

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Monday, June 10, 1991**

2:30 p.m.

Date: 91/06/10

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **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 Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I'd like to file with the Assembly some 1,563 names of petitioners protesting the cutbacks to seniors and demanding the withdrawal of these budget measures. This is a continuation of what I did last week, Mr. Speaker.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file for the information of members opposite four copies of Leviticus, chapter 27, and I would direct their attention to verses 3 through 7.

MR. SPEAKER: It may be appropriate but highly unusual. I'm sure we won't have other parts of the Bible being tabled in the future.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the answer to Written Question 373 and table with the Assembly the biennial review of the Alberta Environmental Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are in the members' gallery today three senior citizens from the Edmonton area accompanied by Ruth Adria, who has spent a good part of her adult life working with and for seniors. I'd like Ruth to stand up as well as her guests, Hazel Johnson, Anna Zielke, and Irene Roberts, and the Legislative Assembly to give them all a warm welcome.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have two groups to introduce to members here today. The first one is a group of 25 students from Oliver school here in downtown Edmonton-Centre. They're with their teachers Bernie Ward, Sharon Fitzsimmons, and Jennifer Taylor. I'm glad they're here, and I'd ask them now to please rise and be welcomed by the members of the Assembly.

Also, Mr. Speaker, from the Jack Bredin Community Institute we have in both the members' and public galleries 75 students who are working at upgrading their skills, together with their teachers Cheryel Goodale, Cathie Olson, Diane Larose, and Jutta Hansen. I'd ask that they now please rise and be welcomed by the members here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce Mrs. Margaret Krips and her daughter Sherida. Mrs. Krips is visiting us from Unity, Saskatchewan. She's been for many years active in the CCF and the NDP. She's here on a holiday, and I'd like to ask her to rise and be greeted by the members this afternoon.

head: **Oral Question Period**

### Conflict of Interest Legislation

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. After the spectacle last year of the Zarusky affair as well as the controversy surrounding the Premier's own gas holdings, this government has finally been dragged kicking and screaming into enacting conflict of interest legislation, legislation that appears to follow the Conservative model of being too late, too loose, and much too weak. I'm sure all members recall the specific situation last year where the Premier got in trouble for only disclosing land descriptions of his oil and gas holdings, a perfect example of disclosure that simply isn't good enough. Let's see how much the Premier has actually learned about conflict of interest. I want to ask the Premier point blank: will the Premier now fully and publicly disclose all of his oil and gas holdings as well as all other holdings he has, including the names of the companies he's dealing with, all direct associates, all partners, and the monetary extent of these holdings, not just the legal description of the land?

MR. GETTY: First of all, why does the hon. member want to refer to the Zarusky affair? There wasn't one; there was no conflict with the hon. Member for Smoky Lake. Then, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get into any trouble with my disclosures. There was no trouble with them. They met all of the disclosure rules, fully disclosed, and that's what I'll continue to always do, as will all of the members of the government.

MR. MARTIN: Well, we see why this government still doesn't understand. They avoid the question, but that's the reality of it, and people understand that full well.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the specific Bill. Obviously there is no disclosure in it. I want to have all members recall the conflict of interest charges against a former federal Conservative cabinet minister Sinclair Stevens, a man whose supposed blind trust turned out to be highly illuminated. I can do no better than to quote Mr. Justice Parker, the justice who led the inquiry into the conflict of interest charges against this Premier's Conservative cousin. He said, and I quote: full public disclosure must be the cornerstone of any conflict of interest legislation. My question is simply this to the Premier: why didn't the government follow this sound advice and demand full public disclosure in the Bill that they brought before this House?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm uncertain why the Leader of the Opposition wants to follow somebody from Ontario's comments. What we did was get the chief judge of the province of Alberta and two other highly respected Albertans, Mr. Frank King, who as members know was the leader in putting on the Calgary Olympics, and then Dr. Walter Buck, who served for so many years here in this Legislature. Now, they made a report, and the report is the foundation for the conflict of interest legislation, which the Attorney General tabled.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reality is that this whole government can just hand in the blind trust again. We still don't know what's going on, and that's not good enough. That's my point: we can still continue to hide from the public private business dealings that could influence the job here. My question to the Premier is simply: when he went to all this trouble, will the Premier explain now to the people of Alberta how they can believe that this government is serious about cleaning up its act when it refuses to come clean and tell them exactly what private interests they have, along with all the relevant details about these interests?

MR. GETTY: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I really question the Leader of the Opposition if he is now saying that the chief judge of Alberta and Mr. King and Dr. Buck were delinquent in their efforts to look at all of the conflict of interest legislation across Canada, some in the United States. They brought us in a 258-page report, I believe it was, which we followed almost entirely in bringing in this legislation. Now to have the hon. member say that when these people, these very outstanding Albertans, make the presentation of their report to us – at our request, by the way; I just remind him that it was the government who asked for this report – somehow things are being hidden, I think is absolute nonsense.

As a matter of fact, there's never been in this Legislative Assembly that I can recall a conflict with the Legislative Assembly Act except the Leader of the Opposition, who as I recall stood and asked the members to let him off on that, which they did because it was a misunderstanding. So don't give us this high and mighty pile of baloney, because what we have here is a report from three distinguished Albertans, the chief judge of the provincial courts. We brought in the details in the legislation, and to now stand in his place and start complaining I think is just political nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question.

MR. MARTIN: The pile of baloney is this exercise in PR that isn't fooling anybody, Mr. Speaker. This is a pile of baloney, and they understand it. This Premier, if he understood anything about conflict of interest, would understand it too.

## 2:40 Openness in Government

MR. MARTIN: My second question to this Premier goes a little further than this. So much for his answers about the new era of openness that we've been promised. Mr. Speaker, conflict of interest legislation is only one component of a comprehensive package of open, honest, and good government, a package that this government has continually refused and continues to refuse to enact. Let's start with freedom of information for Albertans, a glaring necessity best illustrated by this government's refusal, absolute refusal, to reveal the secret agreement it made with its pal Peter Pocklington, an agreement that gave away millions and millions of dollars. To the Premier: when will the Premier bring in freedom of information legislation for Albertans, legislation that allows all Albertans to see exactly how their tax money is being spent?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, of course any member can bring in legislation and convince the House that it should be adopted. That's something that every member has the right to do, and if the hon. member wants to do it, he should proceed that way and

see if he is clever enough and good enough to convince the House.

Having said that, let me just remind the hon. member that the government follows *Beauchesne* and other parliamentary rules by which we provide all the information that is possibly needed and required. The only time that it is not is when it has to do with people's personal private lives or competitiveness. Now, all the freedom of information legislation in Canada also does the same thing. So to hear the hon. member demand certain legislation when we're already meeting all the needs I think is again just tilting at windmills.

MR. MARTIN: Hide, hide, hide. Secrets, secrets, secrets. It's not tilting at windmills, Mr. Speaker. We wouldn't have got into the bamboozles we've been in if we'd had freedom of information. So much for this new openness in government.

Let's look at another accountability issue, Mr. Speaker. Albertans have seen this government for years stuff its bloated foreign offices with loyal Conservative cronies and cram its boards, commissions, and Crown corporations with party bagmen and hacks. My question to the Premier is simply this: when will the Premier bring in legislation that allows all Albertans the opportunity to apply for such positions and that ends the blatant patronage his government has been practising so heavily since it took office?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it must have been the member's association with other members of the NDP over the past few days that has caused him to come back here and start calling Albertans names like that. I mean, what kind of nonsense is it that he has the right to somehow call fine, outstanding Albertans those kinds of names?

What the government does is make sure that in the appointments they are required to make – and I point out: required to make. I mean, we must fill these appointments. Those appointments are filled by the best people that the government can obtain for the job.

MR. MARTIN: That is really the biggest joke I've heard in the Legislature. If you've got a Tory card – there must be a couple that haven't been hired so far, Mr. Speaker. Are there a couple more? No to that again.

Let's try one more thing about good government, and it has to do with this government's secret deals with its friends behind closed doors. We've seen, for example, this government's loan guarantee fiasco blow up in its face. I'm talking about the export loan guarantee program, which is behind closed doors and, as the minister of culture says, it's by who you know: if you're a good Tory, you get it. My question to the Premier is simply this: when will the Premier bring in legislation that requires full public disclosure of all loans and loan guarantee recipients so that Albertans and the business community can know who's getting public money and who is not?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is having a bad day, because what he's done is dredge up all the old questions he's already asked. I guess he went away for a little break and decided that he'd ask them all again. We've dealt with them so many times in the Legislature. The hon. Leader of the Opposition should know – and the Minister of Economic Development and Trade may want to straighten him out again – that this program is one that helps. It is a program that people fit, and when they fit the program, it automatically supports the request for export guarantees. It

has helped small and big companies all over Alberta. It supports them in exporting their products throughout the world, and it is strongly supported by Albertans.

It is true that in some of these loans, obviously there's a competitive feature, and these people would not want their competitive dealings to be made public, because these are things that make them able to compete against others. It's been accepted in parliaments from time immemorial that those kinds of things are not disclosed in the Legislature. Now, for the Leader of the Opposition to suddenly start saying that he is going to demand this, I think again he's just coming up with nonsense. It is fully understood in *Beauchesne* and in all parliaments that this kind of information is not disclosed.

MR. MARTIN: An honest government is nonsense, isn't it, Don.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You've had your questions.

Now we'll hear from Edmonton-Meadowlark on behalf of the Liberal Party.

### Global Warming

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A soon to be published study by Environment Canada predicts that global warming could have a significant and serious effect on soil moisture and therefore on prairie agriculture as early as the middle of the next century. In fact, Stewart Cohen, a climatologist with Environment Canada who wrote the report, went on to say that agricultural drought may be an increasing problem in the future as a result of global warming. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder whether the minister could tell us what he has concluded himself about global warming and what kind of discussions he's had with the Minister of Energy to address this problem?

MR. ISLEY: As I've stated in the House before, Mr. Speaker, we're watching this with a great degree of interest. The signs related to global warming and its impact on agriculture is sending out a variety of mixed signals, and we're assessing the various signals.

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah; I guess the rhetorical question would be: how long are they going to watch, Mr. Speaker?

My second question is to the Premier. I wonder whether the Premier could tell us what he personally has concluded about global warming and why his government has not undertaken to provide real leadership in the areas of electrical energy conservation, enhanced fuel efficiency for automobiles, alternative energy sources, and alternative modes of transportation?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess there was more than one question in the member's presentation there. We are doing all of those things. I find it remarkable that the member's talking about drought in Alberta's agriculture. If he'd get out of Edmonton, he'd find out that the province has got tremendous stores of moisture, that all over the province is turning green and healthy and strong this spring in agriculture.

MR. MITCHELL: It's a common mistake, Mr. Speaker, to believe that tomorrow will look exactly like today looks. If this Premier would understand the effects and the potential effects of global warming, he wouldn't be smiling in his chair today,

laughing about the potential effects of that. There won't even be enough water to half fill Buffalo Lake.

My third question is to the Minister of the Environment. What, I wonder, has the minister concluded about global warming, and why hasn't he undertaken specific measures to require that CFCs from discarded refrigerators and discarded air conditioning units are trapped and collected so they don't escape into the atmosphere and contribute further to global warming?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know where this hon. member has been for the last year as probably the most extensive studies to be undertaken anywhere in the country have been taking place throughout this province through the clean air strategy that has been developed through the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of the Environment, good-thinking people traveling the province to get input into the kinds of things that this province needs to do to make a reasonable contribution to the reduction of those gases that contribute to not only the greenhouse effect, global warming, but depletion of ozone. In addition to that, there are national protocols that we have entered into relative to a decrease in automobile emissions by 50 percent by the year 1995. We have entered into protocols relative to the decrease in packaging and waste by 50 percent by the year 2000. So there are numerous protocols that we have entered into. There are numerous public consultation programs now under way. The hon. member should take the time, get out from under the dome, attend some of these meetings, express his concerns in those forums, and once we get all that evidence in, we will make some reasonable, sound decisions.

### Speaker's Ruling Seeking Opinions

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recommends to Edmonton-Meadowlark *Beauchesne* 409(3). The first part of both of the first two questions was seeking an opinion, and that's not appropriate for question period. [interjections] Thank you very much. You can read the Blues as well as anybody else.

The Member for Clover Bar.

### 2:50 Waste Management for Edmonton Region

MR. GESELL: The departments of Municipal Affairs and Environment have been assisting municipal representatives to try to find a solution to the regional waste disposal difficulties that we have in the metropolitan area. Would either of the ministers update this Assembly about how close to a solution we are?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, just to share the responsibilities of an answer today, I would like to bring the Assembly up to date with regards to a partnership that has emerged over the last few months between the city of Edmonton and the adjacent municipalities. During this period of time the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs is cochairing, along with the Deputy Minister of the Environment, a committee that involves a political group and, as well, a technical group looking at the various aspects that are necessary to bring about a regional waste management authority. There has been significant progress, firstly, in terms of determining the alternatives that are available. Secondly, we are now looking at the various aspects by which this responsibility can be shared.

I want to offer my congratulations in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to those municipalities that have made a very significant attempt to bring about a successful conclusion to this major challenge that's facing Edmonton and regional area.

MR. GESELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the constituents of Clover Bar and I personally believe that searching for a landfill is no longer searching for a solution. Now, is this regional committee or task force looking for a management solution, or are they looking for a dump, if I believe the media reports?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, no, we aren't looking for a dump; we're looking for a comprehensive waste management solution. It's something that certainly hasn't been tried in this province involving a major city like the city of Edmonton. It's being attempted in other jurisdictions across the country; i.e., the metropolitan region of Toronto. It's a very, very difficult situation to deal with, because in this case we have had to bring 19 municipal jurisdictions together to look at the various kinds of technologies that might be used to handle waste in the Edmonton region. I think the main point to consider here is that this government has been successful – Municipal Affairs and Environment – in bringing these municipalities together, in getting from these municipalities a resolve that a regional solution is the best way to go, and these communities will be working together to find a comprehensive regional solution to the very critical waste management problem that exists in the Edmonton region.

#### **Disabled Persons Programs**

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Associate Minister of Family and Social Services. The government report *Claiming My Future* supports people with disabilities living in the community and states, and I quote, "Support and services must be developed from an individual's needs and abilities." Despite this claim, this government has established a maximum of \$3,000 a month for personal support for people with a disability regardless of that person's needs. My question to the associate minister: why has the associate minister put in place a policy that is directly contrary to the government's purported commitment to community living and which prohibits many people with a disability from moving into the community?

MR. BRASSARD: Mr. Speaker, the policy we have put in place to integrate persons with disabilities in this province is not contrary to the intent of the report that was read out. In fact, it's very consistent with that report.

MS MJOLSNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's just absolutely ridiculous. Many people with a disability need more than \$3,000 a month to live in the community. Surely the associate minister understands that. I would ask him: would the associate minister now agree to change this policy and provide for individualized funding based on the real needs of the people that are trying to move out into the community?

MR. BRASSARD: Mr. Speaker, we have in place in this province individualized funding based on the specific needs of the individual, and it's working very well. I might add that at the moment there are at least 400 people living in institutions who have applied to move into the community, and their needs are being evaluated and assessed. That doesn't indicate to me that the program isn't working; quite the contrary. I'm very proud of what we are doing and the strides that we have made for persons with disabilities in this province, and we will continue to move forward.

#### **Worksite Safety**

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, workers throughout Alberta are very vocal, and rightfully so, over occupational hazards that affect their health and well-being. A recent situation involves the now-closed plant of General Ordnance in Raymond, Alberta. The former quality assurance manager was tested at elevated levels of lead in the blood well above the dangerous point. I do not understand how such an unhealthy working environment was tolerated by the department of Occupational Health and Safety. To the minister: will the minister explain why such little regard was demonstrated for workers at that plant?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have little regard for workers in any plant in the province of Alberta. I'm not aware as of today of the circumstances that are being raised, but if the hon. member has more material for me, I'd be glad to look at it. Occupational Health and Safety investigates these concerns quite quickly, making sure that the health and safety of workers is foremost in our policy. So if the hon. member has something for me, I'd be glad to get it.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do. I'll send him over some information so he's aware of what's happening when it comes to working conditions for Albertans throughout this province.

Secondly, to the minister: will the minister inform this House as to when he intends to beef up inspections to ensure that working people of Alberta have the protection they deserve?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has some specifics about safety in the workplace, I'd be glad to get it. I've been touring the province quite dramatically and visiting worksites, and I don't get that reading from the workers or the employers. So when he says have safety for workers, that's exactly what we're doing. I'm doing my utmost in conjunction with Occupational Health and Safety and the Workers' Compensation Board to provide safety in the workplace in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

#### **Alberta Wildlife Park**

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks. There seems to be a lot of confusion in regards to the \$125,000 that Mrs. Helen Ridgeway donated to the Alberta Wildlife Park. Some say that the government was involved. My question to the hon. minister is: what are the facts in regards to this donation?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, the question relates to some of the news items today in which there's been innuendo stating that the government was involved back in the days when Mrs. Ridgeway donated some of her life savings to the development of Aunt Helen's petting area at the Alberta Wildlife Park. In and around the years of 1978 to 1979 Mrs. Ridgeway donated upwards of \$120,000 to \$125,000 of her savings to the private sector, to individuals who were operating and developing an area, a collection of animals, who had stated to her that they would set up Helen's children's farm. Mr. Cochrane and Mr. Jerram at the time were developing a park that later became the Alberta Wildlife Park and was established under a foundation after they had declared that they could no longer financially operate their private-sector development. Mrs. Ridgeway had donated her some \$120,000 to the private-sector operators to

establish an area in their park, not a government park, called Aunt Helen's children's farm.

**3:00**

The other day I approached Mrs. Ridgeway and said that the government would set up an endowment in trust through the Alberta Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation to transfer funds in her name to the establishment in perpetuity of Aunt Helen's petting area. She said she would not accept the endowment unless the park stayed exactly where it was. Therefore, at the present time the offer of the government has been directed to Mrs. Ridgeway in recognition of her commitment to the Alberta Wildlife Park and Aunt Helen's petting area, but if the park finds another destiny, Mrs. Ridgeway has stated that she would not accept this endowment.

**MR. CARDINAL:** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, my supplement is to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Utilities. The Lily Lake road has created some confusion also as to its use and future use. It has been reported that the Wildlife Park is being closed to accommodate a dangerous goods route through that area. Could the minister clarify this issue with this Assembly?

**MR. KOWALSKI:** Mr. Speaker, any such allegation to that effect is absolute and utter nonsense. The Lily Lake road is secondary road 651. It essentially goes from Highway 28 to Highway 33. It goes through three municipalities: the MD of Sturgeon, the MD of Westlock, and the county of Barrhead. This route has been a road in place for decades. Upgrading has been going on along secondary road 651 for years. Work is under way right now on 651 in the county of Barrhead. Recently when the MD of Sturgeon wanted to look at upgrading an alignment that had been in place for decades, they approached Alberta Transportation and Utilities, and we provided them with a grant of \$38,500 to do a feasibility study that was to also include an environmental impact assessment for the section around Lily Lake road. It's a connector between Highway 28 and Highway 33. The alignment has been in place for decades, and it's absolute, utter nonsense to suggest that anything dealing with the Wildlife Park or any upgrading on secondary road 651 has anything to do with the designation of a dangerous or special waste transportation route.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Edmonton-Jasper Place.

#### **Landfill Pollution**

**MR. McINNIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Golder Associates was hired by Alberta Environment to investigate the creosote blob in the city of Calgary. There's now some evidence that this blob may have extended from the south shore, where the plant was located, to the north shore, into the residential area of Hillhurst. In addition, some of the former employees at the plant have told Golder Associates that creosote-soaked sawdust was dumped into the former city landfill at Tom Campbell's Hill. Will the Minister of the Environment admit that the creosote contamination in Calgary is well beyond the area studied by Golder Associates, and will he state what he is doing to secure a timely cleanup of all the creosote contamination in Calgary?

**MR. KLEIN:** Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. member this assurance: we're doing virtually everything we can to deal with a tremendously difficult situation, a situation that was brought about through environmental ignorance and a lack of laws 60, 70 years ago. This was a family-run operation.

We're dealing with a very volatile substance here. It's a substance that is very, very hard to corral, to bring together. It's much like mercury: if it's disturbed, it spreads very, very easily. So we've set out a program.

**MR. TAYLOR:** Sounds like our environment.

**MR. KLEIN:** Nick, you'd be interested in this because you're interested in all things that are slippery and slimy. [interjections]

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

**MR. KLEIN:** I'm sorry. I take that back, Mr. Speaker.

That involves a program, first of all, to identify where this stuff is migrating – it has more moves than a stepped on snake; believe me – secondly, to contain the substance, and the department has done a tremendous job in containing the substance, and thirdly, to identify the kind of technology that is going to be required to decontaminate this site.

**MR. McINNIS:** Well, speaking of being slippery, that answer sounded to me like more studies than anything else.

There is a study in the case of the original site which says that the cost is \$56 million to clean it up, and then you have these two other areas that I've just mentioned. The province has a total of \$3 million budgeted under the groundwater protection program, which covers this site, the two others, and 12 others around the province. I would like the minister to indicate, if he would, in view of all the toxic sites that exist in the province, how and when he's going to secure adequate funding to clean up the mess.

**MR. KLEIN:** Once we have identified the kind of engineering that is going to be required to decontaminate these sites, then it will be a matter of putting in place a program to deal with the situation, but we're going to have to do it on a priority basis. This site, the Canada Creosoting site on the banks of the Bow River, has been identified as the number one priority because it's in an area where it has the potential of impacting a very, very large population. So we have said that this is the priority site. Once again, we need to get a full identification of how this stuff is moving. It's starting to show up in different places. Secondly, we have in place a program of containment, and that program is working. Thirdly, we need to identify the right kind of engineering to decontaminate the site.

I think the fundamental point here, Mr. Speaker, is that this was the first province and is probably the only province to have a program in place to identify contaminated sites. In other words, we aren't like a lot of other jurisdictions: we aren't sticking our heads in the sand and saying that we don't want to know about these sites. Believe me; there are jurisdictions throughout this country where they don't want to know about the contamination because the cost of addressing it and cleaning it up is going to be a lot. This government at least has the courage to identify the site and put in place programs to do something about it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Calgary-McKnight.

#### **Advanced Education Demand**

**MRS. GAGNON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Calgary's postsecondary institutions have been decimated by the failed priorities of this government. In addition to reductions in

student spaces and staff positions, SAIT and Mount Royal College have canceled a total of seven academic programs while an additional two programs at Mount Royal College have been suspended and the college's co-operative education program option in four programs has been canceled. To the Minister of Advanced Education: with Calgary institutions taking the brunt of this government's dismantling of Alberta's advanced education community, is the minister merely ignoring the crisis or is he promoting it?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the postsecondary system, which is funded amongst the highest in the nation, is no different from any other group or department in Alberta: they must learn to live within their means. My view is that we have perhaps the highest number attending our postsecondary system. I readily concede that they are facing some degree of problem with regard to access to the system. However, this government and, I think, the taxpayers of Alberta expect that their postsecondary system, which sets their own admission standards, sets their own programs, is responsible for responding to the needs of these students.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, the institutions are caught in a real squeeze; that is, inadequate funding by this province. At Mount Royal College they already have 400 more applications as of June 4 than the total number submitted last year at the end of August. Does the minister feel that this is acceptable? Calgarians do not.

3:10

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, Mount Royal College has a very proud record in the postsecondary system. There have been a variety of suggestions as to how they could accommodate more students. I don't think we should at first blush accept the principle that there's an overwhelming number, because we do know there is a multiple registering system in the province.

I want the hon. member and other members to be aware that I am concerned about the increasing demand on the postsecondary system. However, I'm confident that the institutions, in the spirit of co-operation, if they continue to work the way they're working, will probably resolve the problem with regard to access to our postsecondary system.

MRS. GAGNON: Why not a central registry?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You did get to ask your questions. I'm sure you can count to two. Thank you.

Calgary-Bow.

#### **Landfill Pollution** (continued)

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Minister, several of my constituents have expressed concern about the finding of three new deposits of creosote in this fine residential area. As this area is directly north of the old Canada Creosoting plant, which Alberta Environment currently has under investigation and control, there is some concern with regards to the health hazards from these deposits. Can the minister give assurance to the constituents of Calgary-Bow that there are no health hazards from these deposits?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, we haven't been working in isolation on this project. We have been working also with the Calgary

board of health and have been keeping the board of health and the city of Calgary and the communities downstream advised on the ongoing situation relative to the Canada Creosoting site. The pool that was found on the north side of the river is a small pool, but it does indicate that this substance is moving in strange and mysterious ways.

I am being told by my department and the board of health and all the other officials involved in dealing with this problem that with proper containment – and that containment is taking place – there is no danger to health.

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Minister, my supplemental is: is there a plan in place for a more extensive exploration of the north shore in the Calgary-Bow constituency to try and determine a little better the magnitude of the spread of these deposits?

MR. KLEIN: Very basically, Mr. Speaker, it's all part of the ongoing investigation. Again I have to reiterate that this substance, this creosote, is very volatile and has tremendous viscosity, and it's able to move in very, very strange ways. It's like an insidious cancer. It's a matter of getting a handle on how this stuff is moving, the ways in which it's migrating, and once that has been identified, coming to grips with the kind of engineering – and it's going to have to be very specialized engineering – that is going to be used to clean it up.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

#### **Midwifery**

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Solicitor General. We look forward to the release of the Health Disciplines Board's report on midwifery and the establishment of an implementation committee to facilitate the legalization of midwifery in Alberta and to provide for proper standards and monitoring to ensure that Alberta women and their babies receive quality care. Meanwhile, Alberta midwives will continue to be subject to court actions which apply inappropriate tests to their actions, such as the test as to whether it is the practice of medicine without a licence. My question to the Solicitor General: what assurances can the minister give that the implementation committee will have a clear mandate and time line that will permit the introduction of legislation in the 1992 spring session?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, it's fully the intention that the legislation, if we are to proceed with it, will in fact proceed in 1992. The Health Disciplines Board has done an outstanding job of preparing the report, which will in fact be filed in this Legislature very, very shortly, and very shortly thereafter an implementation advisory committee will be struck. They will proceed with receiving the necessary and further input from the province, and all members of the Legislative Assembly will then have the report in their hands and also be able to respond to it. It is not the intention of this government to delay any legislation any longer than is absolutely necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly there are major concerns that there will be a delay.

My second question is: inasmuch as the Health Disciplines Board and the Advisory Council on Women's Issues have already had considerable input from the public, midwives, and

other health professionals, will the minister commit that this committee will translate their findings into legislation and regulations that meet the needs of all Alberta women, including those from native and cultural minority groups?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I guess if there is an ethnic component to this whole matter, I have not been adequately advised on it at this particular point. I was of the view that we were dealing mainly with a birthing method which is hopefully acceptable to the general public but is most definitely a health issue. It is our intent to continue to deal with that. Certainly I understand it to be a women's issue, but where the ethnicity of it falls, I am at a bit of a loss.

#### **Aids to Daily Living Program**

REV. ROBERTS: As the Minister of Health knows, the emphasis for health services these days is drastically shifting from the institutional to the community setting, from acute care needs to chronic care needs. Mr. Speaker, together with home care, the Aids to Daily Living program should be the one that expands coverage for Albertans, many of whom are chronically ill, terminally ill, or living with physical disabilities in the community. Yet because of recent government decisions, over 200 low-cost supplies for these Albertans will no longer be as available to them, will be restricted as of July 1. Will the Minister of Health explain why back supports, for instance, for people who are in chronic, severe back pain are being reduced from two supports to only one per year and why vendors throughout the province are already, before July 1, allowing sufferers only one of these supports, not the two that they are entitled to under this fiscal year?

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly look into the contention in the member's question that there's been an advance of the effective date for the changes that we've put in place.

With respect to the first part of the question, which was really about the issue of adding some benefits and taking some off the general list, those which were taken off are those which could be covered at a cost of under \$150 per year to the client; hence the low-cost aids. At the same time, as opposed to it being a program that simply took away things, there were major additions to the program such as those we've already discussed in the House, like power wheelchairs and ventilators and suction therapy, but also low vision aids, diabetic supplies through the Canadian Diabetes Association, ostomy supplies, and catheter supplies, which were not formerly covered under the program.

With respect to the contention in the hon. member's question that someone's jumping the gun, I'll certainly check into that for the hon. member.

REV. ROBERTS: I'll send her the letters from the vendors.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that you don't cut back on services when you're trying to expand a program overall. One of the more insensitive moves, and I think the costs are well over \$150 a year, is the minister cutting by half incontinence supplies, such as diapers and catheters, for Albertans who are incontinent. Now, despite the minister's earlier contention that catheters can be recycled and reused, what evidence does the minister have to demonstrate that she has actually consulted with Albertans who are incontinent to know that it is a wise move to reduce their incontinence supplies and that the increased hygiene now

necessary will be attended to before these reductions are implemented?

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, we certainly consulted very broadly with the medial advisory committee that heads up the Aids to Daily Living program, including urologists who are part of that consultative process. The clean catheterization method, as I've explained in this House, is one that's been used in other jurisdictions extensively, and part of our interest was to ensure that we were not promoting the use of throwaway products if we could in fact promote the use of reusable products.

The hon. member underestimates and in fact undervalues the increases we have provided to the Aids to Daily Living program this year. If he will look at the estimates for the program last year, he'll find that the total expended was about \$48 million, and it was a rate of growth that was running between 10 and 15 percent on the total program year over year. We have in fact increased the budget for Aids to Daily Living this year to \$60 million, as it appears in the Budget Address, in order that we are able to fund more contemporary, more highly technological supplies while at the same time asking that those supplies which could be provided for under \$150 a year would be taken off the list. I think it's a fair assessment of real needs in order to support community living for those people who need it most. Remember that the cost sharing is only to \$500. Any Albertan who needs more cost sharing than that has their bill totally covered by the province of Alberta.

3:20

MR. SPEAKER: Question period has expired; however, the Minister of Advanced Education wishes to reply to a previous question period, questions raised by Edmonton-Beverly.

The minister first, please.

#### **Advanced Education for Seniors**

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Friday last the Associate Minister of Family and Social Services took notice of a question from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly with regard to the seniors' program at our postsecondary institutions. As members may recall, it was about April 8 or April 9 when I indicated to the Committee of Supply the reduction in the program of some \$123,000.

I want to point out in response to the hon. member that for the seniors' program at the U of A, seniors are aged 60 and not 65, and the registration fee of \$25, which the hon. member was asking about, covers as many courses as the senior wishes to take. The actual cost is \$150 per course. The courses are noncredit. They're such things as life-style, the beginning writer, share your story, drive 55-plus, and so on. My department supported that for some 15 or 16 years. The recent grant of some \$30,000 was to cover administrative costs. It's obvious to most that the U of A has provided the majority of the subsidization. We have the further education councils, some 85 of them, community education really, which I think fall within that bailiwick.

Mr. Speaker, my priorities as minister are to see that Albertans are trained and educated. In all good conscience I really can't continue to afford subsidization of this program. It seems to me that in hindsight, because the accommodation charge of \$55 costs \$850, those fees should have been adjusted over the years. I met with some seniors recently here in my office, and I suggested to them a course of action they should consider. I appreciate their suggestion of raising their own tuition fees.

However, I do think the further education councils probably would have a role to play with these future programs.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the response from the minister.

The seniors are in fact prepared to make a contribution. They're prepared to pay some for this educational program. My question again is to the minister, as I asked in my second question: would the minister care to look more closely or more precisely at what grants pay for and whether there are areas within the program where in fact he could make some adjustments? Instead of what will the seniors pay, what can he make up to allow seniors, particularly from rural areas, to be able to access this program?

MR. GOGO: With regard to these seniors, I want to ensure that the hon. member heard me right. The U of A has said that seniors, by their definition, are aged 60. That presents, I think, a bit of a dilemma. The \$30,000 that my department has been contributing has gone towards administrative costs. Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to commit the department to continuing this, because in the matter of priorities my concern has to be with the student in the credit program. So at this time I'm not prepared – I'm always open to suggestions and recommendations. I'll take the advice of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly on behalf of his and other constituents into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

#### **Point of Order Seeking Opinions**

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in response to your mention earlier today with reference to section 409(3) of *Beauchesne* where you indicated that my question might have been inappropriate because I was apparently seeking an opinion. I appreciate that an opposition questioner and a Speaker will probably never agree on the interpretation of a section of this nature; however, I would like to point out to the Speaker, with all due respect, that in fact I was careful not to ask for an opinion but instead asked explicitly for the minister's, the Premier's conclusions with respect to global warming. I would hope, as most Albertans would, that conclusions on an important issue of this nature wouldn't be based on opinion at all but would instead be based upon fact and empirical evidence. To suggest otherwise is to suggest that in fact the Premier and his ministers would draw conclusions on something as important as global warming on the basis of their opinions. Most of us, and certainly I would expect all Albertans, would hope otherwise. Surely ministers and the Premier of this government would conclude on the basis of fact and empirical evidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, hon. member, I'm sorry to have to quote *Beauchesne* back to you. *Beauchesne* is indeed the rules of this House. All hon. members are supposed to be as knowledgeable of it as some of the rest of us are, and the hon. member has been here long enough that that admonition applies to yourself.

There are plenty of other things in terms of oral questions, both in the questions and the answers, which are violated on

almost a daily basis, and one can only hope to try to bring things to the attention of the members when they occur. I believe the Chair was courteous enough that it waited until the end of your three questions today. You were not interrupted; you were not forbidden to ask your question, hon. member.

I am only too happy now to quote back to you what the seeking of the opinion was in your first question: "I wonder whether the minister could tell us what he has concluded himself." That's seeking an opinion. In the second question, "I wonder whether the Premier could tell us what he personally has concluded about global warming." That's seeking an opinion.

MR. MITCHELL: That's a conclusion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member, you're asking for an opinion.

Now, the second part, if you care to examine the Blues . . .

MR. TAYLOR: You're redoing the English language.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. You have no part in this.

MR. TAYLOR: I just wondered where you got . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: Threaten me again.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you again.

Now, Edmonton-Meadowlark, when you do take the time to examine the Blues, you will see that you did then go on and ask a second question within both the first and second questions which then allowed the matter to proceed. I'm sorry that you feel so hard done by to be gently admonished by the Chair that your questions were indeed out of order in their first sections.

MR. MITCHELL: I just made a point that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. [interjection] Thank you, hon. member. [interjection] Order please.

head:

#### **Orders of the Day**

head:

#### **Government Bills and Orders**

head:

#### **Second Reading**

#### **Bill 35**

#### **Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act**

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured and feel very privileged to stand to defend second reading of Bill 35, the Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act, because of our Premier's commitment to dealing as effectively as we possibly can with the issue of substance abuse and its effect on family life in Alberta. I believe Bill 35 strikes the balance of ensuring that we do exactly that, and that is to find some solutions, to explore some new alternatives while not duplicating efforts being made in other areas.

I want to raise five points in my discussion with respect to Bill 35. The first is to focus on the objects of the foundation, and I think it's important to read into the record what those objects are as identified in the Bill. They are really the issue of



identifying new and innovative approaches to the issue of substance abuse and its effect on families, and they are specifically defined in the Act as

- (a) the development and the evaluation of new educational and public awareness programs on family life and substance abuse,
- (b) the development and evaluation of new methods for the treatment of substance abuse,
- (c) innovative basic and applied research projects on the relationship between family life and substance abuse and other innovative studies in the field of substance abuse,
- (d) the evaluation of proposed and current programs relating to family life and substance abuse, and
- (e) the development of an information base on family life and substance abuse in Alberta.

### 3:30

Those objects were very carefully considered as we drafted the Bill, because I think one of the things that we have to look at in the issue of substance abuse is the whole vicious circle that is created by substance abuse and its effect on the family. One of the things that research has not identified, in spite of some effort being done worldwide on the issue, is to define that vicious circle and to define which came first, the dysfunctional family or the substance abuse. Hence, we enter the downward spiral of its impact on family. I think it's exceedingly important that we look at the issue in Alberta, and I think we're very fortunate in Alberta to have the resource of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. What could be a better use of those heritage fund dollars than to get some kind of handle and hopefully some kind of effect of this phenomenon on our families?

The second point is with respect to the powers of the foundation identified in section 5 of the Bill. Those are certainly to

make grants and awards on any condition that the Foundation considers appropriate to any person or organization for a purpose consistent with the objects of the Foundation.

That means that the board of governors of the foundation will be looking at proposals that will be suggested by many groups across Alberta as we try and get some kind of control and handle on this issue. I think it's important to emphasize that the powers identified in the Bill do not include the operation of programs directly. There are many agencies, both governmental and nongovernmental, who we believe are the best operators of programs in the province. The whole purpose of the foundation is research and innovation in order that we can ensure that we're doing the most we can for Albertans on this issue.

The third issue I'd like to address is the one with respect to the concern that Albertans expressed provincewide as we went out with the ministerial advisory committee headed by Doug Cherry, the MLA for Lloydminster, the very conscious concern Albertans had that we not overlap or duplicate programs that were already in place, like AADAC. Let's look at the issue of AADAC, because there were other issues of overlap but I think AADAC was the strongest. I'll address the others in a moment.

[Mr. Moore in the Chair]

With respect to AADAC, AADAC's primary focus is really in-service delivery, and as such it operates a very comprehensive network of prevention and treatment programs. Prevention programs include public education and education directed at professional groups specifically. AADAC's basic belief is that in order to reduce substance abuse, we must focus on the individual and his or her environment. They recognize the role that families can play in supporting the development and

maintenance of a healthy, drug-free life-style. This is really the issue of AADAC, where AADAC has attempted, very effectively I think, when they are treating someone who has a substance abuse problem to involve the family and the friends of that person in that treatment as well. That's a very important part of the success of AADAC's work. Quoting from the AADAC submission to the ministerial advisory committee that went out and consulted with Albertans:

Success in achieving a healthy lifestyle, from our perspective . . . This is AADAC's.

. . . results from an optimal blend of individual capacity and effort, a supportive family and community and economic security.

Clearly influencing all these factors is well beyond the mandate and resources of AADAC.

AADAC doesn't carry out or fund research. As well, there is a need, I believe – and we've seen it identified in the object of the foundation under section 3(d) – to evaluate current and new or proposed approaches to treating substance abuse. I don't think in the '90s in terms of public policy development we can continue to be content with simply saying that we've always done it this way, or this is what has always worked, and therefore that is a reason for continuing it into the '90s and the 21st century. I think we have to instead be very disciplined in our approach and say: what are the evaluative tools; how effective has this program been; is there a better way to use this resource than the way we've always done it? That is part of the role and the purpose of the foundation.

Should it be an AADAC-only research arm? We contemplated this carefully before recommending this Bill to the Legislature and made a very conscious decision that it wouldn't just be an AADAC research arm, but rather it would be a research arm on substance abuse and family life. It may well be that there are other agencies throughout this province who may have some very important suggestions to make in terms of research that could be funded to this research arm. That was what we wanted to encourage and support by setting the foundation up quasi separately from AADAC.

However, I would remind all hon. members that part of the legislation mandates that at least one member of AADAC must be part of the foundation board in order that we can ensure that there isn't a duplication and that AADAC knows what the foundation is doing and the foundation knows what AADAC is doing. But to limit it to AADAC only I think would have been a disservice to the kinds of innovative proposals that we hope will come forward to the foundation itself.

The second concern that's been identified was the one on the Premier's council on the family. The terms of reference for the council are certainly well documented, and members are well aware of how these could impact on this research arm. It would be my intention, as the minister responsible once the Bill goes into effect, to include a member of the Premier's Council in Support of Alberta Families on the foundation board. The reason why it's not mandated in the same way in the legislation as an AADAC board member is because the Premier's council is established by ministerial order and we couldn't reference same in the legislation. But I just wanted all hon. members to know that I will be including one of the people from the council on the family on the foundation board when it's up and running. Indeed, there may be areas that the Premier's council on families can identify which they feel from their research need to be looked at as a potential for funding for research under the foundation.

The fourth point I wanted to make was with respect to the direction by the minister, which is in section 6 of the Act, which,

as members will note, permits the minister to ensure that the work of the foundation is co-ordinated with that of existing agencies. That again is in our very conscious effort to ensure there is not a duplication of effort or a duplication, worse, of government resources towards this issue. Certainly it will permit the minister to ask the foundation to establish some goals and approaches designed to ensure that the problems are addressed in an appropriate and a co-ordinated fashion over time, not just to focus on what may be seen as quick fixes or simple solutions to what are in fact extremely complex issues. The direction by the minister is meant to ensure co-ordination and to ensure that our efforts both public and private, as much as we can control the private side, are working towards the goal of improved health for Alberta families specifically as it is affected by substance abuse.

Fifthly, I wanted to point out the recent research by the Canadian institute for applied research, which is pointing to the importance of coping skills for improvements in health. Therefore, broad health goals need to be related to improving coping skills for individuals and families and communities. This is nowhere more evidently needed than in those families where there is an issue with respect to substance abuse. It is fine to say to a child or a young person, "You've just got to accept that your parent has a substance abuse problem," or your sister or your brother or whatever, but we have to look at what kinds of skills we can give to those young people in order that they can find some peace within that family relationship and yet deal with the reality of a substance abuse problem within that relationship.

There are many ways that we can support initiatives being done by private groups, but I think it should be one of the goals of the foundation itself that it will be a possible area of research that can be sponsored by the foundation, particularly as it relates to substance abuse. Really, the whole issue of health goals and setting some health targets for ourselves is something that the Rainbow Report pointed us in the direction of as we looked to health in the '90s and how we can ensure that we're doing things in a healthy way for Albertans and that Albertans are choosing healthy kinds of life-styles.

Those would be my opening remarks with respect to second reading on the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to the discussion that follows.

**3:40**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Vegreville?

The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you . . .

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

MS M. LAING: Thank you.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, was I recognized?

MS M. LAING: Well, I think he looked at Vegreville instead of Edmonton-Avonmore.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, please.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise to speak against this Bill. I would raise two general issues. The first is

the taking of money from the heritage trust fund in the way that it seems to be taken in this context; that is, without debate in the Legislature. Each time we take money from the heritage trust fund to put into a particular project, it means that we lose the benefit that that fund was set up to create and to give. We have long had concerns about money being taken from the trust fund to fund special projects that may be of special interest to a particular member or the Premier. So I have to be concerned about the process in which this money was taken from the fund to establish this foundation. That is number one, my first concern.

Mr. Speaker, my second concern arises around what I consider duplication. As the minister has noted, we already have AADAC and we have the Premier's council on the family. Now, I would note that the committee that recommended the establishment of this foundation in fact had to be educated by members from AADAC. In their report to the minister they have stated, and I would quote page 2:

Alberta is already internationally recognized for the excellence of the substance abuse treatment and prevention programs delivered by the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission.

The minister has said that in fact this foundation would deal with things that AADAC does not deal with. I would like to now read into the record the objects of AADAC, the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission.

The objects of the Commission are as follows:

(a) to operate programs for the prevention or treatment of alcohol and drug abuse.

That the minister has acknowledged.

(b) to conduct studies and research into and investigate alcohol and drug abuse or matters relating to alcohol and drug abuse;

(c) to provide financial and other assistance to persons conducting programs for the prevention or treatment of alcohol and drug abuse;

(d) to provide financial and other assistance to persons conducting studies and research into and investigating alcohol and drug abuse or matters relating to alcohol and drug abuse.

The second item under Objects is:

The Commission's objects are declared to be public and governmental.

So, in fact, AADAC already has the mandate. What it has not had is the funding.

Coexistent with that we have the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Foundation. Mr. Speaker, it has been in existence for nearly 20 years.

The objects of the Foundation are

(a) to provide financial assistance to universities in Alberta for the maintenance of one or more chairs for research into and education in respect of alcoholism and drug abuse;

(b) to make grants to any person or organization engaged in research into and education in respect of alcoholism and drug abuse;

(c) to solicit and accept gifts of real or personal property for the purpose of carrying out the objects specified in clauses (a) and (b); [and]

(d) to hold real or personal property, subject to any trust conditions, for the purpose of fostering and supporting research into and education in respect of alcoholism and drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Foundation Act at one time had a board, which has been inoperative for the last 16 years.

With these two Acts we have all of the legislation necessary to do what this new foundation would do. What we need to do – and I'm not even suggesting that we reactivate the Alcoholism

and Drug Abuse Foundation Act, although it must be repealed by this new legislation – if we are committed to funding alcoholism, drug abuse treatment, prevention, innovation, is give those funds to AADAC. They have a proven track record.

The problem as I see it is that this foundation narrows the focus to family life. I would note again from the study *A View to the Future*: "The problems of substance abuse and other family issues are [indeed] complex." That is on page 2. Mr. Speaker, they're not only complex; they're interrelated. Indeed, research indicates that significant numbers of people who have difficulties with substance abuse come from families in which they were witnesses to or targets of physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse. So I am concerned about how this will work. I'm deeply concerned that there will be a failure to acknowledge that some family life may be conducive to the development of substance abuse problems and that it's other than substance abuse in the family – there are other kinds of problems that give rise to substance abuse in family members, especially in children – and that that, too, has an intergenerational process. We have to be concerned that this will be too narrow a focus.

I would hold that AADAC in providing treatment does and must address the issue of the reality of the relationship between family life and substance abuse and that they are diverse. It's a diverse and complex relationship, and treatment, Mr. Speaker, requires – it isn't anything shorter or less than that: requires – that we look at substance abuse in the context of family life. Family life must be part of the treatment, and unless we can understand that, treatment cannot be effective. I would say that treatment in the area of substance abuse, especially for women, has been a failure. It has failed to acknowledge the ideology of substance abuse in family life, and we have to look at that. We have to see that substance abuse has an impact on the person but also the family members and then their impact on that person. We know that many people – many men, many women – have come from homes characterized by violence and that for men the linkage with an alcoholic parent is extremely strong and suggests that it is either learned behaviour or a genetic link. That's something we have to look at. What is the genetic connection? That has been certainly the question raised in relation to men who abuse alcohol.

Why do we need a foundation that may narrow the focus of research and innovation to family issues only? Mr. Speaker, this new foundation, as I have said, would only duplicate work that is already being done or could be done by a world-renowned agency. We would note that in the last budget AADAC has suffered an 11 percent cut in funding to education and prevention, the very things that this new foundation is supposed to deal with in that way, so we have to say, "Hey, what's going on here?" Without adequate funding, research, the evaluation components, are not possible. I have seen in our heritage trust fund estimates that Occupational Health and Safety had in fact funded AADAC to do research for them, so it's not that AADAC can't do it. It certainly can. It's the fact that it has not had the money. AADAC is known worldwide in terms of innovation. They're not held to be staying at the back.

3:50

As I said earlier, the Alberta alcoholism foundation provides for the establishment of chairs at the university. There is nothing new in that. Family life is the only thing that is added, Mr. Speaker, and that doesn't broaden our understanding. It doesn't broaden the issue; it narrows the focus. If we want to deal with family life, what we have to do is direct and say that we need a particular emphasis here. I think we will fail to

address broader social implications of substance abuse simply by focusing on the need to strengthen families. When I saw the words "strengthen families" in this Bill, I had to go back to June 8, 1988, three years ago, and I would read into the record the hon. Premier's words on strengthening families, in *Hansard*, page 1577:

Our initiative is to strengthen the family, to provide reasons why the family is stronger, why mothers will stay in the house, in the family while not having care outside of the house. We will have care in the home: parent care, not institutional care.

Now, you may think these answers were about child care, that this was in response to child care. Mr. Speaker, these were in response to questions about treatment for men who batter their wives. We have further on that same day on page 1578, June 8, 1988, the Premier saying:

We want to make sure that parents are at home to care for their families, and we reject the institutional type of thinking of the hon. members,

myself and the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar being those two hon. members that the Premier spoke to.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have very grave concerns about what is meant by strengthening the family. Does that mean we will overlook the things that happen to individuals in the family in order to strengthen this ideal that we have of the family? Is it an unwillingness to say that maybe some families are stronger if one of the members is absent and, goodness knows, if the mother is not in the home caring for the children but in the paid labour force? We have a diversity of families in this province, and when I see strengthening of families in the context of those statements, I get very nervous.

Mr. Speaker, some families are made so dysfunctional that all we can do is provide alternatives to the continuance of the family as it is constituted with the abuser. If other family members, especially children, are to grow and to develop into healthy adults, they cannot grow and develop in the presence of an abusive adult, and it may in fact be in the best interests of that family to have that family unit changed so that loving, nurturing, caring members, people that can care for each other, make up that family.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

We also hear these days about adult children of alcoholics who wished that the healthy, nonabusive parent had dissolved the marriage and created a loving, stable family, albeit a single-parent family, which brings me again to my concerns about the linkage with the council on the family. Certainly the issue has been raised with me that the Premier's council on the family – his words to the contrary in this Assembly a couple of weeks ago – is focused on maintaining the traditional mother, father, and children family unit and that in fact the best interests of some of the individuals in those families will be sacrificed so that we can continue the illusion of the family unit as traditionally defined as being the cornerstone of this society. Families are extremely important. What is important about families is that they create loving, nurturing relationships. It is how people live together that creates or destroys a family. We cannot base it on some idealized version that for the most part never existed.

So my challenge to the minister would be to bring forward a definition of the family that includes the diversity of families that now exists, that she recognize that we may all have an idealized image of what constitutes a family; however, that image may not be in keeping with reality, and imposing that idealized image may, in more instances than we would care to know, work against the best interests of one or more members, even if it

may work to the benefit of society or a dominant and powerful group. Certainly we know that many people in government would prefer to have intact families with mother at home, father in the workplace, it would appear, than have a single mother on social assistance, but in the best interests of families, Mr. Speaker, in some cases it would be better to have a single-parent family.

For too long the nuclear family with a mother at home with 2.5 children failed to acknowledge women as persons beyond being mothers, with dreams and aspirations and potentiality beyond caring for children, husband, and home, and therefore robbed society of women's skills and perspectives and contributions other than parenting, which can in these times occupy less than 50 percent of her productive adult years. This image also often robbed men of the opportunity to nurture their wives and children and may have overburdened them with economic and political responsibilities. Certainly the flight of men from their family responsibilities in the '60s and '70s was indicative of that.

Mr. Speaker, more importantly, men and women may have been trapped in families that at best failed to provide an environment of life, growth, intimacy, and joy and at worst were brutally violent, causing harm – injury and in some cases death – to members of the family, a harm that perseveres into adulthood and may have brought harm to the succeeding generations. So we cannot, I submit, limit our view of how people will create families and limit the support to only accepted families. We have to be concerned more about the stability in the sociological order. We have to recognize that families have something to do with creativity, innovation, and positive social change. So I would ask that the minister bring in as an amendment to this Bill a definition of "family" so we know that she understands the diversity of families and that there is positive value, sometimes, in moving away from what the traditional, idealized image of the family is. More importantly, it is simply recognizing reality as we have in 1991.

I'm also deeply concerned about the lack of autonomy of the foundation. It's so clearly to be directed by the minister. An open, progressive minister, as I believe we have now, would promote research, education, public awareness that deals with substance abuse in the context of, but not limited to its origin and impact on, the family. However, one can be concerned that the foundation could focus on the particular concerns of a particular minister and fail to truly serve all the people.

4:00

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this Bill. I believe it sets up yet another bureaucracy to provide funding to services that are already within the mandate of AADAC, a mandate that has been honoured as acting with the highest standards of excellence and has acted on that mandate inasmuch as funding has allowed. It is unthinkable that we would separate out family life and substance abuse from the societal concern and implications of substance abuse. Certainly AADAC in its present form could target special attention on family life. It makes no sense at all to set up a parallel structure, a bureaucratic structure which has authority in terms of funding over AADAC and is extremely closely linked to ministerial discretion.

Research and evaluation can be done by those doing treatment, education, and prevention. Indeed, an adequately funded agency always evaluates its programs, tests and researches new methods and ideas, as well as extends a basic understanding as to the course and impact of the issue it serves. So why a separate foundation? I would suggest that AADAC could also fund research and make grants to persons outside of it, and that

primarily as a treatment, education, and prevention resource they would be better able to make decisions about the nature of what needs to be done. Indeed, the advisory committee, as I noted earlier, making recommendations as to the establishment of this foundation, had to be educated by people from AADAC. What a waste, it seems to me.

How, I have to ask the minister, does she justify this duplication, this waste of money? We can only express our dismay at the cuts in funding that AADAC has suffered, and would see that this province would be better served if these funds would go to AADAC with a directed mandate to deal with the issues that this foundation would purport to emphasize.

I thank you.

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

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to have an opportunity to respond to this Bill. We've waited for it for some years now, and I hope I'm finally beginning to understand what it is, however vague it still is, that the government intends to do here. There's been so much concern expressed about this proposal that I guess part of me sort of hoped it would just go away, that it would be replaced with more energy put into existing services.

Mr. Speaker, I see this Bill as a response to an earnest and sincere desire on the part of our Premier to deal with a grave sociological problem, but the response, it seems to me, is kind of backing in to try to create something out of whole cloth where we already have systems in existence. It seems to me it's looking for a rationale to translate this desire into some recognizable reality. But this is very puzzling. On the one hand, we are creating a new mechanism, a new entity, but we have at the same time some proven systems to deal with this problem. We have data, we have experience, proven systems that are going begging in our province.

I could, I suppose, support it if these were simply good times when there were plenty of funds to put into this kind of thing – if you kind of had some special little foundation off to one side – as long as the existing programs were adequately funded. Mr. Speaker, they aren't. AADAC has been reduced in spite of its excellent work and the kind of reputation it has achieved. Family and community support services can't begin to keep up to the demonstrated need. The province is privatizing social services and going on fee for service just so fast it would make your head spin. So we have programs that are going begging, yet we're setting up another one; not in competition, according to the minister, but I have yet to have that proved to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill raises many, many questions, particularly as one reads through the Cherry report, the kinds of things that citizens of Alberta said about this idea, this notion. One of the major problems that I think is identified in my mind is that there is a total shift to substance abuse research and treatment and away from the original thought about strengthening family life. The Cherry report talked at some length both about health promotion and their object in their suggested bylaws for the foundation. The objective in the Cherry report comes as a result of hearings with hundreds of Albertans who have been working in the field of practice as well as those who have suffered with their families. The object of the foundation is to strengthen Alberta families through the promotion and co-ordination of programs and research directed at the enhancement of family life and the identification of factors affecting the stability of families, including the prevention and treatment of drug abuse.

When you look at that object, very clearly the essence of it, the centre of it, is "protecting and strengthening family life." Now, this Bill is moving away from that. It's moving away from it quite precisely, and it's also moving away, I believe, from the notion of health promotion that the minister spoke to.

Mr. Speaker, one of my major problems with the Bill is with the absence of an endowment fund definition. There is no clear indication in this Bill of where the funds are to come from, when, or how much. Now, in the original understanding there was to be a \$200 million endowment set up in the Alberta heritage fund. All right. One assumes that the foundation then has access to the interest from that capital, that endowment. One assumes that. Nothing appears to be farther from the truth. This Bill in its sections about that relationship indicates that the foundation is subject to the province's decision about when and how and how much they will get. If there are funds left over, unexpended, the province can take those back. The foundation, therefore, is not directly related to that endowment. The government controls the endowment and hands out funds to the foundation presumably when it believes the foundation proves that it needs them. So I believe the Bill should explain and should contain sections that would help us to see a secure relationship and arrangement between the Alberta heritage trust fund and the foundation and not have that tube that goes through the government who makes the decisions. The suggestion was that there should be a separate unit established to manage the funds, and once again I would question the minister about the surplus going into general revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I have some questions about how grants are to be made. I would hope that there will be guidelines for this coming to the House shortly, and I would ask the minister to comment on whether or not there will be some sort of peer review system, whether there will be an interdisciplinary evaluation by experts – one cannot expect a board of citizens to have the kind of knowledge that is going to be needed here – and whether the foundation will be required to use not only local but national and international expertise so that we find that we are not duplicating research and activities that are going on elsewhere on this continent or in the world.

#### 4:10

Mr. Speaker, I'm not at all sure about how this thing will work in the sense of ongoing operational funding. The Bill is quite unclear as to whether there will be project-by-project funding, giving rise to the unfortunate circumstances that we see in many other cases where an agency or a treatment process is set up by a foundation and then left alone to operate itself and to continue its operation without any sources of funding. There is a great deal of competition already in our communities, and I think this needs to be addressed before we go any further. I hope the minister will comment on that.

The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore has already commented about the section that gives the minister control over this foundation. It had been my hope in listening to the Premier speak to it and reading the Cherry report, that it would be set up as an arm's-length operation, that it would not be responsible to the minister. I think it would be a healthier kind of circumstance. I think that's what our citizens told the Cherry committee they wanted to see, that if we are to have this at all, then it should be set up in that fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the makeup of the personnel. I think it's good that we have cross representation with AADAC, but what about other community groups? What about Nechi? What about business, legal, academic, native groups, youth, the Alberta

Association of Social Workers, the psychology association? Is there any understanding of how these other professionals will relate to this foundation?

The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore has also spoken to the relationship to AADAC, which is the most puzzling part of this whole foundation. The minister has, I think, made a serious attempt to explain the rationale of why not AADAC or an extension of AADAC. I still don't comprehend that. It is not an explanation that I find to be a satisfactory one for setting up a totally separate one, not at the point in time in our fiscal difficulties when we're cutting back. Mr. Speaker, the mechanisms are there, but how do we ensure that the foundation activities are going to be cross-referenced with AADAC? Surely a board member is not expected to do this. Surely there has to be some ongoing, day-to-day interaction and relationship with the service system of AADAC.

The other question I have about the relationship to AADAC is: can AADAC apply to this foundation and get all its resources through this? That's not been made clear at all. That's a question that I've been asked a number of times. Was there any consideration given to using the AADAC administration? I think there could be some economies of scale by using some of the same resources as AADAC.

Again, the relationship to the Premier's council on families has been partially explained, and I suppose we have to take some of this on faith. If we're going to have this foundation, we're going to find out what that relationship is. I would see it, from the way the Bill reads – and the way the Bill reads it is totally different, as I see it, from what the Cherry report was recommending – that the relationship to the Premier's council on families will be an extended one, will not be a close working relationship, as it is expected to be, with AADAC. I'd like the minister to confirm this, if she will.

Mr. Speaker, recently we've had the Cawsey report on native communities, the native justice system. Previous to that we had the Rolf report. This speaks to the grave needs of our native citizens both in native communities and in urban areas. I'd like to ask the minister what her understanding of this Bill is in relationship to those kinds of recommendations that came in that report. To date I have not seen or heard anything from the government that really deals directly with the Cawsey report and with the kinds of things that we can and should be doing now, last year, for people in very difficult circumstances in many communities, not only native but isolated communities in Alberta. I would have liked the Bill to make some reference or have some explanation about those very special needs and about how this research, if it is to be carried on and if it is to be action research, will relate to people in isolated areas and people with special needs in more populated areas of the province.

I have a few other questions. Will the foundation prepare and table annual reports that include comprehensive statements and evaluations of the activities of the foundation as well as financial statements? Will the foundation establish a data base of all substance abuse and treatment programs that are operating in Alberta and where citizens are going to be required to seek treatment outside of Alberta? I suppose that part of the object of this is to ensure that people do not have to leave the province to secure the treatment and care that they need. Will the foundation examine and develop strategies to meet the unique needs of adolescents? There's nothing in the Bill that specifies that; in fact, it's quite obviously absent. Will the foundation focus on means to reach rural and isolated communities who have some particular needs?

Mr. Speaker, finally, we're all suffering, we're reeling from the health care cutbacks: the waiting lists at hospitals, the layoffs, the kinds of concerns that are being expressed about people waiting for surgery and their conditions deteriorating. There is also a crying, urgent, critical need for mental health therapists in our province. Our research shows improvement when mental health therapists are available to work in school systems and in public health and to deal with secondary prevention. These therapists are losing their positions because there are no funds in our communities to keep them going, yet here on the other hand we're setting up a foundation to do some of the things, presumably, that we already know how to do, yet there is no money for them.

I believe that the citizens of Alberta are due an explanation of why the government believes and needs to set up this foundation when we have existing operations, agencies, and government departments who are not being sufficiently funded to do the kinds of treatment and procedures that we know work in caring for families who are experiencing difficulties with substance abuse, when we know that we have methodology to deal with people who are in native communities who need more help, when our school boards and our public health nurses are crying out for more funds to keep their mental health therapists. Why are we doing this when we can't seem to do what has already been proven? Mr. Speaker, I believe the citizens of Alberta need an explanation of that question.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: I didn't think the minister wanted to close debate on this at second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the Chair has already recognized Edmonton-Centre, and I'm sure everybody realizes that when the minister does speak, she closes debate.

So Edmonton-Centre.

4:20

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there's much more at second reading debate that needs to be discussed here, particularly around the principles of the Bill before us. I don't want to add too much more to some of the underlying points of principle that both Edmonton-Avonmore and Edmonton-Gold Bar have laid out. I basically have two questions of principle which I'd like to have clarified in the debate, and perhaps the Member for Lloydminster can respond to it as well.

I just want to get it straight, get it on the record, what basis there is for saying that we need more research in this area. I'm not disagreeing that we might need more research. I just want to know, if we're going to set up this rather large sum of money, set aside \$200 million for this particular area, how it has been convinced in the mind of government that this is an area where that much more of a research effort needs to go on. I think some people looking at this might be satisfied if there was more attention paid to that question. I mean, I know we want to have more research, I know it's directed to research, I know it's an evaluation of various things, but what is the basis for saying that we need this much more money in this particular area as opposed to others? There was some debate on this at the heritage trust fund moneys allocation for this year, but again I'm not clear if the minister or members of the Black-Cherry committee looked into the role of things like the already existing Ontario Addiction Research Foundation.

Now, here we are with a country of 20 million people. We have one province with a number of resources with an already existing, well-established Addiction Research Foundation. What is it that they are not doing that we need now by virtue of this Bill and this foundation to do from Alberta? If we could just have some answers to that kind of question, I think some of us could be more satisfied. Obviously, on the university campuses and in academic circles there is a lot of research being done by sociologists, by biochemists, by psychologists, social workers, who are in their master's programs and PhD programs doing research into addictive behaviours and into family life and into substance abuse. Have we got, for instance, already – what would you call it? – kind of a network of knowing who's doing what research in those areas already on the various campuses throughout the nation and in the province in order not to duplicate that? Given that we do know what research is being done already in this area at McGill or UBC or U of A here, again the question is: what is telling us that what they are doing is not enough in this area, so much so that we need another \$200 million of funds set aside in order to meet some unmet needs, and not just to look at the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation or campuses in Canada but, say, in the U.S. or in the global context?

I mean, it's the information age. We can pass research projects and data and results and conclusions back and forth across the telecommunication linkups. Certainly we know that in the United States a great deal of attention has been paid through their almost drug rehabilitation industry, that a great amount of interest and dollars and research have gone into this area. It may be that there might be some peculiar sociological factors or cultural factors here in Alberta, but still a lot would be transcultural, translatable from work being done in Boston or in New York or in San Francisco that can tell us things that can help us here in Alberta. Or is it not? Is all of that international and global effort, research into this, still not enough?

If we could have some answers to those kinds of questions and the basis, as I say, for saying we need more research, then we can be perhaps a bit more understanding of why the government is going in this direction, but as we know, there's no end to what researchers want to do research on. It's like a bottomless pit, a black hole. It's a huge area. There's never enough. Health and Welfare and their health research development granting agency from federal money is cutting back. I know they said they could only fund I think it was less than a third of the very excellent research proposals that have gone to them. Again it's that question of evaluation. I mean, they're always going to be out there; there are always going to be interesting research projects. There are always going to be researchers who will want to make some money and have a living by doing it. How will we know when we've had enough research? Have there been evaluation processes into research outcomes? As we got into the debate before on some other things, we get some answers, and then we don't have moneys to put some of the programs that they think are going to make a big difference or a significant difference into place in terms of operational funds.

Again, on a basic principle, Mr. Speaker, these questions I think are begged by the minister's standing up and saying: well, we decided we're going to need more money for research in this area. I'd like to have some answers as to why what's currently going on is not enough and how this money is going to do new, innovative things that we know aren't being done now and when we're going to know that we've had enough of it.

The second point of principle I'd like to raise or have clarified is the nature of the research as it's set out. Section 3(c) says: "Innovative basic and applied research projects on the relation-

ship between family life and substance abuse" Maybe we could be helped by having more of an understanding of what is meant particularly in the area of "applied research"; in fact, even from the minister or another member's viewpoint, how much of the moneys is going to be used for "basic" and how much is going to be used for "applied"? It would seem to me that in this day and age there could be a lot more significant investment in the applied research area than in the basic or the pure side. Maybe they want to get in and compete or link up with folks out of the Heritage Foundation for Medical Research looking at how synaptic junctions in the brain are affected by this degree of alcohol or that degree of marijuana or other chemicals, but it would be, I think, more helpful for Albertans if it would be research that seemed to be community based, agency focused, out there in the community kind of applied research. Again, if folks across the way can say a bit more about who it is that can have access or who can make up proposals for which they can apply for funds under this, then maybe, for instance, there might be more of an understanding of "Okay, we can live with that," if it's not just going to be laboratory research that's being duplicated elsewhere.

For instance, here's an example out of my own personal experience, and I don't mind describing it a bit. The Family Life Education Council here in Edmonton is just an outstanding outfit that offers a large number of excellent courses for people, basically impinging on their personal and family lives. I went up there, and we took a parenting course. I don't know if members might think: "Oh, yeah. Well, you don't really need a parenting course. We have those kids, and we raise our kids. We do it by hook or by crook, and there's no need to take an official parenting course because we know how to do it; it's sort of an inbred, natural thing to do, to be parents," but this particular course was based on a book, which I might recommend to all who might be parents in this Assembly, a book called *How to Talk So Kids Will Listen & Listen So Kids Will Talk*. You'd be surprised, Mr. Speaker, just how many times there were things which I might want to do which would not allow kids to talk or how many things I would say which would not let kids listen. Over a six-week Wednesday evening program with other parents talking about their relationships with kids as moms and dads and parents and this basic sort of thesis of how to listen so they'll talk and talk so they'll listen – all kinds of new learnings and new discoveries and things that I think would be very important, which are important to me and which I want to be able to use in my own experience: how valuable that could be for so many, many other people in our province.

So I would wonder whether, for instance, the Family Life Education Council itself could develop a research proposal to look, say, at a very interesting project just to see how universally available parenting courses, which could help to prevent emotional abuse in the home, where you just ignore the kid or neglect the kid or don't listen to what the kid is saying or how the kid is feeling, could help to get at that issue of emotional health – if those were available, how that might in fact lead to a reduction in substance abuse within families.

4:30

It seems to me again – the minister I think raised it a bit earlier – that substance abuse does seem to be something that is more of a symptom than a cause. If we can get at some of the causes, if it is that parents are not listening to their children or children are not listening to their parents – and there can be some ways to focus in on that with some better behaviours, some better insights – and we can get at emotional health, then we can

maybe get at the issue in a better way of how we can healthfully use various substances as they come our way. I don't mean to digress too much, but could it be that the Family Life Education Council, who are underfunded, who don't have money to do advertising for their various programs, who have parents coming to them who can't afford the \$120 for the six weeks of Wednesday nights, could set up more programs, more services, more parenting courses that would be freely available and do research on how that might in fact prevent substance abuse by moms and dads and families down the line?

It gets back to the point that when you do research in this area, in family life and drug abuse, you don't do it in a laboratory. You don't go over and get some – what were those jars called in chemistry? – flasks and jars. I mean, it's not the nature of this kind of research. But I haven't heard, again, very much in detail or in a tangible way to know where that research is to be located: in the community, in the agencies, in the families, in the human context of who we are as a province. I think some of the resentment, obviously, is building, because people are out there on the front lines dealing day to day, eyeball to eyeball with people in these difficult and suffering situations. They're saying: "Well, we're not even getting anything out of this. It's all going to some researcher somewhere else who has some esoteric way of approaching all this. What about us right here?" I think yes, this foundation is a way that they, too, can access money and they, too, can develop and strengthen their programs and do some research on it to ensure that it is the right program; maybe it's the wrong program. But at least if they can have a piece of the pie, a share of the action, then a lot more support in principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, might be forthcoming.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Lloydminster.

MR. CHERRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want it understood that I support Bill 35, the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act. One other thing I wanted to make clear is that Black-Cherry is better than Red Roberts any day.

I want to, first of all, go back, and as chairman of the committee that had a lot to do with bringing this Bill forward and, of course, the report View to the Future, I want to speak for a few moments on some of the issues that we had the challenge of dealing with out there also.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, when I and members of the committee – there were nine members in total. My good friend from Calgary-Foothills, Pat Black, was the vice-chairman of this committee also, and I'm sure that she will have some comments to say. But when we and seven other public members from across Alberta went out, we did listen, and we heard many things. Many of the things we heard were things that I'm sure that anyone in this Legislature never even dreamt was happening. I know I was shocked at several of the presentations that were made to us. It's easy to read the paper and see something related to drugs or family; you read it and it passes over you from that time on. Out there was a different story, Mr. Speaker, and we got it many times, firsthand.

I guess when the minister announced that there would be a committee formed – and I always remember her ministerial statement when she said that AADAC is a wonderful organization, but AADAC can't do everything. That stuck with me, because when we were out in our public meetings, many people felt that we were overriding or were going to override what

AADAC was doing. Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the purpose of what we were out there for. We were out there to gather that information for the minister on a foundation.

Let me tell you, in my words I guess, what I think a foundation is or should be, especially when the Premier in 1989 announced the \$200 million endowment; the interest from that money would be used towards the foundation. I guess, to me, a foundation isn't something that runs the day-to-day activities the same way as AADAC, for example, would run. I believe that the foundation will be tailored after the medical research foundation, which is a highly recognized foundation throughout the world. Listening this afternoon to the Bill, I believe the people that spoke had a different view than the view I have of what the foundation will do and operate. Like the minister said earlier, I believe that this Bill does strike a balance.

Where are we going to go in Alberta today with drug and alcohol abuse, family abuse if we don't recognize it as a major problem within our province? To recognize that, one of the ingredients we must have, in my view, is education. If we don't have that within the family structure, then in my view we are in serious problems.

What is a family? I would ask anyone here in the Legislature to give an answer to what a family is. It's a two-parent family; it's a single-parent family; it might be an uncle and aunt who are caring for them, a grandmother. Any of those people are a family in Alberta today, and it's changed. I know in my own case, when I talked to the committee at first, I looked back to myself and my family in 1956 and what a family was in those days. They assured me that today a family has changed, and I agree with them; it has.

There's no way in which, in my view, anyone that suffers abuse or whatever should stay with that mate and suffer throughout the years, but we must have that education of a family. I look in my own community, or in the community that I represent, that has an AADAC centre there, which is the "Slim" Thorpe Recovery Centre. In the last two years they've put in another committee, which they call the action group. That action group in the committee has gone to the schools. Fortunately, through the efforts of this government, we have a campus in Lloydminster; they've gone to the campus. They've got them interested. This is, I believe, what it's all about. It's something that you and I and individuals within the community have to be aware of, have to do something about, because if we don't do it, nobody is going to do it for us. There's always those leaders in the community that are willing to help, and this is what I believe we need in the communities today. It's a sad state when some of our young people have had to go down into the U.S. to get treatment. They are the severe cases that have to go down there, and it is: it's a shame.

4:40

We traveled to British Columbia and Saskatchewan and looked at their centres. As a matter of fact, in British Columbia we also looked at the foundation that is set up in B.C. there. It wasn't a foundation that had a big bureaucracy. There's a total of three personnel looking after that foundation, three personnel. They had a board of directors who were businessmen from the community that had an interest and wanted to do something, wanted to help. I remember the lady telling us in Vancouver that they had a conference, that 2,500 people came down to Vancouver to this conference for a weekend, paid their own way, much like a lot of people in this House, I'm sure, would do the same thing: pay their own way. They came down and listened,

and they went back to their own communities with a lot more knowledge than what they had before that.

[Mr. Moore in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, I look at page 2, the Bill's section 5, which is Powers, and I can't see what problem we have there with that. I think that the foundation itself can play a very, very vital role within the province. If you look back on the medical research foundation which this is tailored after, they have famous, world-renowned people sitting on the board. With all those intellectuals, you get a tremendous amount of knowledge, not just in the province of Alberta but around the world. What better way to gain knowledge, and this is what we have to have. We have to have that research. Research doesn't stop today; research continues on. We have to find new ways, and I believe that the foundation can establish that.

The minister. Why is the minister directing it? Well, quite naturally, because it comes under Health, so the minister – that is one of her or his responsibilities, whichever the case may be.

So I think it's just a worthwhile Bill that every one of us should support.

One of the things on the committee that they emphasized was that there should be no duplication of services between departments. If you read the report, we've indicated very strongly that we don't see any duplication of services, why there should be.

I'm very pleased when I look at the makeup of the foundation that there is one person from AADAC on it. The minister has already commented on it. The knowledge that we can gather from AADAC is another great thing. I certainly hope that we can look at this in the light that is there and one that we can get on with, one that I think shouldn't have a lot of controversy about it. After all, when we finished the public hearings, when we explained to the people, they were very, very happy. They wanted to say: "Well, when are you going to get on with this? When are you going to enact this? We want some action."

Mr. Speaker, I think I've covered what I wanted to say. I do say that this foundation will be a cornerstone in our future for our generations to come. Without this, I'm sure that we're not going to have the valuable contribution that this foundation sets in itself and sets forward.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a few comments to make on Bill 35, the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act.

During debate in the House when we were debating the heritage trust fund, several concerns arose from that debate in relation to this Act. Certainly concerns have been expressed today in the Legislature once again. I paid very close attention to the minister's initial remarks, and I feel that some of those concerns have yet to be addressed. Perhaps she'll be doing that later.

One of the very fundamental questions that I think we need to ask ourselves, and I would hope the Member for Lloydminster is listening to this, is: why are we setting up another bureaucracy? That's what this Bill is doing.

MR. CHERRY: You're missing the point.

MS MJOLSNESS: I think you're missing the point, because this is what this Bill is doing.



Now, certainly the intentions of the foundation are admirable. I think everyone in Alberta is concerned about drug abuse and substance abuse, but we've got a wonderful organization in the province right now that is doing and has been given the mandate to do the kinds of things that this foundation will be doing. Now, I know the minister in her remarks said that we need this foundation because AADAC does not have the resources to carry out some of the things that the foundation will be doing. Well, why is that? They have been given the mandate to do these kinds of things. Why don't they have the resources? Because this government has cut back on their funding. Now, that doesn't make any sense to me.

If we're going to set up a brand-new bureaucracy to deal with some of these things, particularly research, when we've already given the mandate to AADAC, why are we doing this? I don't think that question has been adequately answered. It may be that the government likes to spend, spend, spend. We know that they like to do that, but other than that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot justify setting up a brand-new bureaucracy. That's the bottom line for me.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, Albertans are concerned about alcohol and drug abuse. When we traveled with our task force, Healthy Children for a Healthy Future, we heard from one group of young people in Calgary that were members of alcoholic families. They had set up a support group through the YWCA in Calgary, and we heard directly about some of the negative and devastating effects growing up in an alcoholic family had on them and how it affected their lives. Certainly it is a concern. Incidentally, their funding had been cut for that support group, and they were concerned about that. Certainly I don't think anyone in the Assembly would disagree that we need to do work in this area. I think everyone in this Assembly, and they've alluded to this, is proud of the kind of work that AADAC has been doing. We support the kind of work that AADAC is doing. Again I will say that AADAC has been given the mandate to do virtually everything that this foundation is going to be doing, so to set up a brand-new bureaucracy does not make any sense to me at all.

The minister had talked about one member of the foundation being from AADAC so that there will be no duplication. Again, why do we need to set up a committee that will make the kinds of decisions that AADAC is very capable of making? They have the expertise, they have the knowledge already in place, so what are we doing here? I would like to say that one member of the foundation will be from AADAC, but who will the other possible 10 members be? Will they be Conservative backbenchers? This is something that we don't know. Certainly when committee comes up, we'll be asking more direct questions in this area.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that we do not need another bureaucracy. AADAC is quite capable of carrying out the research and what the foundation is supposed to be doing. I would just like to say that I hope the minister will be direct in answering that particular question, because I don't think we've had an answer to that question thus far.

Thank you.

4:50

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very much in favour of Bill 35, the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act. I'd like to just address a few things as follow-up to the chairman of the committee, the Member for Lloydminster.

I've listened to the members for Edmonton-Avonmore and Edmonton-Centre and Edmonton-Gold Bar, and I'm going to say to you: get out of this building and go out and see what's on the streets; get a reality picture. Because I'll tell you, if you read the report or even looked at it and looked at the submissions that came from the Alberta Native Friendship Centres, The Back Door, the Calgary Alternative Support Services group, Canadian Mental Health Association, Colonel Belcher distress centre, PRIDE Calgary, University of Calgary, Rotary clubs, Nova corporation, the Metis Association, minor sports, Molson Breweries – page after page after page of submissions from people who in reality supported the foundation and the existence of a foundation because they recognize that the alcohol and drug abuse problem as it relates to the family in this province is growing.

Those are the facts of life. You can hide your head in the sand all your want until you realize that studies which were brought forward to this committee have shown that every family in North America in one form or another is touched or hit by an addiction problem, and every family is faced with a dilemma. When groups like this come forward, not individual MLAs but groups that have a background – school boards, family counseling groups, marriage and family therapist groups – they say: "We need help. We need more than what we have. We need guidance. We need a direction." These people were the basis for this report. They came out to public hearings along with a number of individuals, people who are physicians, citizens, health nurses, mental health workers, social workers, high school principals. It goes on: police officers, counselors, Nechi Institute directors, drug and alcohol workers. Every walk of life came out and talked in favour of this foundation. All of a sudden the members for Edmonton-Avonmore and Edmonton-Gold Bar know more than all of these people who are frontline workers with this problem every day of their life: people from corporations who have been able to gather statistics that show the problems they have in the workplace; people in senior citizens' homes who have looked at the problems with prescription drugs; people in nursery schools who have looked at three-year-olds who are alcoholics; people in elementary schools who are faced with dual users.

Wake up and smell the roses, people. This is a major problem. The foundation is critical so that these very groups can go to some body and say, "We have a program we think will help."

MR. FOX: You don't have to raise your voice.

MRS. BLACK: Well, maybe you don't hear, Vegreville, because obviously we're not getting through to you.

We have a program. Maybe a parenting program could go to the foundation and say: "We think we've got something that will help. Can you help us with funding?" Maybe it already exists in another body. This is the director of traffic. This provides the co-ordinated effort for licking the problem, not dumping it all on AADAC. You know, that just doesn't work. AADAC is a marvelous facility, but as the minister said, it can't do everything. Nobody can be everything to everybody.

As the Member for Lloydminster said, I was absolutely shocked at what we heard and what we saw. I would suggest that if you're under any illusions, go on the trek in Calgary. Go and look at the needle exchange. Follow it around. Wake up. Go out there and see it. It's there every day. Go down to the schools. Look in on the playgrounds, at the drug deals that are

taking place in elementary school. We're not dealing with it. We've got to face it. Look at the kids that are living on the streets and passing drugs and alcohol back and forth. The abuse cases. It all ties in. You cannot treat only the addict; you must treat the family. You have to combine it into a foundation that will do both.

I support this Bill, and I think it's very clear in the Bill that it provides for a co-ordinated effort and a co-ordinated delivery of program. It will be the beacon that will direct all of these groups that are doing a wonderful job within our community, Mr. Speaker, into an objective that is to stop the abuse of drugs and alcohol and get the family working together. What is the family? I don't know anymore. The family is whatever it is to that person. It can be, as the hon. Member for Lloydminster said, mom, dad, two kids, grandma and grandpa, and the dog. It can be the neighbour raising the children, the grandparent. It can be whatever it is in that relationship. There's no definition; that's one thing we found out. All I know is that everybody needs somebody to be part of a family, and whatever that person is has to be there.

I really support this Bill, and I'm absolutely shocked that anybody would not support it and would turn their back on it, because this is an absolute need within our society. If we don't look at it hard and fast, then we're making a big mistake. We've got corporate bodies all across this country that are going around raising funds to deal with it; they recognize it. We've got community groups. We've got churches. We're trying to get schools to get organized. We've got private citizens putting treatment centres in place. And what have we got here? People saying: "Oh, we don't have a big enough problem. AADAC can handle everything." Dream on, kids. This is 1990. We have a problem, and this is one of the solutions.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to get up until I noticed that the government backbenchers seemed to have their tails over their backs, charging down the road in the opposite direction of what the Bill is intended. Nobody is saying that the need doesn't exist out there. We well know how much the need exists. [interjection] We're talking about whether this Bill will solve the problem or whether there's a better way of solving the problem. This is where the problem comes in. I don't know whether to wait until . . . Why don't you go over across the floor, Mr. Vegreville, and blow in her ear? Then you'll get more attention. I was just trying to get the floor, Mr. Speaker.

I'll give an example of how this government operates. In my town, Westlock, there is the FCSS. The Minister of Health, in spite of what she said, cut back the mental health services in this town. One of the big purposes of FCSS in Westlock is rectifying the very things the hon. member for Calgary north . . . The Health minister wrote a letter saying that they had not cut the funds.

MS BETKOWSKI: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, of all the manipulating and twisting around that you run into, Mr. Speaker, and the misleading, the Minister of Health has the nerve to come in here now and ask for a new Bill and won't even use the facilities she has presently.

#### **Point of Order Relevance**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order's been called.

Hon. minister. [interjection]

Hon. member, a point of order's been called.

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is: could we return to the subject of Bill 35, which is with respect to the Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad she pointed it out.

#### **Debate Continued**

MR. TAYLOR: Here's an editorial, and I'll table it: "Nancy, Give us a break." This FCSS, if you do not know, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for family health and advising in the community, yet the Minister of Health, who has that under her administration, has the nerve to cut off the funding for two counselors in the area, two whole counselors. Then she has the nerve to come to this Legislature and propose a Bill. Of all the sanctimonious, psalm-singing hypocrites I've run into, this has got to be one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

5:00

MR. TAYLOR: That is quite legal. Look it up, Mr. Speaker. It is quite in order.

#### **Speaker's Ruling Relevance**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. The Bill before us, for your information, is Bill 35, Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act. Now that you're aware of what the Bill is, would you speak to that Bill?

#### **Debate Continued**

MR. TAYLOR: The Bill is to try to rectify the problem of drug and alcohol addiction and breakup of families. Mr. Speaker, we have two organizations now that work very hard at that. One is called AADAC; the other is called FCSS. Both of them have been denied funding. I'm just pointing out that the Minister of Health, who is now asking for our support for a new Bill, has had the gall to cut down many FCSS whose health budgets were involved with counseling. One of the ones is in the Westlock area. It has created a small riot out there. There are newspaper editorials. There's a letter from Mr. Graham Kay, who is the manager of the FCSS, asking what the dickens is going on. This is all I'm getting at. How can a minister come in and ask for a new Bill when she does not use the facilities she already has? FCSS is funded by the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, it isn't.

MR. TAYLOR: It's social services; I'm sorry.

#### **Speaker's Ruling Relevance**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. You had adequate time during estimates to make your point on

cuts in budgets. This is not the place or time to discuss budget cuts. It's to discuss the merits of the Bill. Mr. Member, I am not going to warn you again to get back to that. Now, please get back to the Bill and speak to it.

### Debate Continued

MR. TAYLOR: Okay, Mr. Speaker. The point is, if we are cutting budgets in the area of counseling of alcoholism and drug addiction, how can the government have the nerve to introduce another Bill and say we're going to spend more money? It's simple logic. Obviously, the only reason for it is rhetoric.

### Point of Order Clarification

MR. TANNAS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, 411(5). The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is labouring under a delusion that the Minister of Health is responsible for the family and community support services. That's obviously under the care of the Hon. John Oldring.

MR. FOX: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is not question period, and the hon. member should not cite *Beauchesne* relevant to Oral Question Period. This is debate on a Bill. The principle of the Bill is that we establish a family life and substance abuse foundation. Inherent in that assumption is that the foundation is worth establishing. I think the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is merely pointing out a degree of hypocrisy vis-à-vis the government's actions relative to that. I think his debate is entirely in order.

MR. TAYLOR: If I may speak on the point of order. He's correct that FCSS is social services, but the mental health workers are under the Department of Health. Would not the minister agree to that? Would not the minister admit that she wrote a letter that has been published in the *Westlock News* saying that she was responsible? I'm just trying to keep these people from weaseling out of . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. First of all, I ask all members to address the Chair. That's the usual pattern around this House, not across between one another.

Secondly, I have told you, hon. member, what the Bill is, and please address the Bill.

MR. SIGURDSON: He's on the point of order.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know he's on the point of order, but it is now back to speaking to the Bill.

MR. TAYLOR: I couldn't speak to the Bill; I'm speaking against the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Are we talking about the point of order or on the Bill? What do you want? I don't believe there was a point of order.

### Debate Continued

MR. TAYLOR: The fact of the matter is that we have a government that is now asking us to pass a Bill to correct a problem. They have shown by cutting budgets in mental health, in my own community amongst others, letters over the minister's signature . . . They now want us to pass a Bill. Well, what's the use of passing a Bill? Abracadabra; if I call it an apple, it'll be an apple. It is still a banana, Mr. Speaker. The point is that we have a government that has no intention of following through.

They'll probably vote some money, hire some friends. If you have blue and orange underwear and are wearing the right pin, you may get another bureaucratic post. The fact of the matter is that this government is cutting funds in mental health and addiction counseling, all the areas that they're now asking us to support a Bill for. As proof positive I will file with the House the May 27 edition of the *Westlock News* and a May 27 editorial talking about the sheer hypocrisy of this minister when it comes to funding mental health and those who work with drug addiction in the Westlock area.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against this Bill. I find it rather hypocritical of the government to set up an institution such as AADAC – and it's doing quite a reasonable job within its mandate and the money that it has – and then to turn around and move a Bill like this.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Of course, it all comes out of the Premier's attempt to capitalize – and I find this most offensive – on a problem that he had within his own family and try to make political hay out of it. So he comes to election time . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nonsense.

MR. McEACHERN: It's true.

### Speaker's Ruling Relevance

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. Order. Let's deal with the merits of the Bill.

MR. FOX: He takes responsibility for his comments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member. The Chair is just wishing that he would be even more responsible.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, I take full responsibility.

### Debate Continued

MR. McEACHERN: The merits of this Bill are nil, and it's because of where it was born out of and the idea it was born out of. It was promised by the Premier at election time as a vote-buying gimmick. It's quite ridiculous that we should set up a second, competing foundation when we already have AADAC, which is perfectly capable of expanding into this area much more fully than it is, at a time in Alberta when we have people going across the border into the states and having their health care paid for by the health care system of this province because we don't have the facilities to properly accommodate their needs within the province. When AADAC and other agencies in this province could provide those facilities, this is really quite wasteful and ridiculous, to set up a separate foundation to accommodate this Premier's whim at election time.

Furthermore, the whole idea of taking money out of the heritage trust fund for this purpose is repugnant to those of us on this side of the House. This Assembly passed the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division estimates earlier in this session, and some \$6 million was allocated to start

this project. It is an unnecessary expenditure. It's out of the capital projects division of the fund, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the moneys that come out of the capital projects of the heritage trust fund should really be subject to and part of the same scrutiny that the ordinary budget of this province gets, and they should have to compete for those same dollars. Doing it this way, taking funds out of the heritage trust fund for special purposes like this, makes the people of Alberta think – or at least the impression that the government would like to give is that because there is this extra money in the heritage trust fund, somehow you could dip into it and do these special projects, and isn't that very nice that we've got this wonderful thing called the heritage trust fund.

The fact of the matter is that we don't really have a heritage trust fund any more. We have, according to the Treasurer's own accounting, some \$12 billion in it. The figure he gives in his own budget speech for this year is \$12.009 million. Sorry; that would be \$12.009 billion.

MRS. HEWES: That's better.

5:10

MR. McEACHERN: Yes. I guess I forgot where I'd put the decimal point there in terms of millions and billions.

In any case, the debt of this province as of March 31, 1991, is very, very close to \$12 billion, so we really don't have a heritage trust fund. Our overdraft on the general revenue account is now equal to our savings account, the heritage trust fund.

MR. LUND: What's that got to do with the Bill?

MR. McEACHERN: Well, that just means that it is rather spurious for the government to say that they can spend extra money on this special project out of the heritage trust fund rather than making it compete for dollars; in other words, to be evaluated against all the other demands of the \$12.5 billion budget of this province.

MR. LUND: It's an investment.

MR. McEACHERN: It should have to compete on that same basis.

Yes, if this government was interested in investing in people and solving people's problems, they could do it through AADAC and the health care system that we presently have. We don't have to set up a separate foundation and tap heritage trust fund money in this manner. That is exactly the point I'm trying to make.

It does not seem to me that there's the same kind of accountability for the dollars out of the heritage trust fund that there is out of the budget and the competition for the dollars. Like, we're only spending \$109 million out of the capital projects of the heritage trust fund this year, and when you say that you have \$4 billion in the cash and marketable securities section of the heritage trust fund, it makes it sound like we've got lots of money lying around that we can use for this project. At the same time, over on the general revenue side this province and this government are in a real crunch. They know it. They've been having to cut back expenditures in a number of areas. They've not cut it back as much, of course, as they have claimed they have, and they will have a billion and a half dollar deficit, not the balanced budget that they have claimed.

So I don't understand why this government thinks that they could just tap \$200 million out of the heritage trust fund for this

project and think that the people of Alberta are going to be in favour of doing that. As usual, the Bill sets it up so that the control is totally with the ministers: they'll set up the regulations; the Treasurer, of course, can tap the money anytime he wants and put it into this foundation. Well, he will have to come to the Assembly and ask for the amounts, but this government will of course feed the foundation at whatever rate they think is expedient politically.

So I think that the government in bringing this Bill forward is not trying to solve the problems that people have with alcohol and other drug substances. I think the government is trying to make themselves look good with the people of Alberta, trying to make them say, "Look, we have this wonderful heritage trust fund," when we really don't have anything left in the heritage trust fund if we were to pay our deficit on the overdraft side. So they think that this will give the Premier a chance to look good and say that he's really concerned and he's really trying to help Albertans and keep the family together, when in fact every day they're refusing to answer our questions about what they're doing with social services, with individual funding programs, with health care funding programs. They're cutting back; we've got people lined up trying to get into our hospitals.

The government isn't half as concerned about people as they are about their own political hides when they bring this Bill in. If they were really concerned about health care, they would address some of the other legitimate questions that we've asked on the health care side, on the social services side, on the exporting of health care dollars to the United States. We've actually got Americans up here recruiting people to go down to the States so we can blow our health care dollars in a rather ridiculous manner instead of building the facilities here under our health care system and through the AADAC system which is already set up.

Mr. Speaker, I find this Bill to be rather offensive, and I hope that the Assembly will reject it. I see no reason why we should make another raid on the heritage trust fund to try to satisfy the whims of a Premier trying to get himself re-elected.

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move into a summation of this debate and attempt to answer the legitimate questions that have been asked. I'll leave the questions with respect to health estimates generally to another forum than this one except to affirm that the health budget has, of course, been increased by 10 percent this year over last, I think an important statement of priority while other departments have had to deal with a good deal less resources in order that that increase could occur.

Firstly, with respect to the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore and the concern expressed about the repeal of the former Alberta foundation on alcoholism Act, the view we've taken is that the issue of substance abuse in the '90s is not one that can be met by the legislative model of the '60s and '70s, which the foundation Act really was. It went a long way to head Alberta into a leadership position with respect to program support, but it was, I think, lacking in the area in fact identified by the Edmonton-Centre representative, which is that we need to ensure that the model is not just an academically-, university-based model, which the foundation really contemplated, but more one of community supports with epidemiological supports with community working groups that can be part of that foundation's programs. So I don't believe that that model is in fact the right one, and although there is some duplication, I agree, with the new legislation that we're proposing here in Bill

35, I think it adds the important component of the family life side.

Contrary to the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, I don't take the view that this narrows the focus. In fact, I take the view that it broadens the focus beyond just the issue of substance abuse but rather looks at how that impacts on family life. Shouldn't that be the broader support of the program? Certainly it was the view of the advisory committee that that be the case. So I guess the issue is that we agree on the problem. We don't agree, perhaps, on the solution that we're proposing. However, I think there's good support for the solution that we're proposing.

With respect to the need to define "family," I think it's dangerous to get into a definition of family because with all the forms of family that we now have, and I'm sure many more to come that none of us have contemplated, it would be rather presumptuous to believe that we could define that as a unit in legislation. I would rather leave it in whatever the definition may come. The definition is not the issue. What is the issue is ensuring that people have support for programs and looking at substance abuse perhaps in a little different way than we've looked at it, only on the operational side through AADAC.

The member also contended that a family can't grow – and I'm paraphrasing – in the presence of substance abusers. That is not a judgment that any of us, I think, can make. If a substance abuse situation exists in a family, we cannot force that family apart. We cannot say that that is not a family that can work, because frankly we don't know what works. I don't think it's a matter for government to define what kind of family works. Instead, I think the issue is: if they decide to break up that family arrangement, find some support for that decision that gives them the support they need for the issue of substance abuse. If, however, they choose to stay within that family relationship, then let us direct our programs to teaching them the skills of accepting what they can change and having the courage to change what they cannot accept. I think that's a far more important role for this foundation and one which the foundation will be supported in.

With respect to the autonomy of the foundation and the concern about section 6, which I did address in my opening remarks, I won't repeat those remarks except to say that I think having an opportunity for the Minister of Health in this case to focus some of the objectives of the foundation is a very important part of ensuring that we're getting the research we need in the areas that we might need it, perhaps in an area identified by Health. It's not unusual that that kind of a section be in a research or a supportive foundation. Just look to the same kind of section that exists in the Wild Rose Foundation.

Moving on, then, to the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, I don't believe we are moving away from a health promotion model. I think we're trying to look at health promotion in an area which has perhaps a specific focus for health promotion, but I don't agree that this moves us away from a health promotion model. I think we need to look at health promotion in a far broader area than we perhaps are now, and I'll have more comments in respect of Edmonton-Centre's remarks.

5:20

The member took some concern with the commitment of \$200 million. The allocation, if you like, for the \$6 million this year, as a first step towards that \$200 million, is not a decision of government but a decision of this Legislature as we work through those estimates. We also have put in place a sunset clause. By the year 2002, when there's a required review of the

legislation to ensure that it's still in place in the books of the Legislature, if the Legislature deems that it isn't a priority, one that we shouldn't be focusing on, then that's an important part, I think, of our discipline as we work through, between now and 11 years from now, on how we're focusing that debate. If we truly need this foundation, which I happen to believe we do, then that will be a part of ensuring that when we get to that, and as we think ahead to that caveat on the legislation, it will make us a little more disciplined in terms of how we use the funds.

How the grants will be made. Peer review? Yes. Inner disciplinary review? Yes. For example, the Alberta Cancer Board has the model of the board, but they also have the spin-off model that looks from a peer review, academic point of view. Specialists in the area of cancer research from all over the world will look at research projects the Alberta Cancer Board will fund. I think that's a model that could be used in this instance as well. Local and international expertise? Yes, absolutely. We certainly don't want to duplicate what's being done in other jurisdictions.

Many members have spoken about the number of agencies that have an interest in this area: for example, Nechi, FCSS, the Cawsey report, Alberta social workers, the psychology group, the Family Life Education Council that the Member for Edmonton-Centre . . . All can submit proposals, which is why I don't think this should just be an arm of AADAC. Rather, it should be the broader foundation with AADAC representation on it so we avoid duplication but not simply an arm of AADAC. I'm not convinced and I don't think anyone in AADAC would say that they have all the answers on substance abuse or the program that we should be supporting. That's what the foundation is for.

Will the foundation prepare an annual report? Yes. In terms of activities, as much as we can. I think there may well be projects which have an ongoing commitment. There may not be an evaluation at the end of one year's time, but as much as we can give it a sense of those projects and the evaluative tools that have been put in place in that project, I think we have to do that.

Will it meet the health needs of adolescents? Will it be directed to look at those? Yes, but to all Albertans as well. Will it be with respect to the difficulties and the uniqueness of rural and isolated communities? Yes, but all Alberta communities. I don't think substance abuse is something that we can say is only housed in a certain geographic location in our province. I don't say the member is saying that. I think we have to look at the special interest groups but ensure that our policy is directed towards the problem in Alberta for Albertans.

Edmonton-Centre made some comments with respect to the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation. Certainly the Ontario foundation has done some very useful work in the past and continues to do useful work, but they can't do it all. Certainly AADAC leads the Ontario addiction centre with respect to treatment. So I think what we are looking at is how we can complement work being done by AADAC and other research foundations, which is why we're setting up this one here. The foundation can provide a very useful contribution, I think, to the research base, and we shouldn't just assume that others are going to do it. Research will never be enough or finished. The discovery of new knowledge and understanding, I would argue, will be part of the momentum that takes us into the 21st century.

Some of the areas that I think we can look at with the foundation are in respect to a data base. The overall mandate of the foundation requires some sound information bases and a data base involving demographics of drug abuse, for example, in

Alberta. An epidemiology is required. Education is a major problem in terms of a lack of awareness and inability to detect an individual's addicted or at-risk behaviour by professionals like teachers, nurses, doctors. Can't we look at how we educate these people in our system to ensure they can pick up on the signs of substance abuse? In terms of treatment, we've talked about new models of treatment. In terms of research and evaluation, basic biochemical research in identifying drug or substance dependency and the factors that predispose an individual to substance abuse later in life is part of the basic research that I think needs to be looked at.

The clinical research is the community based. I happen to support the hon. member when he suggests that we look at community-based research as well. Then training, the development of future care givers. I think, again, it's vital that our professionals here in Alberta understand the issue of substance abuse and how to recognize the signs. There's certainly nothing in the Act to prevent community-based organizations, but the caveat I would put on not just community but on the broader institution as well is that carrying out research or educational projects will only be outlined where there's an evaluation capability within that, and the evaluation of research projects has to be a part, which is why it's part of the objects of the foundation. It has to be part and an important component in ensuring that the project will, in fact, in the view of the research be one that is more universally available in the community, and then it would become operational either through FCSS, AADAC, whatever is the operational arm of government. So to restrict it just to AADAC I think would be a disservice to not only the foundation and Albertans but to AADAC itself.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a few questions with respect to the Member for Edmonton-Calder who asked: is this just another council or commission set up by the Conservative government so they can employ Conservative MLAs or other Conservatives in the province? My answer is no. If the hon. member or any hon. members would like to suggest members who might sit on this foundation as leading Albertans in the area of family life and substance abuse, I would welcome their suggestions to me and then on to cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the issue, instead of being mocked or made fun of, which some members have not resisted the urge to do, is an issue that we need to be concerned about. It's an issue that needs a '90s solution beyond that of a legislative model of the '60s or '70s. I believe the work that we've done in this province to make us a leader is one that we should launch upon as we try to improve the research capability in substance abuse, and I would recommend to this Legislature that second reading of Bill 35 now be given.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health has moved second reading of Bill 35, Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act. Those in favour of second reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

5:30

For the motion:

Ady	Elzinga	Musgrove
Betkowski	Evans	Nelson
Black	Gesell	Oldring
Bogle	Getty	Payne
Brassard	Gogo	Severtson
Calahasen	Kowalski	Shrake
Cardinal	Laing, B.	Sparrow

Cherry	Lund	Tannas
Day	McCoy	Thurber
Dinning	Mirosh	Trynchy
Drobot	Moore	Weiss

Against the motion:

Bruseker	Hawkesworth	Mjolsness
Chivers	Hewes	Roberts
Ewasiuk	Laing, M.	Sigurdson
Fox	McEachern	Taylor

Totals:	For - 33	Against - 12
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion carried; Bill 35 read a second time]

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:37 p.m.]