

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, August 15, 1989 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 89/08/15

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

**Bill 1**  
**Family Day Act**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite pleased today to move third reading of Bill 1, the Alberta Family Day Act, standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise at this time to speak on third reading of Bill 1, the Family Day Act. Certainly we support the concept of a family day. We believe that we must recognize and celebrate the diversity of families in Alberta. We believe that in a fast-paced society it is often hard for families to find time to be together to share in activities, traditions, and the rituals that bind families, communities, and nations together. We need time as a society -- an economic, social, and political system -- to reflect upon how families and their needs and aspirations must be considered in all matters when we are considering all matters of social action.

Too often families are considered unimportant or an impediment to the smooth functioning of other aspects of society, particularly the paid labour force and the marketplace. Yet we must recognize that social and economic structures are ultimately there to serve human needs, the needs that are most often focused and met in the family. So those of us in the public sector, when we are deliberating on matters of importance to all members of society, must recognize the centrality of families to most workers.

I think the associate minister is mistaken if he thinks a family day will change violent and abusive behaviour, as he has suggested during committee study. However, perhaps a family day will help policymakers focus on the needs of troubled families and on families in which there is violence and that such policymakers will then commit themselves to initiating alternatives, remedies, and support to members of these families. This family day can be for some families a time to participate and celebrate together. I regret that the government has chosen to make this merely a public holiday and have not called for retail closing; thus, some families will be denied opportunities for coming together, which I believe is what the Premier is advocating.

Certainly we know that some families cannot be together because one or more members is involved in delivering essential services. However, we can all survive if this is not a wide open retail shopping day. Shopping is not essential to one's well-being; therefore, retail opening cannot be compared to providing health care or other essential services. Therefore, although I support the idea and concept of a family day, I believe this Bill falls short of delivering that to all families in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too want to comment at third reading stage of the Bill. I was here in committee and listened to the remarks of the hon. Associate Minister of Family and Social Services. There is something that struck me about his comments that I think is important enough to bring back to the Assembly, and that's that the minister recalled that Remembrance Day at one time wasn't a holiday. Remembrance Day was a time when we remembered, and in due course we turned Remembrance Day into a holiday.

From that holiday we seem to have had a sale day. You know, I notice that when we get into certain seasons, we seem to have theme sales. We seem to get into situations where we have retailers trying to promote, by using the same language, their similar situation with the holiday that's being celebrated. In and around the November time we have retailers that talk about declaring war on high prices, that they're going to have a blitz that's only going to last so many hours, words that seem to fit in with words that were going on in wartime. We see the commercialization of religious celebrations, of Christmas season being the time to exchange gifts rather than to have a time to be together and talk about the reason that those in a Christian society celebrate or at least purportedly celebrate Christmas. I wonder, perhaps somewhat facetiously, if in due course if we have family day declared and it's going to be a holiday for some but not for everybody -- I wonder, as I said, somewhat facetiously, if you go into a retail store with one child if you are going to get 10 percent off, or if you go in with two children perhaps you'll get 20 percent off, on that day only.

Well, you know the reason for the Bill is good. But the problem that I see with the Bill is that it allows too many people, albeit a minority, to have to work on a day they ought to have off to try and remember that it is family that we are trying to celebrate and show some significance to. Mr. Speaker, it's for that minority that I attempt to speak. It's for that minority that I want to speak out and on their behalf encourage the government to therefore reconsider in due course that there be a retail closing on that family day so that on that day we do remember what is important, and that is the family.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to offer a few comments at third reading on Bill 1 and I guess primarily to reiterate, as we've said before, how much we appreciate the government stealing yet another one of our good ideas. Of course, the fact is that the Member for Vegreville introduced the fact that there should be a midwinter holiday on the third Monday of February, and the jeers which came from the government benches that this was such a silly bit of nonsense at the time -- we also said that in fact maybe we should go to Albertans and ask them the kind of day or the theme or the name that they would like to give this holiday: maybe we could get from the grass roots the kinds of values, the kinds of interests, the theme, the kind of concern that they would most like to epitomize by having a midwinter holiday.

Well, the government in its authoritative wisdom decided to call it family day, and I guess we can't argue with that other than that we still have concerns about it springing from the politics of nostalgia, the fact that maybe the family is a way to look back at the '50s, back to the days when there was swimming in

the river and a dollar was a dollar and people used to watch CFL football games all the time. Those days, of course, are gone, and the family is in a very different mode in the 1990s.

I would certainly submit, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, being a family man myself, being a husband with three kids trying to work our way through this generation into the next, we certainly are going to appreciate having another day designated family day next February. But I would submit to members of the Assembly that it would be my hope for us as citizens of the province and as parents and grandparents or sons and daughters that we see the family on this day not just as a day to -- as I've heard some cabinet ministers say, "Well, we'll just take it to go for another day of skiing or for a family holiday unto ourselves and take it in a day away." I would submit that we might get more value out of this day if we see ourselves as being members of a community where we see all of the citizens as our brothers and sisters in a kind of community of a family which is understood not just in a nuclear sense, not just in a single household sense, but rather in a more community sense, a sense which we as social democrats take very seriously, that we are in a sense our brothers' and our sisters' keepers, that we need to work together, realizing that that individual down the street is not just some separate person but rather someone who is on this planet in this province with us, whose own worth and value we need to support and uphold and share the riches of our provincial wealth with.

So I'd like to see that although I might go down to Ponoka and visit my mother-in-law on this family day with my family, we might also go to the Alberta Hospital Ponoka and visit with those people who are chronically mentally ill, many people with schizophrenia and other mental illnesses whose families because of various circumstances maybe they haven't seen in some time, individuals, Albertans, who have been deserted in institutions of mental health. It would seem to me that if my sons and daughters were going to be good citizens of this province, they might take this day to go and visit some of those people with chronic mental illness at the Alberta Hospital Ponoka and see them as their brothers and sisters as well. Maybe if we traveled down to the southern part of the province and visited a sister-in-law or a cousin who is suffering with autism, we'd see that in fact there are other Albertans who are handicapped in various ways. They are not to be marginalized. They're not to be seen to be disabled in certain ways but, in fact, that they too are our brothers and sisters and that the family membership in this province is such that they are valued and their needs are valued as much as anybody else's.

Then maybe we'd fly the family up to Little Buffalo and have my sons and daughters talk with the sons and daughters of some of the first native peoples of this province, the Lubicon people, and ask them and talk with them on family day and see how it is that the oil industry and how the forestry industry has, in a sense, so ravaged their way of life that it's very difficult for them to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Careful, hon. member. It's third reading. Please confine yourself to the Bill.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to talk about my family and the province of Alberta on third reading of this Bill 1. I thought it might be appropriate.

So there are all kinds of things. I think we as parents and as legislators, people who are concerned about the family, need to

broaden our vision, broaden our sense of what the family is about, to understand that the brothers and sisters that we have in this province aren't just in our own households but in a sense in our provincial household. We need to not just take this day to isolate ourselves or separate ourselves away from them and their experience but rather use it as a way to enter into and to learn from their experiences and be people of empathy and people of compassion who use this occasion to enter more into the experiences which they share.

Then, who knows, Mr. Speaker, maybe we'd come down to the West Edmonton Mall and -- as my colleagues have said, despite the fact that we tried to amend it to make it a retail holiday as well -- find where the power source is for the mall and pull the plug and close it down for a day and say instead, "Why don't we on family day bring everybody out of the mall and this addiction to accumulation of material goods, and let's just have a street dance or some kind of celebration of us being brothers and sisters in this province." Now, we're to have a street dance in Strathcona, this weekend I think, to begin the opening of the Fringe festival. It's a great idea. It's a great experience. It's a way for people to play together, to have fun together, to realize that whether they are gay or lesbian, whether they are new Canadian, whether they are black or white or whatever colour they might be, whether they are rich or poor, no matter what they come from or what their experience is, they too are seen as our brothers and sisters in this province.

We need a time to close down the food bank and say, "No, we don't need any more food banks to have our brothers and sisters go begging for food but to come and have a province where people are given the basic resources and a minimum income, because that's what we'd want for our own brothers and sisters and our own family and our own households." This is the kind of family day, Mr. Speaker, I think that we as New Democrats really want to see take place on the third Monday of February next year.

Then I submit that it's not just that we want to see it on the third Monday of February next year, but we'd rather see this each and every day of the year as a kind of a sense of our family and our values which we'd like to have embraced through our policies and through our life and involvement in the life of the province. I'm glad for the one opportunity to do this on family day, but I'd submit, as would my colleagues, that we want to see the values of the family and of care for our brothers and sisters throughout the province as being exalted in a very real sense and a much better sense each and every day of the year.

Thank you very much.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, interesting to hear the hon. members tonight, because during committee study I thought there were some pretty thoughtful comments regarding the Bill. I guess we got to use them all up.

We have the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre again proving that he wasn't prepared to speak on the Bill. In talking about the Member for Vegreville carrying a proposed Bill to the House, it's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Vegreville, backed up by the Member for Edmonton-Centre, just did such a poor job of selling their Bill that the House didn't accept it. I mean, they blew the chance. Now, that just happens to be poor performance. However, you can't account for that. They had a good idea and couldn't even sell it to a bunch of us who believed that it was a good idea. They blew it so badly that we, knowing that there was such an importance as the family,

recreated something that is going to go on in time in the future in Alberta and is going to play a greater and greater role in focusing on one of the traditions, one of the foundations upon which this province is built and why it is such a great province and why we must come back to those traditions and the foundation.

Now, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre has such a hesitant, fearful, timid view of the capacity of the people of Alberta that he would want in some way to pass legislation that forces people to do certain things. It's the socialist, state-control thought, and it's wrong. It has been wrong in the past, and it's wrong now. You have to have faith in the people of the province that they will develop this family day, that they will work. The government merely provides the framework; it's the people who do it. It's not people against their employers. Surely they're all the people of Alberta. They work together, and together they're going to develop family day. I know that someday in the future that poor, timid, hesitant Edmonton-Centre MLA, wherever he will be in those days, probably ... Well, no, I won't even speculate, because we'd probably have to help him to the food bank.

MR. McEACHERN: What about the food bank?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GETTY: So, Mr. Speaker, what I would do is tell the members to have some faith in the people, realize that we're breaking new ground here, that this family day will be an important part of the future focus on an important tradition and an important foundation of our province.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, although I think some members have made some thoughtful contributions, others who do not wish to support the Bill -- I would find that sad, and I'd urge them to have some vision, have a little thought. Don't be so timid. Get in there; help us make this a very successful new foundation in the future of Alberta. Support Bill 1. I urge all members, and I'm pleased again to move third reading of Bill 1, Alberta Family Day.

[Motion carried; Bill 1 read a third time]

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

No.	Title	Moved by
5	Department of Health Act	Betkowski
6	Securities Amendment Act, 1989	Anderson

**Bill 11**  
**Senatorial Selection Act**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 11, the Senatorial Selection Act, with amendments.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I hope that if the Deputy Premier concludes debate, there will be more dignity to the debate than from what we saw from the gentleman to his left.

Mr. Speaker, we said from the outset that the principle of the Senatorial Selection Act was a good principle, that we would back it. We made a number of suggestions in a way we thought we could perfect the Bill for Albertans. The Senatorial Selec-

tion Act is the first in the process of moving towards a reformed Senate, which I believe is imperative for Alberta. There are many instances, many cases, examples that have been brought up in this Assembly of how central government has not treated this province fairly. There is disparity in terms of economic development in our country, and we in Alberta always seem to get the short end of the stick. So a reformed Senate is important, and having people who are responsible and accountable to Albertans is an important part in that process.

But we cannot support this Bill in its form, in the manner in which it's been presented, because the government has chosen not to make amendments which we thought would have made it easier for all Albertans to have participated in the process. It is unreasonable to ask that somebody obtain 4,000 signatures to nominate a man or a woman to be a senatorial candidate. I've had some experience in getting signatures for nominations at the local level. Ten signatures is easy; 250 or 200 signatures would have been enough to keep those candidates who are not serious out of the picture. But imagine getting 4,000 signatures with an affidavit or a statutory declaration to back up each one of those 4,000 signatures. The effect of it is that we limit the candidate to probably a candidate from a political party, a party that could go out to constituencies where there are Liberals or Conservatives or NDP and get those kinds of signatures.

I think that it's limiting and unfair to say that a candidate must put up a \$4,000 deposit. There are lots of Albertans who don't have \$4,000 in cash who would, I think, like to be candidates. Again, I understand the fact that you want to limit those candidates that aren't serious, and I think there could have been an amount that could easily have done that.

The fact that the Act excludes certain people I think makes it vulnerable to an attack under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I think that somebody could say that all Albertans aren't given the opportunity to participate in that senatorial selection. Numerous members of this Legislature have drawn to the attention of the members present that it was the task force headed up by the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that recommended that existing Senators participate in this election process. I would have liked to have encouraged sitting Senators to engage in this election and in future elections. This legislation precludes that from happening. So the Act flies in the face of the very thing that the government wanted to do by its task force.

I think the final straw that breaks the camel's back in this whole matter is the fact that \$30,000 is allowed as a contribution to a senatorial candidate. Nobody gets that kind of privilege, that kind of opportunity, that kind of one-upmanship running as an MLA or as an MP. I think that it again limits the process to the very rich -- \$4,000 -- and the very rich parties or the established parties and doesn't open up this process to all Albertans. So we can't support the Bill even though we agree with the principle of the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I cannot support this Bill, and I just want to set those reasons out in a very succinct sort of way.

First of all, I want to make it very clear that by not supporting the Bill I don't want anyone to misunderstand that I think that the regions of this country are effectively represented in

national decision-making. I don't. I think that the whole concept of a Triple E Senate has some merit, and I can provide some support for that concept, but I do have a concern with this particular measure. First of all, I think it's wasteful because there's absolutely no guarantee that the Prime Minister of this country will accept for the Senate whatever nominee comes forward out of this process. My second reason for not supporting this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm quite convinced in my own mind that if we want something that's truly effective and equal and elected, that all of those interests have to be advanced at the same time, and to go forward with just the election of a Senate nominee will permanently frustrate anyone who has an ambition towards seeing the eventual goal of an effective, elected, and equal Senate.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We heard comment earlier about the need to develop good legislation if it's to be sold all around. This is a piece of legislation that had the potential to be good legislation, but unfortunately, in my opinion it's not good legislation. It's not a good Bill, so it can't be sold all around. It may be sold within the Tory caucus, but it isn't going to be sold to all members of this House.

There are a number of provisions in the Bill that I feel take away from it being a fair Bill. One of the most important to me is the failure of the government to recognize that we have a system in which we have four levels of government if we look at school boards, the municipalities, the province, and the federal government. I've always seen the four levels of government as being equal in the sense that we're all elected to represent people, and I don't see the provincial government as being senior to the municipal or to the school boards or the federal being senior to us. When we have a Bill that has a provision in it that allows the provincial government to steamroll over the municipalities, to steamroll over the school boards and say that if we choose to, we're going to hold this selection process the same day as the most important thing that happens during the municipal representatives' three-year term, and that is their election. So I think it's wrong that we simply steamroll over them, and we say we're going to do it despite the fact that representatives of the two largest urban centres in Alberta, representing 50 percent of the population, have made it quite clear that they do not agree with that provision.

I have difficulties with the requirements to qualify. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry gave some very, very wise arguments as to why the provisions in there are not good provisions. I do want to correct the reference he made to the 4,000 names, which should be 1,500 names. The 4,000, of course, applies to the number of dollars that are required to be deposited. I think that will take away from opportunity for people to seek or participate in that selection process.

The last reason I want to touch on, Mr. Speaker, is the provision that excludes certain people from running, members of this particular House. I don't think it's proper. I don't think it's logical to propose that if a member wants to run, that member can step down and then turn around and seek election in the by-election that would be created. I think the constituents within that particular area would be extremely frustrated and extremely disappointed, and they would reject that person, and rightfully so.

So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Bill

in its form although I do support the concept of an elected Senate.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I too support the idea of the Triple E Senate, and I certainly know the need for an elected Senate, but I think most has been said by other hon. members: the fact of the high cost of the payment to run and the very fact it has to be held on the same day as municipal elections. In no way can I support this Bill.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, just a short one. I'd like to talk about the general thrust of the Bill. I think when we talked about a Triple E Senate some years ago . . . It's nearly always the party provincially whose federal cousins have experienced a huge majority that suddenly find that the huge majority that their federal cousins won doesn't result in a national policy that is any more favourable to the province than what they had with the other party. In other words, when the Trudeau government ran away with everything in '68, the provincial Liberals all wanted an elected Senate in 1971. Mulroney ran away with the election a few years ago, and then the Tories discovered the elected Senate. I daresay even if the NDP, perish the thought, somehow or another run away with the government sometime in the future, within three years all provincial ND parties would be for the elected Senate.

But the whole idea behind the elected Senate was that we would be caucusing by province or by region, not by party. The whole idea of an elected Senate was to try to get away from the national parties controlling the Senate, as they now do by appointment. So here we had a chance to start out and put together a Bill that would recognize the fact and maybe break through this whole bar of national parties controlling the provincial parties. It'll always be so as long as parties are present because they're much larger and have more money at their disposal and more efforts to influence the people that give money. So if we could have put into this Bill an inborn prejudice, if it was possible, towards independent candidates rather than towards party candidates, it would have been a step in the right direction or at least an impartiality. But, lo and behold, they've put the maximum donation at \$30,000 each. Well, what independent is going to command \$30,000 unless his mother-in-law owns Imperial Oil or Esso or something like that? So obviously it's party donations. A \$4,000 deposit: obviously then the party is putting it up.

This thing is oriented in such a way that they're trying to make the elected Senate nothing more than the pawn of a political party, one of the very reasons we talked about putting an elected Senate together. Now we've liberal-minded people and New Democrat or socialist-inclined, and in Alberta I daresay that there are probably some fascist-inclined people that will want to offer themselves for the Senate. We've had it before. The point is that those philosophies can stand out and the people can reject them, but this way, under a party system, whoever gets elected, especially with \$30,000 donations and 1,500 signatures collected, is going to owe a tremendous debt to a party, and we're going back into a hole that we shouldn't have dug for ourselves in the first place.

The second thing I wanted to tackle a bit was credibility. Not only do we tell the Prime Minister that he cannot pick from the MLAs and the MPs, which has been normal since the dawn of Canada as a probable source of possible Senators -- we say, "No, no; you're not allowed to" -- but we run it at the time of a

civic election when the issues may or may not or probably will be obscured by a lot of civic voting. And if we get the same turnout for this as we do for civic votes -- 50 percent, 40 percent, whatever it is -- you can imagine what a thunderous message that is going to send to Ottawa: \$30,000 donations, \$4,000 deposits, and 50 percent of the electorate turned out. My gosh, won't we be impressive indeed. Every writer for the *Globe and Mail* will have paroxysms of laughter as he rolls down the side there as Albertans with their tiny fists talk about electing a Senate. They've made such a botch of the Act.

No, Mr. Speaker. We had a chance to put something here in the history, and I'm disappointed by it. I suppose that maybe great things have to start with small steps. If that's true, this government has taken about the smallest step possible I think they could have towards a real elected Senate.

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, in summation.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move third reading of this Bill. I am disappointed in the Liberals' attitude. I think it is unfortunate that because they didn't get their way in their amendments, they now renege upon the support they gave in second reading as a matter of principle. But that's typical, I guess: if you can't get your own way, well, then you take your ball and go home.

The hon. leader of the Liberal Party, corrected as he was by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud as to the number of signatures, repeated not once but several times that it required 4,000 signatures. I wonder if he ever read the Bill. It's a good thing that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud had read at least that section, because the hon. leader of the Liberal Party didn't know what he was talking about until he was corrected by one of his own members. Well, that's only one part of it.

But the most ludicrous thing I have ever heard with respect to this Bill was his suggestion that a sitting Senator should be allowed to run for a Senate vacancy. How absurd. How absurd could that possibly be. He said it earlier during the course of previous debate on this Bill, and he said it again tonight. When I first heard it, I thought he was making a mistake, that like 4,000 signatures instead of 1,500, he had somehow mistaken an appointed Senator, sitting there in that patronage-ridden upper Chamber ...

REV. ROBERTS: All Tories.

MR. HORSMAN: "All Tories," says the Member for Edmonton-Centre. My goodness, he doesn't even know how the Senate is composed.

Well, let me just continue, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to point out the ludicrous nature of the proposal. There is a difference between an appointed Senator seeking an elected position for another vacancy created by the death or resignation or whatever of another Senator. Now, talk about wanting to have their cake and eat it too. But that's typical of the Liberals, I must say. They know all about that patronage-ridden upper Chamber, and certainly the hon. leader of the Liberal Party knows more about it than anybody in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is so bizarre as to be beyond belief.

The other objection, of course, that they have raised is that the people of Alberta are incapable of understanding the difference between electing a Senator and voting for a member of a school board. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is an insult to the in-

telligence of Albertans. We can go to the polls, as I do on every civic election day, and I vote for school board members.

MR. TAYLOR: I doubt it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HORSMAN: I have never missed a vote, ever, since I've had the opportunity of voting. So I can tell that to the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. And I never will as long as I'm capable of doing it, because I value so much the opportunity we have in this democracy. So the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon can, in an aside, cast doubt on the fact that I have exercised my franchise. I assure him that I have, and I would accept his apology either here or outside the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: The school board in Medicine Hat doesn't have to have ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HORSMAN: I have voted every time I had an opportunity. I vote for school board members; I vote for aldermanic candidates; I vote for the mayor, I vote on plebiscites, whether it's fluoridation or whatever it may be. You know, so do thousands and hundreds of thousands of Albertans, and you know, those folks know what they're doing. Now, you may not agree with the results. You may not like the decision the people make, but I know that Albertans are intelligent enough to know that if it is the decision to go with the municipal election and with the senatorial vote at the same time, they'll know the difference. I have much more faith in the people of Alberta than the Liberal leader and the members of the Liberal caucus sitting there. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have more faith in the people of Alberta than do the Liberals in this Assembly and that argument.

Now, as for the eligibility question. It is clear, and I pointed it out to this Assembly that the Canada Elections Act and the Alberta Elections Act make it necessary for anybody seeking election to either one of those bodies to resign their seat before the nomination day, and the same principle applies in this particular case. Why there should be any difference, why anybody should be able to protect their seat, so to speak, and at the same time run for another is beyond me. It is a fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy that one parliamentarian from one body should not be entitled to seek election in the other body while they still hold a seat in the other Assembly. It's fundamental.

Now, I've gone through these arguments before, and I want just to touch on the arguments advanced by the members of the Official Opposition. As I said in an earlier debate, the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn has indeed touched on a matter of some considerable concern with respect to this legislation. That is that if every other province did the same as Alberta, eventually we would entrench in an elected upper body an unequal situation, and that would undermine the Triple E. I recognize that as a danger, and that is a very valid and legitimate concern and, quite frankly, from the opposition ranks the only one that really demands considerable attention.

I want to put it this way. We recognize that this Bill is not going to bring about a Triple E Senate. We recognize that it is only a small first step towards achieving senatorial change. But I also know this: at the constitutional table when you are dis-

cussing these matters with provinces and the federal government, unless we take an additional step, unless we put the pressure on through the process that we have available to us by way of opportunity in the Meech Lake accord, it will be much more difficult to obtain real Senate reform. But when the first truly elected Senator sets foot in that House, it will change forever the face of the Canadian Senate and the Canadian Parliament. Make no mistake about it.

Now there are those who are timid, who say, "Oh, the Prime Minister may not accept the person that the people of Alberta say we want to be there by duly elected process." Well, they may think that, and they may have some cause for concern, because certainly the Prime Minister doesn't indicate any happiness about what we are proposing to do, but that doesn't make any difference to me. I don't care whether the Prime Minister is happy about this process or not, because what I want to see is the people of Alberta being happy and participating in the democratic process to elect somebody who will sit in that Chamber. I say that when they are duly elected by the electoral process, the Prime Minister will have the list he requires under Meech Lake, and that list will be abided by, and the people of Alberta will have made a wise decision, whatever that may be.

Now, the NDP have said they will not participate in this election. That's fine. Let them stay out, because it suits them to be so timid, so frightened, so afraid, they just can't stand the thought, perhaps, of losing or that maybe one -- well, we've never heard why or any good reason. They also, of course, are bound so ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HORSMAN: ... closely to their federal party that their only solution is to say, "Well, we want to abolish the Senate in its present form." Well, nobody wants to keep the Senate in its present form, but before we substitute the Senate in its present form for a vacant space, we'd better have an alternative to put in its place. This Legislature has developed that. It's called a Triple E Senate. That, of course, is something we are striving towards. This Bill is a step in the right direction.

Hon. members, you can vote against the Bill. You in the NDP and you in the Liberal Party can vote against it, but I'll tell you this, folks: the people of Alberta want it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Deputy Premier has moved third reading of Bill 11, Senatorial Selection Act. Those members in favour of third reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion carries.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With due respect, hon. mem-

bers, eight minutes should be long enough to be back in our places.

The Deputy Premier has moved third reading of Bill 11, Senatorial Selection Act. Those in favour, please stand.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm glad you're voting, Jimmy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

For the motion:

Ady	Evans	Mirosh
Anderson	Gesell	Moore
Betkowski	Getty	Musgrove
Black	Gogo	Nelson
Bogle	Horsman	Oldring
Bradley	Isley	Paszkowski
Brassard	Johnston	Severtson
Cardinal	Jonson	Shrake
Clegg	Klein	Speaker, R.
Day	Laing, B.	Tannas
Drobot	Lund	Thurber
Elzinga	Main	Zarusky

Against the motion:

Barrett	Gibeault	Pashak
Bruseker	Hawkesworth	Roberts
Chumir	Hewes	Sigurdson
Decore	Laing, M.	Taylor
Doyle	McEachern	Wickham
Ewasiuk	McInnis	Woloshyn
Fox	Mitchell	Wright
Gagnon	Mjolsness	

Totals: Ayes -- 36 Noes -- 23

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a third time]

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**  
(Second Reading)

**Bill Pr. 1**

**Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 1, Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Union College was incorporated in 1940. It is a private college and is registered as a charitable organization. Now, as a charitable organization it is partially funded through donations. This proposed amendment is designed to exempt the college from several provisions of the Insurance Act that would apply because of the way the donations are structured. Now, as I understand this question, these donations are structured so that the donor receives an annuity. Under the Insurance Act, these annuities are deemed to be life insurance for the purpose of the Insurance Act. As a consequence, the Canadian Union College, as an insurer of the annuity, is subject to the regulations and supervision of the superintendent of insurance. The acting superintendent of insurance does not object to the Canadian Union College removing itself from the purview of the Insurance Act, because the structure of the donations poses no risk to the college.

Now, it's my understanding there is no tax implication for

Bill Pr. 1, as the college is not a licensed insurer under the Insurance Act. The college is exempt from the 2 percent premium tax whether or not Bill Pr. 1 is passed. The Standing Committee on Private Bills has done an in-depth review and approved this Bill, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will correct a situation that was not the intent of the Insurance Act when it was amended in 1981. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 1 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 2**  
**General Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Edmonton**  
**Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move second reading of Bill Pr. 2, the General Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Edmonton Amendment Act, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill can tell you just how important the simple little things of life are. This simply adds the word "The" to the title of the hospital to enable them to be able to do better business with the federal department of revenue and so save some hundreds of thousands of dollars. We're pleased that we were able to present it and save the hospital and the taxpayers of the province some money and clean this up with a small article, the word "the."

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 2 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 3**  
**Canada Olympic Park**  
**Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. SPEAKER: Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of the Canada Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1989.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will add the Olympic Hall of Fame to the properties which are exempted under a previous private Act. The Bill is approved both by the current taxing authority, the MD of Rocky View, and the city of Calgary, which may at some time in the future become the taxing authority.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 3 read a second time]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the conversations could be outside.

**Bill Pr. 4**  
**Edmonton Community Foundation**  
**Amendment Act, 1989**

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of the Edmonton Community Foundation Amendment Act, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to reactivate and reinvigorate the Edmonton Community Foundation which origi-

nally came into being in the '70s. This foundation is capable of accepting bequests and serves as a steward of funds which then makes grants to deserving charitable organizations and programs in the city of Edmonton and the region. The Bill will allow for a change in how appointments are made as personnel to the board, persons who will be able to put extensive voluntary time into the affairs of the foundation. The foundation is already in receipt of certain major bequests that could be used to great advantage to support local charities.

I'm pleased to move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 4 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 5**  
**Misericordia Hospital Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. ZARUSKY: I move second reading of Bill Pr. 5, the Misericordia Hospital Amendment Act, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill incorporates two previous corporations, The Misericordia Hospital Act, Alberta 1967, and a company known as Misericordia Hospital, May 18, 1966. After the nuns left the hospital system, it became necessary, for better bookkeeping and company business, to incorporate this under one Act.

I move second reading of Bill Pr. 5.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 5 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 6**  
**Calgary Research and Development Authority Act, 1989**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading of Bill Pr. 6, Calgary Research and Development Authority Act, 1989.

This Act is refining a number of areas that the development authority has found to not reflect today's society. In addition, I should advise the House that there will be amendments at committee stage that we can also discuss at that time.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 6 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 7**  
**Calgary Foundation Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. NELSON: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move second reading of Bill Pr. 7, the Calgary Foundation Amendment Act, 1989.

It's a number of small amendments. In addition, there will be amendments to the Bill at committee stage.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 7 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 9**  
**Claudia Elizabeth Becker Adoption Act**

MR. WRIGHT: I move that Bill Pr. 9, the Claudia Elizabeth Becker Adoption Act, be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for the adoption of one adult by two others and meets with the recommendation of the Private Bills Committee.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 9 read a second time]

**Bill Pr. 11**  
**Tammy Lynn Proctor Adoption Act**

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure to move second reading of Bill Pr. 11, the Tammy Lynn Proctor Adoption Act.

This Bill provides for the adoption of Tammy Lynn Proctor by her stepmother, Caroline Mary Walsh, and her stepfather-to-be I guess, Alexander William Walsh. I should point out that this has the support of the Private Bills Committee. Also, there are minor amendments to the preamble, which will be introduced in committee.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 11 read a second time]

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

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
**(Committee of the Whole)**

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The committee will please come to order. We are dealing with committee study of Bills.

**Bill 8**  
**Department of Social Services Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bill 8 simply changes the title of the Department of Social Services, as it was previously called, to the Department of Family and Social Services. Now, in second reading I expressed concern that the word "family" was in the singular form, and I think that if it were in the plural form, it would certainly ease some of the concern that we have. When I talk about the concern, I'm talking about the fact that the word "family" in its singular form implies one type of family. "Families," in its plural form, I think signifies that there are many different constellations of families. Now, common sense, of course, tells us that there are many forms of families in Alberta today. It's 1989, and we know that there's not just one type of family. But, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I worry that some of the members opposite, on the government side, don't always use common sense. I'm specifically talking about the Premier making some comments last year about the family. He talked as though there was only one type of family. So it remains a concern.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in question period last year on June 8, 1988, when the Premier was answering questions on issues surrounding families in this province, he stated in response to a question, and I'll quote: "We want to make sure that parents are at home to care for their families." This is just one example, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that I'm trying to illustrate, that the Premier and other members of the government side don't always recognize, at least when they're speaking, that there are a variety of types of families in this province. I think the statement I just used as an example shows a definite lack of

understanding of the diversity of families in this province.

I think it is crucial that in this debate, in discussions about families in this province, we do use the plural, because I think it is quite significant. I think as legislators and as leaders in our community and in our province, this is very important, the point that I'm trying to make. We must recognize in this day and age that there is not just one type of family where the father is out working, the mother is at home, and they've got 2.4 children. I think it's very important that all members of the Assembly recognize that there is a wide range of family makeups in this province. I think by using the word "family" in the title of the Department of Family and Social Services, we are making a statement that there is only one type of family. I am concerned about that. I think it's quite important.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to make this evening, and I'll distribute it. The amendment simply is that the word "Families" is substituted for the word "Family" in the Bill's title and all subsequent references to that title.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. The Table is not aware of this amendment. It has to be scrutinized and accepted before it's distributed. Pages, please hold it.

MS M. LAING: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. It's already been accepted and initialed by Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My apologies. We were not up to date on the initialing. Proceed.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that this is a frivolous amendment. I think it's very crucial in our discussions about the families in this province, as I already stated, and I would hope that the government would take this very seriously as well. Now, I'm not sure how they feel about the amendment. Of course, I hope to hear from some of them on that side, and if they reject this amendment, I would like them to at least explain what their feelings are on this particular issue, because I feel very strongly about this, as do my colleagues. By using the word "families" in its plural, I think it demonstrates an understanding and a tolerance of the variety of families in the province, and I think that is very important.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to speak in support of the amendment in that I think it is important that we recognize that there are a variety of families that take place in our society today. We don't just have the 1940s or the 1950s style where the majority of families were constituted by father going off to work in the morning, coming home in the afternoon to a wife and children. You know, when we go out as politicians, at least I would imagine that when we go out as politicians canvassing, whether during a campaign period or during summer break -- summer break; ha! -- or during a recess of the Legislature, and you knock on doors in the constituency, you know full well that you only go in certain sections of your constituency, because in other areas in the constituency there is nobody at home to answer your call.

If I were living in Edmonton-Parkallen, perhaps if I saw my member of the Legislature come to the door, I wouldn't respond either. But, anyway, in my constituency when I go knocking on



the door, I know that in certain areas I'm going to have all kinds of response. I can go and knock on the door and can find probably 80, 90 percent of the folk at home, but those 80 or 90 percent may very well be on welfare. They may be single moms. I go into another area of the constituency, and I can find unemployed folk at home: two partners; both at home, both unemployed. I can go into other areas of the constituency and find nobody at home or perhaps a child, because in that area of the constituency both people are out working, trying to make sure they have enough income to pay a mortgage rate.

Now, what's happened in this Legislature is that we have a belief system seemingly struck by the governing party which says that there is one kind of family that they want to enshrine, one kind of family that they want to try and protect, and only one kind of family. That's the kind of family where Harry goes off to work and Ozziet stays home. And that's a problem. That's a problem because -- what is it? -- 13 percent make up that kind of family. Of those people that are involved in family situations today, only 13 percent represent that kind of family. Mr. Chairman, it's important. We heard the member for Edmonton-Centre only a few moments ago say in the amendment to Bill Pr. 2 that in the General Hospital (Grey Nuns) of Edmonton Amendment Act they added the word "the". Here what we want to do is change the word "family" to "families" to recognize that there is more than one kind of family, more than one kind of family structure in today's society. And that's an important recognition to add to this department; we don't just have one kind. I think that if we have that constant reminder, if the minister and the department have that constant reminder, then we'll all, all of us, be better served.

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

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I do support the amendment. I think it does clarify what I hope the minister and the Premier have intended in drafting this particular Bill. I have spoken many times in this House about different kinds of families, and the Premier, to his credit, has similarly spoken that he understands that there are different relationships in families nowadays than there were when he was younger and when I was younger.

AN HON. MEMBER: Last year.

MRS. HEWES: Yeah, last year.

Mr. Chairman, a family to me is more than one person in some kind of loving and nurturing relationship, a supportive relationship, and it takes many, many forms. The Premier referred to it; the government referred to changing families in their document, which I have criticized many times in this House, called Caring & Responsibility, where they in fact accept the notion that families are different today than they were a decade ago. I am not sure, however, when I read this Bill and see the title of it, that the government, in total, really understands that difference and is prepared to deal with it. I do hope they do.

Families take many forms. Two parents, 2.2 children, or all of the varieties of that: a one-parent family with one or two children, two parents with one of his and two of hers and one of theirs -- it's all right, Mr. Treasurer; it happens -- families where grandparents are raising children. A family is a family: two men living alone supporting one another or two women living

alone or two elders living alone -- of course it is -- a new Canadian family, Mr. Minister, with all of the relatives who perhaps come from other lands and live together communally. We see now very different family forms that are, in fact, loving, supportive relationships. I would hope that the Act in fact reaches out to encompass all of those: families in stress, families in emergencies, families that are broken and are poor.

Mr. Chairman, this title does not encompass that. I believe the amendment from the Member for Edmonton-Calder goes some distance to help people understand that we're reaching out to all kinds of families, and I'll support it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to speak to this amendment. I fully support the points that have been made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. I would speak to another point, however, as to a reason for changing the name to "families."

I think the other reason that we need to change it is to make front and centre our commitment to the centrality of the impact on families of social policies. We have to see them as the central focus of our policies. In fact, the impact of policies on many spheres of endeavour is now being looked at in terms of what it means for families. It would serve us well if, when we look at economic development, we look at, in planning it, how the developmental plans impact on the family structures, on the needs of families. How does it meet their needs? So I think that when we look at policies, particularly in the social services sector, which are very much directed to supporting families, we need to ask: how do the policies we develop impact on the families we would hope to serve? Part of it is recognizing the diversity of those families, knowing that policies which may help one family, if rigidly enforced will harm or hinder another family.

I think we can look at other examples from what is happening in the department of social services now which would at some level hold that they support families. When we look at social assistance levels that are far below the poverty line, we can and should say: what does it mean to live below the poverty line for the members of that family; the mothers, the fathers, the children? What does it mean to a parent and not have any kind of allowance to buy their child a birthday gift or a Christmas gift, something that is fundamental to sharing and caring for those we love, where we express our love in saying, "This I want you to have"? But the mother on social assistance is denied that possibility.

We have to look at the impact on families of some of our health care policies and how they really impact on families. We have to look at the impact on families of our policies around child care and to understand what inadequate, poor quality child care means for families as they live together, the kind of concern that never leaves a mother's mind if her child is in inadequate child care.

Therefore, I think that in naming this department "families and social services," we bring forward two very important points: one, that there is a great diversity of families in this province; and secondly, that the policies developed must serve the needs of those families and not some other need.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any more comments on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree with the amendment as ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Behind you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Hon. minister.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to try to limit my comments to the amendment itself.

I know the Member for Edmonton-Calder and the Member for Edmonton-Belmont would not want to mislead Albertans. I know that through this amendment and through their comments they went to great lengths and great pains to try to suggest that this government and our Premier don't recognize the diversity of the family. I would only want to refer them once again, Mr. Chairman, and I know they have received a copy of a document endorsed and adopted by this government called *Caring & Responsibility: A Statement of Social Policy for Alberta*. It clearly enunciates the position of this government. Before I read it, I do want to compliment the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, who recognized clearly that our Premier has alluded on numerous occasions in this Assembly to the diversity of family.

But, clearly, Mr. Chairman, one of the key principles in this document -- and I want to read it. I know the members have heard it before, but I just want to put an end to any suggestion that this government does not recognize the diversity of the family in Alberta today. Clearly, it's one of the reasons why we have this new ministry called Family and Social Services. But I want to read it, and I quote:

Government policies and programs must recognize the paramount importance of the family as the basic unit of our society and the diversity of family structures.

Nothing could be clearer than that Mr. Chairman. Nothing could be clearer than that.

As I say, I don't think this amendment requires great debate. From my perspective, families are interchangeable. Clearly, it was just an attempt, I think, by the members opposite to try to indicate that this government isn't on top of things. Clearly, we're a couple of steps ahead of them: a policy paper that we adopted over a year ago, after careful consultation with Albertans, after a great deal of work, after a great deal of input from my colleagues in government. Clearly again, Mr. Chairman, this government recognizes the diversity of the family today in Alberta.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments? The Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to comment very quickly in responding to what the minister of social services or whatever said just now. I'd just like to say that he can read all he wants, but the people of this province are watching to see what this government says and what it does. Because that's what counts; not how well he can read from a document.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOX: Just a few comments in support of the amendment proposed by my colleague from Edmonton-Calder. I would hope that the minister and members of his government would pay a little closer attention to the remarks made by the members for Edmonton-Belmont and Edmonton-Avonmore and the Premier's good friend from Edmonton-Gold Bar with respect to the diversity and complexity and reality of modern-day families. I guess it was about a year ago that the Premier twigged to the idea that mentioning the word "family" might garner political support in the province of Alberta, that somehow if you just mentioned family, paid lip service to the concept of family, suddenly people would think that you're aware and you're concerned and they might be more inclined to vote for a Conservative government. So he's certainly done that. And we've just dealt with two pieces of legislation here, Mr. Chairman, that show that the government is indeed prepared to pay lip service to the needs of certain kinds of families in Alberta. We have the Family Day Act, and now we're proposing to change the name of this department to Family and Social Services. What we're talking about, at least in a symbolic way, is broadening the ... [interjection] You're talking like the minister of economic development now; careful. This government should at least show they're aware of the diversity and the needs of modern families.

You know, I'm amazed at the lengths to which this government will go to incorporate the latest modern political buzzword -- that is, family -- into their initiatives. It was during the election that one of the most down-to-earth members of the cabinet, the Minister of Transportation and Utilities, announced a particular program to pave roads, and it was described as an initiative that was meant to strengthen the families in the province of Alberta. You know, "We're going to pave roads for families." Well, we pave roads because they need paving, and I'm sure families drive on them, but one would hardly think that had anything to do with strengthening families.

MR. CHUMIR: Cynic.

MR. FOX: I'm not cynical. I'm just being straightforward here, Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

But I think what we're proposing here by way of amendment is a fairly simple, fairly symbolic amendment but one that would at least demonstrate to the people of Alberta that the government and the minister have paid attention to the very legitimate concerns raised by members on this side of the House in defence of the real needs of families in the province of Alberta.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further comments?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree with the amendment as proposed ...

The Member for *Edmonton-Kingsway*. [interjections]

MR. McEACHERN: Maybe I'll make it long. If the best you guys can do ... [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. I believe that I was moving with reasonable speed to recognize you, but you still have to be recognized, hon. member, before beginning your remarks.

On the amendment, please, *Edmonton-Kingsway*.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was the noise that drowned out your voice, and I wasn't sure that you had not recognized me.

If the best you guys can do is holler "Question" in contributing to this debate, then just don't bother, eh? Why don't you just stay home and forget it.

I just want to answer briefly the Minister of Family and Social Services. If he is so in agreement with the Member for Edmonton-Calder that in fact the government does recognize families as having a wide variety of types and kinds, then I do not understand why he doesn't make this very simple change that would legislate that into proof to the people of Alberta that that is, in fact, his attitude. So it seems to me that either he's just being stubborn and doesn't want to make a reasonable change suggested by the opposition or else he in fact does not agree with the opposition on the variety of families and think of them as being important and in fact does have a singular view of the family. He can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. Either he follows the democratic process and accepts the idea that you should amend things to say what you really want to say, or else he does not agree. He cannot have it both ways.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments on Bill 8? The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is simply a change of title, in a sense, because all we've really done is add that word.

There is one major flaw and one major problem with the Bill as far as I see it, and that is that in spite of the comments in the throne speech, the minister has not as yet in this House articulated exactly what this Bill is intended to do or what this ministry of the family is all about. And that I think I say with regret because one expected from the very noble statements made in throne speech one and son of throne speech later on, that we were going to hear something about the intent of the government related to Family and Social Services. But we don't know. We don't know what the mandate is. We do know that there is to be a council of the family; we do know that there is to be an endowment for drug abuse, which somehow seems to be connected particularly to this ministry; and we do know that there is to be a conference and our patron of the conference will be Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor. But other than that we really don't know what this ministry is designed to accomplish for Albertans and Alberta families.

Mr. Chairman, I see that as a grave deficiency. I think it's regrettable that the minister has not as yet seen fit to outline for this House and the families and people of Alberta precisely how this is anticipated to operate. We don't know at this point in time whether or not the department will operate direct programs. We know that there is a reference in the Bill to a number of other Bills where the titles will have to be changed, and so we assume that there is some interaction with them. But I've asked before in this House and have not had answers to my questions regarding the relationship to other departments of the government, which seem to me questions that are elementary and questions that should have been answered months ago without having to be asked.

How does it relate, how does it connect to the Department of Health, to the Department of Education, to employment, to

Labour? How does it connect to Economic Development and Trade? We have no idea what, if any, the influence of this department will be on the activities and programs in other departments. We have no idea, Mr. Chairman, whether this department will be responsible for operating new programs directly. We've heard the minister announce the new program of shelters, and we're grateful for that. That's additional shelters; that's not something new related to families.

Mr. Chairman, we simply are left in a vacuum as to what is intended. We cannot tell from this particular Bill if the ministry is designed to deal with families who are okay, who are healthy, to keep them healthy. We don't know whether it's designed to work with families who are temporarily in stress, and we don't know whether it's designed to deal with families that are broken and in urgent and emergency situations. Above all, we see the strange situation where we have a department responsible, presumably, for families in our province and for social services that hasn't looked at families in poverty, in dire poverty, since 1982. I think that in itself tells me more than anything else that the idea of what this ministry is all about has not been clearly formulated by the government, or if it has, we are sadly lacking in our understanding of it.

Mr. Chairman, I regret this because I think it tends to be very misleading to the people of Alberta. They believe that there is a department that is going to provide certain things for families, and unless we have some indication from the minister or from the cabinet or from the government about what the true mandate of this department is, what its relationship is to other departments, what its programs are to be, what the extent of its influence is, then I have difficulty, great difficulty with the Bill, and so do thousands of Albertans who have spoken to me.

Mr. Chairman, my only hope -- and it's a pious hope -- is that one day the department may, in fact grow into it. One day the department may grow up and figure out what families are all about and what they truly need in Alberta.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to some of the comments from the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. I certainly appreciate some of the concerns that she's raised, and I appreciate her commitment to this new ministry of the family as well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Minister.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if it would be possible -- the hon. minister is trying to respond to very valid comments raised -- if there could be some order in the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was just about to deal with that matter, hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Would members, as you've been requested several times, please find a seat and could the noise level be reasonable, please.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

What this new ministry is about is focus on the family. It is about commitment to the family, and it's about strengthening the role of the family in Alberta. I'm encouraged with the discussions we've had this evening. I'm encouraged with the discussions we've had throughout this Bill. I'm encouraged to see more and more Albertans focusing on this thing we call the

family; I mean just the awareness, just the level of awareness that has grown in this province and in this nation as a result of our Premier talking about commitment to the family.

I'm surprised when I hear from the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar who suggests that thousands of Albertans don't agree with these initiatives and these directions. It certainly isn't reflected in the mail that I receive. I'm very pleased and encouraged by the response that I've received from Albertans.

The member has alluded already to the Premier's council on the family, an exciting new initiative of this government, Mr. Chairman, and I'm looking forward to seeing that council in place. One of their first mandates will be to get out and consult with Albertans right across this province in all walks of life, to hear their thoughts and suggestions on what they feel the appropriate role of this government should be as it relates to family. I'm looking forward to the Lieutenant Governor's conference and some exciting things that are happening there: the commitment of Her Honour, who feels very strongly about this conference and seeing it succeed.

Mr. Chairman, this ministry will continue to build upon the many things that this government has done over the years to strengthen the family. I'm looking forward to continuing to work with my colleagues right across government, and I'm sure that every one of the ministers in this government could supplement my comments and talk about the things that they are doing to strengthen families in Alberta today.

Mr. Chairman, yes, this ministry of the family is at an infancy stage; yes, it's a new concept; yes, it's a new initiative; yes, we're pioneering some new direction. We're going to do that in consultation with Albertans, and I look forward to continued input and suggestions from the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. We're going to be working to continue to see that those healthy families stay healthy. We're going to be wanting to, of course, work with some of those families that are having problems. I talked earlier in the House today about some new initiatives as it relates to the prevention of family violence. I think that can help to strengthen families. I see this new family ministry as giving us the opportunity of really being able to focus on healthy families but also focus on a preventative mode, and, as I say, Mr. Chairman, to continue to build on those excellent programs that we've put in place already, continue to build on the excellent initiatives that this government has demonstrated in past years in support of families.

I can only conclude by saying how encouraged I am by the response of Albertans to this new initiative; how encouraged I am to hear so many Albertans talking about families and the importance of families in society today.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 8 agreed to]

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 8, the Department of Social Services Amendment Act, 1989, now be reported.

[Motion carried]

### Bill 13

#### Department of Culture and Multiculturalism Amendment Act, 1989

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

Are there any further comments on the Bill? Are you agreed as to title and preamble?

MR. WRIGHT: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Just as a matter of interest, what preamble?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think, hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, the agreement is a matter of form. There are always titles.

MR. WRIGHT: So the word is unnecessary, but you use it anyway?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Could we proceed then, please?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 13 agreed to]

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill 13, the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism Amendment Act, 1989, be reported.

[Motion carried]

### Bill 14

#### Regional Airports Authorities Act

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have some amendments before us.

The Member for Edmonton-Belmont. [The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway rose]

Order please. I would hope that the Official Opposition could be clearer. I had just had presented to me an amendment by the Member for Edmonton-Belmont, which we will peruse, but as I understand it, the speaker is Edmonton-Kingsway.

Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, the reason I didn't jump up very quickly is I sort of assumed that the minister would be making a few comments to introduce the committee reading of this Bill, particularly in view of the fact that I gave him these amendments ahead of time so that he might have indicated some feeling toward these amendments. In the absence of that, however, we will go ahead with the amendments and find out when he decides to vote for or against them.

I have here four amendments. I want to take them one at a time. Perhaps I could have someone pass them out to the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do all members have a copy of the amendment?

Please proceed, then, Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We indicated that we're not really opposed to the basic intent of this Bill but

that we had a number of problems with it. So we have produced some amendments that we think will correct those problems. The first one is section A, and I must admit to a slight wording change needed on that amendment. It reads:

Sections 1(1)(a), 4(1) and 4(3)(c) are amended by striking out "bodies corporate" and substituting "municipalities."

It turns out, on closer examination, that section 1(1)(a) has the words "body or bodies corporate". So in order to make this grammatically correct and cover all contingencies, we had to add. The amendment should now read this way, and it really makes very little difference to the intent. I'll read the amendment with the couple of words added in the appropriate places.

Sections 1(1)(a), 4(1) and 4(3)(c) are amended by striking out "body or bodies corporate," as the case may be, and substituting "municipalities."

The intent, Mr. Chairman, of this amendment is to narrow down the bodies, if you like, that are allowed to petition the government to set up a regional airport authority. It is not acceptable to those of us on this side of the House that the minister could decide to let anybody petition him to set up an airport authority and say, "Well, oh yes, they are representative of the local people, and therefore we think they can set up an airport authority." The only body that is acceptable is the duly elected officials of the municipalities, and so the word "municipalities" there really is referring to the elected officials of the municipalities. We didn't feel we had to put all those words in, however. The word "municipalities" makes that clear enough.

If you look at the Bill, you will see that these various sections that we refer to in the definitions under section 1(1)(a) are just in the definition part, but the key section of the Bill that needs to be changed in this regard is section 4(1) where it says:

One or more bodies corporate that in the Minister's opinion represent the interests of the public or public interests in the region in which a proposed authority's airports would be located may petition the Lieutenant Governor in Council, through the Minister for the formation under this Act of a regional airports authority.

Now with our amendment, that will read:

one or more municipalities that in the Minister's opinion represent the interests of the public ...

and so on. So it would be very, very specific.

As I pointed out at second reading to alert the minister to this problem, the way it presently reads, the minister could accept the chamber of commerce as being representative of the people of a region. The minister could accept the society for the preservation of the Gaelic language as representative of a region. Now, I'm not suggesting that this minister would or that any other minister would, but I don't see why you have to have legislation that's got a hole big enough to drive a truck through when, in fact, you can be very specific. And it is certainly specific when you say "municipalities" and mean the elected officials of the municipalities.

That would have a very important consequential effect on section 4(3)(c). It would now be a little different. I guess I have to read (3) to get into (c) to make it make sense.

(3) Subject to this Act but without limitation on any other matters considered appropriate for inclusion, the petition must specify or contain the following:

And I'm skipping (a) and (b) and going to (c):

(c) the names and addresses of one or more bodies corporate that represent the interests of the public or public interests in the region, which body corporate ...

and that would be changed, of course, to "municipalities"

... may or may not consist of all or include some of the incor-

porators, and that are to serve as the appointers for the authority.

Now the key reason that you need to have the change we are suggesting here is that it is the elected officials of the municipalities who should appoint the directors of the authority.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is why I think that we need to change the sections 1(1)(a), 4(1), and 4(3)(c) in the manner I suggested, and I so move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any comments on the amendment? Hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I was going to deal with, and I will deal with, all the amendments that we have before us, recognizing that we only have the one to vote on, but just to save hon. members' questions as the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway raised. I thank him for his genuine concern, and I must share with him my regret that we will not be accepting his amendments, and I'll explain to him why. For the same reason, we will not accept the amendment from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, because it's much the same; the intent is much the same. We don't feel that we should be bound strictly to those whom the elected municipalities might select. We want to make sure that we do have a broad cross section of people involved, such as those who possibly might come from labour unions.

I must share with the hon. member that I do find a bit of an irony in his statement whereby he wants it to be restricted in one area and then open it up in another. We want to make sure that we do have a good cross section of people involved in these local airport authorities. I don't wish to have my hands tied. We are going to go to those municipalities for a selection of the officers who will serve as directors on the local airport authorities, but we also want to go to a broader base than simply the elected municipalities. I should share with the hon. member that the way the Bill is has received broad acceptance from the municipalities that are involved, plus the local authorities that are putting together a lot of the preparation for the legislation itself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding, I want to make clear to the committee that I would propose that when we get to voting on the amendment, we vote first of all with A and B as a package, and then proceed to the other items in the amendment from Edmonton-Kingsway.

Edmonton-Strathcona, on the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman. It is true that the people who are the proponents of this Bill, whose thrust we endorse, say that the intention is to keep it locally controlled. Our attempt is to bring the wording in conformity with the expressed wishes of the proponents with whom we agree, and at present the wording is broader than that. "Bodies" includes any persona known to the law, and that can be private bodies of any corporate description. It's all very well saying what the intention is -- and meaning it, for that matter -- but the words must follow and encapsulate the thought, and it's not the case. It's as simple as that.

Why it perhaps is more important to us than to the government, Mr. Chairman, I suppose is a simple point. We believe in public control of the airports and other monopolies, or close monopolies, and we want to be absolutely sure that it continues.

Unless the wording is restricted in this manner, there is a danger it will not continue. It's as simple as that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McEACHERN: There's another aspect, though, that I think the minister's answer doesn't quite fit. You see, you shouldn't mix up the appointers, or the people doing the petitioning ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak up, Alex.

MR. McEACHERN: No, I'm just waiting for the minister. I think the minister, with all due respect, mixes up the appointers, who are also the petitioners in the way we were structuring our amendment, with the directors. The directors are a different group, and I agree that the directors, a broadly representative group, should be chosen with that in mind: to have a wide variety of people on the board of directors.

But I guess what we were looking for was some specificity about who had the right to really make the final rules. That's not to say that a chamber of commerce shouldn't be very much involved in convincing the local authorities that this is a good idea and having input into the kinds of regulations they want to make in a particular case, not to say that labour unions might not also be involved and want to get involved in the kinds of regulations for a particular authority in a particular region. But what we were just saying is that the only ones to really have the right to petition are the ones that are duly elected and really do represent the local region, and the only people who do that are elected officials of the municipalities involved. So narrowing down the appointers doesn't stop those appointers from having a lot of input from a lot of people, holding public hearings -- we have an amendment to that effect later -- getting a lot of input from a broad variety of groups, nor does it stop them from appointing as directors people representing a broad spectrum of the population, in terms of different kinds of talents, different kinds of abilities, different kinds of groups that need to be represented on the directors.

But don't confuse the directors with the petitioners. The petitioners are the appointers, and they should be people who really are in some way representative of the local community, with some right to claim that. I would say that the president of a chamber of commerce or the president of the society to preserve the Gaelic language or the chairman of a union, no matter what group you choose, while he may be representative of a large number of people, cannot claim representation of all the people in the region unless he has been elected to some post as a municipal official. That means county councillors, that means aldermen in cities, and so on. So I don't think it's an unfair stricture to put upon the appointers. The appointer should be somebody who really does, without any doubt, unequivocally and not at the discretion of the minister, represent the local people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you have any comment? Does the committee agree with the amendments A and B as proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway?

MR. McEACHERN: Could I maybe just point out the one that I didn't ... Because I was only doing A, the other part of B -- one should look at the consequence of that, perhaps, before we go. Section 4(5) ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Proceed. This is on a technical matter. Yes, proceed with the technical clarification, please.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, it's just the last point of the series of changes these two together would make. I was only dealing with the one part momentarily.

If you look at section 4(5) ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, perhaps I could assist here. The Chair understands that section B would now be sections 4(3)(c) and 4(5)(b).

MR. McEACHERN: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

[Motion on amendments A and B lost]

MR. McEACHERN: Well, if that's the spirit of co-operation we're going to get, I guess we'll carry on with the next one and see if we have any better democratic participation from the opposition.

Section 5(1)(e) would be amended by striking out "the organization of workers" and substituting "the representation of the interests of workers." Neither of the expressions are totally satisfactory, I would admit, but we think the second expression is somewhat better than the first one.

My colleague from Edmonton-Belmont has an amendment which will also help to look after the interests of the workers in this Bill, but it's a different section and is a separate and different point. So we thought we would go ahead with this one as well, and he will introduce the other one in a few moments.

What we're suggesting here is that in some cases in a local authority there might not be an organization representing the workers. Now, of course it would be nice, it seems to me, if the workers have the right to unionize, but in some cases they may not choose to or may not have a union, particularly if you think of some of the smaller centres around the province. The way it's written in the Bill, it makes it sound as if there has to be an organization of workers before you could have worker representation. So what we're saying here is that even if there isn't an organized union in a particular locality under a particular authority, then at least the interests of workers could still be recognized by appointing somebody as a director who was in fact up on and interested in the interests of the workers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further comment on item C? Edmonton-Belmont

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There was just one comment. I want to make clear that when you take a look at subsection (e) and break it down into the various parts, it expects that there is going to be a group of people that have specific interests, and when you look at that interest that calls for the representation of "the organization of workers," that's where there's lack of clarification, and thus the reason for the proposed amendment. "The organization of workers" could very well mean those people who have the ability to structure a time sheet so there is an organization of workers. You can have a management team that has experience with the organization of workers without having any representation from any workers' organization. So there is a problem with the language here. At

least there's a problem with the language here for me. I would hope that the minister, if he's not prepared to accept this amendment, would at least stand up and clarify whether or not we're talking about a workers' organization or whether or not we're talking about somebody who has the ability to organize and manage workers.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to. I appreciate the concern, and I say it with all genuineness as it relates to this amendment. But there really is no substance to the proposed amendment in that our stating of it within the Bill, the terminology, is such that it does refer to trade unions. I'm happy to leave that assurance with the hon. members.

MR. McEACHERN: I just want to point out that in some jurisdictions there might not be a trade union or a union of workers in the particular area, so this expression could easily be interpreted then as the idea of somebody brought in who knows how to manage workers. So I think the point made by my colleague from Edmonton-Belmont, in that context particularly, does raise that spectre. If the minister has any sympathy for our position, then what would be the reason for not accepting the amendment? It would be simple enough to do. Certainly the wording we proposed does not have that problem with it.

[Motion on amendment C lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway on item D.

MR. McEACHERN: This great contribution from the Tory backbenches: they sit in silence, have no questions, have no answers, no arguments in favour of or against ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would you like to proceed with your amendment, please.

MR. McEACHERN: ... what we suggest, but merely shout "question" and "no" at the appropriate times.

One of the most serious problems with this Bill, from our point of view, is section 23. Section 23 presently reads:

An authority shall not sell, lease or exchange all or substantially all of its assets unless the disposition is approved by a special resolution.

I'm sure the drafters thought they were putting in a fairly strong guarantee that the authority could not just sell off this property to any Tom, Dick, or Harry that they wanted. They would have to have a special resolution to do it. But really, a special resolution is no big deal under other sections of this Bill. The only need is for three-quarters of the directors present at a meeting to vote in favour of doing whatever they please with the properties under the jurisdiction of the authority. Since a quorum is only just more than 50 percent -- well, if you had nine directors, which is allowed under this Bill, a quorum would be five people, so all you'd need is three-quarters of five people. I guess three out of five wouldn't quite qualify, but four people literally could decide to dispose of the properties according to this bill.

Now, I understand that the people that set up the regulations for the Edmonton scene had some safeguards built in, and they tell us that the federal government for one thing -- as it relates to the federal government, I guess it would apply to all across

Canada, if it really is federal government policy that they have no intention of letting airports fall into private hands. Fine. But this legislation doesn't parallel that idea. It's also true that the local people -- that is, in the case of the petitioners in the Edmonton area, it seems to be the councils. They've had a lot of urging and pushing from other people. I assume they are considered the petitioners. I don't know who the minister is considering petitioners. According to this, he could accept anybody if he so chose. In any case, assuming that the city council and the local municipalities around the area will be the ones who are considered the petitioners and will appoint the directors and therefore control this, they also say they want their property back if the authority decides they don't want to run it any longer. But this Bill doesn't say that, and I don't see any reason in the world that you shouldn't make your legislation at the provincial level, the enabling legislation, conform to the intentions of the people setting up the authority.

Now, if there are some other authorities in the province where a chamber of commerce or some other group has been very prevalent in the petitioning process and the minister decides they're okay to be the appointers, then we might get a very different thing happening with some of the airports around the province, because the enabling legislation would allow it. Mr. Chairman, we don't find that acceptable. So what we've done here is made a series of amendments. It takes a few parts to actually rectify this situation. Section 23 is amended "(a) by renumbering it as section 23(1)." It would stay as is but be called 23(1), and then there would be another part:

(b) in subsection (1) by striking out "unless the disposition is approved by special resolution" and substituting "except in accordance with subsection (2)."

That would change the part about being able to dispose by resolution of the assets of the authority.

By adding the following after subsection (1), (2) would read, "An authority may not be dissolved except by special resolution," and (3) "Upon dissolution an authority shall transfer its assets to the persons from whom they were acquired, so far as is possible." Of course, if we had accepted the other changes on the municipalities, that would mean that they would go back to the municipalities rather than these bodies corporate which might include a large number of other people. Even without the changes suggested in A and B I think this section 23 still makes sense, because in most cases the petitioners are going to be the present owners of the airports and, in the case of Edmonton, the municipal authorities. I don't think anybody that owns these airports now -- and in all cases they're either the federal government or municipal authorities -- will restrict the regional airport authorities giving back that property only to those people they got it from.

So section 23 is a very important part of this Bill. It is the part that would allow, if left to stand the way it is, an airport authority to sell to a private corporation. We think the provincial enabling legislation should be specific and see to it that it meets the criteria as set out by the intentions of both the municipal authorities and the federal authorities and not just leave it up to the whims of the minister to decide who can petition for an airport authority and who they can sell and then that board of directors has the right to sell or lease any part of that airport to anybody they choose. We must be very specific that it goes back to the local authorities, and it should be specifically in this legislation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further comments?

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I think the points the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway has made are worthy of consideration. Perhaps the minister has an answer here that can satisfy me and the those who are concerned about this. What happens if this entity is wound up and you have \$10 million or \$20 million or \$100 million worth of assets? Does it go to the university? Where does it go? The Act is silent in that regard. Now, I appreciate the fact that the government is really following in the sense that it was the initiative of the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary and their airport authorities that got all of this going, but I think we've got so wound up in corporate niceties here that we haven't determined what will happen if these things conclude.

Where do these assets go? I'm not sure they go back to the federal government, because as I understand the concept, the entity must purchase the assets at fair market value. So they're paying the people of Canada. This entity is paying the people of Canada fair market value for the land. Then let's assume that all of a sudden the federal government decides that Namao should be vacated as a military base and suddenly we've got an international airport starting up at Namao rather than in the Leduc area. What happens to the assets and the money of the international area? I don't know. This Act is silent on it, and unless the minister can help me with this, I think we have to do something about that.

The other point I would like the minister to respond to, and it's really in the same context, is what happens if things go bad financially? There are good financial controls here. It says that the accounting practices must be pursuant to good accounting practices and so on and that there are audits and so on. But what happens if the world falls in on this entity and there's a foreclosure? Is the government saying, because it's silent, that you're content, Mr. Minister, to allow the Toronto-Dominion Bank or the Royal Bank, or whoever is funding the mortgage, to take over on a foreclosure? Perhaps the minister could help us out on that.

MR. ELZINGA: Well, let me deal with this very quickly. I thank the hon. members for their concerns. As to what will happen with the disposition in the event that there is a disposition, it is dependent upon the agreement that is agreed to by the present owner and the local authorities board when they are established. That will be written into the agreement prior to the turnover. In the event that the airport is owned by the federal government or by the municipal government, that is incorporated into the agreement. I should share with you that the section the hon. member refers to does not refer to that. It's section 41(e) which will enable regulations to deal with a dissolution in the event that there is a dissolution. I must share with the hon. member with respect to subsection (3) that he is suggesting here, the proposed amendment, that a corporation cannot legally do anything upon dissolution in that because once it's dissolved, they don't have any legal authority to do anything.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further comment? Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, just a general comment on these and other Bills in which important parts of them are to reside in the regulations. I've quoted it often before that in 1974 there was a

study adopted by the House that said in such cases it is desirable -- it may have used stronger language -- that the regulations be laid before the House simultaneously with the Bill. In this case I think those regulations -- and the minister has just illustrated an instance -- are important. I'll illustrate another one. I ask him: are those regulations in existence yet, and if not, why not?

MR. ELZINGA: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona was kind enough to raise it also when we dealt with it at second reading. No, those are not put together yet.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further comment? Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to make a few comments relative to the amendments. I want to remind the minister that when I spoke during second reading, I indeed said that the Bill was a good one, could be supported, and that the principle of the Bill was fine but the intent -- while we can agree to it, there should be some amendments made to clear it up to ensure that the intent is truly in line with the principle. I think a number of the arguments put forward up to this point have suggested that indeed there is room for clearing up the wording to ensure that the intent is spelled out in the Bill. Unfortunately, the government seems to suggest that that's not the case. They're going ahead with their proposal, with their Bill.

The area I want to touch on, and which I also touched on during second reading, is the concern that's been expressed so far by Edmonton-Kingsway and Edmonton-Glengarry. What happens in the event that the airport is dissolved and is perhaps turned over to private operators? The minister assures us that that's not the case. He had said so during discussion on second reading. I wanted to accept that to be the case. However, again I think there need to be some amendments made. I think the amendments being suggested would in fact rectify some of the concerns I have.

I express these concerns because I and other people have been approached by employees at the airport who have a major, major concern with this Bill and how it's going to impact on them and their livelihood at the airport either a year from now, two years from now, or at some future date. In the event that there is a dissolution of the authority, what happens to the property? But more importantly, what happens to those employed at the airport? I think we have an obligation. When I say "we," I include the government and the minister. We have an obligation to the employees there that they do not live under a cloud of suspicion, in some form of limbo, wondering if and when they may be cast out from being employees at the airport or put under a new employer who may impose different rules and regulations and, in fact, have an impact on their livelihood. I think all of us want to ensure that those employees have some sense of security, that they know they have a livelihood, which they've earned. Many of those employees have been there for a long time; they have secure tenure. I believe we have a responsibility to them and to their families to ensure -- somewhere down the road something may occur that's going to disrupt that kind of service they have provided and the security they presumably have earned.

I think the amendments being put forward by the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway would alleviate those concerns the em-



ployees have at the airports, and I would certainly urge that the minister and members of government look seriously at that situation and really consider approving and agreeing to the amendments that have been put forward.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would give me some help. He's referred to section 41(e). I think what he meant was section 40(h) with respect to dissolution. I wonder if the minister could help me better understand this. I take it from what the minister has said that the regulations that will be drawn up will deal with the issue of what happens on dissolution, section 40(h). But perhaps you could give some help to us, Mr. Minister, and tell us where these moneys might go. What direction would you be suggesting to these people when they come forward with their agreement? Does the money go to the university if there is a profit? What happens to this great big cash sum if it's left? I'm still not clear.

The other point, Mr. Minister, that you still haven't answered is: what happens, heaven forbid, if the matter goes into a receivership or a foreclosure? How will the regulations deal with that situation? Will the government intervene? Will they stop the foreclosure? How can you assure us that Edmonton and Calgary wouldn't lose their international airports to some schemers?

MR. ELZINGA: I apologize to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry if I did a poor job of explaining it. The agreement that will be signed by the authority and the present owners will outline what will happen in the event that the authority itself dissolves. This legislation deals with the dissolution of the authority, not dissolution of the physical structure of the airports. That will be dealt with in the agreement that is signed or agreed to between the authority that is established and the present owners, whereby it's a separate agreement outside our regulations. I apologize to the hon. member if I was not explicit in my explanation.

Let me leave the hon. member with the assurance too that the province will under no circumstances accept any financial liabilities. We are being a facilitator here. The agreements which the authorities do sign with the present owners will have to take that into account. As the hon. member sees under section 37, we indicate that there cannot be any profit for the members themselves. It has to be put back into the functioning of this body.

[Motion on amendment D lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Bill 14 of course is enabling legislation which will allow the transfer of airports and their operations to local authorities. In principle we in the Liberal caucus do support Bill 14, but there are some areas of concern that I simply want recorded. Within the present legislation, if we refer specifically to section 4(1), my interpretation is that it's up to the minister to determine when a corporate body represents the interests of the public or a region. There is no process by which this decision is to be made. In particular, there is no mechanism for dealing with competing groups seeking to obtain the authority over the airport. The Act doesn't provide guidelines as to how the minis-

ter is to make such a decision, nor does it provide for any dispute resolution. It doesn't provide for a process where individuals or groups can appeal a minister's decision to grant or not grant a local authority permission to act as a regional airport authority.

Then there is a question of accountability, which is of significant concern. Section 26 points out, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, that the authority must hold one public meeting per year, allowing attendees a reasonable opportunity to ask questions and express views. The problem, however, is: what benefit is this? The local authority is not forced to act on any of the issues raised by the public, since the Act does not provide for independent challenges of the board's authority.

Under section 27 the authority is to hold at least one annual meeting which is not open to the public. At this annual meeting the authority is to present a statement of its operational goals for the upcoming year. This statement should be made public and available prior to the public meeting under section 26 in order to allow private citizens the opportunity to comment and have input prior to any actions being commenced which affect them. If we look at section 29, that provides that within a prescribed period the authorities, management, operations, and financial performance shall be reviewed. Section 34 provides that this report is to be available to the public, which is commendable. The problem, however, is that the authority selects who is to conduct the review. If the authority selects an evaluator for itself, it lacks the appearance of being unbiased or independent. In fact, this is similar to the environmental impact assessments currently being done that have been referred to on so many occasions within this House.

Mr. Chairman, the question of accountability lingers. The teeth aren't there to make it strong enough to give one the assurances that one can be satisfied that the accountability question is resolved.

Other matters have been raised here tonight that cause concern. The hon. Member from Edmonton-Glengarry raised the question of what happens at dissolution. "When it's dissolved," the minister has replied, "that will be addressed in the regulations." However, that doesn't give us much comfort in knowing that we don't have the opportunity to participate in making up those regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask the question: what happens with this authority, once it's in place, if mismanagement or liabilities occur or something happens of a critical nature, whatever the case may be? What's the process there? Again, who are they accountable to? What's the process to dismantle it if it has to be dismantled?

The other area I want to touch on, Mr. Chairman -- and it was touched on by the Member for Edmonton-Beverly -- is the impact on the workers. Some of us had the opportunity to meet with representatives of the group who have put together the task force, and we were given some assurances that there would be no impact on the workers. Those are assurances that were given verbally. I don't see in the legislation any clear-cut provision that the workers who are currently within those airports can take total comfort in or feel that there's a comfort zone there that would protect them when it comes to security, when it comes to their existing benefits, when it comes to their existing wage levels, and so on. I would hope that two, three, four years down the road this cut doesn't come back to haunt us, that we find a situation where the workers in fact haven't been treated on the same basis they would have been treated if this regional author-

ity had not been put in place. I'm not sure exactly how the minister can address that. It's obvious that the government isn't prepared to accept any amendments, or they may accept them but they're not going to support them, so we're not going to see any changes to this legislation.

Just to sum up, Mr. Chairman, with reservations keying in on those points I have addressed in particular, we do go on record as supporting Bill 14.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've got two amendments to deal with, and I just seek direction from the Chair or from the minister if you want to deal with them separately or together. The minister has got them? Okay, fine.

The first one . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would suggest, if it's agreeable to the minister, hon. member, that we deal with them separately and in order of dates.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you. The first amendment, Mr. Chairman, is one that I'll have distributed straightaway, please. While it's being distributed, perhaps what I can do is just read it into the record. It's an amendment to section 5.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: I think it would be helpful to all members, Mr. Chairman, if any member who intends to move an amendment would have the courtesy, perhaps, of distributing it to the Chair. The Chair could rule immediately whether the amendment was in order. Then the government would have no objection if the hon. member would commence speaking to the amendment, as long as the Chair rules the amendment is in order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Deputy Government House Leader, I was not clear on that I would rule that the amendment to section 14(4) with the addition of subsection (5) is in order, and I understand that that is being distributed right now.

MR. SIGURDSON: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. What we're dealing with right now is an amendment to section 5(2), adding a third subsection, not the other one.

For the information of the Deputy Government House Leader, both of them have been approved by Parliamentary Counsel prior to them being photocopied. I wouldn't want to waste a tree.

Anyway, to deal with the first amendment, just to read it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that amendment in order?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, just let's back up for a moment, hon. member. I had originally commented, and by so doing meant to indicate that the amendment which came to the Chair as being the first one was in order. That was to section 14(4). Now, just for the clarification, I hope, of the Assembly, it seems to be the wish of the Member for Edmonton-Belmont to

proceed with the amendment to section 5(2), with an addition. That is certainly in order, and according to the member's wishes we are now dealing with that one.

Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I wanted to deal with them in order -- not in chronological order but in order as they go through the Act. So let's try it all again. I think most members now have it before them. However, I will for the record now read it into the record, and that is that the beer, the Bill -- wishful thinking -- is hereby amended as follows. By adding after section 5(2), the following:

(3) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall ensure that public hearings are held prior to the creation of an authority.

Mr. Chairman, what section 5 does is allow for the formation of an authority, but it doesn't allow for any public input that I am aware of. We have public input later on, as the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud suggested, in section 26. We have public meetings after the creation of the authority, after the authority has been established, but we haven't any opportunity for public interests to be represented prior to the establishment or the formation of a regional airports authority.

Now, I think it's vitally important that as many people as possible or certainly as many people as will be affected by the creation of a regional airports authority have the opportunity to express their concern to an appropriate body so that those workers, those people who are going to have some economic impact by the creation of the authority, will have the opportunity to state the reasons why they feel the authority is important or in fact why they might very well feel that the authority is going to be of detriment to them.

This is the only opportunity I saw in the Act for that public input prior to the formation of the authority. If I'm wrong, I hope the minister will point out where else in the legislation there is the opportunity for that public input. If not, I would hope there would be support for this, in that when the minister got up to speak at an earlier point in the evening he did say that it was not his intention to accept the amendments at that point that he had from the hon. members from Edmonton-Kingsway and Edmonton-Strathcona. I know he had my amendments, so perhaps he's prepared to accept this one. I'll await the response.

MR. ELZINGA: The hon. member has raised a good point. We believe that within the provisions of the legislation itself -- I'm sorry I can't find the specific section at this time -- there is sufficient accountability as it relates to the local airport authorities themselves. So regretfully we will not be accepting this amendment.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can support the amendment that has been placed here by the Member for Edmonton-Belmont. When we talk in terms of the opportunity for public participation in this entire process -- and those were the points I was raising earlier when we referred specifically to 26 -- yes, there is the mechanism in place to hold a public meeting at least once in each year and so on, but that's after the fact. Then from there there's still no specific direction or accountability as to what's to happen with those views that are expressed. Now, this particular amendment, of course, isn't going to give any guarantees either, but at least it's an opportunity for participation by groups that may feel they have a vested interest, whether it's the organized workers, whatever the case may be. This

doesn't bind in any way the government or the authority, the task force that's now in place, to act upon even any of those recommendations that may go to such a process, these public hearings. It's simply opening up an opportunity for participation, and we should never, never, never shy away from providing an opportunity for public participation. I don't understand why there would be any hesitation whatsoever in allowing this amendment to be accepted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Speaking on the amendment. The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One gets a little impatient with the minister when he stands up and says that, well, he can't find the section in here, but he's sure there's something there somewhere that allows something to happen like some public accountability, and considers that to be good enough to reject a perfectly sensible solution and, in fact, a rather innocuous one, one might add. We could, of course, have come up with a much more stringent idea of how accountability to the public at large might have been implemented in this Bill. One way to do that would have been to restrict the actual petitioning of the minister to the elected authorities, because those people would have public accountability because they would be elected. But in the absence of accepting that, then he's really saying that no public accountability is necessary almost, or certainly that, well, somewhere in here there's something that allows some public accountability, but we certainly don't need public hearings.

Why don't we need public hearings? I mean, this is a very major move. This is a serious business of deciding to turn over your airport to a local authority instead of having them continue to be under the municipal government. The city government in Edmonton, for example, has been making money on its municipal airport for a number of years. Why should they give up that revenue and turn it over to a local authority that may very well decide to move the traffic that goes into that airport out to the International Airport? That question has not yet been answered, yet we are going ahead and setting up an authority that will be charged, I guess, over the next 10 or 20 years with making that decision. It's a very major decision, and the people of Edmonton have a big stake in that. The people in the counties around have a big stake in that.

We don't see anything in here. You can say that they're going to be in the regulations and that each local authority and the federal government will make their own agreement, that this is only enabling legislation. But you are enabling certain things to take place and are not seeing to it that they conform to what makes sense and what seems to be the intent of at least the parties involved in the Edmonton area authority.

Now, I don't quite know what some other proposed authorities might be thinking in Calgary. We don't know what the models might be in Montreal. We don't know what the models might be up in the Grande Prairie area, if they do one, or Lethbridge or Red Deer. We would like to see some built-in accountability to the people of the local region. I think the Member for Edmonton-Belmont has made at least just a minimum suggestion. The minister just dismisses it and says: "Oh, well, I don't know where it is, but somewhere in here there's some accountability." Mr. Minister, that's just not good enough. I mean, you've been very mild mannered and very nice, and you said that some of the ideas were good ones, but

you've not accommodated any of them. You've not used the democratic process, the give and take of debate and suggestion, to make this piece of legislation a good piece of legislation. It's an unacceptable piece of legislation the way it is. The people of this area are not well served by that legislation as it stands, and you should really seriously consider some of the suggestions we've made.

Maybe you need to hold up the Act and go back to the drawing board and think it over again if you're not prepared at this stage to accept these amendments. You've had the majority of the amendments for several days, and certainly you've had time to address some of our comments from the last time around. So you fail on all accounts. You just say: "Oh, that's very nice, and I'm glad you're concerned, but don't worry. It's okay the way it is." It's not okay the way it is.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a problem, first of all, in that the minister, I think, is directing our attention to section 26, which is an accountability section, but it is after the fact, as the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has noted. I think it's a good section, which allows for questions to be put and explanations to be given. But the amendment made by the mover here I think flies in the face of subsection (6) of section 26. Perhaps the mover can help me with this, then, if I'm reading this incorrectly. There is a prohibition against any meeting. I should say not a prohibition, but there is not a requirement for a public meeting to be held in the year in which the entity was incorporated. So I'm asking the minister to make the change. I think the suggestion is a good one. It allows people to come forward and make their case. There is no binding position that anybody is forced to, but it allows for frustration to be vetted or vented and, I think, for sensitivity to occur. It would require, though, a change to 21(6), Mr. Chairman.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, let me again thank the hon. members for their thoughts on this and indicate to them -- and I regret that I didn't have it at my fingertips -- it is section 26, as both hon. members from the Liberal Party have referred to.

I must indicate to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont -- and I thank him for his kind comments as they relate to the discussion we're having this evening -- I had his amendments, but I did not have the amendments from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont nor the amendments from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona prior to this evening, contrary to what he indicated.

In addition to that, I should indicate to the hon. member that he answered his own question that he put to me in that this is simply enabling legislation. This provides a framework. In the event that the Edmonton airport does not come up for transfer to the local authorities board under which this will function, in the event that the municipality of Edmonton doesn't agree to it, then it will not happen. All this does is enable those authorities that wish to transfer it to an authority such as this that we're establishing in the event that they wish to establish, then it will be transferred. In the event that the city of Edmonton does not wish to have it transferred to the establishment of an authority by way of this legislation, it doesn't happen. The same with the federal government's airports. If they don't wish to have them transferred, they are not transferred. That's where the agreement, as I referred to earlier, is so crucial. Whatever authority presently exists under which the airports do function, they will have to agree to the terms that it is transferred. This just simply

enables a transfer to take place.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister speaks of this legislation as being enabling legislation, and what this amendment does is enable people to have input prior to the formation of the authority. I, too, like my colleague from Edmonton-Kingsway, regret that the amendment was dismissed so out of hand. I would have hoped that perhaps the minister would have taken the time to consider and perhaps even soften. If he feels that the use of the word "shall" is too strong, then perhaps there could have been some change there. But there still isn't anywhere in the Act or provision under any of the existing regulations that I'm aware of that allows for input prior to the formation of the authority.

Now, I know that the minister has stood up and said that there may be provision somewhere in some legislation that allows for some input. But it's not there. It's not readily available. So if it's not there, why then is it so difficult to accept this simple amendment that says that we can have the opportunity to make some kind of input prior to the formation of a regional authority? If it's going to be redone, then so be it, but I think to err on the side of public input is far better than to say well, there's just no provision for public input after the fact. For goodness' sake, I think that we ought to err on the side of public input.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, this legislation does not disallow that opportunity for public input. Let me reword it for the hon. member and stress to him again that in the event that the municipality under which the Edmonton airport does fall now wishes to have that public input, they can do that. There's nothing within this legislation that disallows the opportunity for public input. These airports presently do not fall under this jurisdiction, and in the event that the federal government or the municipality under which the airports do fall wishes to have that public input, there's nothing within this legislation that disallows that to happen.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the minister, with the greatest respect, is getting exasperating on this point. What he's saying is that there's nothing in the Act that forbids the people involved doing all kinds of right things, but equally there's nothing that enjoins them to do that. His fallback position is: but there will be agreements in the context of which the airports will be turned over, and provisions can be put in the agreements saying this and that. Well, the same can be said about almost every one of the provisions in the Act. As the minister correctly says, this is the framework within which these transfers, if they take place, will take place. Precisely so. The framework should include certain minimum requirements.

This isn't the Bill we normally come to debate in this House, which is a government Bill originated by the government. This is a Bill to set out in the legislative framework an idea that originated quite apart from the provincial government anyway and a very commendable co-operative venture certainly with regard to the Edmonton airports and, I think, applicable to other airports but originating up here, because we have several large airports in the vicinity. So it's a joint endeavour to reach a conclusion that we all are working towards, and I see no real divergence

between the opinion of anyone that's spoken tonight as to what we're after.

So I would ask the minister to come with a slightly different approach than one a minister normally brings to Bills in this House which have originated in the government, gone through their caucus, and all that sort of thing, and represent the government policy. This is another sort of Bill that's akin to a private Bill but dealing with a public matter. It is very proper to come before us as a public Bill. So I submit that perhaps because of the necessity to hurry or something these amendments are not being taken with the seriousness with which they deserve, in my respectful submission, Mr. Chairman, and that would apply to my amendment when it comes up too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, I find that there is merit to this amendment, and I'd like to give an example of a specific concern that I have for comment by the minister. It's a matter that's already been alluded to, and it relates to the potential control of the Edmonton Municipal Airport by the Edmonton authority. The concern that I have in particular relates to the potential for commercial flights being prohibited from coming into the Edmonton Municipal Airport. This, of course, has been discussed in recent years. As a Calgarian I unashamedly note that I would suffer from something beyond loss of enjoyment of life with respect to travel in the event that the airport were closed. I daresay that there are many people in Calgary and in Edmonton who share that sentiment. Indeed, it should be of concern to the provincial government, because the province, through its employees and members of government, is probably the greatest beneficiary of having that wonderful quick transportation route available for purposes of transacting governmental business. The potential cost in terms of money and efficiency from having that facility closed is phenomenal.

Now, I hear it said that in the event the airport is transferred to an authority, the Edmonton city council would probably exclude the power of closure. But that may not be the case. If it isn't the case, it's certainly something that should be of tremendous concern if that power may potentially be transferred to a private body. I'm wondering whether the minister can explain what protection we have. What notice does the public have that as a result of a Bill which is passed through this House at 11 o'clock of an evening, while everyone sleeps except those who can sleep in in the morning, what protection is mere for citizens of indeed not just Calgary and Edmonton but of other parts of the province who use this as a transit point that their concerns will be heard and they will have adequate input? I think, if I understand that correctly, the intent of this amendment is to ensure that this takes place.

Now, there may be many other issues of concern. I know, for example, taxi drivers are somewhat concerned, particularly in Calgary, with respect to the type of regime that will exist at airports as to whether or not one company has a monopoly, as is in the case in some cities, as opposed to the situation which prevails in Calgary now, where all companies have equal access. I know that those taxi drivers would like to have some input, and they've spoken to me about the issue. They are quite worried.

I am very concerned to see that major decisions which have broader public implications are not dealt with on a very narrow commercial basis between a private entity and a transferring

authority, so I'd appreciate the minister's comments on that.

MR. ELZINGA: Let me just respond very quickly to the hon. member that whether the Edmonton airport remains open or closed has no relationship to this legislation whatsoever. If anything, this legislation will strengthen the possibility of it remaining open. It's as the hon. member indicated himself: it will be a decision by the municipal government as to whether it does remain open. I would assume that would be written into the agreement. But we have no direct jurisdiction. This legislation, if anything, strengthens the opportunity for us to have a say in the continuance of that airport.

MR. McEACHERN: I just wanted to say to the minister that I did not mean to imply that you had the amendments from all three of us, but you did have my four amendments. The two amendments which are still to come are very closely related with my amendments, so that is why I said that you did have the amendments. But I did not indicate you had theirs, and it is true you did not.

I do have some further comments, but I will save them for one of the amendments which is more directly related as opposed to the one that's presently before the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further comments?  
Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I'm wondering if the minister could just very briefly explain how it is that this legislation does increase the likelihood that the Edmonton Municipal Airport will remain open. My heart soars like a hawk, as Chief Dan George used to say, at the very thought. I may go and have a double rhubarb and strawberry pie at the Café Select after this in order to celebrate if that is the case. But I'd be comforted if I could hear exactly why that is the result.

MR. ELZINGA: I indicated to the hon. member, and let me repeat to him, that this legislation has nothing to do with whether the airport stays open or closed. But there is a possibility, in the event that we wish, that we can inject a regulation when they do petition us, as it relates to the airport authority. I just throw that out. I probably shouldn't have because it is somewhat hypothetical, because the legislation itself does not deal directly with it.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Belmont

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'll deal with the second amendment, which was delivered on August 10. That amendment that was signed August 10, 1989, and deals with section 14 and proposes that there be a subsection (5) . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could I just interrupt, hon. member. For the clarification of members of the Assembly, I believe the copy that we have, which is initialed as being in order, is dated August 15. Oh, that's the first one. Okay. All right You're right. Let's go. August 10.

MR. SIGURDSON: I think maybe we should all go out for some of that double rhubarb pie soon.

We're dealing with the August 10 amendment that proposes to add to section 14 a subsection (5) that would read:

Each workers' organization which has a collective agreement with the authority shall have one representative from that organization serve as a director on the board of directors.

Now, earlier in the debate, under section 5 when we proposed an amendment to change the structure of the wording of subsection (e) from the "organization of workers" to the "workers' organization," the minister did state that his concern was to not be restricted and to have some union representation on the board. I believe that I'm paraphrasing, but that was the intent of the minister. If I'm wrong, I'm hoping that he will clarify it

In section 13

(1) An authority shall have a board of directors [not less] than 9 members [but not greater] than 15 . . .

So there is an area of six board members that may or may not be present. What this proposes to do is that those workers that do have a collective agreement with the authority will have a position on the board of directors.

Now, I heard comment from the back that we could have 22 people that serve on the board of directors coming from the union. With due respect, I don't think that any authority is going to try and have collective agreement with 22 bargaining units. It's more than likely that the authority will have an agreement with two or perhaps three components that make up a bargaining unit. I can think of a couple right now without going into names. Those groups, I think it's important that they do have a sharing of information at the board level that can only come from the board level to make sure that that information goes back to their membership so that they are aware of what's going on. Also, it allows for workers' interests to be well represented, not only at a stage in the collective bargaining process that may be confrontational and therefore, perhaps, even meaningless, but at a stage when all considerations are being made to changes that will happen with an authority.

What this does is allow for an opportunity to have workers represented at the board level. In fact, they are directors. This is not something earth shattering or new in a number of jurisdictions, although it may very well be relatively novel in our jurisdiction. It's certainly not new in a number of jurisdictions in a number of areas, and I would certainly recommend support of this amendment

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any comments on the amendment?

The Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: I'd just like to rise in support of the amendment as proposed by my colleague from Edmonton-Belmont. I happen to have had the experience of working in an organization in which representatives from the bargaining unit sat on the board of the organization that I worked for. The hon. Minister of Advanced Education is familiar with these situations, because all of the postsecondary institutions in the province do have representatives from both the faculty association and from the clerical workers' unions and the public service workers' unions sitting on their boards.

That's a recent innovation. When I first started to work for an educational authority, that was not the case. I think the experience by and large has been a good one, because when you have representatives from the various employers' groups sitting

on the board, a lot of problems that would otherwise lead to some fairly intense conflicts are headed off, and a better spirit of co-operation develops between the management of those institutions and the employees of that institution. Further to that as well, in Europe most large industrial organizations have representatives from their unions that sit on the boards of those organizations. It heads off a lot of bitter conflict between employers and employees.

I think, generally speaking, that's a goal we should be moving in collectively. I think all governments in this country would want to see the conflict that currently exists in bargaining relationships and the lack of trust that exists on both sides reduced as much as possible. I think it's incumbent on governments that whenever they get the chance, they provide opportunities for management and labour to see that each other are not really wolves, that people of goodwill can get together, and they can work effectively in the collective interests of all.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, in responding briefly to the amendment that's before us, I want to indicate at the outset, too, in dealing with this amendment that we are breaking new ground with this legislation. If over a period of time we find that amendments like this are required, I'm happy to leave the hon. member the assurance that we will examine the possibility at some later date.

I want to share with him my reservation as it relates to this, and he dealt with it himself. I, as I'm sure he does, feel much the same. We don't have any assurances as to the number of organizations or bargaining units that presently will be involved. I recognize that he dealt with that argument, but we don't have any idea as to how many might be involved with a local authority, and for that reason I find that we cannot accept this. Also, we have included provisions, as the hon. member has acknowledged, under 5(1)(e) to make sure that workers do have an opportunity for input into the establishment of these authorities.

But I'm happy to leave him with the assurance that in the event that we find there are areas where we can improve this legislation as time goes on over the next number of months when we do sit together, I'm more than happy to examine amendments to the Regional Airports Authorities Act at that time.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the amendment is fuzzy and is not workable. The city of Edmonton has 10 unions and two associations, 10 collective agreements. This kind of an amendment would call for 10 directors on a board of 15 people. I think it's unreasonable, and I think the minister's point is a good one, that you really have to wait till the final entity is struck.

But I wonder if the minister would give us this assurance: when the regulations, in fact, are made up or when he is dealing with the entity as it's bringing forward discussions to the minister, would he assure this Assembly that at least one member of that board of directors will be an employee of that airport entity?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. The idea of having workers' representatives on the board of directors of an authority or a corporation is old hat in places like West Germany and Sweden and most of the rest of Europe. It's not, for some reason, widely acceptable amongst union people in the United Kingdom, the

United States of America, and Canada, and perhaps other parts of the English-speaking world, but it ought to be. So we can make the legislation even more progressive by accepting this amendment. If the reason for the minister's rejection of it on behalf of the government is that it's open-ended, then we can certainly fix that up ... Maximum of three?

MR. SIGURDSON: Sure.

MR. WRIGHT: ... by adding at the end of the proposed amendments, a subamendment: not exceeding three in number. I so move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, do you have that subamendment written out for the Chair?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I have a spare, but members can write it on. There's nothing in the Standing Orders about having to have every single amendment, or any, in fact, in writing. It's a courtesy to members so they know what they're doing. But here we all have this amendment. We can simply add the words, if we wish it to be written out in front of each of us: "not exceeding three in number." And that's what I move.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please.

The subamendment would be in order, although I would repeat that it is usually a courtesy to the Assembly that amendments be written out and copied and distributed.

MR. WRIGHT: This is a subamendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A subamendment. Okay, We'll accept that.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Chairman, very briefly. As I indicated to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry ... Not Glengarry, I'm sorry. The member who moved the ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Belmont.

MR. ELZINGA: Belmont; I'm sorry. ... the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont, we believe it's adequately covered in 5(-1)(e). I'm open as time goes on, because I agreed with the premise whereby there has to be a greater and closer working relationship between all segments of our society. But I will leave the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry the assurance that there will be workers represented on a local airports authority.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the subamendment, Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure that the minister rejected. He did reject it, and that's unfortunate, because the subamendment does say that there is going to be a board of directors between nine and 15. Certainly three members who come from a bargaining unit or a variety of bargaining units wouldn't constitute a majority on the board, you know. At best it goes from 30 percent to 20 percent, if the board is filled at the level of 15 directors.

You know, perhaps the minister is clearly satisfied, perhaps all the government backbenchers are satisfied and the cabinet is satisfied, perhaps even the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry is satisfied with section 5(1)(e). It gets back to the point that the structure there, the organization of workers, isn't clear enough. I mean, my goodness, as I said earlier -- I can only reiterate what I said before, that the organization of workers could very well mean a manager who has the ability to organize workers. We're not talking about a workers' organization; we're talking about an organization of workers: somebody who has experience with the organization of workers. That's not clear enough. It's not in the Interpretation Act. It's not anywhere to be found in terms of the labour code, in terms of the Employment Standards Code. There's no reference to the organization of workers. There is reference to the workers' organization.

Now, if the legislation is going to be consistent, if there's going to be some degree of consistency between the Department of Labour and the department of economic development or all departments of government, surely to goodness then, the term "workers' organization" would be the term that would be used inside this legislation. But it's not here. So, therefore, for the minister to stand up and say, "Well, it's sufficient" -- it's not sufficient. It's not sufficient to this member. It's not sufficient to this caucus that constitutes the Official Opposition. It's just not good enough for the minister to stand up and say, "Well, this is what we hope to have, this is what we'd like to have, but this isn't binding." Anybody can come along and give an interpretation to this, as I have, that says that does not have anything to do with workers and their representatives inside a bargaining unit that have a collective agreement.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think it's vitally important that while the minister leaves us with the assurance that at some future point, hopefully, there might be the possibility of union representatives serving on a board of directors, it's just not good enough. I'm not prepared to support the legislation based on a hope and a possibility of something down the road. So I would certainly hope that the minister would reconsider the subamendment that says "not exceeding three in number" and then reconsider the amendment to section 14.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn debate on Bill 14.

[Motion carried]

### **Bill 19 Appropriation Act, 1989**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any comment? Are you agreed as to title and preamble? [interjections] Order please. Hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's seems like I'm going to have to introduce the Provincial Treasurer's Bills. That's a new experience. He's not going to introduce them himself.

Mr. Chairman, this Bill 19, an Appropriation Act -- by spending even a few minutes on it kicks in our Standing Orders such that it gets dealt with tonight, as does Bill 20, which we've dealt with in second reading, and as well the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund appropriation Act, that being Bill 21. Whether we get to those other ones

tonight I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, but really all that the Bill does is to put in place, in the form of legislation, what we've spent some time reviewing in a detailed way in the estimates of the individual departments in the last several weeks.

I guess the point I'd like to make this evening, Mr. Chairman is this. There are a couple of them. It's basically that while we're being requested to give authorization to the government to spend close to \$11 billion in this fiscal year, considerable amounts of this money are going to have to be borrowed in order to make up the deficit. All of this money is not going to be supported by tax revenues but is, in fact, going to result in a significant increase in the overall debt of the province of Alberta and certainly a significant deficit in this year's budget.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is certainly not at all in keeping with the kinds of things that we were told only a few months ago during the provincial election. It concerns me that what I'm seeing again tonight is *déjà vu* all over again. I can recall my very first session as a member of this Legislature, a brand new rookie MLA, and we had in front of us a budget by the very same Provincial Treasurer that, quite frankly, didn't seem to me at the time to reflect a lot of reality in terms of where the financial affairs and the fiscal plan of the province were going. By golly, you know, it was just the following budget year that the Provincial Treasurer said: "You know, we goofed. There's a major problem, and we're going to have to make major cuts in our school programs. We have to make major cuts in our health care. We have to make major cuts to municipalities. We've got to take another billion dollars out of the pockets of ordinary Albertans in the form of additional taxes."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I can see that this same situation is unfolding again, and it's an agenda that I expect is going to be put in place almost as soon as this Bill is passed in the Assembly and this session is over with. I expect the Provincial Treasurer will discover that all this deficit he's building up in his fiscal plan all of a sudden is going to reach crisis proportions and the Provincial Treasurer is going to start telling ordinary Albertans: "You know, you're responsible for all of this spending. You're responsible for all of these high costs. We're going to have to tighten our belts. You're going to have to get soaked again for tax increases, and you're going to have to put up with cuts to necessary services."

Mr. Chairman, you know, this government is going to get back onto its agenda, and they're going to use the deficit as an excuse to do that. They're going to hope that the promises made only a few months ago that taxes would not go up -- that Albertans are going to forget that promise. They're hoping that the promises made to balance Alberta's budget without making major cuts in health care and other social services -- that those promises are going to be forgotten. The promises that Alberta's fiscal management plan will result in a balanced budget by 1991: they're hoping that people are going to forget all of these promises because this Provincial Treasurer knows that they can't be kept.

It causes me a great deal of concern, Mr. Chairman, that we can have a government that can so blatantly and shamelessly tell people one story during a two-month period leading up to an election and then blithely forget anything they said in that time period. As long as they get re-elected, then it seems as if they're not accountable in any way, shape, or form for the promises that were made. Now, the Provincial Treasurer may believe that these promises have only a life span of one year, that with this appropriation Act this satisfies the promises that were made, and

after this year is over with, well: watch out; all the bets are off. That's no way to treat the public. That's no way to treat our responsibilities in this place.

So while there are important services included in this appropriation Bill and services that I've worked very hard for, that my colleagues have worked and fought very hard for over the years -- and we support some of those endeavours -- we also recognize that there's considerable waste. We also recognize that the taxation system to bring in the revenues to pay for this is very, very unfair and, as a result, we don't believe that this government can maintain its so-called fiscal strategy. Certainly they can't keep their fiscal promises. While this Bill itself may bring to a close the budget process that was started with the Provincial Treasurer's speech a few months ago, we know that this is not the end, that this is only the beginning of what we anticipate to be a significant fight over fiscal policy, social policy, and the direction of this government. It's going to be a fight over the integrity of this government to keep its promises. That perhaps has been put on hold to some extent with this budget in front of us this year, but we're watching, and we're not going to accept the same kind of fiscal strategy that this Provincial Treasurer foisted on us only a few years ago. We expect this government to keep its promises, and if they can't keep their promises, they shouldn't have made them in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, this government's on a course that I expect their agenda will not be so hidden as it is in this appropriation Bill in front of us. It's an agenda that unfortunately I anticipate will start raising its head in the next few months to come and in the next budget year. That's unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that my predictions and my prophecies will be wrong, but given the experience that I've had in this Assembly with this Provincial Treasurer and the roller coaster careening out of control type of fiscal policies that he's following simply are not acceptable to the people of Alberta. They don't keep the promises made by this government during the last provincial election, and I for one will be very much keeping my eyes on and ready to take on this government if at any point they indicate that they're not prepared to keep the promises that they made to the people of this province.

So, Mr. Chairman, we've gone through the estimates in a detailed way. The individual votes are in front of us, but they all add up to one thing: the bottom line does not balance, and it's because the tax system is unfair in this province. This government is not a good fiscal manager, is not a good steward of the public's resources. This government spends too much of its efforts and attention catering to a small and wealthy elite in this province, ignoring in many cases the needs of ordinary Albertans. This government is expressing its policies through the ultimate policy document, that being the budget and the appropriation Acts that give it force in law.

Mr. Chairman, this may only postpone for another year the real hidden agenda of this provincial government, and I just will say tonight that that's not a fight that we will back away from. It's not one that we welcome. To see a government breaking its promises is not something that we find acceptable. We don't welcome any fight in which we might have to take a government on that breaks its promises, but I will give notice that we will have no fear in taking on that fight if that's the intention of this government next year.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The member for Edmonton-

Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make a few comments first of all, if I could, on the process which is new to me. I must say that the process that we went through to get to where we are as far as the budget is concerned, this particular Bill that is in front of us, is quite [interjection] -- I'm sorry, Member for Edmonton-Centre -- an amazing process. There is no mechanism in place that allows for the mechanism of, let's say, a finance committee where an all-party committee could sit down and have department heads come forward, have department heads grilled. There's obviously no mechanism in the whole process to allow for amendments that will be accepted by the government. In other words, we've gone through an exercise from A to Z, but Z remains the same as A even though in between there were a lot of faults that were clearly pointed out to the government.

Mr. Chairman, I always see a budget process as an opportunity for the government to set priorities, for the government to show direction, for the government to address concerns within the community, for the government to use some creativity in overcoming concerns. This particular budget left out or did not address many of those concerns that are brought forward to us who sit here in this particular Assembly. For example, some of the problems relating to occupational health were not addressed in the budget process. The question of sufficient funding for early childhood. In the department of economic development I saw no specific attention given to stimulating in a substantial manner small businesspersons' opportunities or diversification in that particular area. No mechanism to address the ongoing concerns that are expressed with the Meals on Wheels, for example, another community-based program. We allow activities like the food bank to continue where proper budgeting could eliminate that type of problem. I don't see the problems of the CRC program addressed in the budget. In fact, in the budget they compounded the problem. The question of resolving the problem surrounding the taxation of the cultural centres was not addressed. There were many, many -- and I could go on and on and on and point out examples like that where members from this particular caucus pointed out shortcomings but they were not taken seriously. They simply weren't given any consideration. Hopefully, somewhere along the line they will be picked up on and dealt with seriously.

The one thing that I did find within the budget, or it appeared to me -- and maybe the Provincial Treasurer could respond to this one if the Provincial Treasurer is hearing what I'm saying. I'm not sure that he is. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure how one gets the attention of the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, as much as your comment may have merit, there is nothing the Chair can do about that. So please proceed.

MR. WICKMAN: In the sketchiness of the budget details, Mr. Chairman, to the Provincial Treasurer ... It's impossible, eh? To the attention of the Provincial Treasurer ... Mr. Chairman, if the minister doesn't hear me tonight, possibly he may read *Hansard* tomorrow and be able to address this.

In the sketchy details of the budget, one item that was of particular interest to me in doing some additional research, is the large sum of money that's being allocated towards new computerization. What I'd like to see the Provincial Treasurer ad-



dress or respond to -- is any of that computerization that's being brought in being used or anticipated to be used or is presently being programmed to accommodate the value-added tax the federal government is proposing? In other words, in this budget are there any dollars being spent that will allow to implement that value-added tax, even though the provincial government maintains it will fight that tax? I'm not sure if the Provincial Treasurer has heard those questions or not, but somewhere along the line I'd like to see him address that.

This whole process, Mr. Chairman, I found extremely frustrating, and I question why we go through a process where opportunity isn't given to properly question those people that are responsible for spending the dollars that are allocated by this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would just like to make one comment with respect to the process, and it has particular reference to another broken promise or promise not yet lived up to, which is minister after minister going through the departmental budget estimates saying, "Well, questions that were asked which we couldn't get back to verbally we'll give a written response to." Now, I know that the only minister I've heard so far to have tabled such written responses to questions is the Minister of Advanced Education, and I appreciate that very much. I think that other ministers, if they're going to make such a statement in the House, should fulfill that kind of obligation and promise to hon. members.

I don't know what's going to happen to the series of questions I asked to the minister of career development. At the time she took them and said they were very good questions and she had no information with respect on how to answer them but she would get back in written form. Now she's no longer the minister, and I don't know if the acting minister is going to be able to do that or who is.

Similarly with Executive Council. I asked a host of questions about the Public Affairs Bureau and was assured by the Premier: "Oh well, when the minister gets back, he'll get the written answers to you." I think there are others of a more detailed nature in the Department of Health. All of these are questions which we've been asking, and the ministers have said, I thought rather graciously, without any degree of timidity, "Oh yes, we'll get back with it in written form." Well, if they're going to be people of their word, if they're going to have this kind of integrity which they throw around at election time, maybe they should have a sense of integrity and completeness of purpose in terms of what their obligations and promises are to us as hon. members of the Assembly.

So it makes it very difficult to assent to this appropriation when a number of our basic questions have not been answered, and it makes it even worse and a greater indignity that the ministers said that they would and in fact, to this date, have not. So I would urge them to fulfill those promises and improve this process.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When this Bill came up for committee reading, I immediately resolved to cancel my order for rhubarb and strawberry pie and instead write

out a cheque to this minister, to this government, to cover some part of the deficit.

Now, this Bill can't be approved without noting for the record -- and the government admits this, so the number is probably somewhat higher once we get through the trick accounting. You can't help but note that the spending, including expenditures for debts costs, represents an increase of 7.4 percent over 1988-89 forecast spending and that at a time when we are facing an admitted \$1.5 billion and probably a \$2 billion-plus budget deficit. So how can you tell that this was an election year?

Now, the Bill is a reflection of extremely poor management on the part of this government, and it's a long tradition of poor management. Management? That's with a question mark. The budget speech, for example. In the budget speech the Provincial Treasurer talks of a freeze on the travel budget by government members, yet we see members flying all over the continent on boondoggles, sheer boondoggles. The budget speech says, and I quote:

We will initiate program cost reviews in several departments this year.

Well, strong action. Strong action. After being in power for 18 years, the government is now going to initiate reviews in several programs. Where have they been? Why not reviews in all of the programs? These, of course, are long overdue.

Now, most of the programs that we have, the larger programs, are valuable in concept, but they're poorly administered and very badly managed. One can't help but note a very small list of the programs in which there is such obvious waste that the government should be ashamed. I recently spoke very briefly about some of the waste that one sees in the management of our hospital system. The \$1.5 million angioplasty machine in the Peter Lougheed hospital, where there is no heart unit; you should be glad you're not responsible for that. We find there, in the same hospital, incinerators without scrubbers, so they can't be used. We find that rural hospitals were built with such haste that their foundations are now cracking and, as in the Black Diamond facility, the patients are now moved to the Rockyview in Calgary.

We find the Alberta stock savings plan where multi, multi, multi millions are being poured down the drain in benefit of business ventures to entrepreneurs without providing commensurate benefit to the people of this province. We have the Alberta royalty tax credit program in which money is being wasted in many, many ways, not the least of which is the pyramiding of royalty tax credits by numerous companies, a matter which has been a source of frustration, comment, and disgust by members of the oil patch in Calgary and elsewhere.

We have the ABCD program, admittedly with small money, but which has really been a giveaway, a slush fund for pals of the government in ridings throughout the province which now, finally, the responsible minister has said is being put on hold. We have a community facilities enhancement program for \$100 million, which is very nice for the particular communities involved, but really it's money being pushed out by government MLAs in order to curry favour on the part of their constituents at the same time as CRC grants are being cut back and providing hardship and a burden on municipalities. We have increased advertising propaganda on the part of the government, not to serve the people of this province but to extol the virtues of the government. We have \$67 million of assistance being provided to pals of the government like Peter Pocklington, and we have the government neglecting, as I pointed out three weeks ago,

even to access the \$1.5 million which would be available under the federal CAP program to help our legal aid program, which is a program, as the recent report of the legal aid committee pointed out, badly in need of improvement.

Now, when we look at all of these, you can very easily find room to save \$100 million, I would venture, with the proper management, but as not C.D. Howe but Seedy Johnston over there would say, "What's a hundred million dollars to us nabobs?" The bottom line when you look at the common denominator here is that spending decisions have been made for political reasons and to help out establishment pals of the government at the same time that they have ignored the needs of low-income and average Albertans. That's just unacceptable.

The result of this, of course, is that with all of this waste we have a tremendous budget deficit, and most significantly, we now are paying in this fiscal year over \$825 million in interest costs. Next year it's going to be over a billion dollars. Just like at the federal level, we're going to find that this rich province is pretty soon paying so dam much interest that it's going to eat up our budget revenue. We're going to be in a worse and worse position year after year after year unless we get skated on side by the increase of natural gas prices and volumes in future years, which is what the Provincial Treasurer is betting on, and watch him crow if it happens and take credit for it. When the price of oil goes down and we get poorly represented by the government, as we did in the deregulation agreement in 1985, it's not the government's fault; it's somebody else's fault. But when oil and gas prices go up, they're going to be claiming credit.

In any event, we're going to support this Bill because the province and the programs need ... [some laughter] Well, I'm hearing laughter from my friends at the right who have done exactly the same thing. After criticizing these Bills, they've recognized that not to pass ...

MR. WRIGHT: We're laughing with you, not at you.

MR. CHUMIR: You're laughing with us? Well, thank you. They're laughing with me.

MR. PASHAK: We're going to vote against it this time.

MR. CHUMIR: Pardon me? You're going to vote against this one?

In any event, to vote to defeat this Bill ... If we were to go on a hunger strike or something of that nature, it would merely be to hurt the many worthwhile uses of the funds. We're going to vote for it. We're frustrated, we're disturbed, we're upset, and we want you to know it.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're not going to take it anymore.

**Bill 19**  
**Appropriation Act, 1989**

**Bill 20**  
**Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1989**

**Bill 21**  
**Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1989-90**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Pursuant to Standing Order 61(4), a single question is now to be put to the committee proposing the approval of Bills 19, 20, and 21.

[Motion carried]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The committee will now rise and report.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Highwood.  
Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration the following Bills and reports Bills 8, 13, 19, 20, and 21, and reports progress on Bill 14.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House concur in the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the business of the government tomorrow will be motions and Bills on the Order Paper. Before adjourning for the evening, Mr. Speaker, I've had advice from the hon. government Whip that hon. members following the adjournment perhaps could retire to the Confederation Room. I think the government Whip would entertain the hon. members out there.

[At 11:47 p.m. the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]