ambulance Services Act, it could be more limited, if we'd had another Act in place. In fact, what we're doing is writing an Act out of what exists in three sections of the Municipal Government Act at this point; in other words, the voluntary ambulance service as opposed to the one that we're now compelling. So I apologize for the very broad regulatory power. I think we need to have maximum flexibility to get this system up and running, although I fully appreciate that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar might not agree with me.

Section H, with respect to the whole issue of bad debts and the charges of a fee. There is no province or territory in Canada that does not require at least some contribution by a patient who secures the services of the ambulance. I realize that the member believes it should be a universal system and that we should abolish premiums altogether, but perhaps we can leave that debate for another day.

Section I, with regard to the liability for payment. The rationale is really similar to that in clause H. I can also add that about 5 to 10 percent of all ambulance revenues are not recovered, and I think there must be some recourse for recovery given the involvement of municipalities and ambulance authorities.

Number J. The ministerial regulation-making power I believe should be used to set standards, not recommend them. We do have in place a committee, which is I think the intent of the hon. member's amendment, and that is the ambulance standards working committee. It's an expert committee made up of

physicians, paramedics, the postsecondary education system, the Alberta Hospital Association, and nurses, who are making the recommendations with respect to the standards that we will be applying under the Act. So although it's not legislated in practice, it's under way and it's working very, very well and has been of great help in the drafting of this legislation.

With respect to section K and the whole issue of 911 and a whole central registry, no, this does not set up a provincial communication program as yet. The proposed establishment of the provincial 911 only implies that the number would be used to access the local emergency response centre; 911 of itself doesn't ensure co-ordination. I think our efforts at this point have to be to make sure the districts are operating within their districts. It would be wonderful to be able to have a 911 access system anywhere in the province. We're not ready for that yet. I think we need to work towards that. There's nothing in the Act that would prevent us from setting it up.

L, defining "intermediate life support" and "advanced life support." I don't know what the definition of "intermediate" is. There's basic and advanced, but section 36(2)(u) provides for regulations "respecting levels of ambulance services," so I think it's dealt with. The word "intermediate" is not defined in the ambulance service as far as I'm aware.

M, I think, is the same issue with respect to the universality under the plan.

Now, I know the hon. member through her questions has also raised some questions with respect to the Act that do need responses. Between yesterday and today I haven't fully garnered them, but I will commit to the hon. member that I will give her those answers if the House is still sitting, and if not I will do them through correspondence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar had asked whether we proposed to vote on these things individually or collectively. Is there any particular reason for not dealing with it as a bundle?

MRS. HEWES: I'm in your hands, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the interests of expedition, then, perhaps we could deal with it as a bundle. I would also remind members of the committee that if there was a division on this, it would be subject to the short bell that was adopted unanimously yesterday for the committee work with respect to this Bill.

[Motion on amendments lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments, questions, or amendments to be offered?

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of other questions just to raise and make sure that we've clarified some of them.

One is a bit more of an elaboration about the fees and the rates that are going to be charged and the whole payment mechanism. I take it that we're certainly following some sort of per capita amount to the different district boards. Certainly there are going to be some costs associated with implementing this legislation now. I'd like to know more about how much the users are going to have to pay out of pocket, and even more, how much the municipalities are going to have to find the moneys for, how much Blue Cross is going to have to pay.

Because, as I'm hearing from some of the providers, ambulance services are getting increasingly costly to provide. The maintenance of the vehicle, the increasing standards now by virtue of this Bill, and the traffic out there are just causing them more and more costs.

Also there was the cost of air ambulance. Now, I don't have it with me, but a very interesting letter that I had received, and I think perhaps others did, from the Lake-Land Ambulance Services – the air ambulance provider up in the Athabasca district, who continues to want to provide an air ambulance service but is finding some real discrepancy between what he is trying to provide and what he is called upon to provide, and that was sometimes three and four people on board and then finding out that the department only provides the funds for one or two people on board. It's leaving him with bills that he can't pay. That's just one instance of a number of costs that he's incurring to try to continue to provide that air ambulance service, and it's putting him soon out of business, he tells me. He has other friends and people in the U.S., and he's thinking he's just going to go and try to do business down there.

So with respect to the whole air ambulance service, I know it's not a full part of this Bill, as it's still left in the minister's and the department's hands, but the costs are increasing there. Certainly, even as we drive into Calgary now and see the big sign about the need for air ambulance service and the campaign that's going on there . . . So some elaboration about the funding, as we now have the Bill and as the costs are increasing for both air and ground.

Also with respect to the air ambulance service – for instance, the one out of Grande Prairie has caused some concern of late. It's always been a matter of some issue in Grande Prairie about whether it's Wapiti air or Grande Prairie Air that provides the service. The hospital a while ago decided to go with Grande Prairie Air. Then again the real anomaly of Grande Prairie Air, as I understand it, in flying patients from Grande Prairie and the Queen Elizabeth II hospital there, is that they have to fly them into the Edmonton International Airport, where they have their own Grande Prairie ambulance vehicle which then takes them to the University hospital. It'd be, in fact, a lot closer to fly them into the Municipal Airport and go by Edmonton ambulance to, say, the Royal Alex or the University hospital. But in order to get there, to complete the service, they feel they have to fly to the International and board one of their own vehicles, which they keep at the International Airport to transport patients. It seems to me a very odd setup, and I think in an emergency case it would take even more time, not to mention more cost.

Now, apparently even Grande Prairie Air wants to pull out of the air ambulance business from up in Grande Prairie. Some questions were raised locally about the standards, whether they've met federal regulations and the rest, and some dispute about an emergency landing that had to be made because there wasn't enough fuel on board. A few of these questions were raised locally, and next thing Grande Prairie Air pulls out of the contract altogether with the hospital. So I think that whole issue begs a lot of questions, and since it falls still under the minister's purview with respect to this Bill, I wanted to raise them at this point.

I guess it was back in second reading, but I was interested in the minister's comment about – I'm not sure I even have the title right – an emergency trauma committee or group that's working on a number of questions. If we're not going to have the commission – which I think was such a terrific idea, and perhaps this advisory board might do some of it – certainly there

are going to be a lot of issues breaking with respect to increased technology and increased demand and some of the changing nature of the ambulance industry. I speak, for instance, of the question of whether or not physicians and nurses should be on ambulance vehicles and whether they're able to dispense certain medications or actually do certain medical procedures on board. The whole issue of diagnostic services – I've just read about this – some forms of X-rays or some sort of diagnostic information taken on the ambulance and then sent through some telecommunications network into the hospitals so they can get some read on it in terms of how they should proceed on the ambulance . . . So the ambulance almost becomes a minihospital on wheels, traveling around. I think that would be terrific if it's going to save lives and reduce the response time to get into the hospital. But again it's going to be costly, and we'll have to have some regulations with respect to who delivers that service, whether nurses, doctors, or emergency physicians are going to be heading that up.

I would be interested to know if this committee is looking at that issue, not to mention this whole very difficult issue of triage, which borders on some real ethical concerns when you've got a lot of needs and only a few ambulances or emergency services people available, where they go to meet the need most quickly. I think it was again the advisory committee's report, which talks about how to service a certain Albertan who has difficulty at the midpoint of an ambulance district – it might be equidistant between two ambulance dispatch centres – and how they're going to determine who gets there most quickly. So I guess it borders on this co-ordination and communication side, but I think a lot can and should be done in that area. I'm hoping that somebody is looking into that and can provide some answers.

I think the only other point I wanted to raise at committee stage here was a sort of side issue. It has to do with Out-of-province emergency services, when people are traveling outside the province and fall into some mishap or need medical services of an emergency nature and how that is provided for. I thought I remembered reading in the department's budget that there was more money going into out-of-province costs. Whether that has to do with emergency, I'm not quite sure.

Then some explanation for people who have written to me and, I think, the minister about how it is that on the Alberta health care insurance card mail-out there was information about how people could get private coverage, whether through Blue Cross or through the Alberta Motor Association, to cover those Out-of-province emergency costs, when in fact there are a lot of travel agents and others, who are small businesses and providers of travel service and health coverage out of province, who could also provide that kind of coverage and resented very much the mail-out that just seemed to cite that the Blue Cross and Alberta Motor Association were the only coverers of that and it seemed to give them a leg up in terms of some advertising on a very important matter, on a costly matter.

I think that's all the other miscellaneous things I had, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: With respect to funding, the Act of itself does not provide any extraordinary funding beyond the \$41 million that the province is currently funding for the provision of ambulance in the province, nor does it prevent it. Certainly it leaves the opportunity for grants to be given. I think I've already indicated my view that given the tight fiscal situation and the fact that I don't see it letting up for the immediate future at least, my preference would be that rather than per capita grants right across the province, we target the grants in those areas

least able, as opposed to least willing, to move into the provision of ambulance services. This Bill requires that all areas of the province be covered by basic life support and that we move towards that. So the measure of whether or not we will permit emergency responder service or how the limited resources in addition to the \$41 million will be allocated will be done on the basis of ability to meet the standard as opposed to desire. So that would be my idea with respect to funding and targeting.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ability to be . . .

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Ability to meet the standard, as opposed to whether or not they agree with the legislation. That would be the way I would hope to proceed.

With respect to air ambulance and the standards, we are currently in the process of starting to tender services for air ambulance around the province. My recall is that there are about eight air ambulance services in the province, and I don't see, unless they can't meet standards, that any of those would be forced out, even to the point of permitting two different carriers in a particular area. That possibility exists. Certainly standards need to be at least comparable, I would say, to other provinces' in Canada with respect to qualifications of pilots, Canadian air transport regulations, and all those kinds of things, and that's part of the regulatory and the tendering process that's currently proceeding.

It's understood I think generally within the industry that a funding level of about \$5 per capita will allow the ongoing operation of a BLS service, and interestingly enough the ability to pay doesn't appear to have any relationship for municipalities with respect to their level of ambulance. I pointed this out before, but I think it's worth repeating that a community like Mayerthorpe, which is a relatively less affluent community in terms of its population base, has advanced life support. I think it's a comment about the commitment of that community to this kind of service and the kind of people that are available for the service.

The hon. member asked me about the Provincial Advisory Committee on Trauma Services, and it's one that I did speak about quite extensively in second reading. Once we've got the final terms of reference for that committee, I'd be happy to send them off to the hon. member. The membership, I would hope, will be very broad, including the Association of Emergency Medical Services Physicians, the task force on rural medical care, the association of emergency nurses, the Alberta Ambulance Operators. I think the membership on that committee should be very broad, and certainly it will be working as a committee towards the integration of transportation and emergency care, both from a prehospital and a prediagnosis and a triage and emergency physicians care. So it will look at that spectrum of pre-entry into the acute care funding, and I'm very encouraged by the support thus far of the health professionals for the setting up of this kind of committee. We're going to be concentrating with the committee on Edmonton and Calgary in the co-ordination of emergency care services at the beginning, but certainly we're going to learn a lot about how to smooth the move into the hospital, and that is certainly applicable in rural as well as urban Alberta.

The hon. member asked about the Out-of-province increase in the budget. My understanding is that that's as a result of coverage under the Alberta health care insurance plan. I'll check for him on what happens with emergency care out of province and whether Blue Cross covers it. I don't know the answer to that.

The hon. member did raise the question of the whole issue of sending out in the health care premium bills advertising for the Alberta Motor Association and Blue Cross. The main reason for that is that for some reason when people are traveling by air to another destination out of Canada, they will go through their travel agent, they will get the coverage for Out-of-province care, but when they're motoring, they won't. Since most people pick up their maps at the AMA, we thought it was a good point for them to think of getting out-of-province or out-of-country care if they're driving. There's an awful lot of motor traffic out of this province, so many of the claims we get out of province are ones that are motoring traffic as opposed to air traffic. So that's why we did it the way we did. It wasn't to give them a leg up; it was simply to look at the care of Albertans and their access to care.

That's the best I can do with the questions raised by the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. I will provide him and the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar with the other answers.

REV. ROBERTS: Just to be clear, one final point about this other advisory committee, the emergency medical advisory committee. I thought you said earlier that it was already in place. It's still to be announced, and it's going to be dealing with prehospital admission. The advisory and appeal board set up by the Bill is going to be monitoring and overseeing the whole service throughout the province. I'm just wondering if there's some overlap there. The primary question is: when is the other advisory committee, the advisory medical committee, going to be up and its mandate announced?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: The Provincial Advisory Committee on Trauma Services – PACTS, the lovely acronym – is virtually ready to go. Certainly we're consulting with those associations for nominees to it, but we are up and working on it. It's not announced officially perhaps, but it's there. The advisory and appeal committee is the one referred to in the Act. It, of course, isn't yet formed and won't be until this legislation receives approval.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 49 agreed to]

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 49, the Ambulance Services Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 26

Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Amendment Act, 1990

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few brief remarks to sort of sum up the heroic struggle of the Official Opposition to try to talk some sense into the government on this particular initiative in Bill 26. For the information of hon. members, we're talking about a power rate increase in the range of \$100 million which is being imposed upon the province by way of eliminating the rebate of utility company income tax, which we previously sent back to the consumers by way of a rebate on their power bill.

My colleague representing West Yellowhead riding has put forth an amendment which is presently before the committee. The amendment suggested this matter should go to the Public Utilities Board, which normally has jurisdiction over the approval of rate increases. In fact, the Public Utilities Board approves all customer rates by power companies and financing. In the Alberta system the utility companies estimate their total costs of service and their revenue requirements over a period, and those are put forward in what's called a phase 1 rate hearing. After the revenue requirement is approved by the board, the utility companies design rates for all customer classes, and then there's a proposed schedule of rates which is presented to the board for approval at what's called a phase 2 hearing. Now, the purpose of the amendment is to try to get this particular increase through the normal channel, because that's the way that perhaps we could prevent some mistakes from being made.

I think we should recall for the members of the committee a public letter in the news media in the Edmonton area from the general manager of Stelco indicating the possibility that an important recycling industry in the capital district could lose its lease on life as a result of this particular initiative. The general manager reminded people in this area, and I hope the government as well, that the reason they were attracted here was low-cost electricity for a recycling industry. I think for sure the government does not want this tax increase to result in the death of an industry which supports some 570 jobs within the capital region.

This amendment suggests what is the normal vehicle for dealing with rate increases, including rate increases imposed by the government. You know, I recounted for the Assembly a likely scenario of how this initiative was arrived at: the Treasury Board trying to put together a budget, trying to live up to the Premier's promise of no tax increases, and noting in the tax expenditure column there is a \$110 million figure in utility company income tax rebates and saying, "We'll take that and spend it." Well, perhaps that's a sort of beginning point, but it's not an ending point, and in between that beginning point and the ending point, there should be a process. The process suggested by the Official Opposition is that the Public Utilities Board do what it normally does.

Now, I think it's worth reminding the committee that the largest utility in the province of Alberta, TransAlta Utilities, reports that in 1989 coal supplied fuel for 94 percent of TransAlta's power. Ninety-four percent of the power produced by the largest utility comes from burning coal. From there we went on to suggest that perhaps this government should be concerned about the amount of coal that's being burned, the amount of carbon dioxide and greenhouse gases which go into the atmosphere, and look at perhaps the imposition of this new tax on the customers as an opportunity to address that problem. A great number of initiatives were discussed in the Official Opposition, including lighting systems that will reduce electricity use by some 80 percent.

MR. GESELL: Refrigerators.

MR. McINNIS: You know, my colleague here from Clover Bar mentions refrigerators, and I think he's absolutely right on. With refrigerators it's possible to save enormous amounts of electricity. But just to take one very small example, compact fluorescent bulbs now on the market cut electricity consumption by 80 percent over the conventional light bulbs most people are using. Now, every customer who installs one of those high-efficiency bulbs can save \$40 a year on electricity. More

importantly, the utility can save \$200 in capital costs for every energy-efficient light bulb that's installed. That's why some utilities are actually giving away these high-efficiency light bulbs, giving away light bulbs that in the market cost \$25 to \$35 apiece, because every one of those that's installed saves \$200 in capital costs. That's something for this Assembly to think about. The modest and reasonable amendment put forward by my colleague suggests that we would have an opportunity to assess the economics of that. Refrigeration, as mentioned by the Member for Clover Bar; questions dealing with all kinds of household appliances; industrial consumption of electricity: all these things would help the government address the problems that are there in the energy utility system.

We're dealing today with a policy which has been in place for many, many decades putting customers of public and private utilities on an equitable footing, and I think when you hear from a company like Stelco that they are considering closing down their operation, going back to the reasons they came to the province in the first place, there is cause for concern. Because if we're competing with neighbouring provinces that have public utility systems, those utility systems do not pay income taxes, and therefore the customers do not have to pay incomes taxes. We shouldn't kid ourselves. Who pays the taxes that are paid by a regulated utility? The customers do in the rate base. So you know, a company like Stelco is looking at their operations. If they can go to another jurisdiction where there's a publicly owned utility and there is no income tax that has to be paid to a provincial government anxious for more revenue, then there's going to be a competitive advantage.

We have to look at how many of these competitive advantages we can throw away, especially in the very difficult field of recycling, because Stelco is a recycling company. It's the only major industry I can think of that recycles a postconsumer product out of the blue box system. You know, from the blue boxes in Edmonton, paper goes to Korea, aluminum cans go to South Carolina, glass goes into the landfill, plastic goes into storage, hoping they'll do something. It's only the steel that's remanufactured here in the city of Edmonton, in the county of Strathcona, and that's an industry we can ill afford to lose. The Minister of the Environment talked today about the recycling and waste reduction strategy he's been working on, although in these many months since he's been appointed Minister of the Environment, we lost the glassworks in Medicine Hat-Redcliff, we lost the Applied Polymer operation here in the city of Edmonton. I hope we don't lose the Stelco operation, because that's one of the most important industries left.

So I think my colleague has put forward a very useful initiative from the point of view of the government: to look at the effect of this on the industrial structure, on the recycling industry, on the prospects for savings financially and in consumption of carbon dioxide. Did you know, Mr. Chairman, that for every energy-efficient light bulb we will save 450 kilograms of greenhouse gases and nine kilograms of other air pollutants that cause environmental problems like acid rain? So we've got a way you can save some money, save on greenhouse gases, save on pollution. I think it should be looked at, and therefore we suggest that the government accept this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any more comments on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before calling the question, could the Chair have some direction from the committee as to how it would wish

to deal with this matter? In case there is a division, would the committee want to have the short bell system we adopted for Bill 49?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, could I just offer a comment? I'm not sure there are to be divisions, but in the event there are, could I suggest that the first division be conducted according to our procedures and then some who may be in the Annex would be over here. Then at the conclusion of the first division we could raise that question and everybody in the Assembly would know what the ground rules are from there on. There may not be a division, but in the event there is, could I offer that as a suggestion?

[Motion on amendment lost]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 26 agreed to]

MR. JOHNSTON: I move the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills. The committee reports the following Bills: 26 and 49.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of concurrence, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

head: Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 26 Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Amendment Act, 1990

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Provincial Treasurer, I move third reading of Bill 26, the Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Amendment Act, 1990.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to take a couple of minutes to place on the record our disappointment with the Bill. I'd like to hit on only two points. One is that we feel there's been a grievous error on the part of this government's financial planning to allow the federal government to come in and tax citizens of Alberta. That's just what we're doing

when we pass this. The federal government now gets two-thirds of the corporation tax; the province gets one-third.

The thing to remember when this Bill stops rebate, Mr. Speaker, is that as far as power generated in Canada is concerned, approximately 54 percent of power generated by investor-owned power companies is generated here in Alberta. In other words, when we tax private power companies, we are in effect taxing mostly Alberta companies. Therefore, if we are going to hold back our share of the income tax, it is only a matter of time, and a very short time indeed, before the federal government will say: "Well, holy smoke, we only put in this law in the first place to help Albertans because they had investor-owned utilities. Now that Albertans are pocketing the income tax, we will pocket ourselves." That means that if the present withholding of provincial income tax is raising the price to the consumers somewhere in the 12 to 15 percent category, if the federal government follows, which it most assuredly will, it will be an additional increase of 24 to 30 percent. Taking all this together, it means that the power users of Alberta can be looking at a 40 percent increase over last year's rates in the next three to four years. That's the first thing I want to hit on very closely.

The second, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to environmentally clean power. You might want to call environmentally clean power the wave of the future. Whether it's windchargers or small irrigation-type water movements, whatever the system used, generally it will be privately owned. So we're tying another stone around the necks of those that want to get into the power business to generate clean power. In effect, a private small power user will be expected to pay federal and provincial income tax, yet a large publicly owned organization like Edmonton, which uses very dirty power, coal-generated power, will not be paying income tax. So what we have here is the environmentally dirty, large, government-owned organization – and yes, government-owned organizations can be dirty in spite of what some people try to tell you – having an economic advantage over the small private entrepreneur who is trying to break into the market with his environmentally clean power.

Those are the two points I wanted to put on record, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a sad day indeed that this government, which has long posited itself in the front of leaders in free enterprise, would go to the extent today of actually undermining or, as one of the members over there said earlier, torpedoing the whole free enterprise ethic in the question of generating power. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to welcome the Liberal Party to this debate. I think this Bill, because of the use of closure, has had more time in debate than any other Bill on the Order Paper so far. Some of the others we would have liked to have debated, of course, but that wasn't possible given the government tactic.

I believe the Liberal Party is right to be concerned about this, because all of rural Alberta is very concerned about the effect of an arbitrary increase in power rates, which is going to impact heavily on our municipalities, on our agricultural sector, on a great many industrial sectors, including some we can ill afford to lose. It's a revenue grab pure and simple, and it's one that's not very well thought out in terms of the impact on power customers, in terms of the impact on their operations, in terms of their competitive advantage or disadvantage vis-à-vis publicly owned utilities that operate in other provinces. The other

provinces have seen the wisdom over the years of having public power. Even those who call themselves free enterprise have seen it.

I don't wish to revisit the great debate between public and private power other than to say that one of the arguments the Hon. Ernest Manning used in those days was that they would rebate the income tax so there would be no disadvantage to customers of investor-owned utilities on that account, that they would be treated equitably vis-à-vis the customers of publicly owned utility systems. That isn't happening. In fact, that long-standing policy is being reversed under this legislation, and it's going to have some serious consequences. We certainly wish the government had thought those through, and if they did, we're certain they would withdraw this initiative or at least offer public hearings through the Public Utilities Board.

With that in mind, I'd like to indicate that the Official Opposition is opposing this Bill in third reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question. The hon. Minister of Advanced Education, on behalf of the Provincial Treasurer, has moved third reading of Bill 26. Those in favour of third reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Carried.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Gesell	Orman
Betkowski	Gogo	Osterman
Black	Isley	Paszowski
Bogle	Johnston	Rostad
Bradley	Jonson	Schumacher
Calahasen	Kowalski	Severtson
Cardinal	Laing, B.	Shrake
Cherry	Lund	Sparrow
Clegg	McCoy	Tannas
Day	Moore	Thurber
Drobot	Musgrove	Trynchy
Elzinga	Nelson	Weiss
Evans	Oldring	Zarusky
Fowler		

Against the motion:

Barrett	Hewes	Mjolsness
Bruseker	Laing, M.	Roberts
Ewasiuk	Martin	Sigurdson
Fox	McEachern	Taylor
Gibeault	McInnis	Woloshyn
Hawkesworth	Mitchell	

Totals	Ayes – 40	Noes – 17
--------	-----------	-----------

[Motion carried; Bill 26 read a third time]

Bill 49 Ambulance Services Act

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 49, the Ambulance Services Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, thank you. In trying to summarize debate in third reading on the Ambulance Services Act, it's really hard to express the kind of bittersweet victory that this represents. As you know, we in the New Democrat caucus have brought forth an ambulance Bill every year in this Assembly since 1984. It's been a major concern of ours that this province has been one of the last ones in Canada without any comprehensive ambulance legislation. Somehow the government's finally played catch-up with this issue and has brought forth the Bill. I've often tried to reflect upon why it's taken so long to bring in such a Bill when clearly it's been so necessary and called upon by some people for so long. I can only conclude that it really still hinges on the institutional bias that this government has with respect to health care.

We seem to think that while we can build hospitals and we can have institutional care, the means of getting there is not a matter of great debate. The whole community-side sector has been a matter of great neglect. I really regret that that bias has been in place for so long, though there are some signs that it might be changed and that this Ambulance Services Bill represents the fact that yes, we need to look more comprehensively at the health care system, at health care outside of hospitals, outside of the walls of facilities, whether it's in the community or in emergency and catastrophic cases.

So we have the Bill in these last days of this session. It seems kind of odd to have left it – I think the response time of this government on it even has proven to be somewhat slow – so that we now in the last days are finally coming to the conclusion of this very important Bill. It should have been one of the first Bills presented by this government back in March or April. If we really care about Albertans and their full health care services, that should have been the priority and the mandate and the imperative. I must say I was encouraged that the minister brought it in last year under the guise of Bill 25 and that it was presented and allowed to die on the Order Paper for public discussion over this past year. Yet, Mr. Speaker, even there . . .

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

REV. ROBERTS: . . . when the Bill comes back under Bill 49. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. I have a point of order.

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If my memory serves correctly, you, Mr. Speaker, have admonished twice during this session with respect to third reading. I'm citing *Erskine May*, page 509. I don't have *Erskine May* in front of me, so I'll have to go by memory. I believe *Erskine May*, page 509, states that debate on third reading is somewhat limited and should be confined to the substance of the Bill. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. The citation is indeed correct. *Erskine May*, 509, very briefly: "Debate on third reading,

however, is more restricted than at the earlier stage, being limited to the contents of the bill." I'm certain the Member for Edmonton-Centre will bear that in mind.

Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: I'll certainly bear that in mind, Mr. Speaker. I'm just a bit surprised that the member's so sensitive about the . . . In fact, the substance of the Bill leaves so much to be desired, and the whole substance has been left to such a late date as this. Because the substance of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, as we have it . . . I think the minister has brought back in Bill 49, insofar as she seems to think – well, it's been ratified by all the providers out there, by the AOA and the Alberta Hospital Association and others.

I would just like to say at third reading, Mr. Speaker, that there are still two groups, I think, who are very unsatisfied by Bill 49 and its contents, particularly section 4 of the Bill and, as we've discussed, other sections of the Bill. The first group is the native groups in this province. The minister can talk all she wants about the fact that there was a full consultative process and that all the providers are onside and so we should just sort of sit back here in the Legislative Assembly and let it sail through without any critique or question or frivolous points of order. What we have instead, Mr. Speaker, is a very important group in this province, being the native peoples, who are still very upset and angry and dissatisfied with section 4 of the Bill as it's now come to third reading, and I regret that very much. I regret that they don't feel that they have been consulted with properly and that even the federal officials of Health and Welfare Canada are in support of the native peoples on this and opposed to the minister.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Show me.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, we'll show you, Madam Minister, in the documents that we have. And what I'm most afraid of now is that having gone through this process, this Bill will be challenged in the courts, because they've exhausted political routes and the only recourse left to them is under the federal legislation, that this be challenged in a court action. I know previous ministers of health have been taken to court before under certain matters. I think that would be regrettable if that were the case here. Nonetheless, it's the product of a faulty consultative process and, I think, a lack of fuller debate in the Assembly here.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, in terms of fuller debate: we've come to third reading; I've heard only one member of the government caucus even comment on this Bill. The Member for Taber-Warner had very good comments, but I think the silence of the rest of the government members either speaks of some great division over there with respect to this Bill or the fact that they really haven't been prompted by the concerns of their constituents to speak on it, even now at third reading. I think there might be some opportunity for certain members, if they want, to get in on that. Mind you, at second reading almost every member of our caucus, the New Democrat caucus, stood and spoke on their concerns about this Bill. I'm very proud of them for that, and I think it shows our commitment to improved ambulance service in the province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, our final commitment is not just to the providers and not just to those involved in the ambulance industry but to Albertans generally, as individuals and as patients and as consumers of the service. It's still true that in this province there are over one million citizens who are not

covered for ambulance services, who have no coverage at all through Blue Cross or through any private insurance means, one million Albertans who will be left with major financing after some catastrophic accident or injury. I mean, how can we continue to live with that kind of inequity?

The minister talked about other provinces and the fact that they don't have the system that we in the New Democrat caucus and the Alberta Medical Association have called for. But when I look even at the advisory committee's report, Mr. Speaker, at third reading in the Bill there's no substantive addressing of the fact that Albertans are not covered for ambulance services. But here it says that in British Columbia there's no charge to users other than co-insurance charges; in Saskatchewan, no other charges; Ontario, no charge other than a co-insurance charge, a deductible of \$22. I'm even hearing that in the province of Ontario they're wanting to drop the deductible.

Mr. Speaker, in the substance of Bill 49 in third reading I am disappointed, our caucus is disappointed that this province continues to leave so many Albertans uninsured. It makes me wonder how many Albertans they've actually consulted with respect to this. Constituents that I've talked to and letters and calls that we get from people who are concerned about this – they maybe haven't been canvased or polled in any comprehensive way, but it keeps coming up that Albertans are left with charges and bills for ambulance services. It's just not right for them in this province that claims to have a universal health care system. We have a great province. We have a great ambulance industry, thanks to many in the system who have brought it up to the level it is. We have a great number of citizens who need better coverage. What we don't have at third reading of Bill 49 is a government that really cares fully about a comprehensive health system but has deferred and delayed and now brings forth a Bill that's inadequate. We just can't support it at third reading. We're going to want more when we're government next time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my intention and the intention of the Liberal caucus to support this ambulance Bill. I've indicated that earlier in the House.

Mr. Speaker, my review of the matter, discussing this long-awaited Bill with the major stakeholders in our province, is that they are satisfied with it. They are for the most part pleased and supportive of this Bill. There have been some questions raised, and to be sure, it's difficult to be committed to it totally without seeing the regulations. I'm pleased that the minister has assured us that these regulations will be forthcoming shortly and that there'll be ample time for consultation with the various stakeholders on the regulations before they are written in.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also assuming, from the minister's commitment in this House, that there'll be close monitoring of the ambulance system as it develops in the province. Particularly, I would hope that that monitoring is related to the provision of ambulance services through contracts with the native reserves. This has been a very difficult situation, one that we've heard varying reports on. The minister has attempted to build confidence in the House that in fact the native peoples of the province can be confident, can be satisfied with the Bill as it exists, that it will serve their needs and will in no way conflict with their rights to control and manage their own services, as we understand from federal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to be concerned about the absence of a provincial communication service because, in my own view, the ambulance service provincially cannot and will not operate efficiently in the fashion that we want it to or that we believe it will until there is a provincially funded and provincially managed communications service to make it run properly.

I will also be keeping a close watch on the accountability of the boards that are created to their various municipalities, who are going to have to pay the bills. I think the ratepayers in our province will be watching it carefully too.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I will support the Bill, as will my caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a few remarks here on third reading of Bill 49 regarding, particularly, the ways in which this legislation is going to affect those Alberta citizens who fall under various treaties in this province, who enjoy treaty rights, and fall under the very special jurisdiction of the government of Canada.

Now, a number of amendments were made at second reading, one in particular by my colleague for Edmonton-Centre to amend section 4, to fix a flaw that exists in the legislation. Regrettably, the minister and the government did not accept that amendment and instead directed the members to consider the provisions of section 32 as being able to fix the problem which we identified regarding Indian people in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the minister and members of the House that section 32 does not do the job that she thinks it's going to do. The problem with section 32, again as it relates to the principle of the jurisdiction affecting people serving Indian people through ambulance services in this province, is that this section the minister referred to allows the minister to enter into agreements with the government of Canada or any person. The reason the minister said in second reading that this satisfies the concerns we raised is that a band would qualify under the provision of being "any person." I have to tell the minister that no reserve and no band in this province feels that they can enter into an agreement directly with the provincial government. First of all, the provincial government has no jurisdiction over Indian people, and secondly, Indian people are afraid that they may lose a treaty right by voluntarily giving it up by entering into such an agreement with the provincial government. So there is no way under the provisions of section 32 that I can see any band willingly stepping forward to enter directly into an agreement with the minister.

The provision also allows the government of Alberta to reach agreements with the government of Canada, but again, Mr. Speaker, this is not adequate either, because there is no way of ensuring that the relevant band would be at the negotiating table when those agreements are entered into. After all, the present ambulance services being provided in Alberta and the proposed ambulance services to be provided on Indian reserves in Alberta are not being provided directly by the government of Canada either through the department of Indian affairs or the Department of National Health and Welfare. They're not the ones directly administering those services. It's the bands, or bodies established by Indian bands, in this province that are administering those services. So how can the government of Canada realistically come to the table to reach an agreement with the province unless they bring the bands with them to negotiate those agreements?

That brings us back to the option that would solve the problem: by establishing within this legislation permissive legislation for tripartite arrangements, with all three parties – the province, the government of Canada, and third parties: third persons or bands – being at that table to reach those agreements. Now, this may seem arcane to the minister, but it's very, very important, because the provisions of the Act under section 32 don't allow for the government of Canada and any person. All it says is that it gives the power to the minister to enter into an agreement with one party, either the government of Canada or any person, and doesn't allow for a tripartite arrangement to be established.

Now, the minister has also said that she met in June with the people who are most directly concerned about these services and most directly concerned about the provisions of this Act. Well, a lot has happened since that meeting with the minister. I would just summarize what has happened by drawing to the attention of the minister that I've had band council resolutions from the Blood Reserve. For example, I've had a board resolution brought to my attention by the Blood tribe department of health incorporated. I understand that the Alberta Indian Health Care Commission has written to Mrs. Betkowski regarding these concerns. Again, I have information that the Samson Cree Nation has provided their concerns in writing since that meeting to the Minister of Health. I have a copy of a memo to the assistant deputy minister of the medical services branch in Ottawa from the Alberta region medical services branch of Health and Welfare indicating their support of the positions that Indian people have been taking on this issue. I have a band council resolution from the Samson Band. Then just a few days ago, by chiefs from all over Canada, a resolution was adopted again to bring to the attention of the minister their concerns and views that this legislation is seriously flawed.

All of this comes on top of a resolution adopted by the Indian Association of Alberta earlier in June, and the story, the position, the arguments are all identical, they're all the same. They're all being repeated because the minister doesn't seem to this point to have understood the depth of concern that these people are expressing and the feeling that they have about this particular legislation. It's an issue that, without having been properly handled by the government, has now gone all across Canada, and concerns are being raised by Indian people all over Canada.

So after the meetings, the consultations that the minister had with the pertinent groups, knowing the position that they've put forward, knowing the resolutions that have been adopted and the continual re-emphasis of this point, I asked myself: why was the minister so reluctant to make the appropriate changes to this legislation? It couldn't have hurt to facilitate with permissive legislation in this Bill the possibility of entering into tripartite agreements between the federal and provincial governments and third parties. What harm would have been done by allowing that possibility to exist in legislation? I can't see how in any way, shape, or form the interests of anybody could have been hurt by allowing that sort of permissive legislation to have been adopted within this particular Bill. It couldn't have hurt, and yet the government, for whatever their reasons are, refused that amendment. They refused to bring it in themselves and instead pointed to some inadequate other provision within the legislation.

What has happened is that this decision by the Alberta government has ended up angering an important community, an important group, an important collection of Alberta citizens. It was not necessary; it could have been avoided. The minister

could have acted in a different way to have prevented that feeling from being created. It seems to me, as I look at it, to have been born out of some kind of stubbornness or else misbelief, I guess, that the actual legislation in front of us, particularly section 32, would in fact work, but I want to say at third reading that I believe the government has made a mistake. It seems at this point it's too late to prevent it before this legislation is passed. But, my golly, if this minister doesn't take seriously in the implementation of this legislation this concern that's been expressed in a way that I haven't seen expressed by Indian groups for some time, the mistake is simply going to be compounded.

Now, the minister said at Committee of the Whole reading that it was not her intention to deprive anyone of their aboriginal rights. That may well be her belief or her intention. Her intentions are good intentions, but I think we all know what road it is that has been paved with good intentions: it's the road to broken treaties and betrayed promises. I'm sorry that despite the deeply expressed and widely expressed concerns from the Indian community in this province, the changes were not made to this legislation. It seems that this government is unable to understand the importance of treaty rights, especially from the viewpoint of those most directly affected by treaty rights; that is, the Indian people of this province. Who would know best about aboriginal rights and about treaty rights if it's not the people who have the most to lose if those treaty rights are gone or if those aboriginal rights are eroded? It's the people who have the most to lose that have made it abundantly clear where they stand. They've made their position clear, they've made it consistent, and they repeated it many times in the last six or eight weeks. I would have thought that that kind of response from the Indian community in this province would have given the minister pause and that this government would have responded with the proper amendment to the legislation.

I believe the ignoring of this issue and ignoring the amendments that we raised at second reading, that were raised by the Official Opposition . . . Those amendments would have solved a problem for the government, would have solved a problem for the Indian people, would have facilitated another option in the delivery of ambulance services, and everybody could have walked away today winners. The government could have been a winner. The Indian people of this province could have been winners as well.

I believe this unwillingness to adopt the changes proposed at Committee of the Whole are going to cause problems, and I believe serious problems, in the implementation of this legislation and the delivery of ambulance services to a significant number of people in this province. I hate to think that this will happen, but there is a scenario, and I think a realistic one, that it may mean the result that there will be a loss of native-run ambulance services for native people in Alberta. If that is the result, because they don't qualify or fit as a result of this legislation being passed, if that happens, I can assure the minister and this government that if they think Indian people are angry now, they haven't seen anything, if they lose their ambulance services as a result of this legislation and as a result of this government ignoring the advice and the amendments brought forward during Committee of the Whole.

The government has made their decision: they've decided that they would reject those amendments. That's regrettable. I'm saying to the minister that there are consequences when decisions are taken, and if one of those consequences happens to be the loss of Indian-run ambulance services in the province

because they're not financially viable as a result of this legislation, then there are going to be very angry people on her doorstep in the months and the years to come. If that is the result, I would just say that it's regrettable, and doubly regrettable especially because all of it could have been very easily, in fact so easily, been avoided if the proper amendments had been made, amendments that would have helped. I couldn't see and I can't see yet how anyone would have been hurt had those amendments been adopted.

I'm afraid to say that the provisions pointed to by the minister at Committee of the Whole are inadequate. They're not going to do the job that she thinks it's going to do. I'm sorry that the changes weren't made when the government had the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly I'd like to speak in support of the Bill and also at the same time I think provide some corrections to this Assembly, specifically to a couple of concerns that were brought forward by the members for Edmonton-Centre and Calgary-Mountain View.

I personally live in a community that has an ambulance service run by treaty Indians themselves, and it works very well.

Both of these members indicated that the Indian people were not consulted. I personally talked to the chairman of the Indian Health Care Commission awhile back and asked that if they did have concerns, they should put them in writing and bring them forward to myself or the Member for Lesser Slave Lake, who also is a native person and has native ambulances in her riding. We never did ever receive anything in writing to indicate that there is a problem. Now, if there was a problem somewhere in relation to ambulances, then I would hope the members that were responsible for those issues would have come forward to us with their concerns in writing so we could have dealt with them. I believe the first time I've seen anything in writing in relation to Bill 49 is this resolution which came in yesterday, which I didn't get till today. So it was very, very hard for me to deal with this issue.

I also personally consulted with members in my community and asked if there were concerns about this Bill and some of the proposed changes. No one has come forward to indicate any issues, verbally or in writing. Therefore, I can't help but at this time support this Bill as is. But in the future if there are problems, I'll definitely be the first person to come forward to address native issues.

It may be possible that the group may be going to the wrong person for making changes. If that's the case, they'd better learn pretty fast that we can deal with issues of this nature on this side of the House because we have native members that are very, very familiar with native issues. In the future maybe people will understand that. If they do have concerns, we're here to deal with native issues also. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I chair the health and social services caucus committee dealing with issues exactly of this nature. No one in a year and a half has approached me to meet with him in regards to concerns they may have. [interjections] I'm here, open to deal with native issues and nonnative issues in Alberta. No one has come forward. I believe this government is moving the right way in dealing with this Bill.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to the member for . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The holiday hasn't begun yet, schoolchildren. We've got another little while to go.

The Minister of Health.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View. It's a pity that he wasn't able to present his views during Committee of the Whole; I think we might have had a more full airing of them.

The issue with respect to the permissive amendment, which was proposed by the New Democrats, is one which is provided for in the legislation. I repeat what I said during Committee of the Whole. I think it's a very, very important point, and I don't want to tar the third reading of this Bill with any perception that there's anything but that reality within the legislation.

I would urge hon. members to support third reading of this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health has moved third reading of Bill 49, Ambulance Services Act. Those members in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter carries.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Gesell	Orman
Betkowski	Getty	Paszkowski
Black	Gogo	Rostad
Bogle	Hewes	Schumacher
Brassard	Isley	Severtson
Bruseker	Jonston	Shrake
Cardinal	Jonson	Sparrow
Cherry	Kowalski	Stewart
Clegg	Laing, B.	Tannas
Day	Lund	Taylor
Drobot	Mitchell	Thurber
Elzinga	Moore	Trynchy
Evans	Musgrove	Weiss
Fjordbotten	Nelson	Zarusky
Fowler	Oldring	

Against the motion:

Barrett	Laing, M.	Mjolsness
Ewasiuk	Martin	Roberts
Fox	McEachern	Sigurdson
Gibeault	McInnis	Woloshyn
Hawkesworth		

Totals: Ayes – 44 Noes – 13

[Motion carried; Bill 49 read a third time]

MR. GOGO: 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 Alberta, took her place upon the Throne]

HER HONOUR: Please be seated.

MR. SPEAKER: 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: Your Honour, the following are the titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

No.	Title
10	Small Power Research and Development Amendment Act, 1990
15	Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1990
16	Real Estate Agents' Licensing Amendment Act, 1990
17	Municipal District of Badlands No. 7 Incorporation Act
18	Personal Property Security Amendment Act, 1990
19	Financial Consumers Act
20	Consumption Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 1990
22	Agricultural Development Amendment Act, 1990
23	Agricultural Statutes Amendment Act, 1990
24	Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1990
25	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990
26	Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Amendment Act, 1990
27	Advanced Education Statutes Amendment Act, 1990
28	Victims' Programs Assistance Act
29	Public Utilities Board Amendment Act, 1990
30	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990
31	Livestock Industry Diversification Act
32	Irrigation Amendment Act, 1990
33	Metis Settlements Accord Implementation Act
34	Metis Settlements Land Protection Act
35	Metis Settlements Act
36	Constitution of Alberta Amendment Act, 1990
37	Alberta Government Telephones Reorganization Act
42	Liquor Control Amendment Act, 1990
43	Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1990
44	Dental Disciplines Act
45	Professional Statutes Amendment Act, 1990
46	Legal Profession Act
47	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Amendment Act, 1990
48	School Amendment Act, 1990
49	Ambulance Services Act
50	Alberta Cultural Heritage Amendment Act, 1990
51	Gas Utilities Statutes Amendment Act, 1990
53	Parentage and Maintenance Act
54	Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 1990
55	International Conventions Implementation Act
56	Gratuitous Passengers and Interspousal Tort Immunity Statutes Amendment Act

- Pr. 1 Sisters of Charity of Providence of High Prairie Amendment Act, 1990
- Pr. 2 Edmonton Research and Development Park Authority Amendment Act, 1990
- Pr. 4 Canada West Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1990
- Pr. 6 Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1990
- Pr. 7 St. Therese Hospital (Grey Nuns) of St. Paul Amendment Act, 1990
- Pr. 9 Young Men's Christian Association Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1990
- Pr. 11 The Campbell McLaurin Foundation for Hearing Deficiencies Amendment Act, 1990

CLERK: These are the Bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated her assent]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these Bills.

HER HONOUR: Mr. Speaker, hon. Premier, hon. ministers, hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and Members of the Legislative Assembly, I feel sure that none of you wish to listen to one more speech today after the many speeches. I just listened to the mighty workload that you've undertaken during the past months. However, since I truly believe that this is the last time I shall appear in this Chamber as Her Majesty's representative, there are a few thoughts that I would like to leave with you today. Of course, I'm not sure whether or not this is the last time that I have the honour of representing Her Majesty here with you in this Assembly, since I am not able to read the minds of my government nor do I know exactly the thoughts of our Prime Minister. I do know what my thoughts are, and I truly believe that much and all as I have enjoyed this great honour over the past five and a half years, I shall not again appear in front of all of you in this particular capacity and in this honourable Assembly, so I want to take just a moment or two of your time to tell you a bit about how I feel and some of the things I think.

Let me begin by saying to you, Mr. Premier, that at all times I have been courteously, efficiently, and well served by the members of the public service. As well, I am particularly appreciative of the travel arrangements that I have been able to make in order to visit the many parts of this great province to which I've been invited.

You're all anxious, I know, to be free of your duties in this Assembly, even though your responsibilities go with you to your homes and to your constituencies.

I feel sure that none of you need to be surprised to hear me say that I am concerned and troubled over the present situation in our country. As community leaders and opinion-formers I urge you to give careful consideration to our circumstances and to consider the future and just how you want our Canadian map to look as future generations study their Canadian history and their geography. I would like you to impress upon Albertans and Canadians that we must be diligent in the protection and development of our country, that what is part of our past will not necessarily be part of our future, and the future is the responsibility of all of us here and outside, throughout this great country. Present circumstances should not be taken lightly but should be considered not only with our minds but with our hearts.

Finally, let me say that public service, particularly in an elected capacity, is a good and noble thing. It saddens me when I occasionally encounter opinions to the contrary. So to each of you, who are rendering good and noble service to the public, each in your own way, I say on behalf of that public: thank you very much.

So now go in peace. May you have a pleasant summer; may you have a happy and successful future. [applause]

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the Chamber]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in the interests that we may carry out the ceremony that's planned, I would seek unanimous consent that we stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried. Thank you. Time stands still.

Would all the pages please come forward. So no messages back and forth, gang.

Lots of people around here keep us functioning, and our thanks go to them all. But to begin with, we have a special presentation to be made to the various pages. The Member for Highwood and the Member for Calgary-Millican are going to dish out some goodies first.

MR. SHRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Every year I think the pages that we've had are always the best, and somehow Mr. Speaker goes out and finds some that are just as delightful and just as witty and just as bright. I hope some of you during this last session have had a chance to talk to some of these pages. I sometimes perhaps kid around a bit, but I find that our pages often have a better wit than a lot of the wit I have heard in the House here. Maybe that's not hard though.

It's been a good feeling seeing these young people, because as long as we have young people like this, our future is going to be in good hands. All members of the House very cheerfully contributed, and we have a small token for each of our pages. It's from all members of the House, from all parties.

We wanted to get a Legislature book for each of them. We figured they're all scholars. I'm sure you've all seen them out there as they were doing homework and stuff and thought, "What can we get them?" We got them a desk set with two pens so they can do lots and lots of homework. It's got a nice clock on it so they can always be punctual, and it is engraved. Unfortunately, three of our pages were here last session, and they already have a Legislature book. We didn't want to give them two, so we got them instead I think something appropriate: the coat of arms of the province of Alberta. It is inscribed with a brass plate. This says: many thanks. It has their individual name, the province of Alberta, 22nd Legislature, 1990.

I'll start with our head page, Jannet Nguyen.

MR. SPEAKER: Just a minute, dear.

MR. SHRAKE: Don't run away. I'd like you to open that so everybody could see what . . .

MS NGUYEN: Oh, right now?

MR. SHRAKE: Why not?

MR. SPEAKER: The clock's stopped. Why not?

You have a very nice pen set. In addition, you have the scroll from the Legislative Assembly together with a picture of the group of all pages together with the staff. Okay?

MS NGUYEN: Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I dare you to forget us after all that. Take care.

MR. SHRAKE: Judith Altarejos, Jay Riva-Cambrin, Jill Sheverman, Darya Fustukian, Karen Meagher, Mike Dasilva, Monique Higham, Sumreen Ahmad, Sarah Stemkens.

There are two that unfortunately are not here with us today: Ken Blonski and Susan Dioszeghy. Mr. Speaker, we'll see that they get their gifts.

Thank you, all of you.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the pages is on a French immersion course in Quebec, and the other one has really had to tough it and has gone off to Europe.

Before I entertain the final motion, again I want to say thank you to everyone. I want to say thank you to all the members of

the House for the co-operation that you have given to the Chair – not on all occasions, but I thank you for the co-operation when given to the Chair. I also in particular want to thank the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, also Ron Moore as our second backup quarterback, and the Table officers. But, in particular, I want to say thank you to your staff as well as to mine.

There's one group. Remember when we were here till 10 to 3 in the morning and all those various nights while we set the record for the most days, the most nights, and the longest nights? There is a special thanks that needs to go to the people in *Hansard*, who are usually here about another two hours after everyone else.

I wish you all a safe summer, and I trust I'll see you here again in the fall.

The Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn in accordance with government Motion 18 passed by the Assembly on Friday, June 15.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Let the record show unanimously. The House is accordingly adjourned.

(The House adjourned at 5:37 p.m.)

