

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Wednesday, September 15, 1993**

8:00 p.m.

Date: 93/09/15

head: **Committee of Supply**

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we should call the Committee of Supply to order.

head: **Main Estimates 1993-94**

### Transportation and Utilities

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Tonight we're going to be dealing with Transportation and Utilities. Would the Minister of Transportation and Utilities like to open with a few words?

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is my first opportunity to thank the voters of Whitecourt-St. Anne for giving me the opportunity to serve them again. I want to thank them from the bottom of my heart that they would see fit to send me here as their MLA, and of course I want to thank the Premier for giving me the opportunity to serve on Executive Council.

MR. N. TAYLOR: We can watch you easier when you're here.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'll tell you that if the Member for Redwater keeps on interrupting – he's lost some pavement, and I can assure you that before I'm done, he might lose everything.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta Transportation and Utilities is responsible for a number of projects, and I'd like to go through them quickly so I can give the members enough time to ask questions. We have some 13,643 kilometres of primary highways, and 92 percent of those are paved. We have some 15,120 kilometres of secondary highways; 60 percent of those are paved. In this year we have tendered some 76 projects under primary highways and some 25 projects under secondary roads and some 18 other projects in the province of Alberta.

We have under our jurisdiction 143 airports in the province of Alberta. Fifty-two of the airports are operated by Alberta Transportation and Utilities. Sixty-six airports are operated by communities. They're called community airports. Five are federal airports operated by Transport Canada. We have two regional airports operated by the original airport authorities – that is, Edmonton and Calgary – and we have 18 airports that are staffed and maintained by Alberta Transportation and Utilities.

We also have within our portfolio the rural gas co-ops. We have some 70 rural gas co-ops throughout the province. This year during the construction season we expect some 4,000 services to be installed, and that's sort of ongoing on a yearly basis.

We're also responsible for the rural electrification associations of the province. We have some 148 REAs in the province of Alberta. Eighty-one of them are serviced by TransAlta, and 61 are serviced by Alberta Power.

We have a program under Alberta municipal water and wastewater partnership. In this '93-94 budget we have some 157 grant applications, and the budget for that is approximately \$31 million.

We have in our portfolio the Alberta cities transportation partnership. This covers the 17 cities in the province of Alberta where they receive a grant of \$25 per capita, and that budget is approximately \$43 million. I want to just cite two of the major cities on \$25 per capita. The city of Edmonton grant for this year, 1993-94, was some \$15 million-plus. We also provided to the city

of Edmonton \$885,000 to assist them in purchasing 59 low-floor buses. Our total grants from 1990 to 1994 to the city of Edmonton under that program are approximately \$212 million. The city of Calgary grant for '93-94 is approximately \$18 million. We have provided to the city of Calgary some \$750,000 for 51 new low-floor buses, and the grants for 1990 to '94 for the city of Calgary are approximately \$216 million.

We have within our jurisdiction the Alberta Resources Railway. I might say to the members of this Assembly that this is one of our first few years that we've had an increase in tonnage and an increase in revenue. The increase in tonnage over last year from July '92 to July '93 is some 228,690 tonnes, with an increase in revenue of over \$450,000.

We have provided, Mr. Chairman, on Highway 16 and Highway 16X a new project called the emergency roadside call box system, which has been working very well. The Alberta Motor Association is the one that looks after the calls coming in from that call box system, and my understanding is that when the project ends at the end of December of '93, we will take a look at it to see if we can expand it across the province.

We have developed since I've become the minister an advisory committee throughout the province in just about every constituency to look at improving the trucking industry. This advisory committee consists of truckers, shippers, industry, and of course our motor transport personnel. That committee is looking at how we can improve trucking regulations throughout the province, keeping in mind – and I want to emphasize this – that safety is paramount. Safety is paramount.

I want to just spend a few minutes on our budget. Over the past 10 years our budget has been reduced by over 40 percent. It was at one time \$1.1 billion, and today we're going to approve, I certainly hope, a budget of \$645 million. In the same period of time, Mr. Chairman, we have reduced the manpower within transportation by over 1,000 pertinent positions. We will be right-sizing in government. We'll be right-sizing in Alberta Transportation and Utilities, and we will have the necessary personnel to do the job.

So what is our challenge? Our challenge is a balanced budget. Our challenge is to develop partnerships with local governments; that is, counties, MDs, IDs, villages, towns, cities. Our other challenge is that by working together, we can accomplish the kinds of things we want to do. We can do all this, Mr. Chairman, without compromising our infrastructure and the safety of our people.

Let me close, Mr. Chairman, in saying again: I'm honoured to have this position, and I want to thank the Premier for allowing me to take this position and to serve Albertans. I've enjoyed the meetings that I've had across the province with people be they in MDs, counties, IDs, villages, towns, cities. I've enjoyed traveling throughout the province. In the last two months I've traveled to all corners of the province, as far as Cold Lake in the northeast, Vermilion, Bragg Creek, Grande Prairie, Edson, Caroline, Westlock, and many, many other roads and highways that I've traveled over.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have traveled in my luxury car. As the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has said: the Liberals have a principle; they have a principle that they drive their own cars. I'd like to drive my own car, but I know by the mileage I put on, it would cost the people of Alberta more than using the car that I have. I've traveled over 13,000 kilometres in two months, and contrary to what the *Edmonton Journal* has said, there is no trailer hitch on my luxury car. There has never been a trailer hitch on any government car I've driven. So I'd like that on the record.

Mr. Chairman, members of the assembly, I have outlined to this Legislature some of the things we're involved in, and I know that by working together, we can make a better Alberta.

**8:10**

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The hon. Member for Fort McMurray.

**MR. GERMAIN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, by way of background I would like to advise tonight that we'll be trying to ask questions, at least from this side, in smaller bites so that I can follow the answers. I'd like to first of all indicate to the House that the minister was very cordial in advising me that I could feel free to contact him at any time on any matter involving Transportation and Utilities issues. I'm grateful for that invitation, and I want to point out in this opening comment that he has extended that invitation to me.

Mr. Minister, before we get into, though, the actual Transportation and Utilities budget, I wonder if I might ask with your permission just a few questions on the aspect of the transportation and utilities issues that overlap into the public works area that relate to transportation. I want to speak and ask about those items that are found on page 70 of the 1993 government estimates, sir. Now, on page 70 at the bottom there are some Transportation and Utilities elements that are found in that public works budget that outline various transportation depots that have been built or are scheduled to be built around the province. Can the minister tell me at what stage of the construction bidding or tendering process each of those are and whether any of those projects could be deferred on issues that relate to budgetary restraint?

**MR. TRYNCHY:** Mr. Chairman, I would hope that he would raise that question with Public Works, Supply and Services when they have their budget. That is not part of the budget that we're trying to get through the House this evening. That is budgetary funding that belongs to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and not Alberta Transportation and Utilities.

**MR. GERMAIN:** Yes, I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Do you have a point of order?

**MR. THURBER:** Mr. Chairman, not really a point of order. I would just like you to bring up these things that relate to public works when we get into the public works estimates if you would, please. We'll certainly have the answers for you.

**MR. GERMAIN:** I'm happy to be corrected on that. I had thought in my own peabrain mind that we could keep the transportation elements together, but I'm happy to return to that issue, and I'll rise again later and now give another member a chance.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

The hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House.

**MR. LUND:** Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I want to congratulate the minister on being reappointed minister of transportation after the last election. Certainly I believe he is doing a tremendous job. He indeed was out to the Rocky Mountain House constituency and did come out with me and look at some problems in the area. I really appreciated that and so did the municipalities that knew that he was there.

I want to make a few general comments, and then I will get into some specific questions on the elements in the budget. First of

all, I want to make a comment or two about the National Safety Code for trucks. I have felt for a year and a half or more that it was a mistake that we ever joined it, and I'm more convinced than ever that it was a mistake. I remember asking at the time when we were talking about going into this how it was going to affect our trucking industry in Alberta, the trucks that never leave Alberta: the oil and gas people, the gravel haulers, the log haulers, and all of those folks. I was assured, or at least I thought I was assured, that this was not going to be a problem for our trucks within Alberta. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. I continually get a lot of phone calls complaining about things that are happening within that industry and how truckers are being forced increasingly to spend unnecessary funds for various things.

Mr. Minister, I want you to be aware of a most recent thing that happened on September 1, at which time another regulation came out that is going to require that tri-axle trailers be extended another nine feet. Now, the reason given by the safety people is that this is supposed to be much safer, and there is a minimum length now that's going to be required for these trailers. This is causing major problems, particularly for those trucks that are hauling gravel in these tri-axle trailers. The problem is that when you move those vehicles off the major highways, their boxes are so long that they become very unstable, especially if there are any soft shoulders. There's a major problem out in the settled areas where you have power lines crossing the highways or roads they're working on. The boxes are so long that they will actually reach those wires. I've also been told that there is a problem where these kinds of vehicles are used on surfacing projects, because as they try to turn these trailers to get out of the way of the tractor, they're going over the edge of the road simply because of their length. Talking to a number of the people in Rocky that are using the current trailers, they are just astounded that we're insisting on going to this, so I really would like you to look into that.

The rural gas co-ops. I've had a number of concerns that we are interfering in being very specific on the way they tender their contracts, and I think this really is wrong. We are contributing less and less to their construction projects. In other words, their percentage is going up, and I think we are making a mistake when we interfere to any great extent in their tendering process. As a matter of fact, one rural gas co-op told me it's gotten so bad that they wish we'd get out of it completely. They believe they could do their construction themselves, pay for the whole thing, and do it cheaper than they're doing it with our interference. I wish you would look into that.

I'd like to know where we're at with the REAs, the new proposal where we would have a minimum charge of \$5,000 and then a graduated scale up. Now, I know the proposal is that we'd probably have four pools: the two major rural, the Alberta Power, and the TransAlta Utilities pool. But there's a problem with that that it's this large. Now, I would like you to look at two things. One, to break it down into regions or districts. We could do that based on the representation on the executive. They each have a regional or a district representative that sits on the provincial board of the REAs. We could break it down into that kind of area. Also, there's a real mistrust of the utility companies holding that pot of money. They would like to see us have that money and control it from there. So I would like to know where we're at in that discussion and if it's possible to look at breaking that down further than the two pools.

I also want to mention what's known locally as the Forestry Trunk Road, 940. That road is worn out. I recognize the great difficulty we've got in trying to balance our budget and build those kinds of roads, but that is a main road, and I think we're going to have to really start looking at it. The road is completely

worn out. Just a bit of maintenance is not going to do the trick. The longer we leave it, the greater the cost is going to be, because those curves really take off and the cost gets major.

**8:20**

I also want to talk a bit about the resource road program. With all these forestry developments now, we're running into a major problem in a lot of municipalities where the plant is in one jurisdiction, the timber is in another, and of course the road leading out of the one jurisdiction, the area that's growing the timber – it's the responsibility of that municipality to pay for the road, but they have no taxes out of that.

Now, I have a situation, a very classic one – and I know there are many more throughout the province – just to give you an example of what I'm talking about. There is a road known locally as the Sunchild Road, and it leads from Highway 11 to the Brazeau Dam. That's a main transportation route to transport timber out of that area up to Drayton Valley. Back when I was reeve of the municipality, in the early '80s, we attempted to have that road redesignated as a secondary, but of course that didn't happen. And really I'm not asking for that. I don't think it needs to be redesignated, and I think we would lead into some problems if we did. But it certainly should be qualifying for a resource road. I know that you're looking at going to one-third, one-third, one-third – one-third the municipality, one-third the province, and one-third the industry – but that really isn't fair in a situation like this. There is absolutely no tax base coming out to the MD of Clearwater in this case. For them to put a third into the construction of that road is unfair.

I know we have to keep our budget down, so what I'm really asking is if there would be a possibility of transferring some dollars from the secondary road program into the resource road program to address these very issues.

I just want to raise another area, and I'm not sure how we're going to deal with it. Around so many of our lakes we are running into a major problem with sewage disposal, very expensive to do anything with. We have so many summer villages and subdivisions around these lakes that it's going to be a massive problem the longer we leave it. Of course, what's happened: so many of these subdivisions were created, and the lots are very small; they've installed septic tanks in fields in these little areas. That was fine as long as they were using these areas for summer residences only, as a cottage sort of thing, but now they've become permanent residences, year-round residences, and these systems just can't take it. We're starting to see a lot of problems.

In the Rocky constituency I've got a major problem around Sylvan Lake and one developing around Gull Lake. I think it will be too bad if we allow these lakes to get contaminated to the point where they're not enjoyable for the folks that go there.

If I could turn to the elements, I have a number of questions in there. First, in the Government Estimates: Supplementary Information, Element Details, page 73, going to vote 2.1.1, Executive Management. Under that, in capital investment, I see an increase of about \$2,500. It's not much, but I'd like to know what that's all about.

Then Property Services. Once again, a capital expenditure has increased there by about \$15,000. I'd like to know what that's about.

Moving on down to 2.2.4, Improvement District Road System, I see \$17,231,000 currently, so it's a drop of about \$2 million from '92-93. I guess I should mention 2.3.2 as well, because that deals with the improvement district road system. With the incorporations of the improvement districts, how are you handling the money that was spent on roads that are in the green area or in

the forest reserves? Those numbers are so close that it looks to me like we're spending a similar amount in the IDs that we were a year ago, yet they have incorporated. I know a large portion of that is relative to the roads in the green area and the forest reserve, so I'd like to know how we're handling that. It appears it's not being picked up totally by the municipality.

Turning over to 2.4.3, Grants to Special Areas, I see that there aren't any. I'm wondering what has changed there that we no longer are providing any money. What's the change? I'm not complaining about it. I just want to know what the change is.

In construction and improvement, down in 2.6.1 there's a major drop in operating for Rest Areas. What is this, and how did we drop that high a percentage? It's not a lot of dollars – it goes from \$115,000 down to \$16,000 – but I'd like to know what that's all about.

Moving on down to Airports, I see that we have \$639,500 for capital investment, and I'd like to know where that's at and what it is.

Moving over to Rural Electrification Grants, element 4.1.3., we have a major drop from \$2,112,000 to \$700,000. I'm wondering what has happened there, what policy change, that we have such a major reduction.

Municipal Water and Wastewater Grants, 4.3.2: a fairly hefty increase in that one, and I would like an explanation. How did that come about? What created that increase?

With those questions, Mr. Chairman, I will leave someone else with the opportunity to ask the minister questions.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The hon. Member for Leduc.

**MR. KIRKLAND:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When looking at this, and initially when I viewed the transportation budget, I would confess I am not particularly astute when it comes to numbers and reading balance sheets. But overall, my initial and preliminary view of it is that it looks good. It looks like we're moving along a path of reduction here, and I think that's desirable. I certainly think that when we look at privatization with some of the road projects, as I read in one of the documents, that certainly speaks well for the department and suggests they are also moving along in that direction as well. Throughout the course of the night I hope I can be provided some education and assistance here as to how we arrive at prioritization of road-paving projects and designation of roads, be they resource roads or secondary roads or private roads. I think that would help me understand the budget a little more so than what is normally here.

In attempting to get a handle on the situation, I have gone back through the records for approximately five years just so I have a little bit of a feel for where we're going and where we've been. After having complimented the hon. minister on what I see is a move toward a sound reduction of costs for the citizens of Alberta, the only area that jumped out at me was one that actually is right within the management aspect itself. When I look back in '85 and '86, it seems to contradict where the rest of it goes, but when I look back there I see that today we have six assistant deputy ministers where we had four back in '85-86. We seem to have an increase in executive directors and managers and assistant managers. Let me see; there are, as far as I can determine, about 100 as opposed to about 64 in '80 and about 64 in 1986 and '87. We seem to have a relative cost increase there as well.

**8:30**

Rather than load the minister up with about 15 questions and so we can proceed with some clarity of answer, perhaps at this point I would ask the hon. Minister of Transportation and Utilities if he

could give an explanation as to why we seem to be headed up with an increase in management numbers and management costs, which seems to contradict where we're going with the actual operational and capital expenditures.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like first of all to congratulate the minister and thank him for his trip to Medicine Hat. He came down and met with some of our constituents from the county and the MD. I must say that they were very impressed, and it was a very successful trip, Mr. Minister. I thank you for coming.

The other thing I thank you for is allowing some of the campers in my area to pull boats behind their fifth wheels. [interjection] It's quite a serious issue in our area, Dr. Oberg. In fact, people do appreciate that, because we have a lot of people pulling those fifth wheels and boats behind them.

To be a little more serious here, colleagues, a couple of questions for the minister or comments I might have. I'm looking at the budget here and wondering about Provincial Air Facilities. We've got almost \$3 million, and I'm wondering if we're spending that on operation of airports or maintenance of airports or exactly what it is. If we are spending that on operation of airports, I'm wondering how we can recover some of those costs from the user. I know that in many places they've privatized the airports, and they've got airport fees and so on. I'm wondering if we can go that way and recoup some of this cost or turn it completely over to private business.

The other area I might comment on is toll roads. We've got a number of roads – for instance, the road between Medicine Hat and Calgary, Calgary and Edmonton – that are excellent roads, much like the Coquihalla in British Columbia. If we want to move to a user-pay philosophy, it seems to me that the toll road is the ultimate in the user-pay philosophy. I'm wondering if you have considered that at all. It's important that we do this, because I think it would certainly be worth while for the people, especially truckers that put the wear and tear on our highways with their heavy loads, to be able to contribute something to the usage of our highways.

A couple of other comments I might make. I have a large constituency. It's got about 10,000 square miles, and we've got a lot of gravel roads in our area that are relatively well maintained. The problem comes with some of what I believe we call primary highways. A primary highway, as I understand it, is a highway with a single or two-digit number on it. We've got Highway 61, for instance, in my constituency, which is not a very good highway. It's got no shoulders, and it's winding and rolling down. It's a school bus route. In terms of the school bus route, we actually had an accident on there last year where a school bus rolled over and some young people were hurt. We've got a large budget here, I notice, for Construction and Improvement of Highway Systems, some \$322 million. Because our constituency is so large and not well populated, it's necessary that we perhaps get in my constituency funds a little disproportionate to my population. Mr. Minister, when we're having accidents on our highways, it's important that we have some of these funds available to us.

We have a number of roads like this. Highway 61 is just one example. Another example I might give you is the Red Coat Trail, which is being paved and was certainly not a priority to many of my constituents. We had a small pressure group called the Red Coat Trail society that wanted that highway paved. It

appears to me that the ministry caved in. I'm not sure if that's the appropriate wording. [interjection] It's not? The ministry gave in to this pressure group and . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. L. TAYLOR: . . . agreed – thank you – with this pressure group and paved it. It certainly was not a high priority in our constituency at all. For instance, I believe there are nine kilometres still in the MD of Cypress that aren't paved, and it's certainly not a priority with the MD of Cypress, according to my understanding. I would certainly urge the minister, before he commits any funds to paving this, to consult with the MD of Cypress. I realize there is this group pressuring to have this highway paved. Mr. Dunford might be considered to be part of that pressure group. You can pave it in his constituency, but certainly don't pave it in my constituency without first consulting the MD and knowing exactly what their wishes are.

Other than that, Mr. Minister, if you could reply to some of my concerns in those areas, I would certainly appreciate it.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Redwater.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd also like to add my congratulations to those of the House to the minister. He's been around a long time. It seems to me that he might be the only one in the House that's older than I am. I'm not sure. Or is it just the mileage; I can't tell. Of course, besides congratulating him, I would thank him for the amount of paving he is doing in my constituency. He did suspend some of it, and then I think he would be excused for thinking there were 100,000 voters in my constituency rather than just 20,000, because of the racket they made. I'm very pleased to know that it's all back on track now and we can now go like the dickens.

I have a couple. One is a philosophic one. I don't know just how this ties in, Mr. Minister, but I have some farm truckers complaining that they get clearances from Transportation audit as far as using purple gas to haul farm products, hay to market or moving hay back and forth. Then the needle-nosed investigators of the minister that sits on your right – it turns out he's auditing expenses, and they come out and throw out what your auditors have said and reassess these farmers, arguing that any time they have purple gas in their truck when it's not being used between the farm and town, it should be taxed. Whereas I think the people in Transportation are using a right thing. I would think that you would take the young fellow out to the woodshed someday and tell him what they do in rural areas as far as trucking is concerned and explain to him that he doesn't need these rent-a-fuzz or whatever he uses from his department to go out there and terrorize local truckers and ask for re-evaluations on their tax bill, sometimes going back as far as three or four years.

MR. DINNING: What did you say, granddad?

MR. N. TAYLOR: Pardon? You're talking. These are truckers. You know, they drive the things with dual wheels. You see these bales of hay going down the road. Well, they're not made to feed Tories; they're made to feed cattle. That's an agricultural thing. You get marked gas, purple gas to you city slickers, in order to haul it around. What's happening is the department of transport has said that it's okay. The inspectors have been checking out the purple gas, and it's all right: you can move; it's okay in your truck. About three or four years later one of the henchmen,

probably worried about holding his job, or for all I know the minister may be paying him on a commission basis, suddenly arrives and wants to go through the farmer's records. They're reassessing the farmers. I would just ask the minister to take his junior on the right in hand and let him know some of the facts of life and that it's just not proper to go out there and tax somebody after the first department has let go.

Moving on quickly to the budget part, I'm a little bothered in one area. You have Development and Support of Utilities Services; that's in the first vote on page 274. You've increased from \$42 million to \$43 million.

8:40

AN HON. MEMBER: I asked that question.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Yes, I know. It's a good one, but you don't know the minister like I do. You may have got his attention by hitting him over the head; I am now going to talk to him.

The point is that I want to know what that \$1 million increase includes. The water system in the town of Radway has . . . He's already shaking his head. Well, Radway has voted and gone ahead in accord with a promise last spring, back before lightning hit the constituency and it went Liberal. They thought they were going to get enough water. Now you couldn't drown a rat; there's no water there at all. Speaking of rats, that's another question.

You are still putting more money into water utilities in the province in general. I can't understand why you would cut off a town from the water grant if it is ready to go, and it was ready to go last spring. Now, I'll admit it's getting a little late in the year. Maybe the minister could tell me whether he has plans to do it next year; in other words, I'm leaving you a hole to get out.

On page 275 you have the Purchase of Capital Assets: \$120,000. Well, that's a lot more than the car you drive, so could you explain possibly what that would be? I don't know what a capital investment purchase would be for.

Also I'm a little intrigued: "contracting of roadway and airport projects" and "develops and supports strategic planning" for airports. Is there any kind of interface between your department, Mr. Minister, and the Edmonton Municipal Airport, or is that strictly outside your ambit entirely? Oh, you're lucky. I was just hoping I could tag you with that one.

Moving on again - I'm trying to get through here. Has there been any update on the studies for a Calgary-Edmonton rail corridor. Remember that it was quite popular a number of years ago to get Calgarians to Edmonton in a hurry or Edmonton to Calgary. I was interested in it a number of years ago. I think I was the only Calgarian that spent 15 years trying to move to Edmonton, but I kept losing every election. Anyhow, I would be interested to know whether there's been any update of that study, or are we trying to keep ahead of the general trend and see where we're going?

Also, Mr. Minister, highway 651 - this has been expressed in my area - which you are paving as far as Lily Lake, completing it from Barrhead to Lily Lake: I was wondering if the minister is thinking at all or has looked at moving two miles south and going around Lily Lake to finish it up to Redwater. Then people could move from Redwater to Barrhead in a hurry. Now, I noticed most people will not think that's very important, but if you live in Redwater or Barrhead, it is very important. [interjection] Oh, I didn't notice the hon. member for Barrhead. I'm trying to . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: And Westlock. Never forget that: Westlock.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I'm trying to do some of your dirty work for you and get a highway going.

The other item: Provincial Air Facilities. This is in the supplementary information, element details, at page 74. I'm into that a bit. You're talking about spending almost exactly the same as you did last year, \$2.9 million, \$3 million. I'm just wondering: is that really necessary in a time of budget restraint? I'd be very interested in knowing why the minister felt he would go that way.

The other area is just another question. I know it's not part of the Alberta Liquor Control Board; the old privatization member from Vermilion may not get his paws on it. It's the Alberta Resources Railway. Well, that much steel and that much equipment, you know, the minister would sell tomorrow if he had it, and I was just wondering, now that the debt is paid down, whether you would not think of some of the enterprisers like - who's the man, the one with the big beard, who has the Stettler . . . We have free enterprisers now, Mr. Minister, that would be interested in running a railroad that this government has been dropping \$3 million to \$4 million a year on. Is the minister thinking at all about privatizing the Alberta Resources Railway?

The other thing, again back to Municipal Water and Wastewater Grants. That's page 75. That has jumped from \$22 million to \$30 million. I'm just kind of intrigued what that would be. What would cause that big a jump? I know it couldn't be the Radway water, because you shook your head on that.

The remote heating grants have been cut from \$1.3 million to \$350,000. That seems to be discrimination against those living out in the nether regions. That is a big drop. What happened there? Did you just walk away from the propane bill? Just what was the reason?

That's the first bale of hay. I'll have a little bit later on after he's munched on that for a while, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The ability of the people of Calgary-Varsity to address transportation is certainly not punitive in light of the upcoming completion of the John Laurie interchange that solved a major traffic congestion problem in the city and was well accepted by a number of constituencies, Calgary-Varsity being one, Calgary-Foothills, and Calgary-north.

The question I have is from one of my constituents, Mr. Minister. He has written me and asked me to inquire of you the department of transportation's position on the proposed 2 cents per litre road tax put forth by the Alberta roadbuilders' association. I would like your reply to that.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Bonnyville.

MR. VASSEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I too would like to congratulate you on your reappointment to the ministry.

After looking at the budget preparations, we find that the overall figures are going in the right direction. That certainly is along the direction that we'd also like to see, a reduction in expenditure.

I noticed in your opening remarks and presentation that you alluded to a few of the existing programs that are out there. I'd like to bring up three additional programs that are part of your department and, for the benefit of a lot of the people here on our side and probably the new members on the government side, maybe explain how those programs work. I know you've sent us to the library and back to our researchers sometimes, but I think that if we could get an explanation or a brief overview on programs for the benefit of those who are here for the first time -

like the street improvement program, that is very, very important to the small communities, programs such as the Alberta municipal water and wastewater partnership that came into effect in April '91, and also in the area of road construction and maintenance for the MDs and IDs. I would assume that it's probably the same thing in special areas. For example, in the IDs the construction of roads and the maintenance of roads is looked after by the department of transportation a hundred percent.

**8:50**

Now, our concern in the rural areas is that if there is any major decrease to the funding that goes for maintenance and building new roads, it creates an additional hardship at another tax level, being the property tax level, and all that we're doing is down-loading. So if there's a major decrease planned for the future, the municipalities and the local IDs would certainly like to know that.

Going back to the street assistance program, Mr. Minister, that was a five-year program put into place, and I believe we're either in the third or fourth year of the program. [interjection] First year in funding?

AN HON. MEMBER: One more left.

MR. VASSEUR: One more left. So we're in the fourth year of the program. My question would be: was that front loaded in expenditures, or is there a considerable amount of money left for the final year, being in excess of 20 percent if it was a five-year program, and would that increase expenditures in the next year's budget? There's some concern out there because of some people having drawn money from the program and asking the question: are we going to be able to get our total funding that was allocated to us four years ago when the program was announced?

I'd like to give you the opportunity to answer those questions right away, but I'd like, Mr. Chairman, to have the opportunity to speak again on rotation.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

#### **Chairman's Ruling Decorum**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call the hon. Member for Vegreville-Viking, I think if we just keep the noise down a little bit. Somebody said, "I thought you were deaf." I said that I am, but I can still hardly hear the hon. member. So just keep your voices down.

The hon. Member for Vegreville-Viking.

#### **Debate Continued**

MR. STELMACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the minister. In reviewing the document, I have a number of questions. Looking at the line to do with the Construction and Improvement of Highway Systems, I noticed that for the Secondary Highway System there's a reduction of over \$5 million from the year previous. The comment I'd like to make to the minister is that we're on the verge of introducing some new legislation, a new policy on transporting grain in this province, and no doubt there will be quite an increased use of our secondary highway system by now having to truck the grain rather than ship it by the railway system. I'd like to highlight that particular area, because I think we're going to have to seriously look at that and see if we're going to have to come up with some dollars to ensure that we're ready for the need.

Also, Financial Assistance for Rural Transportation, Engineering Assistance. I know that a lot of the towns and villages depend on the grants for engineering, and that has been completely canceled according to these documents. We're going to probably look at that and maybe advise all of the jurisdictions that there won't be any of that funding coming this year. I'm just wondering about those counties that have initiated projects and have done some preliminary engineering and now are in the midst of a project that may require some further work to be done.

Grants to Counties and Municipal Districts is down. The actual operating expenditure is down; so is the capital investment. Now, is the \$5 million that's removed from capital going to be added on to the Secondary Highway System? I'm not quite sure where that comes into play, what we would be paying for there in the counties. My understanding is that if they're receiving the grant to build roads, the \$27 million that we have in there - I'm not quite sure what the \$5 million is for.

Also, I'd like to leave with the minister the fact that Highway 36 has seen quite a widening of the road from Lethbridge north, and there's a real bad narrow stretch from Viking north. There are a lot of people taking that road to Andrew to see the duck. It's a dangerous stretch of road that may require widening.

We do have a problem in the county of Beaver. I mentioned that to you previously, Mr. Minister. That is one county that seems to be quite behind in sort of an equitable paving of their designated secondaries. They do have a problem with the high corridor road, secondary 834. That's the intersection right in the town of Tofield where all of the heavy equipment and vessels that have to be transported to the plants north have to come into town and make quite a tight corner, and the town was wondering what we could come up with there.

Mr. Minister, the village of Andrew, as you know, has run into some problems over the last three years. Whitford Lake has completely dried out, totally evaporated. They are having some serious problems finding water. They have done the preliminary testing to see if they can drill new wells. They were unable to find any groundwater, at least in amounts suitable, and they're now preparing to either pump the water from the North Saskatchewan River or tap into the Vegreville water corridor from the town of Mundare. I was just wondering if these documents reflect some help for them, because for a year and a half they've been hauling water to town. Other than that, that should keep you busy for a while.

Thank you.

#### **Chairman's Ruling Speaking Order**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't know what the procedure is here. We have a lot of people on the list here, and I just thought that we would, in fact, go for another half an hour and give the minister a chance to go through the list.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman. Just on that point. I think it's easier for the minister if he can answer what he has on his list now, because I know it must make an awful pile of questions. I have some follow-ups too. So it would be nice if he could go ahead and answer now; then we'd go back at it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then I'll ask Edmonton-Rutherford to give the remarks, and then we'll ask the minister because I've promised him already.

Edmonton-Rutherford, please.

### Debate Continued

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to add a few comments on Transportation and Utilities. When I go through the budget, the one thing that really, really sticks out, stands out fairly dramatically, is when we look at the amounts of dollars that are slated for municipalities for road improvements and so on. We do see a fairly significant decrease, but the greatest portion of that decrease is in rural constituencies. In other words, the urban portions of Alberta are being asked to pay a much, much heavier price than the rural ridings. I wonder if this is somehow linked to what I'd call political paving; in other words, roadway projects in so-called favourite constituencies. The question of new roadway projects, of course, arose prior to the election and during the election, and indication was given at that particular time that projects in the minister's own riding, for example, were going to be approved, yet the city of Edmonton was having some difficulty and trying to struggle with many of the projects they have under way.

MR. TRYNCHY: Explain yourself. Come on, outline what you're accusing me of.

9:00

MR. WICKMAN: I'm not. I'm just asking you a question, Mr. Minister. I'm not accusing you of anything. I'm asking: are these decisions made on a political basis, or are they done on a needs basis? That's the question I'm driving at, and I said that there is some speculation that there are political factors that are taken into consideration, particularly in the midst of an election, and it becomes somewhat questionable in some people's minds as to exactly how these decisions are formulated.

Mr. Chairman, getting onto the one area that I'm familiar with. Quite a number of people involved in the trucking industry – and a couple of points have already been raised that pertain to truckers. The truckers are a unique breed in the sense that they have a very difficult time organizing and collectively getting their views together and lobbying, trying to influence change, because they're scattered all throughout North America. Truckers that are based here in Alberta can be traveling in B.C., in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, into the States, and so on. So it is very, very difficult for them as a group to get together and say, "Look, there are certain actions we've got to start pressing government to undertake on our behalf." Yes, there is a truckers association out of Calgary; I'm aware of that particular one. Still, there is a distinct difficulty when it comes to truckers, individual truckers, the independent drivers and such having the ability to communicate.

In our caucus in the last term we tried to come up with a questionnaire that we could send out to the various truckers and try and get that input from the grass-root level. I'm wondering if the minister has developed any type of techniques to try and get down to the grass roots: what's on the minds of the truckers? For example, truckers have told me in various parts of Alberta, such as Hinton, Edson, and Whitecourt, the minister's own constituency, that logging trucks from British Columbia have an unfair advantage in that logging trucks from Alberta, when they go to British Columbia to work, have to have some type of six-month residency clause, yet those coming from B.C. are able to bid here immediately on projects in Alberta, thus taking Alberta drivers out of work, whereas the Alberta drivers don't have the same advantage with B.C. projects.

There's also the difficulty that has arisen on many bases where drivers are concerned about the training, the ability, whatever it may be, of the individuals that will stop them on the road and

give them a check, concerned as to whether they're fully qualified as mechanics to carry out the inspection and whether they have the training to be fully sure of what they are doing prior to shutting down that truck. My understanding is that they can shut that truck down if they feel that it hasn't met their criteria without first going to a fully qualified mechanic. That's something I took up with the former minister of transportation on a number of occasions. It's a problem that he was trying to resolve, and possibly it has been resolved.

Mr. Chairman, the cities, particularly Calgary and Edmonton, have faced some severe crunches, downloading in the last several years in terms of their projects. Funding that at one time I believe was as high as \$70 per capita has slowly been decreased to a point where it's somewhere now in the neighbourhood of 25 bucks per capita, which of course places that additional burden on the local taxpayer. A question I have in this particular area. At one time – and it's still there, but I'm not sure as to what the existing system is when it comes to weighing projects – there was sort of like a pot, let's call it, that dollars go back into from municipalities that have not used their per capita allowances, and then other municipalities are allowed to bid or to make proposals against that so-called surplus amount of money. I remember the city of Edmonton doing that on numerous occasions for special projects such as an overpass or whatever the case may be.

Reference was made by one of the private members on the proposal from the road builders where 2 cents per litre be designated specifically to roadway improvement to, I guess, assist the road building industry. I'm wondering if the minister does have a reaction to that, and if he does, as to whether he's looking at an additional tax of 2 cents a litre or looking at taking the existing tax and designating 2 cents out of that existing tax, rather than passing on some additional tax to the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, those are the only questions I'm going to ask now. I do have some other questions that I will ask later if the opportunity arises, but there are others that want to speak. In fairness to them, I want to give them the opportunity too.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Whitecourt-Ste. Anne.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll answer questions up to what I have here, and I'd like to start with Rocky Mountain House. He talked about the national safety regulations for trucks. Yes, that's a concern that I have too. That's the reason, members of the Legislature, that I have set up trucking review committees across the province. Hopefully you'll be part of that and get back to me with what we can do to improve the regulations for trucking in the province.

He talked about rural gas co-op tendering. Yes, we do have some restrictions and some guidelines in regards to tendering, and that's there because it's public funds. If the tendering was such that it did not involve government funding, public dollars, we wouldn't even be bothered with it, but there is something in regards to rural gas co-op tendering. The whole program of gas co-op funding will be under review. I hope to have a policy this fall.

REAs: a \$5,000 charge in the pooling. That was suggested by myself last spring or early January when I was at the convention, at their meeting. That's still not in place, and I have asked our department people to see if we can change the whole system to get it down to along the same lines as the rural gas co-op funding. I want the rural gas co-op funding to be the same as the REA. So we're looking at that because there is mistrust – yes, considerable

mistrust – and we'd like to get that clarified. Hopefully, before April 1 we would have the national safety regulations for trucks, with the MLAs' help, resolved, the rural gas co-ops resolved, and the REAs.

Road 940, the Forestry Trunk Road. I'll have to have a look at that and see where we're at. I'm sure the Member for Rocky Mountain House will be in to see me in regard to that.

The Sunchild Road, the timber haul. Yes, it is a concern that we should all have: that when you haul products from one area to another and there is no tax base from where they take the trees or whatever it is and they take it to another place, there should be some cost-sharing. I think that should be done between the two local governments, and if there's some assistance that I can provide, we will.

Sewer problems around lakes is not something that I can resolve except that if they have summer village councils' applications, we have funding for all villages, summer villages, towns, and cities in regards to sewer funding. I shouldn't say cities because we have eliminated them.

The ID road transfer, the transition. Yes, we will provide to all the IDs that move away from the government. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself announced on April 1 that every ID in the province of Alberta had the opportunity to move with road authority as of April 1, 1993, and could then go to their own people for a vote to move to their own local government. We will be providing transition funding for the next few years, and that is worked out one on one with those IDs.

The water and wastewater increase. Yes, to all members, there has been an increase. That's because we are falling behind, and I wanted to make sure that we can get caught up with this as quickly as possible because it's so important to rural Alberta that we get caught up. We were getting quite a ways behind.

#### 9:10

The Member for Leduc asked about prioritizing of road projects. Yes, there are a number of ways that we do that. We get priorities from the local MDs, the local counties, and in some cases if the MLA is on his or her toes, they might even provide that to myself. He goes on to say that we have more deputy ministers and personnel than we did in '85-86. I can't argue with that, except I know that since I took over on December 15, we have moved from six ADMs to four. We are rightsizing every way we can since I've taken over. So I'm not going to spend much time in going back and plowing old ground in '85-86. The member can if he wants to, but I won't.

The Member for Medicine Hat talked about airport operations and maintenance. Yes, as a matter of fact, we're about 20 percent below the funds that we really need to keep the airports that we have under our jurisdiction in good condition. We have a number of airports where we have to extend the runways, where we have to put seal coats on to keep the rocks from flying up into the propellers of the airplanes. So that is something that we have to have there. As a matter of fact, the funding should be more.

Toll roads for truckers. I don't know how you could designate a toll road. I'd be interested in comments from anybody in this Assembly in regards to how we would charge just the truckers for toll roads. The truckers tell me that they pay a sufficient amount of dollars for fuel, repairs, tires, and what have you, that we take taxes off, that they shouldn't pay an extra road toll. I suppose if we had a road that was going from point A to point B, a new road in the future such as they have in B.C., we could put a toll on it and charge everyone that uses it. Right now to charge somebody from Lethbridge to Edmonton, to just charge the truckers – I don't think we could sell it, but I welcome the comments.

Highway 61 has no shoulders. Well, to the hon. member, we have a number of highways in the province of Alberta in that same condition. I would suggest that we have to do the best we can, talk to our local governments. Highway 61 is probably no different than Highway 63 leading to Fort McMurray, which is a heavily used road that needs widening. There are a number of roads that we could improve on if we had the dollars. As I've heard across the way, they support the reduction of dollars. In one breath you can't say that I'm a good guy because we're downsizing in dollars and then ask me to provide more dollars for widening of roads.

The Red Coat Trail. I've got about four question marks. Why was it done? I will now say to the MLA for the area that I look forward to his priorities in the future. This was something that was prioritized by the previous MLA, by previous groups. Nobody twisted my arm. It was a priority from the community, and I am surprised that it's not welcome. If we could stop it, maybe we should and take that pavement and put it someplace else, but I don't know if we can. [interjections] We'll talk about that later on.

To all MLAs: if you think you have a good feeling for priorities on roads, highways, or whatever in your constituencies, you should sit down and put pen to paper and let me have those priorities. I would only take them from each of you if, of course, you've had the blessing of counties, IDs, and local governments, because I would hate to see us do one thing when somebody else does another.

The Member for Redwater talked about farm truckers' permits for purple fuel. That's right, but once those truckers are not using that truck for farm use, they can't use purple fuel. I don't make those rules, but that's the thing. He tells me that we should have a woodshed promotion for the Treasurer here. I don't know what that means, but I will look at that.

A water program for Radway. I don't believe that's in this year's budget. It's been requested of me. We have to look at it, and as I've just said now, we've put in extra dollars. I believe you asked the same question, sir: why do we have so many dollars in our program for water and wastewater? That's because we're trying to catch up, and we'll look at it down the road. You say that we need more dollars for our water programs. We've just expanded the budget by millions of dollars. We have to do this in a sort of systematic way, and we will.

Calgary-Edmonton super railroad project. I have to be careful here. I believe I heard someplace that somebody in Germany would like to come in here as a private sector and put that in. If anybody knows about this, I'd welcome that. I'd like to see that person. We would encourage that industry to come in here.

Secondary highway 651, the route. There will be no movement on 651 other than what we've done now until everybody is satisfied that they're either going through Lily Lake or whatever way. So that project is on hold and will be on hold for a number of years unless somebody within that area agrees to it.

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

Stop airport funding. Well, that's great. The Member for Redwater says: stop it. We have the member over there saying we need more. The calls I'm getting, the letters I'm getting from all across the province say we need longer runways now, whether it's at Cold Lake or Rocky Mountain House or wherever. So I don't know.

Alberta Resources Railway. He suggests selling it. I would like to advise the House that I am working very, very diligently with CN to get rid of ARR as quickly as we can at a price that is

acceptable to Albertans. We should have some news on that in the next while.

He says that we should increase water grants. Again, that was a double comment by the hon. member. I wish we could, but within the budget we just have to wait and prioritize our programs on a year-by-year basis.

Remote heating grants had a sunset clause, were to expire on December 31. We've extended them for a little while. The reason they're gone is because the program was at an end. We're not out to get anybody in rural Alberta that uses propane. As a matter of fact, if there are cases where there is a hardship, we would look at that.

Calgary-Varsity asked about the John Laurie interchange. I'd like to advise the member that we have some \$2,680,910 in this year's budget for the interchange completion. So that's ongoing.

The 2 cents per litre road tax . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, talk to your microphone. Some of us who are getting elderly and hard of hearing can't hear you when you turn around.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you can't hear, would you sit right beside me here? I'll do that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I can hear him, and you're not missing anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay.

MR. TRYNCHY: The gentleman across the way from Redwater has just lost another 10 miles of pavement.

The 2 cents per litre road tax has been raised in a number of cases, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Calgary-Varsity, in Edmonton city council and in a number of places. It's great. You're saying to the minister to raise that tax. Everybody else says: don't raise taxes. I wonder what the public would say. I think and I really believe that if the motoring public knew the facts in regards to roads, highways, and what these dollars were going for, they would probably accept it. That's something that I will consider in the future.

Bonnyville asked about the street improvement program. Yes, we're on our last year. Those communities that applied on year 5 will get the per capita on their population. A lot of the communities waited just for that purpose. If they were growing, they wanted the final dollars. So that's there, and as far as I'm concerned, there will be no village or town that will not qualify for their full street improvement program over that period of time. If anybody here in this Assembly hears of a community that was shortchanged, please get back to me.

The municipal water program: the same that I've answered to all the others. We've increased the funding because we're trying to have a catch-up.

Roads in IDs are the responsibility of the IDs, not the government. The secondary roads we will construct. We will turn them back to the IDs. We will base-course them. We'll turn them back to the IDs. We'll put the final paving on. They belong to the IDs. They're not a provincial government responsibility. We're involved in doing that, but I want to caution the members in the House that all secondary highway programs from this year on will not be done unless the local governments will contribute. If we have a decrease of 20 percent in our budget for next year and this year, I will ask all local governments to contribute the 20 percent so we can get as many miles done next year as we did this year.

9:20

He also said he approves less road grants in our budget. Well, you can't have it both ways. If we have less dollars in our budget, we can't build more roads. So I hope maybe you can clarify that with me.

Vegreville-Viking wants to know why there's a reduction in secondary highway funding of \$5 million. It's a good question. That happened because we reduced all our program budgeting across the board: primary, secondary. The only place where we increased funding in our last year's budget was for water and wastewater programs across the province.

Engineering costs will be borne by local governments in the future. That's their cost-sharing portion. We will watch and see how much we download on them, because that should be their 20 percent.

Grants to municipal governments are down, and that's right. We will be seeing less funds to everybody. Highway 36 is narrow along with Highway 61. Yes, they're all narrow. I want to say again to all members in this Assembly that when you're talking to local governments – be they villages, towns, MDs, counties, IDs – you can expect a 20 percent reduction in transportation budgets in the next year. Now, that doesn't say it will be 20 percent across the board. It might be 30 percent in some programs, it might be 40 percent in some, and we might increase some, but you can expect that in the global budget we will have 20 percent less dollars in '95-96 than we have this year.

The county of Beaver concerns, the 834 connection. Yes, we've discussed that with the MLA, and I see the little connection that we need there should be done. In regards to the village of Andrew, lack of water, that's something that was raised by the member across the way in regards to Radway, and that's something we have to look at.

Edmonton-Rutherford. Now, this is interesting. He says that there's too much reduction in urban cities and it's political. Well, I want to say to that member across the way that that's a low blow. Unwarranted, untrue, and unbecoming a member that's been here for a number of years. I'm disappointed, sir. I am disappointed that he would make that remark.

He says that the highway projects in my area were questionable. Well, the hon. member has had a number of days to sit down with me and ask me what took place. I've said it to the media, but of course they don't understand, just about the same as the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford. When you have a highway network that needs overlay and after 18 to 20 years this highway is worn out, that project is done regardless of who the MLA is for that area. It's done automatically. The overlay is done to make sure we protect the infrastructure. That's what was done in my constituency, \$2.4 million. For the hon. member to say that it's questionable, to say it in this House is uncalled for, is less than unbecoming a member of this Assembly.

He says that truckers want a say. Well, we have committees now set up across the province, and if he has truckers that want a say, why hasn't he got them to my office?

AN HON. MEMBER: They're too busy making a living.

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if they can talk to him, they can pick up the phone and talk to me just as easily. So I don't buy that.

He tells me that the Liberal caucus is doing a survey of truckers. Well, I want that survey presented on my desk as quickly as possible, because the Liberal survey will help me and my colleagues in putting our survey together to help the truckers of this

province. Now, let's not just talk about it, Mr. Member; let's get some action.

MR. WICKMAN: I said that we'd love to do it, Peter, but we don't have . . .

MR. TRYNCHY: Hey, wait. You've had your say. [interjections] Mr. Chairman, would you allow the minister to continue? You know, I listened to him. I listened to him; I never interrupted. I never said a word. I kept writing. Now he wants to rebut what I'm saying.

To the rest of the members. We'll exclude the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford, because he wants to argue. Will you get that caucus of yours together, talk to the truckers, and get that survey back to me?

We have a concern with B.C. trucks versus Alberta trucks. Let me tell you what we've done. When an Alberta trucker wants to go to B.C., the first thing the Alberta trucker must do is pay the provincial sales tax of the province of B.C. Then B.C., socialist government that they are, says that you can't have trucking authority in the province unless you go through a whole bunch of rigamarole to get some authority.

Here's an example that I want to use. When a trucker from Alberta goes to Saskatchewan, he hits the border, then he must phone three truckers in Saskatchewan to get a price on moving that load from Lloydminster on to wherever. If nobody can match it or take it on, then he's allowed permission to continue. That's an Alberta trucker. We have talked to them, and I've given both provinces this – what can I call it? – ultimatum: if you treat our truckers in a manner that we don't feel is right, we will in turn treat your truckers the same way.

So what has happened is that Saskatchewan has now agreed to drop the three calls to truckers and allow our trucks to move, which we should. We have believed in and we've signed the interprovincial agreement for truckers, but we're the only one that accepts that.

[Mr. Trynchy's speaking time expired]

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, doesn't the minister have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, perhaps what you could do is take your seat for a little while, let some of the other people on this great long list that I have, and then you can catch up.

MR. TRYNCHY: Would you let me finish for two minutes? It's the last one I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have unanimous consent to let the minister continue?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?  
Mr. Minister, go ahead.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you kindly. I'd lose my train of thought on the B.C. and Saskatchewan truckers.

So I have now advised the minister in B.C. that we want to sit down quickly and resolve this thing. I know we can't change the sales tax that they have to pay, but we want to make sure that the trucker in B.C. that moves into Alberta, which they can – they can pick up a licence plate; they can go to work tomorrow,

because we are a free enterprise province. We're not the socialists that are across there, where they say you have to pay a sales tax before you enter, and you have to buy an authority. So that's the difference.

We have two more comments in regards to our motor transport officers' truck inspections. He says that they don't know what they're doing. Well, Mr. Chairman and members of this House, the motor transport officers that inspect trucks across the province are licensed mechanics. Nobody else will inspect them. If they are, they shouldn't be doing it, and I'm made aware that they're not. So anybody that does an inspection on a truck across the province is a licensed mechanic.

The Liberals say we should have a tax increase of 2 cents per litre, and I'm glad to hear that.

MR. WICKMAN: No, no, no, no, no.

MR. TRYNCHY: Gosh, he just said that.

MR. WICKMAN: I asked if you were going to do it.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm sorry. He says that I'm going to do it. Well, to the member across the way: I'm not going to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that answers all the questions that I had so far, and I'd be glad to take some more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

**9:30**

MR. LANGEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, Mr. Minister, would like to offer you my congratulations on your appointment. I appreciate that when I had some written correspondence with you, you were quick to respond. I appreciate the co-operation that I received.

This evening I have two or three questions that I would like to address. The first one is on the Conklin Road project. I would like to know where it's at at this time. I have the minutes here of the ID team. This road is a very important road for the people of Lac La Biche and also for the residents of Conklin. There is at this time only a winter road that's accessible between the two communities. In the summer they have to go around by Fort McMurray and back to Lac La Biche, which is an enormous amount of miles. It makes it very impractical. At the August 19 meeting of the ID the district engineer from Lac La Biche is quoted in the minutes as saying that he advised the council that the project is ready to proceed to contract. However, the project is on hold pending the departmental review of expenditures. I would like to know, Mr. Minister, how these reviews are coming and what the status of this road is at this time and how soon it might proceed to contract.

I have another question. Highway 881 farther south and north of St. Paul to Highway 55: that highway was designated years ago, and in 1989 it was moved three miles west to line up to the hamlet of Mallaig. In May of this year there was a town hall meeting in Goodridge where a petition was presented to the then MLA of Bonnyville requesting that the highway be realigned in the previous location, which is known as the St. Vincent alignment. At that time the then MLA had said in public that a review of the highway would be done and that an answer would be forthcoming: if it was to remain in the Mallaig alignment or moved back to the St. Vincent alignment. If it's moved back, I'm also wondering what's going to happen with 882, which is north of Glendon, because if you relocate the highway, then there's not enough distance between the two highways, according to the rules,

I guess, and regulations of setting secondaries. So, I'd like to know the status of these two roads, Mr. Minister.

Also, in Lac La Biche there's a problem with water and sewer to the area of Lac La Biche west. Lac La Biche west is mainly an acreage area. It's not incorporated, and it's not designated as a hamlet. ID 18, I understand, has applied to have some provincial funding for that project, and there's a hang-up because that location is not a village or a hamlet. I would like to know what the rules are as far as obtaining cost sharing. The services, Mr. Minister, would be supplied by the town of Lac La Biche to Lac La Biche west, and they'd like to enter into a cost sharing with the province to look after the water and sewer for that area.

These are three of my concerns this evening, and I would appreciate receiving your comments on these.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Calgary-Montrose.

MR. PHAM: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate the minister and his staff for a job well done. Looking at the budget for 1992-93 and 1993-94, I am quite impressed. The Department of Transportation and Utilities managed to cut \$52 million from the 1993-94 budget and reduce 300 full-time positions. A cut of this magnitude will have some impacts on the service delivered by his department. I'm hoping that the minister can give us some more details about these impacts.

Also, on page 283 I see that the budget for the municipal services development and support program is increased by \$9 million. It is a big increase in this time of fiscal restraint. I would like to hear from the minister as to why this program costs us more in 1993-1994.

Also, the Alberta government is now reviewing all of the programs and services that we deliver to Albertans and trying to find better ways to deliver these services more effectively and efficiently. Privatization, I think, is the way to go. I encourage the minister to take a hard look at all the things his department does to see if any service, any programs can be privatized.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert.

MRS. SOETAERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad for this opportunity to speak directly to the minister of transport.

I just have a few questions concerning my constituency, and these are priorities that have been expressed to me by the reeve in Sturgeon, Mr. Schoenberger, who says he's a good friend. So that's nice. Primary Highway 37 was one of the priorities this year. I just wanted to know the status of that. Highway 794: I know we were requesting that it be changed to primary because it's so busy plus it leads to Barrhead-Westlock, so I'm sure it's well traveled.

I had a concern from a few constituencies about the drainage system in the new overpass between 16X and 794. I referred it to the reeve of Parkland, and I'm sure he will be getting in touch with you. Maybe you're aware of that. Those were issues I put pen to paper and sent to your office, so I know I'll be getting that reply soon.

One other thing I didn't put down on paper. The Villeneuve community has no water system to speak of except their own – what do you call them? Some have wells, and some have their own tanks. That, I hope, will be somewhere in the future: a plan for Villeneuve. It's very lacking in a good water supply.

That's all at this late hour. I did notice that the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat didn't want some of his pavement. Feel free to put over here whatever he doesn't want.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now call on Lesser Slave Lake, then St. Albert.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the minister on his reappointment to Transportation and Utilities. I'm really pleased to know that a member from a northern constituency has been appointed to this very important ministry, since roads are so important, especially in rural Alberta and, more specifically, northern Alberta. As the minister realizes, I have hundreds of kilometres of roads, both primary and secondary, which require building, upgrading, and paving. I've received some petitions from northern communities such as Garden River regarding their Highway 58, which they would like to see developed so that they can get in and out of the community. I think the people from Fox Lake and John D'Or would really appreciate seeing the relatives which they have been unable to drive to in recent months because, due to the rain, the road has been in such terrible shape. The question I would like to ask, and I have a number of questions for the minister, is: how can we advance Highway 58 so that it can be built so that people can get in and out of the communities?

The other primary highway is Highway 88. It seems that I've acquired a number of miles of Highway 88, which I didn't realize that I would have. However, that highway, a primary highway, does not even meet some of the secondary standards that we have, and I'd like to know how we can get that so that it becomes a road we can be very proud of as a primary highway.

The other is the secondary roads. As in my primary highways, I certainly have many kilometres of secondary roads which are requiring paving. The minister has been very generous in his allocation of paving, and I'd like to thank him for that. I know the communities where the people don't have any paved roads are very thankful for getting the paving that we've received. However, we still have a lot of paving that needs to be done, and I'm really extremely interested in ensuring that these roads get paved so that these constituents can also have roads to travel on where they don't have to worry about ruining their vehicles.

9:40

I've had the misfortune of going through three Ford vans – I'm now on my fourth van – a Chrysler vehicle, and a Ford truck since I began to run in 1989. Unfortunately I rolled the first van. It happened to be on a secondary highway which was in such bad shape that the van rolled off the highway into the ditch. I know that some of my constituents now feel even today that there is still some upgrading that needs to be done and possibly paving so that the road can be in better condition so that people like myself and others will not have to worry about such problems as we've experienced. I know what it feels like. My question to the minister of course is: how quickly can we get these on a priority list and whether or not there is any way that we can get these roads paved. Anybody who doesn't want any of their paving money: it can certainly be put into my road so that we can get these roads paved as quickly as possible.

Those aren't the only roads. The other roads that I'm quite concerned about are secondary road 750, secondary road 686 east and west. Relative to that is the question: if the ID should assume road authority and the decisions are made relative to which roads get paved, how can we ensure, especially in communities or

in constituencies like mine, where these roads may lead to Metis settlements, where they may lead to reserves, that these roads will continue to be considered a priority if the road authority is taken over? How can we ensure that these things are going to be put on the list so that the people are not forgotten in anything to do with fiscal restraint, especially when we're dealing with IDs and the nature of the IDs of looking at what is fiscally responsible?

Settlement roads. I have three settlements in my constituency. This issue of roads is still a major issue which has not been resolved. I would really like to see this nagging issue dealt with somehow so that we can come to some resolution. The three settlements that I have are still working very hard to see how they can work with the Transportation and Utilities department to get this road issue off the list as quickly as possible. I know the minister will probably work towards it in a most expeditious manner, but I'd like to encourage him to continue to work as hard as he has been. How can this be taken off the list?

Bridges: a great problem. Regarding logging trucks, we seem to have a problem where we don't have enough funds to be able to deal with bridges or build bridges, and I'd like to know how we can ensure that these bridges meet the safety for all vehicles passing on them and how we can sort of look into the future at making sure that these bridges are built without having to close the bridges to the logging trucks that have to go on these bridges. Presently we have load restrictions on them, and I'd like to see how we can deal with that in a better way and a more proactive manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, I wonder if we could bring the conversation level down to an inaudible level, at least inaudible to us, and let the member speak and the minister hear. Thank you. That's wonderful.

MS CALAHASEN: I don't think the minister had any trouble listening.

However, regarding water and wastewater, I really believe that that was an exciting initiative, and I'd like to encourage the minister to continue to do that. However, there's a small problem regarding small communities that can't seem to get any funds from anywhere regarding extension of water. I just wondered whether or not the minister would look at such things as the gas utility and distribution system, whether or not that can be included in something like that. There are some small communities that cannot afford to get the water distribution. There is nowhere they can get the money whether it's on a cost-sharing program or otherwise. I wonder if we can look at that idea and advance that idea to some degree. At one point I think the NSF fund was excellent to be able to do that, but now there's no NSF fund and I don't quite know how else it can be done. Gasification: I know that I've asked the minister how reserves can be involved in this. I don't know whether or not it's possible, but maybe if we can get into a cost-share program with the feds, this may be a way for us to be able to ensure that all Albertans can get gasification or water distribution in any way.

I think I'll leave those as my questions, Mr. Minister. I'd like to thank you for everything that you've done, but I would like to ensure that maybe whatever anybody doesn't want for paving, you certainly can send my way.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: St. Albert.

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to thank the minister. They've made great strides in the end-

product specs, from what I understand. Where the efficiency has been improved, contractors now can use pits and materials of their own choosing, and it ends up in a better product and a better road.

The one concern I do have is on the day labour. In the northern pulp mills people are hired by the hour instead of having these contracts tendered out to the lowest bidder. There's also the extra cost of supervision added to the day labour costs.

Moving on to a question on the 56 community airports, I believe they were built by the provincial government and down-loaded to the municipalities. Could the minister tell us the usage of these airports, and, secondly, if a municipality cannot afford the maintaining of the airport, will the province take it back?

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, would you like to answer the questions now?

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll start with the last speaker and go backwards. Yes, the end-product specs for highway construction is something we'll be moving to entirely in the near future. We have just a few where we don't have that route, but that has been proven to be successful, and we'll be moving in that direction.

The Member for St. Albert said that we should reduce day labour or we should increase day labour?

MR. BRACKO: Sir, it was day labour.

MR. TRYNCHY: We will be moving as much as possible to contracts, and we'll be moving as quickly as possible and as often as possible to privatize everything we can. At the present time we have our highway painting privatized. We have our grass cutting privatized. We have the guardrails privatized. We have the pulls privatized, the posts. The only thing left within transportation that isn't privatized is our snowplowing, and I don't know if we can go that route. We will not go to day labour where we can get contracts to do it and let the private sector get involved.

In regards to municipal airports, we constructed municipal airports at the request of municipalities, and we have no intentions - I want to make that clear. Any municipal airport that the municipality will not operate, we will not take back. I have no intentions of taking back an airport that a local municipality asked for, received from the government as a gift, and now asks us to take back. I can't conceive myself to approve of that.

The Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul wants to know where the Conklin Road is and when - and that's a good question - with the reduction of funding. Now, I might mention to the member that I think when he campaigned in this recent election along with the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford, they said they would reduce capital expenditures by \$800 million. So now I don't know why they're asking for capital expenditures on roads when they would have wiped that out completely. I hope they tread softly, because it's a ways down the road on all those projects.

Secondary 881 to 55 and Goodridge, I know all about it. It was moved some time ago three miles west. Now it's moved back. There is just no way that we will have two secondary roads that close together, so 881 is moved back. There will be no 882. We will eliminate the road three miles away. We're not going to have two secondary roads three miles apart, so one has to go.

9:50

He asked about water for Lac La Biche west. I'd like to have more information on that. There is a water program across the

province. If there's some difficulty that they can't meet the criteria, I'm not aware of it. So I would hope that if we don't ask these questions in our estimates, that all members across the way would take the time to put pen to paper and say: here's my concern. Then come into my office. My door is open, and I will respond as quickly as I can. You know, let's not play games. There's an old saying that my mother told me years ago that I'm sure the Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert would know: you catch more flies with honey than you do with vinegar.

Calgary-Montrose talked about the reduced budget and said that it's good. Yes, I appreciate that, but, ladies and gentlemen, how much can we cut before we wreck the system? How much can we cut before industry closes down, our roads contracts are not there when we need them? How much can we cut until we lose the infrastructure that we have in place today? So be careful, all of you, when you say cut, cut, cut and then in the next breath ask for more. We haven't increased the budget, as I mentioned before, and that's because we're trying to catch up on some of the backlog of priority wastewater programs across the province. We must find better ways to serve Albertans, and we will. We have to. We will privatize everything we can that makes sense. We will not privatize things that'll cost us more.

The Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert wanted to know where Highway 37 is. I've traveled that road. Yes, there are some things we have to do there, and I'll be looking at that from Onoway down to Highway 2 and across.

The 794, change it to primary: no, we will not change that. I've traveled that road just recently. I took the time to travel that road, as I have a number of roads across the province. I traveled it to Westlock over to Barrhead and back to Mayerthorpe, so I know the road quite well. There is a stretch on 794 at the far end out of Westlock that is quite curvy and should be corrected, but the rest of it is good. I've traveled it in the afternoon when there was a lot of traffic on it, and I had no difficulty. So I don't think that is a high priority.

The drainage on 16X and 794 I don't know anything about, but I'm sure we'll check. Thank you for advising me.

If there is no water in Villeneuve – and I know the community; I used to work there – there is a program available to these villages. They'll have to go through the regular routes. I can't answer that question. I'm sure there are other questions in tonight's *Hansard* that I'll look at and get back to the members.

Lesser Slave Lake asked some questions in regards to 58. I looked at the map, and I know the area. The east-west road needs a grading project because they're using corduroy, which we used back in the '30s, and when it rains, you're overtop of your rubber boots in mud.

Eighty-eight needs upgrading. Yes, we know that. It's just a matter of budget. As I said, 60 percent of all secondary highways across the province are paved. We have another 40 percent that we need to upgrade and pave, and that'll have to take its time through the process. I apologize that she wrecked her unit, but I see she needs a driving test, and I would be glad to take her out.

She wants to know how she can get her roads on the list for future consideration. I would suggest to her, as I did to all the members, that you have an MLA priority sheet that you should develop and get to me.

The question in regards to 750 and 686 and what happens when the local government gets involved: I can't resolve that. When the people elect a local government in their own community, that's the people they should go to firstly because it's their roads. All we do is cost share with them in a partnership. So let the local government decide. Let the local people get on the phone

or whatever it is and talk to the local ID advisory members, or, in your case, if they form a new MD, it'll be an MD council.

Settlement roads. I'm not sure we're involved in them. They're not our jurisdiction unless they're secondary. We have to be careful there.

There's one thing that she raised which is very important. It's bridge repairs. We have some 59 bridges in the province of Alberta that are needing upgrading very, very quickly, and the reason for that is that when these bridges were constructed, they were constructed to normal traffic weights. What we've done in the winters is allow the logging industry to have a much higher load limit and weights on their trucks. So they are the reason for our bridges being in such poor repair and having to be upgraded. What we have to do is look at an extra fee to the forest industry so we can have them upgraded.

She asked if we could provide a new water grant program for small communities. I'd like to look at that and see what that means and how we can help them.

I'd like to get the estimates through. What I'd like to do now is ask the members to approve our estimates. Should you have any questions, both sides of the House, would you please get a letter to me. I know the Deputy Premier wants a road, but he'll have to wait. If we could move now, Mr. Chairman, to the estimates and get them approved, I'd appreciate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's very tempting to have it, but we have a great long list, hon. minister, of people who are seeking the same kinds of quality answers to their questions as you've given to the other hon. members. If we're going to proceed, then Grande Prairie-Wapiti is next.

MR. TRYNCHY: Could I interject just for a second? Now, I appreciate all the members wanting to ask questions, but my door is open. I'm sure they can come and see me. They can write a letter or come and see me in my office, and I'll probably give them better answers than I will tonight. I might even be more flexible if they come and visit me. So I'd ask if we could move on.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I still think, Mr. Chairman, in all deference, that members of his own caucus find it quite easy to visit him. We in the opposition only have a few questions, if he would take a couple of minutes. It's quite a trek out through the cold and the blizzard all the way from the annex over to your office. We just have a few questions. I had one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, if the minister is going to agree, then I'd like to stick to the list that was submitted to me earlier.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister has ended on a good tone tonight inviting all people to come to his office. He's reflecting the openness of this government in being willing to address questions and concerns. On that tone, I would move that the committee do rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader has moved that we report progress.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, we can't report progress as long as somebody's willing to ask a question. If the minister doesn't want to answer, he can leave the room, but as long as he's

sitting in the seat, he has to answer. Those are the rules. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Out of order. Please, hon. members, we have a motion on the floor put by the Deputy Government House Leader, and we must address that.

**Point of Order  
Motion to Adjourn**

MR. N. TAYLOR: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. You can't take a motion as long as there's somebody ready to ask some questions. I would submit that you adjourn for two minutes and talk to your legal counsel. You can't make up rules whenever you feel like it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This isn't a matter of personal feelings. I have consulted with the counsels that you so wisely suggested that I do, and they have informed me that it is not debatable, that we have a motion to adjourn. If we wish to continue the debate, then let us defeat the motion to adjourn.

MR. N. TAYLOR: A point of order. Nobody's suggesting that, Mr. Chairman. The point here is that you entertained a motion while there were still people waiting to be recognized. Why don't you run for an extra game and see if you can get away with that?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, please. The reference for this is Standing Order 18(2). It's very clear what the Standing Orders are. "All . . . motions, including adjournment motions, shall be decided without debate or amendment." Those are the Standing Orders of the House. The hon. gentleman from Redwater has been here since 1986. He knows them as well as anyone else.

**10:00**

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a sneaky way for a cabinet minister to run out and try to hide, but the fact of the matter is . . . [interjections] It's quite true, Mr. Chairman. You have to recognize that the motion was made, but the point is that you didn't have to accept the motion as long as we were ready . . . [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you please come to order. We have a motion.

MR. N. TAYLOR: It's a kangaroo court, complete with bag and ears.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you care to withdraw that, Member for Redwater?

MR. N. TAYLOR: I don't think I have to, Mr. Chairman. I'm saying that this is a kangaroo court.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, *Beauchesne* is very, very clear that there should be no reflections on rulings by the Speaker. The citation for that is *Beauchesne*, section 71.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition House Leader rose. Did you wish to address this point?

MR. MITCHELL: It's been addressed. No, it's fine.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, certainly you have all the rights of a Speaker, but I think you'll find – and I haven't found it yet – that in the rules of order the chairman or the Speaker

cannot close off debate while there's somebody ready to speak. Not in committee stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, each night we have ended when the Government House Leader has stood up and made the motion. On the nights that I have been chair, we have always had a great, long list. Our list is no less short tonight. I think there are about seven or eight members still on this list, including yourself. I was quite prepared to let debate go. The matter is in fact in the committee's hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion on the floor made by the Deputy Government House Leader. It is in order. It's not debatable. All we have to do is call a vote. If you and the people wish to continue to debate tonight, it's fine with me; I'm your servant. You can carry on debate until whenever the witching hour might be. But we do have a motion, and let us deal with the motion.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, for the record I'd just like to address this issue, and it's important that it's arisen now. The issue isn't that a motion of this nature is or is not debatable; of course it isn't. The fact is that you recognize the Whip in no particular order. While I understand that at some point the Whip has to be recognized to finish debate at a timely hour, it is the case that we have never been consulted on whether we would stop at 10 o'clock or 10:15 or 10:30. In fact, one night last week I did talk to the Whip about that and got the sense that, well, it was going to be 10 o'clock that night regardless of what we did. I'd just like to state for the record that we haven't been consulted and that in fact 10 o'clock is an arbitrary cutoff. In a sense you've been part of that process. I'm not being critical of that, because you do recognize that person. You could recognize the next person on your list just as readily, so it is an issue for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. First of all, the Whip has not given me any instructions tonight. I've received the motion from the Deputy Government House Leader. We do have a motion on the floor. If we want to defeat that and continue the debate, I am happy to chair that. I have not been consulted on the times and so on when they come. It's my understanding we have 25 days to debate this and we can continue later on.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

**Point of Order  
Imputing Motives**

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order under section 23. The hon. Member for Redwater imputed motives against me, saying I was sneaking out of the House. I'd like you to check the Blues tomorrow and have the Member for Redwater apologize.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I didn't impute. I said it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: We'll check the Blues, and that will be ruled on tomorrow.

**Debate Continued**

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions of the Department of

Transportation and Utilities, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: All in favour of that report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, as has been the custom in this Chamber for approximately the last 90 years, at this approximate hour in the evening I would move to adjourn and to reconvene tomorrow at 1:30 o'clock.

[At 10:09 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Thursday at 1:30 p.m.]

