

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Thursday, September 2, 1993**                      **2:30 p.m.**  
 Date: 93/09/02  
 [Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head:    **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

head:    **Introduction of Visitors**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature the Hon. Gerry Ducharme, Minister of Government Services for the province of Manitoba. I'd ask Gerry to please stand and be accorded the usual welcome of the House.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce Mr. Bernie Gagosz, Consul General of Canada, Seattle office, who was appointed in January 1993. Mr. Gagosz is responsible for Canada's broad relationship with a territory of the United States that includes Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Two-way trade between Canada and these four states amounts to over \$8 billion annually. Alberta exports to this area exceeded \$2.1 billion in 1992. I would ask Mr. Gagosz to rise and receive the recognition and warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly I would like to extend congratulations to Dr. Elmer Ernest Roper, a former Member of the Legislative Assembly. On June 4, 1993, Dr. Roper celebrated his 100th birthday, and on June 17, 1993, he and his wife, Goldie, celebrated their 79th wedding anniversary.

Elmer Roper was born on June 4, 1893, in Ingonish, Nova Scotia, the son of Capt. George Franklin Roper and Nettie Edith MacDonald. In 1914 he married Goldie Bell, and they had four children. Dr. Roper was a member of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and was first elected to the Alberta Legislature in a by-election on September 22, 1942, representing the constituency of Edmonton. He was re-elected in the general elections held in 1944, 1948, and 1952 and served until 1955.

Dr. Roper's son Lyall and granddaughter Mrs. Patricia McCoy are seated in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon, and I ask that they please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head:    **Introduction of Bills**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

### **Bill 201** **Freedom of Information and Protection** **of Personal Privacy Act**

MR. DECORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 201, a Bill entitled Freedom of Information and Protection of Personal Privacy Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same Bill that I've introduced since 1989, and hopefully this Legislative Assembly can soon have a freedom of information Bill.

Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

### **Bill 202** **Deficit Elimination Amendment Act, 1993**

DR. PERCY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Deficit Elimination Amendment Act, 1993.

This Bill would provide the much needed penalty clause in the government's Deficit Elimination Act for failure to meet the specified deficit targets. In the event the government fails to meet its first-year deficit target, all MLA salaries will be reduced by 5 percent. In the event the second-year targets are not met, a general election must be called.

[Leave granted; Bill 202 read a first time]

### **Bill 203** **Recall Act**

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Recall Act.

This Bill, sir, would provide Albertans with an effective means of control over their politicians by providing a method of recalling MLAs. The procedure that we've chosen would require a tough four-stage process to prevent misuse by interest groups. The four stages would be: firstly, an application; secondly, a petition; thirdly, a referendum; and finally, a by-election.

Thank you, sir.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

### **Bill 204** **Stray Animals Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. BRASSARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 204, the Stray Animals Amendment Act, 1993.

This is an Act to put in place the ability to manage our wild horse population in Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

### **Bill 205** **Agricultural Resources Conservation Board Act**

DR. NICOL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Agricultural Resources Conservation Board Act.

Given that agricultural prime land is finite, this Bill establishes the agricultural resources conservation board. This will minimize the transfer of good land for other than agricultural purposes. It will also stimulate the development of agricultural practices to maintain and protect land.

[Leave granted; Bill 205 read a first time]

### **Bill 206** **Auditor General Amendment Act, 1993**

DR. PERCY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Auditor General Amendment Act, 1993.



**Bill 218****Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. FRIEDEL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 218, being the Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will amend chapter B-15 of the *Statutes of Alberta 1981*. The section will give the official of the registrar of companies the power to demand an accounting from receivers and to apply to the court to have the receivership expedited in the interests of those affected.

[Leave granted; Bill 218 read a first time]

**Bill 219****Members of the Legislative Assembly  
Salaries, Allowances and Expenses Review Act**

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 219, a Bill entitled Members of the Legislative Assembly Salaries, Allowances and Expenses Review Act.

This Bill is intended to look at all perks and allowances and benefits that members of this Assembly receive, to be studied and to be determined by this commission and reported back to this Assembly.

Thank you, sir.

[Leave granted; Bill 219 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

**Bill 220****Students Finance Amendment Act, 1993**

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Students Finance Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will provide for postsecondary student representation on the Students Finance Board. This will correct the oversight of lack of student representation on this board.

[Leave granted; Bill 220 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

2:50

**Bill 221****Arts Council Act**

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 221, the Arts Council Act.

This Bill will create a very much needed nonpartisan, arm's-length, peer-reviewed organization for arts funding in Alberta modeled largely after the Canada Council.

[Leave granted; Bill 221 read a first time]

**Bill 222****Limitation of Actions Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Limitation of Actions Amendment Act, 1993.

Sir, this Bill would have the effect of allowing survivors of incest and sexual abuse to sue the wrongdoer notwithstanding the expiry of an arbitrary limitation period. It would effectively recognize, sir, that victims have rights too.

[Leave granted; Bill 222 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Wainwright.

**Bill 215****Ethanol Strategy Act**

MR. FISCHER: Thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Ethanol Strategy Act.

This Bill shall develop a strategy for the use of ethanol in fuel.

[Leave granted; Bill 215 read a first time]

**Bill 223****Liquor Control Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. FISCHER: I request leave to introduce Bill 223, the Liquor Control Amendment Act, 1993.

[Leave granted; Bill 223 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning.

**Bill 224****Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1993 (No. 2)**

MR. SEKULIC: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 224, the Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1993 (No. 2).

This Bill, sir, will ensure complete adoption records are accessible for all affected parties who have reached the age of majority and will include the necessary contact veto registry.

[Leave granted; Bill 224 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Bill 225****Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 225, the Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would allow for certain clinics and agencies to bill the health care insurance plan for counseling and treatment services for family violence abusers and victims.

[Leave granted; Bill 225 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

**Bill 226****An Act to Commit Government to a  
Three Year Funding Planning Framework**

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 226, An Act to Commit Government to a Three Year Funding Planning Framework.

The intent of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to allow for a framework of funding for municipalities to eliminate some of the doubts and uncertainty that are currently created by government when it comes to their funding anticipation.

[Leave granted; Bill 226 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Roper.

**Bill 227****Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 227, being the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will require that all lottery moneys received by the government go through the same legislative procedures that are required for all other money. It will place the lottery fund within the general revenue fund of Alberta as recommended by the Auditor General.

[Leave granted; Bill 227 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East.

**Bill 228****Water Transfer Control Act**

DR. NICOL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 228, being the Water Transfer Control Act.

This Act will recognize that Alberta water is a precious and limited resource and set forth the procedure that will require a public hearing and approval by the Minister of Environmental Protection before any water is transferred out of Alberta. It will completely eliminate transfer of water outside of Canada.

Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 228 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly.

**Bill 229****Children's Advocate Act**

MS HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 229, the Children's Advocate Act.

This Bill will expand the authority of the Children's Advocate making the office a more independent body, similar to the provincial Ombudsman's report.

Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 229 read a first time]

**Bill 230****Planning Amendment Act, 1993**

MRS. GORDON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Planning Amendment Act, 1993.

This amendment will require adjoining municipalities to review their joint general municipal plans every five years. This amendment will further require municipal councils which have designated land for certain public uses in a statutory plan to act within a certain time frame and will also address amendments to required reserve dedication.

[Leave granted; Bill 230 read a first time]

3:00

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

**Bill 231****Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1993**

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1993.

This Bill requires the government to live up to its promise to table the public accounts of Alberta in a more prompt manner than has been the practice in the past.

[Leave granted; Bill 231 read a first time]

**Bill 232****Ambulance Services Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 232, the Ambulance Services Amendment Act, 1993.

The purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that when a physician recommends that a nonadmitted patient be transferred to another facility because the originating hospital is unable to provide adequate medical treatment, the minister will bear the cost of such transfers.

[Leave granted; Bill 232 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

**Bill 233****Farm Practices Protection Act**

MR. JACQUES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 233, being the Farm Practices Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to establish a board with the powers to resolve a dispute involving an agricultural operation.

Thank you, sir.

[Leave granted; Bill 233 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

**Bill 234****Wildlife Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 234, being the Wildlife Amendment Act, 1993.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will amend the Wildlife Act to provide for protection of feral horses while at the same time making provision for range management.

[Leave granted; Bill 234 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

**Bill 235****Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1993**

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will provide whistle-blowers with protection from punitive action of their employer if they make complaints under the Ombudsman Act.

Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 235 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater.

**Bill 237****Aboriginal Justice Act**

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce Bill 237, named the Aboriginal Justice Act.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will establish a native justice system for Indian and Metis people. It will operate parallel to the traditional justice system for minor offences by setting up a native justice division of the government to which native justice cases can be referred, providing for the recruitment and training of aboriginal people to work in the justice system, and improving facilities for released offenders.

Thank you.

[Leave granted; Bill 237 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

**Bill 238**  
**Environmental Bill of Rights Act**

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Environmental Bill of Rights Act.

This Bill recognizes the right of the people of Alberta to a healthy and sustainable environment and provides Albertans with adequate remedies to protect and conserve that environment, including protection for whistle-blowers.

[Leave granted; Bill 238 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

**Bill 239**  
**Non-Smokers Health Act**

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 239, the Non-Smokers Health Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for smoke-free workplaces and the provision for designated, separately ventilated smoking areas.

[Leave granted; Bill 239 read a first time]

**Bill 240**  
**Conflicts of Interest Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Conflicts of Interest Amendment Act, 1993.

Sir, this effectively incorporates recommendations of the Ethics Commissioner. It would prevent members of this Assembly from compromising the independence or the apparent independence of our judiciary, and subject to narrow exemptions MLAs would not be able to make representations to judges concerning particular cases before the court.

[Leave granted; Bill 240 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod.

**Bill 242**  
**Service Dogs Act**

MR. COUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 242, being the Service Dogs Act.

This piece of legislation would guarantee that handicapped persons accompanied by a service dog would not be discriminated against in public places.

[Leave granted; Bill 242 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

**Bill 243**  
**Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund**  
**Amendment Act, 1993**

MR. HLADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1993.

The purpose of this amendment is to allow for a reasonable return of profit from investments that are also environmentally friendly.

[Leave granted; Bill 243 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

**Bill 244**  
**Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1993 (No. 2)**

MR. HLADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1993 (No. 2).

This would provide for people riding on public highways to be wearing a helmet.

[Leave granted; Bill 244 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

**Bill 245**  
**Small Business Support Act**

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Small Business Support Act.

The purpose of the Act is to find ways to reduce or eliminate unnecessary statutory and administrative requirements imposed upon small businesses.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw has moved first reading of Bill 245, Small Business Support Act. All those in favour of first reading, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

CLERK: Tabling Returns and Reports.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to file with the Assembly the report . . .

**Speaker's Ruling**  
**First Readings**

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has there been a change in procedure? I'd like to be advised of this. We were in the process, and the Chair still has notice of several private member's Bills to be introduced. We had concluded the moving of one without the final completion of that item of business when we seem to have come to a halt.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure at what point this would be, but the Government House Leader did not advise anyone in the Clerk's office as to what private member's Bills would be called today or not. Because these are private member's

Bills, it certainly is not the responsibility of the Government House Leader to deal with that.

It seems that we've made very good progress today in coming to some 43 or 44 private member's Bills, and perhaps we might revert to them tomorrow or days following, sir. So with your indulgence perhaps we just might be able to move on. It's certainly not the prerogative of the Government House Leader to advise the Speaker or the Clerk how to deal with this matter. [interjections]

3:10

**Bill 245**  
**Small Business Support Act**  
(continued)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Well, the Chair will then ask for the conclusion of the proceedings with respect to the moving of Bill 245, which had been moved but the Clerk had not read it the first time. At least that is the Chair's recollection. For the clarification of the Chair would the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw advise whether he had moved first reading of Bill 245?

MR. HAVELOCK: Mr. Speaker, yes, I had.

MR. SPEAKER: And the Chair had called for the vote on it, and the motion carried.  
Clerk.

CLERK: Bill 245, Small Business Support Act, introduced by the hon. member Mr. Havelock, is now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the Chair will ask if there is unanimous consent of the House to move on to the next order of business and carry the remaining Bills forward to another day.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table four copies of the 1991-92 annual report for the Department of Transportation and Utilities.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to file with the Assembly two reports today. The first is entitled Alberta Windows, a report on Alberta's foreign offices and their potential.

The second is the Alberta Global Business Plan for 1993-94. This plan outlines the Alberta Advantage in the area of tourism, trade and investment, and technology development.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table with the Legislative Assembly today the following annual reports: the Alberta Cancer Board for the year ended March 31, 1992; Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee for the year ended December 31, 1992; the College of Physical Therapists of Alberta for the year ended February 28, 1993; and the Alberta Registered Dieticians Association for the year ended March 31, 1993. Copies will be distributed to all members.

Additionally, I'm tabling the financial statements for the Alberta Cancer Board for the year ended March 31, 1993.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Family and Social Services.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly today chiefs from Treaty 8. The chiefs we have today are sitting in the members' gallery: Grand Chief Tony Mercredi, Chief Gordon Auger, Chief George Desjarlais. I also notice that Senator Walter Twinn, chief of the Sawridge band, also joined us.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to indicate the recent signing, in fact in January, of the memorandum of understanding between Treaty 8 and the Alberta government to work on a number of major issues in relation to the bands and the province, and today we had a very interesting meeting with the Hon. Brian Evans and my colleague Pearl Calahasen to talk about co-management of wildlife, which is an immediate issue that we've got to deal with.

They are seated in the members' gallery, and they are standing. I'd like you to give them the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **Ministerial Statements**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**Liquor Sales**

DR. WEST: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise to announce a new direction for the Alberta Liquor Control Board that is consistent with this government's mandate to provide economic opportunity and encourage free enterprise. This government is changing the way it does business.

In July we launched a business proposal to involve the private sector in the direct service delivery of our major registry, licensing, and information services. Today the retailing of liquor products follows suit. The existing 204 Alberta Liquor Control Board stores will be phased out over the coming months and replaced with a private-sector retail system based on a free enterprise concept and open to all Albertans. This new liquor retail system will allow the private sector to take full advantage of a business opportunity without government competition.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many changes in Alberta over the years with respect to liquor products. We started a system of delivering liquor products to adult Albertans who chose to consume them after Prohibition ended in 1924. Now it is time to move into the 21st century, understanding that it is not necessary for the Alberta Liquor Control Board to be in the retail business and that the private sector has demonstrated its ability as a reliable and competent retailer of liquor products. This is evidenced by the growth of the number of retail outlets in the province of Alberta since 1990 from 225 government-owned stores to over 800 outlets, 600 operated by the private sector.

Amazingly enough, with this increase in outlets, according to statistics compiled by the Association of Canadian Distillers, the total consumption of alcohol has declined approximately 26 percent while Alberta has experienced an increase in population of about 14 percent, or 400,000 people. Individuals are exercising their right to make responsible decisions with respect to a socially acceptable product in our society. Lifestyle changes and education, not access, have resulted in Albertans choosing to drink less.

Mr. Speaker, the private sector has demonstrated the ability to be a highly responsible and competent retailer of liquor products. We want Alberta business to be highly successful. However, this initiative will not diminish the Alberta Liquor Control Board regulatory role over liquor products. The Alberta Liquor Control Board will maintain strict enforcement of the Liquor Control Act and deal swiftly and severely with any breaches of conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Liquor Control Board will meet with all interested parties as soon as possible to answer any questions

they may have. The model we have created will provide many business opportunities but ensures the primary business is liquor sales.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

3:20

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start by pleading with the ministers, the government, in the same way that the Leader of the Opposition in the last session had to plead with ministers, to have ministerial statements delivered to my office much more quickly. As I was leaving for this forum this afternoon, I was handed the ministerial statement. I had a little more time with respect to the ministerial statement that was given to me by the minister of environment, perhaps five or 10 minutes. All I ask is their indulgence to give us some time to have a proper look at these statements.

Mr. Speaker, this is a profound change to the system of sale of liquor to Albertans. Now, we heard the government yesterday and the day before brag about the consultative process. We heard the minister of environment say that the consultation that went into the new environment Bill is the most extensive that has ever occurred. We hear the Premier brag about how consultation is taking place with respect to cutbacks. All of that's good. All of that is expected, I think, by Albertans.

This is an issue that brings with it tremendous emotion from people, people who are opposed to the complete opening up of the system, people who want it much more tightly controlled, and those who want it completely open. It seems to me that in the spirit of what the government says they've been doing, what should have happened in this case is that a very extensive consultative process should have been instigated. Mr. Speaker, there's much more than simply looking at the maximization of profit. People are at stake. I'm asking the Premier to give consideration to that. He's been pretty good about a consultative process, and I hope that he'll consider putting that process in place here.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this statement doesn't deal in any kind of detail with the difficulty of labour adjustment. Many, many Albertans are going to find themselves out of work. They feared this. Now today they know it's coming; they know it's at hand. What sort of arrangements have been made with union leaders to talk about this and to deal with this matter? If that's the intended course, what provisions have been made to lessen the impact on people?

Mr. Speaker, my final point is that the tendering process that we saw the government go through last time in giving wine boutiques licences was pathetic in that political people were given those concessions rather than Albertans. That should have been dealt with in this statement as well.

### **Speaker's Ruling Introducing Private Members' Bills**

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Prior to commencing Oral Question Period, in case the Chair forgets, would those members who didn't get the opportunity of introducing their Bills today kindly return them to the Table before you leave the Chamber today. Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

head: **Oral Question Period**  
**Beatrice Foods Inc.**

MR. DECORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Long before the election the Premier of Alberta said that his government would

reduce or eliminate direct support to businesses, fuzzy wording in a document called Seizing Opportunity. On April 23 of this year our Premier told Albertans and told them in this Assembly about how his government was getting out of the business of providing financial support to corporations. Many members on that side opposite campaigned and gave their constituents the undertaking that there would be no loans and no loan guarantees given to corporations in the future. But yesterday this same government gave Beatrice Foods a \$2 million loan guarantee, a loan guarantee to a huge multinational corporation, a corporation that has huge assets in the United States and in Canada, a loan guarantee to build a cookie factory. If it wasn't so sad, it would be laughable. I want the Premier to tell Albertans why he broke his word on this issue.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll tell Albertans that I haven't broken my word on this issue. As a matter of fact, this was a loan backed by the federal government through the Agricultural Development Corporation along with the western diversification office and Agriculture Canada. The ADC is mandated to do precisely that. My question, I guess, or my ponderance: would the hon. member have us then break down ADC? That is the Agricultural Development Corporation, a corporation for the development of agriculture, right here in the city of Edmonton.

Now, he makes light of a cookie factory. A cookie factory is value added. Making cookies is value added. It uses grain; it uses canola; it uses sugar. It uses numerous products that are grown in this particular province. Mr. Speaker, the ADC is set up to do precisely that, and as the minister of agriculture pointed out yesterday, there have been some 32 of these kinds of programs initiated with no fuss or bother whatsoever.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, we were given the same story on NovAtel, GSR, MagCan: value added, we were told. Value added to the extent that \$2.1 billion now has to be picked up by the taxpayers of Alberta. This company could have done it on its own, Mr. Premier, and you know it.

My second question to the Premier is this. The Premier has kicked the teeth of children who are on welfare by denying them school supplies. I want to know, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. Government House Leader is rising on a point of order. [interjections]

MR. KOWALSKI: After question period, Mr. Speaker.

### **Speaker's Ruling Brevity**

MR. SPEAKER: But the Chair would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition with all respect that a preamble is allowed for the first question, which should be succinct and brief. The Chair has been rather lenient with the hon. leader on his preambles, but for supplemental questions we do not go into long preambles, hon. leader.

### **Beatrice Foods Inc.** *(continued)*

MR. DECORE: Here it comes, Mr. Speaker. I want the Premier to explain why he gives priority to a multinational company that creates a cookie factory over children on welfare for school supplies.

MR. KLEIN: You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Liberal opposition has a tendency to express himself sometimes in the most stupid of ways. Really.

The Canada/Alberta partnership on agrifood, CAPA, is an \$18.4 million program. It is one of eight western economic partnership agreements in Alberta, which total \$120 million. These programs are 50 percent funded by the federal government and 50 percent funded by the provincial government over a three-year period. These people over there were well aware of that program and said absolutely nothing about it. As a matter of fact, the hon. Member for Redwater was fully supportive of the program. The program started in the fall of 1992 and expires March 31, 1995. Projects may be eligible . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I'm going to go as long as you will allow me just so he gets all the facts. Projects may be eligible for repayable funding up to 35 percent of capital costs to a maximum of \$2 million if the project – now this is very important – adds value to the agricultural commodity. I'm sure the agriculture critic would be in favour of that. It creates new economic activity and employment, which it's going to do right in the city of Edmonton, where most of these people are from. It demonstrates long-term competitiveness, involves significant private-sector investment – I would mention that in this case the company is investing \$9 million of its own money – and increases Alberta agrifood markets without detriment to existing industry.

3:30

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, you would think that after losing \$2.1 billion, this government would be more careful with taxpayers in providing loan guarantees.

My last question to the Premier is this. We have lost \$2.1 billion, all since 1985. I'd like the Premier to tell Albertans: how many more of these loan guarantees are we going to see this year and next year?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just isn't absorbing this. He's not getting it. This is a program under the Agricultural Development Corporation in co-operation with the federal government. It's a program called CAPA. It's a program that was endorsed by this caucus. The CAPA program replaced the old agricultural processing and marketing agreement, and the advantages of this program over the previous program are that the funding is fully repayable rather than a grant. It encourages high value-added agricultural processing. Funding is targeted to projects which increase exports or replace imports. The administration has been streamlined and taken over by Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation at a much lower cost than previous programs. The loan to Beatrice was fully in accordance with the mandate of ADC.

MR. N. TAYLOR: He's more like a short Getty every day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Chair would point out that we extended 14 minutes on the first question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DECORE: You've got to tighten up the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

### Social Assistance

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the department of social services has written to its clients, mothers and fathers who get social assistance, and they've said that those mothers and fathers that

can't afford to pay for school supplies should go to their school boards and ask for a special waiver of those fees. In Lethbridge this week a mother who has serious physical disabilities did exactly that. She went to her school board. The school board denied giving her that exemption. Meanwhile, the Minister of Education says that school boards will pick up these fees in spite of the School Act saying only that they may have to pick them up. My first question is to the Minister of Education. In the same way that the minister of social services didn't consult with Albertans, I want to know why the Minister of Education didn't consult with all the school boards in Alberta to find out and deal with this very sensitive issue.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to note that the government has provided considerable in the way of resources to the school boards of this province during the school year which is just now beginning. There is an overall budget of \$1.8 billion, actually in excess of that amount. Alberta Education was one of the few departments, I believe one of three, that received an increase in funding this year, and quite a significant increase. School boards across this province received overall an increase in funding. Thirty million dollars additional money was put into equity funding to help with the challenge in funding faced by some of our less wealthy school boards. I think that overall the school boards of this province have received for this particular budget year sound and adequate funding, and they will be dealing with this particular matter. I'd like to emphasize that no student in this province will be denied access to education for the coming year.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, my question was: why didn't he consult with all the school boards?

My next question is to the minister responsible for social services. We now see a cruel situation of passing the buck: one minister not knowing what he's doing; another minister not doing what he should do and not knowing what he's doing. Knowing that people are being denied by school boards to get this waiver, I'd like the minister to tell Albertans: what now, Mr. Minister, are you going to do from your department for these people?

MR. CARDINAL: I'd just like to advise the hon. member of our priorities, Mr. Speaker. I've always indicated in this House that our high priorities are people that cannot fend for themselves, and that includes children in this province. Everybody knows, like I mentioned in the House yesterday, that we are spending close to \$250 million on services for children. The processes we have in place will allow the parents to find additional money through additional earning exemptions to make sure that the supplies are looked after.

I'd like to just advise the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have right now over 8,000 children in Alberta receiving services from this province. We have 1,200 foster homes, and we have 2,396 children in foster homes right now. Mr. Speaker, 50 percent of those are native children. I'm not proud to say that.

I'd just like to show this House how there's so much political grandstanding in this House in relation to children. The Leader of the Opposition on November 7: "Decore concedes he probably slighted native people." It says: "Why do you want to write a book about Indians? Nobody gives . . ." [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order please.  
Final supplemental.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to go through this question slowly so that the minister can hear it, because obviously



he didn't hear it last time. A mother has been told – Mr. Minister, this isn't a funny matter. Don't laugh at this question. It's not funny when a mother is denied the ability to send her children to school in the appropriate way. For people laughing on the front bench, this is not a funny matter. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DECORE: This is not funny.

### **Speaker's Ruling Describing Members' Reactions**

MR. SPEAKER: No one's arguing that it is, hon. Leader of the Opposition, but the Chair is unable to see anybody in this Chamber laughing about that. It is not a function of the question period for hon. members to give a scenario of what is happening around the Chamber. The function of question period is to ask questions and try to elicit answers.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I noted that the minister responsible for social services was laughing at this, and this is no laughing matter.

### **Social Assistance (continued)**

MR. DECORE: I'd like to put my question to the minister. This mother in Lethbridge has been told no. Mr. Minister, what are you going to do for this mother and other mothers who are going to be told no by school boards?

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, this is not a laughing matter. The only reason that I may have smirked is: how sincere is that leader when you're dealing with native children? That is why I read this. That is the only reason: your sincerity in relation to native children.

Mr. Speaker, no children will be left out of school. My department will ensure that this individual case is followed up on and looked after.

I'd like to indicate to the hon. member also that the changes recently made in the welfare reforms will allow parents to earn additional income. Welfare clients are expected to use other resources, the same as working Albertans. Welfare clients can use the child tax credit, paid monthly; quarterly GST refunds; and in some cases the school boards will allow the payment of the fees over a longer period of time. There are other ways of dealing with the issue. As a province we are working and working very hard to make sure that our children are looked after. We have today signed 18 of 44 bands in Alberta, negotiated agreements in relation to children's services, Mr. Speaker. The Metis children's services of Alberta is looking after . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House.

MR. JONSON: Might I be able to supplement the hon. minister's answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Briefly, hon. minister.

**3:40**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the school boards of this province are well aware of the legislative provisions that exist, and procedures have been in place for some time to deal with these

particular incidents which may arise where there is a misunderstanding over who's responsible for ensuring that all students in this province have access to an education. I would like to say further that normally in a situation such as this the hon. member posing the question would check on the particular circumstances involved, refer it to my office. If he would do that, I would certainly look into this particular individual case.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House.

### **Alberta Cement Company**

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because of the turndown in petroleum exploration and development in the Rocky Mountain House area, our area has experienced a very desperate economic slump complete with business closures and a high unemployment rate. After four years of serious work we finally got a forestry project going, which will provide about 300 jobs. Last spring Alberta Cement Company came forward with a proposal announcing the possibility of building a cement manufacturing plant in the green area west of Rocky Mountain House. An application for this plant was completed with the department of the environment about mid-August. To the Minister of Environmental Protection: the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act was proclaimed yesterday, September 1, and I'm wondering if this will have any negative effect on the construction and operation of the plant. In other words, will it need an EIA or an NRCB hearing before construction and operations can begin?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environmental Protection.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, our department received applications under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts from Alberta Cement Company back in November of 1992. We have followed this process, and in point of fact, as the hon. member has indicated, the applications under those two Acts were deemed to be complete in the month of August. Under the transitional provisions of the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act any application completed before September 1, when the regulations came into force and effect, will be handled under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, hon. member. As a result of that, the decision that was made by the department that an environmental impact assessment would not be required will stand.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplemental question?

MR. LUND: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is certainly good news. As I have discovered, probably less than 1 percent of the people in the area would agree that those unnecessary hearings and process would be necessary.

There is a concern about the quarry. I'm wondering if the minister could indicate whether in fact it will need an EIA and a hearing.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The quarry's a different matter because we do not have a completed application for the quarry, and under the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act any mineable quarry which has in excess of 45,000 metric tonnes being produced in a year requires an environmental impact assessment and an NRCB process. So yes,

hon. member, we will be going through that kind of a process on the application for the quarry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

### International Offices

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last spring the former members for Red Deer-South and Calgary-Currie jet-setted around the world to the tune of \$45,000 of taxpayers' money and met with a variety of secretaries and receptionists in an attempt to analyze Alberta's foreign offices. Today, six months after I requested a copy of the report, the minister finally tabled a copy in the House. The startling revelation from this report suggests that if we reduce the amount of office space and reduce personnel, we could save money. What a revelation. My first question to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism is: what happened to the report these guys were supposed to do and apparently, by this report, never did?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm really impressed with the histrionics of the Member for Calgary-North West. First of all, corrections, please. In fact, this report cost \$40,000, not the inflated price the hon. member talked about. Secondly, this report has been public for some period of time now. Anyone who wanted to have a copy from my office as much as four to five or six weeks ago could have one.

MR. KLEIN: The *Sun* had it six weeks ago. Where were you? You get most of your stuff out of the *Sun*.

MR. KOWALSKI: The hon. member must have missed it, obviously, Mr. Speaker. He may have been busy this summer, but the report has been available for some period of time. Thirdly, it's an overview, a précis report of an analysis done on foreign trade offices of the province of Alberta. Since that time we've implemented a number of changes arising out of the recommendations provided to us by the two individuals who did write the report.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, I appreciate that we saved \$5,000, I suppose.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister is simply this. This report could have been written in a taxi ride on the way to the Heathrow airport. Is this the kind of product that we can expect for the \$50,000 that we're spending on Juan Oldring to develop our NAFTA strategy for Alberta?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, if you aren't confused in listening to a Liberal when they first start off, you certainly will be by the time they've ended. It seems to me I just made it very clear a few minutes ago that the cost of the report was \$40,000. The member now has inflated it to \$50,000.

In terms of the quality of report one can become very subjective. I'm one of those, I guess, who believes that if you can say something in 10 words and make your point, that's far better than hiring a, quote, Philadelphia lawyer and having him write for pages and pages and pages.

The point is very clear in the report, number one, that the protocol emphasis that we've had in our foreign offices in the past would be changed. Two days ago the Speech from the Throne came down. There's a very important paragraph in that Speech from the Throne which indicates that the intention and the focus of our foreign offices is going to be moving away from the protocol side to, in fact, in terms of the investment, tourism, and

economic development sides. Secondly, there are some very important recommendations in here about changing the makeup of the foreign offices that we have. I'd be very, very pleased, if the hon. member wanted to raise another question, to point out to him what changes have already been implemented in the last number of months with respect to these foreign offices. The fact of the matter is that there is a new direction, and that new direction came out as a result of the consultations that former members of this particular Assembly made as a result of their visits to a select number of foreign offices associated with this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

### Support for Agricultural Industries

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I expressed concern with our involvement in the proposed Beatrice food plant to be located in Edmonton. I was assured that our participation is a result of a direct agreement that was already in place with the federal government under the CAPA program. I guess if I'm honest with myself, I'd have more concern with breaking an agreement than I would with this particular project. So I'm going to ask the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development if he'd please tell the Assembly how much of that \$18.2 million has been used to date and if there are any other projects being considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister of agriculture.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. The program, of course, that we're alluding to is the CAPA program, and I think our Premier has explained the program very thoroughly and very properly. The amount that was in the program was \$18.4 million, which was jointly contributed to by the federal and the provincial governments. The program was established in 1992 and is one of many programs, as the Premier has mentioned. It's a program that's designed to a specific part of the development of agriculture within the province. The amount that has been used is a significant amount. That is difficult to put an accurate number on, because as the money is repaid - we have a revolving fund, so it just keeps revolving itself as it is paid back. To date we have had no defaults on this program.

MR. BRASSARD: Mr. Speaker, I respect that this loan was made through the Agriculture Development Corporation and only came before this government because of its size. Can the minister assure me and this Assembly that accepted business financial criteria was used in the evaluation of this project to ensure its economic viability?

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you again. Certainly the question is an important one. Yes, indeed; acceptable financial controls have been placed on this program, as all other programs. In order to be funded, this program has to go through a criteria that is acceptable to all financial institutions. That's how we operate the ADC. That is why ADC has such a successful background. We will continue to operate our loans through that type of a process: fully accountable, fully successful.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

3:50

### Immaculata Hospital

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The people of Westlock deserve access to quality health care, as do all Alber-

tans. However, every health care decision must now be made in light of the arbitrary, across-the-board \$200 million cuts to health care in this province. My question is to the minister responsible for health care planning. Could the minister please tell us how the \$10 million Westlock hospital project fits into an overall, cost-effective plan for delivering health care to Albertans, particularly in light of the roundtable's call for a moratorium on all health care capital spending?

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, that question is for the Minister of Health. My job is to commence with the 10 roundtable hearings and come back with a report. That project along with many others is under review.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, the Immaculata hospital at Westlock has been through a long process of planning and has had to suffer some time of waiting for that. It is one of the oldest hospitals in this province, the first part of it built in 1927. It serves a population of about 16,000 people. I am sure that the hon. member across the way is sincere in the desire to provide safe health care to the residents of that community and safe working conditions for the health deliverers that are in that community.

The discussions at the Red Deer roundtable gave us some very good information on the long-term planning of the use of facilities, how we deliver health care. I think I explained very clearly yesterday the process that would be followed after I receive the summary report, which I expect in days, as to how we will proceed with the planning process on the long-term restructuring and delivery of quality health care in the province of Alberta.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I'll turn from the minister responsible for roundtable planning – that's a big job – to the minister responsible for health. What kind of plan could this minister possibly have contrived that would see her left hand cutting \$200 million from Alberta's health care budget while at the very same time her right hand is reaching into the pockets of Alberta taxpayers to build a \$10 million hospital in none other than the Deputy Premier's very own riding?

MR. KOWALSKI: Your leader announced it on June 14 in Westlock. [interjections] Well, you both announced it, took credit for it.

MR. MITCHELL: There's a \$200 million difference between then and now. [interjections]

MR. KOWALSKI: On June 14 Laurence announced it in Westlock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Time is flying.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think in my first answer I explained that this project has been in planning and deferred since 1985. Also, I sincerely believe that the people in Westlock or the surrounding community should have quality health services delivered in a safe manner both for themselves and their community. Secondly, I would remind the hon. member that in any planning we must have a procedure for looking after the immediate and the short term as we move along. I suppose it would be the ultimate in our desires to be able to stop the system while we work on the long-term restructuring, but I again remind the hon. member that we do have to make decisions on a day-to-day basis for the safety of the health services that are delivered and indeed the safety of the people who work in our institutions. We will

have to continue to assess that as we move through the planning process. I would also remind the hon. member that this is the replacement of a facility, with new needs in the community being addressed in the extension of the long-term care beds that are there and the reduction in the acute care beds that are there. This very much reflects the health needs of the community of Westlock, and I have not heard from the community of Westlock that this is an inappropriate project or that it is not needed in their community.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Stony Plain.

#### White Stag Apparel Ltd.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Labour. The White Stag textiles operation in Edmonton has announced a shutdown. Over 100 people will be thrown out of work.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Put them to work making cookies.

MR. WOLOSHYN: That is one of the benefits of the cookie plant, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Minister of Labour concerned at all about this, or are these employees, many of whom are new Canadians, going to be left to fend for themselves?

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the government does not think this is a laughing, joking matter. The member of the Liberal Party just indicated that he thought it was a joke that people were out of work.

It is always somewhat distressing to employees and to the community when there's an announcement of a plant closure. White Stag certainly has been active for many years, hired hundreds of people, and put millions of dollars into the economy. I can assure the member here that we are very concerned about the employees. The president of the company notified my office on August 23, and that was following legislation, our own Employment Standards Code, which requires an announcement four weeks ahead of time if more than 50 employees are going to be involved in a termination. I can assure that within 24 hours officials from my office had made very clear to the people at White Stag the full degree and breadth of programs that are available through Alberta Labour, through Advanced Education and Career Development, and the federal programs in terms of retraining, upgrading. All of that's been made available, and we are monitoring the situation.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, retraining is fine, and I'm glad to see the minister has initiated that for the benefit of the workers after they're out. However, a shutdown like this may give the employer the potential to leave employees stranded as far as wages and other obligations are concerned. Will the minister stand by and hope for the best, or will he actually do something to make sure that the employees get their wages and the other entitlements that they have coming?

MR. DAY: Well, we're certainly doing more than just hoping for the best, Mr. Speaker. Along with information provided to the company in terms of programs available, officials from my department also make it very clear as to the provisions in the Employment Standards Code for the fulfillment of obligations in terms of wages, in terms of severance, holiday pay, whatever might be forthcoming. We work with the company on a day-to-day basis and with the employees to make sure that happens.

### Loans and Loan Guarantees

DR. PERCY: Mr. Speaker, over the last three years losses in loans and guarantees backed by this government have averaged \$258 million. The Tory record now stands at \$2.1 billion lost on speculative ventures that the private sector wouldn't touch with a 10-foot pole. My question is to the Provincial Treasurer. In the last budget Treasury predicted losses in bad loans at \$10 million. How is it, Mr. Treasurer, that this government can go from an average of \$250 million in losses to \$10 million without Albertans thinking the books are being fudged?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to debating the issue with the hon. member when the budget is released next Wednesday afternoon at 4 o'clock. I would, however, remind the hon. member that we have undertaken a review of the province's books through the Financial Review Commission, and they recommended a number of significant recommendations, which we have begun to implement. One of them, which the hon. member will see, is a very direct approach to our accounting to make sure that we book those kinds of liabilities earlier on than we have in the past. I think he'll be delighted to see those changes in the books.

I would remind him, however, when he raises numbers like \$2.1 billion or others – it was interesting to go back and do a review of that number, and \$730 million of that was a loss on one entity, the credit unions of Alberta. Why did the credit unions suffer the problems that they did, Mr. Speaker? It was because of the Liberal-led, NDP dominated and backed national energy program. It was a travesty they should not be proud of.

4:00

DR. PERCY: Mr. Speaker, my supplemental is to the Provincial Treasurer. Alberta taxpayers are presently footing the bill for \$20 million a year on interest payments on MagCan and Gainers loans outstanding. Just so this government won't take the hit on the \$200 million on bad loans outstanding, Mr. Treasurer, when will this government come clean and take the hit on those losses that are out there?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, they have been booked already.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

### Community Tourism Action Program

MR. JACQUES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In May of this year \$12 million of lottery funding was added to the community tourism action program, commonly called CTAP, and the program was extended to March 31 of 1994. Given the government's commitment to balance the provincial budget together with its commitment to get out of grants to business, will the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism please advise this Assembly whether or not consideration is being given to freeze CTAP applications immediately or as a minimum action to eliminate CTAP grants to private-sector operators?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, when the community tourism action program was created in 1988, what it did was basically set up an infrastructure whereby municipal councils throughout the province of Alberta appointed local community tourism action plan groupings that took applications and dealt with them.

Members of this Assembly were unaware of what was happening in terms of what applications were forthcoming to these various committees in local communities, but it seemed that every time an approval was provided by the private-sector administrators

of this particular program, individual members of this Assembly came under some degree of criticism. I recall in the past, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that not one member of this Assembly was involved in the decision-making here in the city of Edmonton when the local CTAP committee here approved funding for the bungee-jumping project they had in west Edmonton, it was hon. members of this Assembly who somehow took the heat. The former Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, I guess now Edmonton-Rutherford, just echoed, as he always does in the Assembly – he talked about an ice cream parlour. The same thing applied in this particular individual member's constituency: totally unknown to him, the local group approved such a project and my other colleagues have to take the heat on it.

So we have been looking at the community tourism action plan, and we've been looking at it in a variety of mechanisms. First of all, to ask the question: what was the original purpose of CTAP? It was basically to assist nonprofit organizations to promote tourism development in their particular communities. Funding was also provided to private-sector entrepreneurs and groups, Mr. Speaker, and we've decided that as of today, we will not be accepting applications from private-sector groups under the community tourism action plan.

MR. JACQUES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I want to acknowledge, I think perhaps on behalf of all members of this House, that that is welcome news. Having said that, Mr. Minister, could you please advise whether or not you would be giving consideration to reducing the amount of funds that would be available between now and March 31 of '94?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are currently some \$8 million worth of applications, I'm advised, with respect to the administrators of CTAP. First of all, the program will terminate March 31, 1994. It will die March 31, 1994. As of today no further applications will be accepted from the private sector. As of September 30, 1993, no further applications will be accepted by the administrators under CTAP. We'll deal with the bank of applications. They'll be processed if they merit consideration. If they do merit consideration, they'll be approved; if not, they'll be rejected. But after September 30 of this year no further applications will be accepted. The program will be wrapped up and wound down.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

### Liquor Sales

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the Speech from the Throne this government indicated that it was going to consult widely with Albertans. Today, only two days after this commitment, the government is pushing ahead with its plan to privatize the Alberta Liquor Control Board without public consultation. My question is to the Premier of this province. Will he please tell this House and the people of Alberta why he's broken his promise to consult with them?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't broken any promises at all. Indeed, the hon. minister who explained the program in his ministerial statement, I understand, has consulted with numerous affected groups and will be consulting as the process takes place.

Relative to the fundamental principle, it was also noted in the throne speech and other government documents that this government will put to the private sector those things that legitimately

should be in the hands of the private sector, and that's exactly what we're doing.

MR. BRACKO: Mr. Speaker, the government brought together a select group of stakeholders for a summit meeting on privatization. These meetings are shrouded in secrecy and are occurring without input from the 1,400 workers that will be affected by the outcome of this summit. Will the Premier please tell this House and those workers who were not invited to the secret summit why their opinion does not matter to them?

MR. KLEIN: I think, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would perhaps absent himself from the House and go down and listen to the minister, he will get the details of this program and he will find that indeed over the course of the privatization there will be a tremendous consultation. I reject the fact that there was a select group. As I understand it, there was representation from a broad section of Alberta business interests and labour and organizations such as MADD and others. I understand that indeed there was a good and honest representation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Lacombe-Stettler.

#### Community Facility Enhancement Program

MRS. GORDON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many municipalities and organizations in my constituency were pleased when the government announced an extension to the community facility enhancement program, now known as CFEP 2. These funds will continue to play a vital role in assisting communities in completing various capital projects. Many feel that the government should also be allocating some of these funds to assist local organizations in operating now existing programs and facilities. They feel existing programs and facilities must be maintained or there will be nothing to enhance. My question is for the minister responsible for lotteries. Will the community facility enhancement program guidelines be expanded to include operating funding to local organizations?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the question's a valid one because it deals with a very important policy and it deals with a policy that this government has always followed in allocating lottery funds because lottery funds tend not to be of an infinite perspective. In other words, in any particular quarter of the year we may very well find that our profit level reduces itself. It's a marketplace reality. So we have always followed a philosophy of not taking lottery funds and having them tied to anything of an operational nature. There's a very important reason for that because experience in other jurisdictions in the world clearly indicates the difficulties one can get into to.

4:10

Michigan a few years ago had committed nearly a billion dollars to health care and hospital costs under their lottery fund. It showed up one October and all of a sudden found that their budget could only see about \$700 million. They had to reduce almost 30 percent of the allocations they gave to their schools and their hospitals. We don't want to do that in Alberta.

Quite clearly the policy has been to make sure that operating dollars do not flow out of the Alberta lottery fund. The answer to the question addressed by the Member for Lacombe-Stettler is unfortunately no.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a supplemental question?

MRS. GORDON: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. The hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated that he had a point of order.

#### Point of Order Imputing Motives

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 23(h) and (i). Section 23 says, "A member will be called to order by Mr. Speaker if that member makes allegations against another member." That's (h), and (i): "Imputes false or unavowed motives to another member." During the course of question period questions that I put to the hon. minister of social services, he responded by alleging, stating, imputing that I had somehow put down or negatively spoke of native children. I have never, ever, ever put down or negatively spoke about native children, and I think those statements should be withdrawn by the hon. minister.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, what I said was "native people." I just assumed that included native children.

#### Speaker's Ruling Parliamentary Language

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair was going to bring up Standing Order 23(h), (i), and (j) as well concerning question period. The Leader of the Opposition has read out (h) and (i). Subsection (j) is also of interest here because it says, "Uses abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder."

The Chair would say that it believes there was a fair amount of disorder in the first question. The Chair believes it was caused by two words: one from the Leader of the Opposition, the other from the hon. the Premier. The Chair doesn't really believe the use of the words "kicking the teeth of children" or the use of the word "stupid" in this context is really of the highest parliamentary nature. We saw the result of that: there were several members who didn't get their opportunity to ask questions today. The Speaker was incorrect in assessing the time for the first question as 14 minutes; it was in fact 10 minutes. Ten minutes is far, far too long to devote to one question. Most of it arose out of the use of these provocative words that the Chair would urge hon. members to try to avoid. Surely in the vast richness of the English language there can be better words to obtain the same result without inflaming people.

#### Point of Order Imputing Motives

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I apologize and withdraw my comments about the Premier kicking children in the teeth. I'd still like a ruling on the point that I drew, and that is that I'm most offended by the comments by the hon. minister.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to read again what I read. I said, "Decore concedes he probably slighted natives." I just assumed that would include native children.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will then take the Leader of the Opposition's representation under advisement to check the Blues and make a ruling on that tomorrow.

Speaking of tomorrow, hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, the Chair has not in fact tried to rule against your point of order yesterday, but the Chair anticipates making a ruling on that point of order tomorrow as well.

### Point of Order Election of Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Speaking about points of order, the words "point of order" were mentioned in this room on Monday, and the Chair would like to make some observation on Monday's proceedings to elect the Speaker because a request was made by members on both sides of the House for some comment.

First, members should be aware of the limitations on that procedure that was adopted last Monday. When the Speaker is elected, the Assembly does not yet exist as an Assembly. There is just a group of people in a room. The Lieutenant Governor has appeared and asked the group of people to elect a Speaker. That is the only business that can be conducted until the Lieutenant Governor reads the causes of summoning the Assembly. Here I should add parenthetically that the election of the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman of Committees in the Chair's opinion is the election of the Speaker because if the Speaker can't act, there has to be a deputy. The causes of summoning the Assembly is the Speech from the Throne. In this regard, I'd refer hon. members to *Beauchesne* 253 and 256. Until that time, the Assembly is not able to move any motions, including any motion to determine how the Speaker should be elected. The Table officers and the Clerk in particular have no authority whatsoever in this regard, so a point of order or any appeal to them is of no use.

Second, as to the actual procedure used, the only authority which existed at that moment was section 16(1) of the Legislative Assembly Act and the Lieutenant Governor's request that a Speaker be elected. Our Standing Orders are silent on how the election is to be conducted. That being the case, we are required by Standing Order 2 to revert first – and I emphasize "first" – to the usages and precedents of the Assembly. The precedent which was then available was the manner in which the Deputy Chairman of Committees was elected on Tuesday, January 26, 1993. Nothing else could have been done. It is the Chair's understanding that that form of election had been agreed to by the House leaders of the parties then present in the Assembly: the present Government House Leader, the then Member for Edmonton-Highlands, and the present Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. Regardless, the people in this room on Monday, August 30, 1993, had no power to change the existing procedure or to adopt a new procedure. Everyone's hands were tied.

Finally, there may be some uncertainty as to the role that *Beauchesne* plays in the proceedings of this Assembly. Again, Standing Order 1 requires all proceedings to be conducted according to our Standing Orders. *Beauchesne* is based on the Standing Orders of the Canadian House of Commons, but it is often useful in interpreting our Standing Orders. When our Standing Orders differ from those in Ottawa, *Beauchesne* is not as useful. When our Standing Orders do not deal with a matter, Standing Order 2 requires us to look at our own usages and precedents. If an answer cannot be found there, Standing Order 2 requires us to look at parliamentary tradition. *Beauchesne* and *Erskine May* are very useful as sources of parliamentary tradition.

In Alberta, Standing Orders do not define the process for the election of the Speaker. We must rely on the precedents of the Assembly. In contrast, the Canadian House of Commons Standing Orders were amended in 1985 to specify the process by which a Speaker is elected, and *Beauchesne* describes those Standing Orders. Since we do not have those particular Standing Orders, *Beauchesne* is not relevant to our election process.

4:20

On Monday reference was made to *Beauchesne* 150, which states that points of order have been raised during the election process and dealt with by the Chair. This is possible because

House of Commons Standing Order 3 specifies who was to take the Chair during the election process and the powers the Chair has to hear points of order. Again, we do not have the benefit of such a Standing Order. It would not have been possible legally or administratively for the Clerk to suddenly adopt the House of Commons Standing Orders as discussed in *Beauchesne* for that election.

Did the hon. Government House Leader have a point of order? Then would he like to make it?

### Point of Order Parliamentary Language

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, yes. I did have a point of order, and it arose out of the first exchange that occurred, but subsequent events since then have ruled it redundant. In essence, the point of order that I was raising had to do with the usage of certain words by the Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition, but the hon. gentleman has now retracted those words, and we thank him for that.

In the same token, Mr. Speaker, were the Premier in his chair at the moment, he would be retracting the usage of the word that he used in reference to a question coming from the Leader of the Opposition.

### head: Orders of the Day

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, with respect to all questions and motions for returns on the Order Paper, we'll ask them to be held.

[Motion carried]

### head: Motions Other than Government Motions

#### Members' Statements

201. Moved by Mr. Severtson:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to include a member's statement period to the Tuesday and Thursday Orders of the Day schedule.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great pleasure to rise today to speak on Motion 201. Many members of this Assembly today are aware of the goals and objectives of this motion, but a few of those here that are new will not understand the objectives of this motion. I'd like to cover some of them in introductory remarks.

One of the key reasons I entered politics was because I wanted to bring a strong voice for the constituency that I represent. I'm sure that everybody in the House has the same feeling. They want to represent their political perspectives from their ridings. With the idea of enhancing the ability of an MLA to represent his constituency, I introduced this motion in 1991 urging the government to consider the inclusion of member's statements.

Yesterday I had the honour of moving the Lieutenant Governor's Speech from the Throne. I was able to speak on the new directions this government is taking on budget reform, on tax reform, and on reform of the way government does business. The June election and the Speech from the Throne are signs of this government's mandate to balance the provincial budget and to involve Albertans in government as they never have before. This reform can extend to the parliamentary process as well. On Monday this Assembly elected its Speaker for the first time in the history of this province. We're considering the possibility of

changing the number of days we meet per week in this Assembly during this session. The aims of this motion fit well into these reforms.

There are many different ways a government MLA can contribute to the political debate that affects Albertans. We try to be effective spokesmen for our constituents on the various committees we sit on, the committees we chair and serve on. In question period we ask questions, and we can take part in the many legislative debates on the Order Paper, such as this one.

This motion is really a logical continuation of this government's desire to fully and completely represent Albertans in this Assembly. Basically what I'm proposing is a designated period for any MLA to stand up and make a brief statement on the issues and the concerns of his constituents. I believe the member's statements period would be another positive way for MLAs to contribute to the overall legislative system. We can also bring more responsibility and accountability to our jobs as MLAs.

There are other reasons to include members' statements in the proceedings of this Assembly. Often members of this Assembly compromise present Standing Orders by making member's statements in the House during question period. Question period is for questions, not member's statements. Quite often you'll see in this Assembly that when question period's on, members from both sides of the House will make statements and then at the end of their preamble leave it with a question mark, but mainly it's a member's statement. This is flagrant abuse of question period which must come to an end. By including a member's statement period in the Orders of the Day schedule, this Assembly would have a designated time for MLAs to make their statements. It's a supplementary intention of this motion, but nonetheless it's still an important part of this motion.

Other jurisdictions throughout the country have also included member's statement periods. Before I get into the details of the proposal that I'm proposing, I'd like to highlight some of the features of member's statements in other jurisdictions. In the House of Commons there's a members' statement period every day for 15 minutes. The need for a members' statement period came about in 1982 through the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures. It was unanimously accepted by the House on a one-year trial basis. The impact of the member's statement period was so positive that it is now a permanent part of the Orders of the Day. British Columbia has a member's statement period every Friday, seven members up to one hour. The Northwest Territories has one member's statement period on the opening of every session. Ontario's member's statement period is the first proceeding of each day, 90 seconds up to three members from each party. In New Brunswick members are permitted to make a 90-second statement before question period for a 10-minute period. In Prince Edward Island a member can speak on a matter for two minutes, one member per day. These six jurisdictions have incorporated member's statement periods into their daily routines on a permanent basis because it is the type of parliamentary forum that all sides of the House find useful and valuable, and it's working well. MLAs take their statements seriously, and they present them distinctly, and question period is for questions, not speeches.

What I have tried to do is pull together the best features of member's statement periods from other Assemblies and bring them together in this motion. Before I present the details of Motion 201, I should state that I look forward to the debate in this Assembly and I am open for certain amendments and believe that it is important to flush out as many ideas on this issue as possible. I realize the House leaders are meeting to discuss maybe including member's statements in the reformed Legislature Orders of the

Day. So some of my rules might not apply if we change to a four-day sitting instead of five-days.

First of all, the member's statement period would fall on a Tuesday or Thursday because this is when we do private members' business. This period would come right after Ministerial Statements and just before question period. The member's statement period would last six minutes with a maximum of four speakers. I believe that a minute and a half is plenty of time, and it's the average length of the 12 other jurisdictions that I looked at. Each Member of the Legislative Assembly will be granted 90 seconds to make his statement. Rebuttals or comments on the statements will not be permitted because these statements are not designed for debate. B.C. is the only jurisdiction to have response to statements, but they also have devoted an hour. We just don't have that much time.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right, hon. member. Pursuant to Standing Order 8(3), we are now required to suspend debate on this motion until the next time private members' motions appear and proceed with the next order of business.

head: **Public Bills and Orders Other than**  
head: **Government Bills and Orders**  
head: **Second Reading**  
**4:30**

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I would like to move pursuant to Standing Order 73(2), I believe is the correct reference, that the House give unanimous consent to the debate on the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition's Bill 201.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

**Bill 201**  
**Freedom of Information and Protection**  
**of Personal Privacy Act**

MR. DECORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the minister of the environment for the motion. This is the fifth year in a row that the Liberal opposition, now the Official Opposition, has brought forward an Act entitled Freedom of Information and Protection of Personal Privacy Act. Four of those five times I personally stood in this Assembly to argue the principles of my Bill. My recollection is that one of those five times I was ill and couldn't, and the late Sheldon Chumir spoke on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it's hard to imagine how citizens could be denied information from their own government or by their own government. It's hard to imagine in a democracy that prides itself on the fact that people are elected by the people that those same representatives of the people would then turn around and deny, refuse to provide information to the very people that elected them. Democracy isn't served and wasn't served and hasn't been served in this province because that's not been allowed. Albertans have not had the right to ask for information and get information.

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge every state government in the United States has freedom of information legislation. The federal government in the United States has such legislation. Every province in Canada except two, Prince Edward Island and Alberta, have freedom of information legislation. I am told that the Northwest Territories also does not have that kind of legislation. When I started proposing that this Legislative Assembly pass this

Act, there were a number of other provinces that did not have freedom of information legislation. Manitoba was in the throes of bringing it forward. Saskatchewan did not have it, and British Columbia did not have it. Manitoba now has it, Saskatchewan has it, and British Columbia has it.

In the workup in looking at freedom of information legislation in Canada, there is a very incredible progression of legislation from the provinces that first put it into place to British Columbia, the last province that legislated it, an incredible progression in the sense that provinces, Canadians, have learned from the experiences that have occurred in other provinces and have strengthened and improved their legislation. I think that British Columbia has very good legislation and has made improvements on the Ontario model, which was the model that we, the Liberal Party, used to build our freedom of information Bill on. We made changes to the Ontario model, but there are lots of examples that we can use to see where there are difficulties and improve on those difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, it's in the same way unbelievable that you could imagine that citizens could be denied information. It's also unbelievable to go back on the *Hansard* record of this Assembly and review some of the statements that have been made in this Assembly about freedom of information. I did pick up *Hansard* and did look at some of the statements. I recall some of the statements made by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury when he spoke against the Liberal freedom of information legislation. That hon. member – I guess he was trumpeting the line of his party – stood in this Assembly and said: we don't really need freedom of information legislation; you need only come to this Assembly and get whatever information you want by asking questions in question period or by putting it on the Order Paper as a written question or a motion for a return. That argument was made not only by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury but other hon. members on the Conservative side.

What we did, Mr. Speaker, was start tracking for the benefit of this Assembly answers that weren't given by written questions, and we started to track motions for returns that weren't allowed, weren't dealt with, and we started to track questions that weren't answered in question period. You will recall that we released those statistics and they were alarming because they showed that you couldn't get answers, that you couldn't get information. I remember one in particular that had to be the most unbelievable of all. When one of our caucus members asked for the statistics from the Provincial Treasurer on how much money accrued to the provincial government on tobacco sales, the only response from the government was: question rejected. Whom do you hurt by providing that information? Whom could you hurt? Nonetheless, we didn't get that information.

As a very new member of this Assembly four and a half years ago, I remember reading the technical documents on the GST that were brought forward by the Conservative federal government, and I particularly remember a provision whereby lands that are bought and sold by the province would come under the provisions of GST and taxes would have to be paid. All sorts of bells and alarms went off in my head because, having been a mayor of the city of Edmonton, I knew how much land is bought and sold and taken for roadway development and so on and believed that that could be astronomical in the sense of our province or cities or municipalities in Alberta having to pay money on GST. So I picked up the phone and I called the deputy minister in charge of the Treasury, and I asked for the information. It wasn't in the financial documents. I asked for the deputy minister to provide me with the data on how much land had been bought and sold by the province of Alberta last year and the year before. The deputy minister

made it clear to my office that he couldn't provide that information unless I first wrote a letter to the minister and the minister wrote a letter to the deputy minister and I was authorized to get that information. Who could have been hurt by my getting that information? Could anybody imagine why there would be a bureaucracy that would thwart that kind of information being given out? But it was and it still is in place.

Well, it wasn't only the Member for Olds-Didsbury that made those comments. The hon. Minister of Labour, in opposing the Liberals' Bill, also stood in this Assembly and said right after I spoke that we could come into this Assembly and get any information that we wanted. The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East made the same kinds of statements. How sad to look back on the record of this Assembly and see those statements.

I remember the very strong debate that occurred in this Assembly on NovAtel. I remember the information that was asked for day after day after day by Mr. Martin, the Leader of the Opposition, and members of his caucus and by me and members of the Liberal caucus. Day after day we attempted to probe and find out how \$645 million of Alberta taxpayers' money could have found its way into United States cellular telephone companies, but every time we attempted to get that information we were thwarted. Who would be hurt by having that information given to Albertans? How could it be made worse than it already was to get that information?

4:40

To this day, Mr. Speaker, we haven't received the full story on NovAtel because freedom of information hasn't been put in place to give us that information. We know, and I used this example a few days ago in this Assembly, that we found out the information from the freedom of information statutes in California. We found out that a corporation in California that NovAtel was dealing with was taking Alberta taxpayers' moneys and they were giving them to directors of a company. We found out that Alberta taxpayers' moneys were used to buy land and build a building in California by some cellular company. We discovered that there was a cute little deal between a California company and some company in South America. We asked about that, and still today we can't get all of the details on that transaction. We discovered that special deals were given by NovAtel for companies to set up cellular operations in the Gulf of Mexico. Still there's no information, even though we requested that information, provided to the people of Alberta – \$645 million. My argument is that if Albertans had been told, if they could have received the information, we would have had better government, and the kind of mistakes that occurred in NovAtel would not have occurred.

I watched the previous minister responsible for science and technology, who was responsible for NovAtel, stand in this Assembly for two weeks and say that the only kind of money that was being given out by NovAtel was product-financing money from the people of Alberta, from the taxpayers of Alberta. That minister was either misinformed by his own staff or information coming from the United States to his bureaucrats wasn't proper. Nonetheless, he had to apologize in this Assembly two weeks later and say that the financing had gone way beyond what he had known it to be. If we'd had freedom of information in place, those things could have been looked at quickly and understood and critiqued and perhaps stopped.

Mr. Speaker, we have \$67 million in loans and loan guarantees between Gainers, between Mr. Pocklington and the people of Alberta. I remember listening and reading to the representations made by the minister of economic development when he said that there would be a hog processing plant in Picture Butte, and I



remember reading when the minister assured Albertans that there was a guarantee of jobs in Picture Butte, on the moneys that were given to Mr. Pocklington. Mr. Pocklington put \$6 million of \$12 million that was intended for that hog processing plant in his pocket, and to this day there is no Picture Butte hog processing plant. Those documents have been asked for in this Assembly and still to this day have not been shown to the people of Alberta, and that's a tragedy. How could an individual get away with that? You can't get away with that when you go to your bank and try to get money. Try doing that and you'll find the window or the door pretty quickly in your bank, but Mr. Pocklington was able to do it. I'm a firm believer that if the people of Alberta had seen that, that horror story wouldn't have gone on and wouldn't have become as big and as horrible as it did and was.

The Conservative government provided a \$102 million loan guarantee to MagCan. It looks like that money's going to be lost. The agreement that set up that loan guarantee has been requested in this Assembly, and still the people of Alberta have been refused the knowledge, the information, in that agreement. One of the provisions in that MagCan arrangement with the government should have dealt with or did deal with technology transfer. Didn't Magnesium International have a claim on the technology that was used in High River? Well, we don't know. We think that there's a \$33 million hit coming against the people of Alberta. That information has been requested in this Assembly so many times I don't think we could count them on the Treasurer's hands and feet, and to this day that information still has not been provided.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, when the former Premier jet-setted off to England to have tea with the Queen, we stood in this Assembly and asked what the Premier would be doing. The Premier refused to give an itinerary or a schedule on what he would be doing. I think Albertans are entitled to know what's going to be done; who the Premier, then and now, or any minister is going to meet with; the purpose of those visits; and how much this is going to cost Albertans. I think Albertans should be entitled to get that information now or as quickly after the event as possible, not two years or 18 months after the fact.

Mr. Speaker, how sad for Albertans to access knowledge on the debt of Alberta from rating agencies in New York that will give you the exact amount of Alberta's debt, because a prospectus must be filed and signed by the Provincial Treasurer. Albertans themselves or members of this Assembly, when they ask questions in the House as to the exact extent of the debt, have been denied that information. That's what's happened.

Time and time again members of the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party asked to see the leases that were made between the government and Olympia & York involving the City Centre Building in Edmonton. There is an allegation that the lease payments were far in excess of the going market at that time. To this day those leases have not been provided. That information has not been provided to Albertans.

Well, the purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that that kind of information is provided. Two purposes are set out in this Act. The first purpose is

to provide a right of access to information under the control of [government] in accordance with the principles that,

- (i) information should be available to the public,
- (ii) necessary exemptions from the right of access should be limited and specific, and

(iii) decisions on the disclosure of government information should be reviewed independently of government, and that there should be a protection of

the privacy of individuals with respect to personal information about themselves held by [government] and to provide individuals with a right of access to that information.

Mr. Speaker, a Bill has to have teeth. This Bill has teeth. This Bill allows for a commissioner to deal openly, to deal in public with a request. This Bill allows for a commissioner, that man or that woman, to determine that information which is requested should be given and must be given to an Albertan. If that information is not provided by a deputy minister or a minister or some functionary, some bureaucrat, there are ways, provisions, in this Act to compel that information to be given. Surely an Act that would allow a deputy minister or a minister to simply say "I'm not going to provide it" and get away with it is not the kind of legislation that Albertans should have.

The Act also deals with exemptions. There must be exemptions to protect certain cabinet discussions, certain positions that government takes in workup of policy. We know that, and we accept that, but the exemptions should not be so unreasonable as to deny Albertans the information that they should have. I note with particular interest that the Bill that was filed just a few days ago by the hon. Premier allows for an exemption, allows for third parties involved in financial transactions with the government to exclude or exempt themselves from public scrutiny. That would mean that the NovAtel \$645 million request for information would be denied or could be denied. That would mean that matters involving Gainers would be or could be denied. That would mean that MagCan information would be or could be denied, that travel expenses would be or could be denied, that leases could be or would be denied. Mr. Speaker, there has to be certainty and understanding and a sense of properness to the exemptions that are set out. There cannot be long delays, and I think this Act provides for that.

4:50

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that perhaps needs to be written into the new Act that's set out for Albertans is the assurance that the commissioner that is picked is not somebody who is under the thumb of the government, that that individual should either be a person who is selected by an all-party committee of this Assembly or perhaps by the public service commissioner. My preference is to see that that person is somebody that is selected by this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it is just unbelievable for us as legislators to accept that we could allow the situation to continue as it has in Alberta without the proper kind of legislation. Government has made a positive move towards repair of the damage that has been caused – that is, in not providing information – by coming forward with Bill 61. There are many improvements that need to be made to that Bill. I would hope, if we're now negotiating, as we are, for improvements and reform of this Assembly, that hon. members on the other side might consider that the first Bill that would allow for free votes on amendments and the substance of a Bill be this Bill, Bill 201, or Bill 61, or the combination of the ideas out of the both of them after the panel of five legislators reviews the situation. I don't think that would be too difficult for this Assembly to handle. I think it would be a wonderful test of the reform that we're talking about. I think it would produce the kind of Act that we would all be very proud of. I think it would allow for incredible debate from members on the opposite side and from this side. There are some problems, I'm sure, in Bill 201 that can be made better by input from hon. members on the other side, in

the same way that we're proposing input on Bill 61. We invite and we urge and we plead with members and the government to allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no further delay in getting freedom of information legislation that protects the privacy of the individual. That is critical, because in this world more and more information on the individual gets stored up in computer banks, and it's so easy to bring this all together and to create great embarrassment to individuals. We saw that in a computer disk that got away. That means that there have to be certain things put into place to control documentation, that archivists have to be there helping us to determine how to manage and inventory what we have. There has to be a way of ensuring that Albertans know what it is that exists in departments. Inventories must be provided to them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm hopeful that we're now just on the cusp of getting the kind of freedom of information legislation that Albertans so dearly and so completely desire.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary-Bow.

MRS. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to stand today to speak on the very first private member's Bill debated during the First Session of the 23rd Legislature. I'd like to congratulate you on your election on Monday and say that I really look forward to working with you in this new session.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt the government is committed to freedom of information, as we've heard in the throne speech and as we saw with the Premier tabling Bill 1, Access to Information and Protection of Privacy, in this House on Tuesday. This government will ensure that all Albertans have access to information.

Mr. Speaker, we have debated Bill 201, Freedom of Information and Protection of Personal Privacy Act, in this House before, as the hon. member mentioned. It's by no means a new Bill; in fact, Mr. Speaker, Bill 201 is a close cousin to the freedom of information Act as it exists in Ontario. In contrast to Bill 201, Bill 1 is uniquely Albertan, and once Albertans have been given the opportunity to review this Bill in a very open and public process, Bill 1 will represent the views and ideas of Albertans, not solely those of the Liberal opposition or the government of Ontario as in the case of Bill 201.

Freedom of information and personal privacy are valuable principles to democratic governments. Access to information is something we should all concern ourselves with. Mr. Speaker, at the same time, we must ensure that a process is put in place that will ensure that any legislation, particularly this piece, is created in such a way that the final product is really representative of what the people of Alberta want and need.

As all members of this House are aware, the Liberal caucus issued a press release on August 26, 1993, detailing their criticism of the government's freedom of information legislation. They felt that their piece of legislation provided all of the answers. They did not even acknowledge the possibility that perhaps their legislation may require some fine-tuning. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say this: as with many things in the Liberal caucus, the Bill was not perfect, and to suggest such is an affront to the people of Alberta.

This government has by no means suggested that our Bill is perfect. In fact, the government released a discussion guide in order to seek out public input in the process. The hon. Premier has pledged to listen to Albertans, to talk with Albertans, and to deliver a Bill on freedom of information that really represents Albertans. This process will begin very soon. An all-party

committee will be asked to go out to Albertans for their views on freedom of information, and these views will be taken into account before Bill 1 is passed by this House. As with all Albertans, the Liberal caucus is welcome to bring its ideas to the table, as they're doing here today with Bill 201. Without a doubt there certainly are ideas within this Bill which have merit, and without going into the Bill in great detail, I would suggest that perhaps some ideas also need to be changed or are unacceptable, but in no way would I suggest that the government Bill is also perfect. Instead, I would suggest to all interested parties that they participate in the process of public consultation so we may truly create a Bill that's acceptable to all Albertans.

It's very positive that the provincial and federal governments are taking steps to improve their freedom of information and protection of personal privacy, but by no means is it an easy task to cover these areas. Legislation passed years ago in other jurisdictions has not stood the test of time. They have required extensive amendments, even in the Ontario legislation, which is so highly regarded by the members opposite. It has undergone a review leading to many suggested amendments. The stated purpose of an information Act is to allow people to have better access to information. This is a worthy intention, but in truth such legislation can turn out to have an entirely different result from what was really intended. The government of Alberta is addressing these concerns now by presenting the framework for legislated access to information and protection of personal privacy to allow Albertans an opportunity to craft such legislation in such a way that it will truly stand the test of time.

A variety of problems can and will arise when information Acts are not thoroughly and meticulously thought out. Our fellow provinces can certainly attest to this, and their problems are far from over. We can list among the problems denial of access to information, prohibitive and unnecessary cost associated with information requests, nuisance problems, and manipulation of the legislation and the intent behind it.

#### 5:00

The federal government represents a good case to begin with. Several years ago Ottawa backtracked on a promise to provide personal information held by Air Canada and Petro-Canada. The federal Justice department recommended that Air Canada be exempted from the Privacy Act, while Petro-Canada was allowed to take advantage of special loopholes in the legislation to sidestep its responsibility as well. This incident is only one example of blatant misuse and disregard of the information regulations.

The federal government has set a poor example to follow in the areas of efficiency and cost control. Canada's Information Commissioner spent over \$5 million in 1988 alone. Manitoba is also experiencing increased costs in administration of its access to information system. In this time of reduced government expenditures we must make very careful consideration of the cost implications of access to information.

Manitoba is also suffering from problems in the appeal process. Civil servants have become reluctant to apply the law and release information. This has caused applicants to begin a long and torturous appeal procedure that lasts as long as six months. Manitoba is not alone in its appeal tribulations. At the federal level one out of eight requests results in a complaint being lodged with the federal Information Commissioner. The province of Quebec has also encountered difficulties with an unwieldy appeal process, and often during appeal hearings lawyers must be retained by both the government and the plaintiff, costing both parties dearly. Is this the kind of example that we want Alberta's law to follow?

Mr. Speaker, we must also take a good look at Ontario, as the Bill we are debating today is modeled after their legislation. Ontario's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act holds as one of its basic principles the public's right of access to government records. Of course, certain exceptions have been considered where it's deemed necessary to protect the confidential nature of some information and to expedite government administration. While this seems reasonable, in truth has turned into an opportunity for government to take incredible latitude for itself in administering the Act. Vague and imprecise language in the Act allows the government to manipulate the conditions, to determine information they want to suppress as privileged and confidential almost at will. Information from the Department of Health concerning physicians who broke the law by double-billing was denied to the public. The department of agriculture refused to release information on a list of publicly inspected meat plants. Information on corporate violators of the Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act was withheld. These are just a few examples of information that should have been allowed in the hands of the people of Ontario and was denied.

In Ontario we also witnessed that the Act is applied discriminately in regards to institutions. The reason for this is simple: the Act lacks specification of criteria. The result is that some government agencies are covered by the Act and some are not. Furthermore, the Lieutenant Governor in Council is able to remove institutions from the list simply by way of an amendment to the regulations. Can the opposition assure us that they've taken this problem into account? Or can we assume this is yet another problem that Alberta would encounter under the new Bill that's proposed?

Ontario also provides a wonderful example of the problems we may encounter with a compelling public interest. Such a clause allows both the head of an institution and the Information and Privacy Commissioner to override an individual's right to privacy. Interpretation of what constitutes a compelling public interest is open to vast interpretation. The Premier of Ontario has used this provision in the past to force the disclosure of an Ontario Hydro employee's salary. Using a very liberal interpretation of the vague compelling public interest clause ensured that disclosure of information took precedence over the individual's right to privacy. Is this what we can expect in our province, or do we as Albertans deserve much more than this?

In addition to research and administration costs, the Ontario Information and Privacy Commissioner has stated that public awareness of the Act must be increased. This has resulted in a huge outreach program being launched, utilizing public and municipal training programs, public addresses, conferences, brochures, newsletters, and the list goes on. For a government in such severe financial trouble it is possible that there are more appropriate areas right now to invest that capital.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal opposition news release talks of a commissioner with real power to enforce the Act. The Liberals would have this commissioner appointed by the Legislature and function in a realm with very little accountability. They speak of a commissioner who has coercive powers to ensure that the truth he or she sees is exposed. I think Albertans will want to take a very close look at where this is coming from. Should we resort to coercion in our attempts to find what is right or wrong? There are limits, and this particular area deserves very careful consideration.

We must also address the issue of nuisance requests under the Ontario Act. These include the famous example of a psychiatric patient who abused the system in Ontario to the tune of \$200,000 with his 2,500 requests for information spaced out over a four-

year period. Nuisance requests are a real problem and deserve very careful consideration.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 201 has the potential to be an effective and responsive tool in guaranteeing freedom of information and protecting personal privacy, yet it requires the scrutiny of others, including the people of Alberta, before it can be considered. The government of Alberta has put forward as its number one priority Bill 1, Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act. This Bill is by no means the answer. It is merely a framework of ideas for Albertans to consider.

I would ask all members of this House to not support Bill 201. To do so would be a slap in the face of Albertans who want and demand the opportunity to participate in the drafting of this legislation. This will have a much greater and profound effect on each and every one of us, given the opportunity to participate. I would indeed ask the Liberal opposition to consider all suggestions and ideas brought forward through the public consultation process and not pass judgment so quickly. To seek the passing of Bill 201 in the Legislature today would be a grave error. We are all committed to an open process of public consultation, and I think we should consider that there are other options open when we do the public processes.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I thank all members for giving unanimous consent to allow debate on this important legislative proposal to take place this afternoon.

I might make the observation, Mr. Speaker, that this particular type of legislation has had an incredibly torturous path that brings it here in front of the Legislative Assembly this afternoon. I can tell you that I had some involvement I think starting in about 1974. This was at a time when Mr. Ged Baldwin, the former Peace River Member of Parliament, started to sponsor this radical concept or notion that taxpayers had a basic core right to find out how their tax dollars were being spent or misspent. I had the good fortune to be part of a small group including my predecessor, the late Mr. Chumir, in Calgary that was involved in terms of doing some lobbying for an adequate freedom of information statute in this country.

I think that it's not a question – and I haven't heard anybody from this side suggest that this particular Bill is perfect and flawless. I take the member opposite's point that we need the input and can benefit from suggestions from all members and all sides in this Legislature. But I do think it's a basic kind of responsibility for governments and legislators to come forward and learn from the experiences in other jurisdictions, to put in front of us the very best piece of legislation that we can craft. I think since the Member for Calgary-Bow has raised the comparison between Bill 1 and Bill 201, I simply have to say, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 1 virtually ignores 10 years, a decade, of experience across the country that other jurisdictions have had with access to information, freedom of information laws.

5:10

One would think that while there may be plenty of constructive suggestions in terms of how we could make this law more effective, more comprehensive, surely the starting point is to find the strongest law in the country that exists now, and let's add onto that. It's astonishing to me and I think many members of this Chamber that when the government reintroduced the old Bill 61 now as Bill 1, what we see is a statute clearly modeled on the original freedom of information law, the federal statute, a statute in which we have had a chance to see the weaknesses, the flaws,

the imperfections, and the kinds of improvements and amendments that are required. What we've done in this Bill, sir, is we've tried to learn from that experience. We've looked across the country. We've talked to people involved who utilize freedom of information mechanisms and processes to be able to make sure that we have a system here that empowers Albertans, that gives them the right they are entitled to: to have information about how their funds, how their resources are managed and spent.

I think, as has been pointed out by the Leader of the Official Opposition, that although the federal law was first, what we've seen in the intervening decade or so is increasingly more sophisticated statutes, more comprehensive legislation, and more effective legislation. What we've tried to do with Bill 201 is in fact to make improvements, to learn in terms of what's happened in other jurisdictions. In fact, the Bill that this caucus has introduced in this session is an improved version of that which we put forward in the last session, and I think we remain open to constructive suggestions and improvements.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about freedom of information, it's important to keep in mind that the best freedom of information statute in the world is absolutely worthless, useless, unless there's a good information management system. If we look across the country, we find that Alberta has the remarkable and somewhat embarrassing distinction of probably having the poorest and least sophisticated information management system anywhere in the country. If somebody can find a worse system, I'd be delighted to have that pointed out. But what I see when I look across the country are other provinces that have realized that if you don't know what documents you've got, how on earth can you retrieve them to be able to respond effectively and promptly to a request from a concerned citizen?

In Alberta what we have is a provision in the public works, supply and services Act that provides for a committee. The committee doesn't include opposition representation, as is the model in other jurisdictions, and I think we'd be doing well to emulate that. What we have is that each department is left on its own to develop its own schedules for which kinds of documents are going to be destroyed. I don't think that's satisfactory.

I think in addition to simply having the right kind of text, the right kinds of words in a freedom of information law, we also need a commitment on the part of any government to put in place an information management system so you know what information government has, you can retrieve it when you have to, and when documents and information are destroyed, it's done as part of some overall plan and not on the basis of some helter-skelter, ad hoc decision-making.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that gives me a great deal of concern in terms of freedom of information and an information management system is that there are really three different kinds of documents we have to deal with. There are what I would characterize as departmental records, and these are the kinds of records that are kept in the course of a department fulfilling its mandate. The second category is ministerial documents, and these are the documents that members in the front bench opposite accumulate in the course of performing their duties as ministers of the Crown in right of the province. There's perhaps a third category of documents which would have to do with government members' personal papers and constituent matters and that sort of thing.

What's of interest is that in Alberta it's only the first category that's dealt with in our policies that relate to management/destruction of documents. Ministerial records are absolutely, expressly exempt. It was an astonishing revelation to this member when I discovered it. I had assumed that in the course of

discharging their responsibilities as members of the Crown, those records didn't belong to them; they didn't have a proprietary interest in them; they were our records as taxpayers. What I found is that that's not the case. So I think when we start improving our records management system, there's no better place to start than, say, ministerial records. Those documents are the property of the taxpayers and the citizens of this province, not the minister. When the minister leaves, the minister is welcome to take personal papers and postcards and notes from constituents, but the ministerial records stay because they belong to the province of Alberta.

The Member for Calgary-Bow said she's anxious to see the kind of input we're going to have from Albertans in response to the task force that was created the other day. I join with her. I'm also looking forward with some anticipation to the kind of interest we're going to get from Albertans, and I want to draw the attention of all members to a particular event which is going to happen on November 13 in the city of Calgary.

The Alberta Freedom of Information Conference is going to take place then, and at that conference they're going to bring in the experts. You know, there are a significant number of people in this country that have a body of experience and expertise dealing with freedom of information. This conference in Calgary, which I think all members of this Legislature should make a point of attending, are going to include Mr. Bruce Phillips, the national Privacy Commissioner. It's going to include Murray Rankin, a professor from the University of Victoria, who is perhaps the most prominent legal authority in this area of freedom of information. It's going to include Mr. Thomas Reilly, who's an international consultant when it comes to information management systems and freedom of information both in this country and internationally.

I was invited the other day to identify the single most important issue, the thing that makes the difference between a strong and effective freedom of information law on the one hand and a weak and ineffective statute on the other. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I had some problem with that but finally decided that there are other issues that are important and other features that are critical, but perhaps no one feature is as important as the power of the commissioner. Will we have a commissioner similar to that which exists in the federal regime, similar to that which is contemplated by Bill 1, who simply is an individual who can make recommendations, and ministers and department heads can say yea, nay, or simply ignore the commissioner's request? We can go with that model, or we can go with a model such as exists in Ontario and British Columbia. This is a model where the commissioner has some real power.

The last speaker took offence at the words "coercive power." I simply remind the Member for Calgary-Bow that coercive power means nothing other than a statute that says "must" and "shall" rather than "may" or "might," and it's not anything we need be fearful of if we're simply anxious to ensure the right of Albertans to get information. I think we want to put those kinds of restraints on government, because that's what this legislation is all about. It's not about making the work of government easier, because it probably doesn't. It's not about making the job of the government smoother. It probably doesn't do that either, but it does address the people that we're all supposed to be serving, the people we're supposed to be listening to, the people we're supposed to be empowering. That's what this kind of legislation is all about.

I think that when we talk about the power of the commissioner, you do start with a selection process. I'm not sure if I understood the Member for Calgary-Bow to be critical of our suggestion in this Bill that the privacy commissioner would be appointed not by the cabinet, not by order in council, but by an all-party legislative committee. Isn't that the way we do it with the people on the

Legislative Offices Committee when we're finding an Ethics Commissioner, discharging an Ethics Commissioner, monitoring the work of an Ethics Commissioner, the Ombudsman? To me that seems like the most reasonable way of both hiring and installing a person in this absolutely important position and then monitoring the work. It involves both sides of the House, so members of the government should welcome the fact that you get away from allegations of political interference. I respectfully suggest that this position is absolutely too important to compromise the commissioner, to compromise the effectiveness of the commissioner's office by leaving in place some kind of an appointment process that's suspect, that's not open, that doesn't involve both sides of the Legislature. Once you get beyond the appointment process, there's a whole range of kinds of powers that we could give a commissioner.

5:20

Now, the government's Bill 1 concerns me enormously. At the same time the Member for Calgary-Bow expresses concern about court challenges. I listened to that with considerable interest because if there's one shortcoming, one particular flaw that jumps off the page when we look at Bill 1, it's that if taxpayers, if citizens can't get the information from the commissioner, they have to go to court. I say, Mr. Speaker, as somebody who has practised law for some 20 years, the legal system has some virtues and some advantages, but it's perhaps one of the last places I'd look if we're trying to ensure that ordinary Albertans can in a cost-effective and speedy fashion get information about what's happening with their resources and their tax dollars. I just think that's absolutely the wrong way to go. I oppose that suggestion absolutely, and I certainly oppose that provision in Bill 1. I think it's one of the things that makes Bill 1 an ineffective statute before it gets any further.

I think that, you know, when we look and talk about the power of the commissioner, we're provided with an absolutely excellent example of why the kind of commissioner that the Member for Calgary-Bow is proposing doesn't work. The federal commissioner determined that there was some information that should be released. The information I'm talking about is extensive public opinion polls that were undertaken by the federal government after the failure of Meech Lake, something I think a lot of Albertans were interested in seeing. A request went in to get that information. Now, these were polls that were done to determine what Canadians were thinking. We paid for it; it's our tax dollars. We wanted the information. The department involved said, "No way; we won't share it." An appeal went to the commissioner. The commissioner, Mr. Phillips, reviewed the submissions from both sides, made his finding: this information should be disclosed; it should be made public. It wasn't exempt. What happened? The recommendation went to the government of the day. Presumably, they found this information would be politically embarrassing. So what happens? The government says no. What then ensues is that some \$200,000 is paid out in taxpayers' money fighting a court challenge.

Now, I don't know of many Albertans who may want to get information and access this law who have resources and are prepared to fund an expensive and involved lawsuit to get some information. Even if they can afford it, what we saw in this federal example I'm mentioning is that by the time the court finally agreed with the Privacy Commissioner and ordered the federal government to release these poll results, the reality was that the Charlottetown accord referendum had taken place and the information was absolutely no good to the requester, the applicant, in the first place. The proposal just advanced by the Member for

Calgary-Bow demonstrates clearly why the procedure set out in Bill 1 isn't going to work, isn't going to serve the needs of Albertans.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

There's an issue as well in terms of what government bodies are covered by the Act. I think the Member for Calgary-Bow has raised a good point, and I agree absolutely and completely with her that it's not acceptable that we have simply the right for the cabinet by order in council to add agencies and departments to the list of bodies that are subject to the statute, because they also have the right to delete it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of strengths in this Bill. It's not that this is a perfect Bill by any means, but it's vastly more effective and holds out far more promise for effective freedom of information than anything that's evident in the four corners of Bill 1 that was introduced by the government yesterday.

We had some talk earlier this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, about an opportunity for private members to assume some role and some importance, and I can think of no better opportunity, sir, than to deal with an issue on which I think all members of this Legislature agree: freedom of information.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move that the question now be put on this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to speak on this Bill, Bill 201, the Freedom of Information and Protection of Personal Privacy Act. Various speakers have brought up some very good points for this Bill, and a number of other members I'm sure would like to speak on this, so at this time I'd like to sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are there any further members who wish to participate in this debate? The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

MR. HAVELOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of the time I would beg leave to adjourn the House sitting.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that debate be adjourned on Bill 201. All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

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

5:30

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

For the motion:

Ady	Friedel	McFarland
Amery	Fritz	Mirosh

Black	Gordon	Oberg	Against the motion:		
Brassard	Haley	Renner	Abdurahman	Germain	Percy
Burgener	Havelock	Rostad	Beniuk	Hanson	Sapers
Calahasen	Herard	Severtson	Bracko	Henry	Sekulic
Cardinal	Hierath	Smith	Bruseker	Hewes	Soetaert
Clegg	Hlady	Sohal	Carlson	Kirkland	Taylor, N.
Coutts	Jacques	Tannas	Chadi	Langevin	Van Binsbergen
Day	Jonson	Taylor, L.	Collingwood	Leibovici	Vasseur
Doerksen	Kowalski	Thurber	Dalla-Longa	Massey	White
Dunford	Laing	Trynchy	Decore	Mitchell	Zariwny
Evans	Lund	West	Dickson	Nicol	Zwozdesky
Fischer	Magnus	Woloshyn	Totals:	For - 44	Against - 30
Forsyth	Mar				

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:41 p.m.]